# Undergraduate Program Review

This document provides guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews at The University of Tulsa. (This document applies only to academic units whose undergraduate degree programs that are not subject to comprehensive reviews by external, specialized accreditation agencies.) The University expects each academic unit to develop processes consistent with its specific mission, goals and needs; however, the following characteristics must be included in all program review plans:

- There are two types of internal program reviews: (1) annual program assessment report that culminate in written reports approved by academic unit faculty every May; and (2) 5-year comprehensive reviews conducted by a five-member TU faculty committee.

- The five-year review will examine all aspects of program effectiveness, e.g., curricula; professional development of faculty; student services, including teaching, advising, mentoring, research and creative work; and alignment of program planning and development with program mission and learning objectives.

- Student outcome data will be evaluated to identify implications for program improvement, e.g., program enrollment and student profile data ; retention and persistence rates; GPA averages; graduation rates; post-graduation results (full- or part-time employment, graduate studies); licensing/qualifying exam pass rates.

- Input from stakeholders will be invited, e.g., students, alumni, employers.

- Five-year reports will demonstrate commitment to continuous improvement by showcasing specific examples of changes driven by assessment activities, e.g., changes in  curricula, pedagogy, service learning or community engagement initiatives, student services.

**Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews**

**Statement of Purpose:**

Undergraduate program reviews provide mechanisms for our faculty and administration to evaluate the effectiveness, progress, and status of our academic units on a continuing basis, and through the feedback loop, the faculty may continue to improve the programs. The review is designed to:

- Review and evaluate the composition and effectiveness of the curriculum as a whole for the degree program(s), the academic unit's demonstrated attitudes toward customer service (*i.e.,* prioritizing student needs via class scheduling, advising, retention, job placement, etc.), and its openness to new pedagogy, service learning, technology and the University's mission.
- Identify needed improvement and address these needs through long-range strategic plans that will endure through short-term administrative changes or budget crises
- Provide criteria and data whereby observers are enabled to make responsible judgments concerning the strengths and weaknesses of programs within the context of the University and its mission statement
- Showcase innovation, community engagement, pedagogical changes and student enrichment undertaken by the academic unit.

**Scope:**

- The undergraduate program reviews will be conducted at the academic unit level.
- Review covers all undergraduate degree programs offered by the academic unit. If an academic unit offers multiple degrees, data will be reviewed for each degree separately where appropriate and in a combined manner where separate treatment is not feasible or where combined treatment is more practical.
- While the primary thrust of the review is internal, the Review Committee is invited to look outward via comparison to programs at other institutions.
- One report will be issued by the committee for the academic program.

**Review Schedule:**

- Each academic program is reviewed once every five years
- Interim reviews may be scheduled as needed, based on specific findings from regular reviews.
- Programs under specialized accrediting agencies should be reviewed only if their records do not meet expectations of the UPR system or if significant issues are raised by the specialized accrediting agency.
- The Office of Continuous Improvement will determine the schedule of the reviews within respective colleges.

**Review Committee Members:**

- Selected by Dean in consultation with Associate Dean
- Composed of
    - 2 from department under review
    - 2 from college (outside of department under review)
    - 1 from a different college
    - Associate Dean serves as convener of the committee; chairs meetings and maintains records, including minutes; and coordinates the drafting and finalization of the review report by delegating writing responsibilities to committee members in a mutually-agreeable manner

**Data to be Reviewed** (to be assembled by the two committee members from the department being reviewed):

- Previous program review report(s)
- Annual assessment reports since last review, including underlying assessment data
- Reports from specialized accrediting bodies (ABET, AACSB, etc.)
- Faculty vitae
- Institutional data (Institutional Research and other sources) specific to program:
    - Enrollment in degree program by semester/year
    - Retention and persistence rates (FR to SO, SO to JR, JR to SR)
    - Major GPA averages by semester/year
    - Transfers out data (transfer to another TU degree program, transfer to another institution, drop-out)
    - Graduation rates
    - Job placement and other post-graduation data (full-time employment, part-time employment, graduate school)
    - Courses taught by semester
        - Enrollment
        - Instructor
    - Licensing/Qualifying Exam pass rates
- List of program faculty teaching and providing service to the Tulsa Curriculum Program, list of courses taught by program faculty, and contributions to the Tulsa Curriculum continuous improvement planning.
- List of program faculty teaching and providing services to the Human Cultural and Gender Diversity educational program, list of courses taught by program faculty, and contributions to the Human Cultural and Gender Diversity continuous improvement planning.
- Course evaluations (questions 10-18 plus mean of questions 10-18)
    - Academic Unit should include all courses and sections for the review.
- List of 2 or 3 curricular changes (if any) adopted and implemented since last review
    - What was the change?
    - Why was the change made?
    - What assessment data supported the change?

- o Assessment and evaluation of changes
- Surveys/Interviews/Focus Groups (must do at least 1 time over 5 years)
  - o Current Students (explore possibilities for incorporating in existing SmartEvals, separate SmartEvals, or other communications with students)
  - o Alumni
  - o Employers
  - o Other University stakeholders (Center for Student Academic Support, Center for Global Education, Athletics, etc.)

**Report**

- A final written report will be presented to the Dean and Associate Dean of the college, the department chair of the program being reviewed, the Executive Director of University Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, and Program Review Committee.
- The report should follow the following outline at a minimum. Each program should include evidence and program criteria that is relevant to their program and add additional sections if circumstances warrant.
  - o Scope
    - Define the academic program covered by the review.
    - Define the five-year period covered by the review, stated in terms of academic years (*e.g.,* 2013-14 to 2017-2018).
    - After the initial review, identify the date and period covered by the most previous program review
  - o Review Committee
    - Identify the members of the review committee by name, faculty rank, department and college), including the associate dean serving as committee convener.
    - Identify the time frame during which the review was conducted.
  - o Departmental Mission Statement and Program Learning Objectives
  - o Data Reviewed
    - Refer to the section above (Data to be Reviewed) and provide a narrative discussion of the data reviewed and the findings gleaned from the data. It is not necessary to attach the actual data or artifacts reviewed, unless it is necessary to illustrate a point that the committee feels is important to make.
    - Provide a table of faculty (resident, adjunct and visiting) showing:
      - Faculty name
      - Faculty rank
      - Terminal degree
      - Courses taught
      - Average course evaluation
    - For major curricular changes identified by the academic unit (2 or 3 requested) detail:
      - The nature of the change

- Why the change was made
- What assessment data supported the change
- How the effectiveness of the change has been assessed and evaluated
  - Include examples of three to five graduates during the review period who illustrate typical job placements for graduates (name, year of graduation, employer, job title/duties) or typical graduate school placement.
- Conclusions Reached by Committee
  - Strengths and weaknesses of the academic program
  - Areas for program improvement (this may include a response by the academic unit if the academic unit desires to do so)

**Departments Not Covered by Specialized Outside Undergraduate Accreditation**

- Biology
- Geosciences
- Math
- Anthropology
- Art, Design and Art History
- Media Studies
- Economics
- English
- Film Studies

- Languages
- History
- Philosophy/Religion
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Theatre
- Exercise and Sports Science
- Communication Disorders

For questions contact: Monica Varner, Ph.D., Executive Director of University Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness