

MANUAL FOR PROGRAM REVIEW OF NON- ACCREDITED ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY CARBONDALE
FAQs and FORMS

Prepared by:
Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Programs
1265 Lincoln Drive, Mail Code: 4305
Carbondale, IL 62901
Email: apap@siu.edu
Tel: 618-453-7653
Last Updated April 2020

SIU Mission

SIU embraces a unique tradition of access and opportunity, inclusive excellence, innovation in research and creativity, and outstanding teaching focused on nurturing student success. As a nationally ranked public research university and regional economic catalyst, we create and exchange knowledge to shape future leaders, improve our communities and transform lives.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| OVERVIEW..... | 1 |
| Introduction | 1 |
| IBHE Guidelines for Program Review..... | 1 |
| ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW | 2 |
| Writing the Self-Study..... | 2 |
| Selection of Reviewers..... | 2 |
| Site Visit | 3 |
| Reviewers’ Report..... | 3 |
| Final Meeting with Provost..... | 4 |
| Final Steps | 4 |
| PROGRAM REVIEW EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES | 4 |
| External Reviewer Stipend..... | 4 |
| Travel and Lodging..... | 5 |
| Meals..... | 5 |
| APPENDIX..... | 6 |
| Sample Invitation Email from Program to External or Internal Reviewer | 7 |
| Sample Follow-up Email from Program to Reviewers | 8 |
| Sample Program Review Itinerary Template | 9 |
| Sample Reviewer Questions | 12 |
| Self-Study Template..... | 14 |
| SIUC Annual Assessment Report Template | 18 |
| SIUC Assessment Plan Template..... | 20 |
| Reviewers’ Report Template..... | 22 |
| Program Review Dean’s Report Addendum | 25 |
| IBHE Guidelines..... | 26 |

OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) require institutions to maintain a practice of regular program review including reporting on program level assessment and continuous improvement. In order to meet this requirement, programs at SIU undergo a program review every eight years. For accredited programs, this review is guided by accreditation standards, policy, and procedures. For non-accredited programs, this manual provides guidance on the process.

In general, the process of program review for non-accredited programs is aligned with the best practices used by accreditation bodies. There is a standardized process that meets the requirements for program review by IBHE, a self-study, peer review, and a final report of the findings with recommended actions. Programs should also address improvements in the effective delivery of the curriculum using technological innovation and comprehensive data systems. Because of this, accredited programs on campus find that elements of program review process are useful for their planning and documentation of assessment and continuous improvement required by the accrediting bodies.

The material presented in the manual are on the website for the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Programs (pvcaa.siu.edu). This manual was requested by programs to provide a comprehensive resource for the process.

The outcomes of each review are summarized in the Program Quality Assurance Report (PQAR) submitted annually to the Office of the President. A complete report for the system is submitted by the Office of the President to the Board of Trustees and Illinois Board of Higher Education (<http://siusystem.edu/academic-affairs/reports.shtml>). In addition, a summary of the reviews is presented to the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council annually.

Other reviews conducted at SIU include:

- Mandatory 3rd year review for new programs and centers seeking IBHE approval
- Priority Review/Low Producing Programs
- Center Reviews

For further information, please contact the Office of the Associate Provost of Academic Programs (APAP, apap@siu.edu).

IBHE GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

IBHE recognizes that academic program review is a critical and constructive process whose essential elements are documentation of learning outcomes and identification of actions for program improvement. They require program review on an eight year cycle. The report must provide:

- a) Description and assessment of any major changes in the program/disciplinary context (e.g. in the discipline or field; student demand; state need; institutional context for offering the degree)
- b) Major findings and recommendations, including evidence of student learning outcomes and identification of opportunities for program improvement

- c) Actions taken since the last review, including instructional resources and practices, and curricular changes
- d) Actions to be taken as a result of this review, including changes in instructional resources and practices, curriculum, and assessment of student learning

ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW

The APAP office posts the schedule for program review. Academic units should identify a faculty member or administrator as the key contact for the review. Workshops are offered that cover key elements of the review process, with a focus on preparing the self-study and scheduling the review. It is recommended that faculty and staff attend the workshops.

WRITING THE SELF-STUDY

The assessment plan and annual assessment reports provide information required in the self-study. If these are up-to-date, the time to prepare the self-study is reduced. Programs are advised to write the self-study in the spring term prior to the review. If a program offers degrees at the undergraduate, graduate and doctoral levels, the self-study can address all three programs provided that there is a clear distinction between the student learning outcomes and assessment within each degree. The major elements of the self-study are:

- Brief overview of program including student learning outcomes
- Points of pride
- Overview of Assessment and Continuous Improvement
- Curriculum and program changes since last program review
- Faculty
- Research, scholarship and creative activities
- Cost Study Data
- Enrollment, graduation and placement data
- Facilities
- Modalities of programs

SELECTION OF REVIEWERS

According to the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act (5ILCS 430), units must avoid nominating reviewers with potential bias or conflicts of interest with the program or its faculty. Current or former collaborators, colleagues, mentors, and students, faculty and staff of unit are inappropriate, as are past reviewers of the unit. If you have any questions about possible conflicts of interest, contact the APAP (apap@siu.edu).

- In the spring term prior to the year of the review, the academic unit should identify potential reviewers, including alternates, and informally ask if they are willing and available to serve. For some disciplines, it is acceptable to nominate a reviewer from industry. The on-site visit will occur in the fall or early spring of the next academic year.

- The names, contact information and affiliation of the reviewers are submitted to the dean for review and approval. The dean then sends the list of the nominations to the APAP Office.
- The APAP office compiles and submits the list of all the nominated reviewers to the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council for review and approval.
- The APAP Office will notify the department/school of the results.
- The academic unit then sends an official letter of invitation to the reviewers. For external reviewers, the letter will include information on travel reimbursement and honorarium. Once finalized, provide the names of the reviewers to the APAP office.
- In the event that a scheduled reviewer cancels, the program should use the alternate reviewer approved. If the list is exhausted, an alternate should be nominated by the program and approved by the dean and APAP Office.
- The final review team should have at least one external and one internal reviewer. Programs have the option to request an additional external and/or internal reviewer. Those requests should be sent to the APAP at apap@siu.edu for consideration.

SITE VISIT

- Determine the date in the spring prior to the academic year of the review.
- The academic unit is responsible for travel and hotel arrangements for the reviewers. Reviewers should not book their own arrangements.
- A sample itinerary is provided (pvcaa.siu.edu and in the appendix).
- The academic unit is responsible for setting the itinerary. Meetings should be scheduled with the provost, APAP, dean, faculty, students, staff and appropriate support units on campus. Programs are advised to schedule meetings well in advance to assure that key people are available.
- The APAP Office will host a video/phone conference with reviewers and key contacts for the program approximately two weeks prior to the site visit. This will provide an opportunity to go over the purpose of the review, the itinerary, and address any questions.
- The week prior to the review, the academic unit should distribute the itinerary and self-study to program faculty, provost, dean, and any key people on campus who will be meeting with the reviewers. If the self-study is too large to distribute through email, consider removing the appendix and distributing an abbreviated self-study with a note that the full self-study is available upon request.
- The final meeting with the reviewers will be with the APAP and the dean. During this meeting, the reviewers will provide preliminary findings.

REVIEWERS' REPORT

- An external reviewer will be identified as the lead writer for the final report. The report must follow the reviewer template (pvcaa.siu.edu and in the appendix). This allows us to comprehensively evaluate the review across different programs.
- The report should be submitted within a month of the review. Submit electronically to the APAP Office (apap@siu.edu). The report will be reviewed for completeness prior to forwarding the results to the college and program faculty.

- The academic unit should submit expenses paperwork to APAP Office immediately (within one week) following the site visit. Once the reviewer report is accepted in final form, the APAP Office will submit the expense report to reimburse the reviewer's travel expenses and authorize the honorarium.

FINAL MEETING WITH PROVOST

- The dean is required to submit a letter that summarizes the review for the provost. This summary should include the Dean's Report template as an addendum to the letter (pvcaa.siu.edu and in the appendix). The letter should also be submitted to the APAP Office.
- Upon receipt of the dean's response letter, the APAP Office will schedule a final meeting for the dean, provost, and APAP to discuss the program review. During this discussion, a decision on the outcome of the review will be finalized (program in good standing, program flagged for priority review, program enrollment suspended).

FINAL STEPS

- A report summarizing the reviews for the academic year are submitted to the SIU Office of Academic Affairs, Faculty Senate, and Graduate Council. A final Program Quality Assurance Report (PQAR) is compiled from this reports, similar reports from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, and reports on the status of accredited programs. The PQAR is submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
- APAP will send letters of appreciation to the reviewers.

PROGRAM REVIEW EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

The APAP office will provide up to \$1000 per external reviewer. These funds are earmarked for travel and lodging expenses of external reviews, the student luncheon, and reviewer team meals. Costs that exceed this amount are the responsibility of the academic unit.

Administrative units should utilize p-cards to secure travel and lodging reservations. Reviewers should not book their own travel or lodging.

EXTERNAL REVIEWER STIPEND

External reviewers will receive a stipend of \$250 after the submission and acceptance of the program review report. The department is responsible for preparing documentation necessary to release payment from SIU. All documentation should be submitted to the APAP Office for processing. The stipend should not be augmented. Internal (SIU) reviewers do not receive a stipend.

1. Download appropriate SIU forms for payment of vendors at <http://eforms.siu.edu/index.php>. The following forms are required.
 - a. Invoice Distribution form
 - b. Independent Contract Analysis Form
 - c. SIUC Independent Contract Analysis Form (for collection of social security number)
 - d. W9 Form

2. Obtain reviewers signatures prior to their departure, and submit the forms to the APAP office during or immediately following the site visit.

TRAVEL AND LODGING

Reimbursement is subject to State of Illinois guidelines.

- Economy seating on flights is required. The program's administrative unit should make all arrangements.
- The reviewers should not book their own travel. The only exception is if a rental car is necessary.
- Administrative units should use SIU p-cards when making reservations. The APAP office will provide budget purpose and account details for processing payments. P-card purchases should be submitted on the p-card request form with copies of receipts and/or supporting documentation
- Check with the Procurement Office or the APAP for the current preferred hotels. Reservations should be made at the SIU discounted state rate.

MEALS

Meal reimbursement is limited to the State of Illinois per diem rate.

- No alcohol is permitted. Detailed/itemized receipts are required. If itemized meal receipts are not available, a signed Expense Certification Form must be submitted.
- With the exception lunch with SIUC students and reviewer team meals, SIU faculty, staff, or affiliates should not join the reviewers for any meals.
- If desired, it is acceptable for the internal reviewer to pay for the review team meals and submit the receipts for reimbursement.

For questions regarding program review expenditures please call 453-7653 or visit the website for the APAP at pvcaa.siu.edu

APPENDIX

Sample Invitation Email to Reviewers

Sample Initial Thank You Email to Reviewers

Program Review Itinerary Template

Sample Questions for Administrators

Self-Study Template

Annual Assessment Report Template

Assessment Plan Template

Reviewers' Report Template

Dean's Report Template

IBHE Guidelines

SAMPLE INVITATION EMAIL FROM PROGRAM TO EXTERNAL OR INTERNAL REVIEWER

Date

Dear xxx,

Given your commitment to excellence in higher education, you have been nominated to serve as an [Internal or External] member of the Program Review Team for the [20XX-20XX] review of the [name of program]. I am writing to ask if you would be willing to serve. The review visit will entail a day and a half time on campus plus travel.

As required by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the university conducts reviews of its academic programs and centers at eight-year intervals. The purpose of these reviews is to assess systematically and objectively the strengths and weaknesses of each program and to use the information gained in the process to enhance program quality. During the [20XX-20XX] academic year, the [name of program] program will be reviewed.

If you agree to serve, you will participate as part of a review team consisting of yourself and [one other internal] faculty member who has been nominated by the program. [Internal or External] reviewers will also be on the team. If external add: Your expenses will be covered based on the expense guidelines set forth by the State of Illinois. In addition, you will receive a \$250 honorarium.

You will receive a copy of the self-study document a minimum of 30 days prior to the scheduled program review. Approximately two weeks before the review, there an on-line meeting will be scheduled in order for the team to meet with the program leadership, to answer questions, and to go over the itinerary. For additional information about program reviews please visit the website for the SIU Associate Provost for Academic Programs (pvcaa.siu.edu).

I hope you are able to accept our invitation. Please notify me of your acceptance no later than [date]. If you are not able to accept this assignment, please let me know at [email and/or phone number] so another reviewer may be selected without delay. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Chair/Director
Program name
College name

cc: Dean
APAP Office

SAMPLE FOLLOW-UP EMAIL FROM PROGRAM TO REVIEWERS

Date

Dear XXXXX,

On behalf of Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC) and the College of XXXXXX, I would like to thank you for reviewing the XXXXX program.

At this stage of the process, you have completed your on-site visit. The final step of the review is to complete and submit a report of your findings to apap@siu.edu within one month of the site visit. The required reviewer report template is attached

Again, I want to thank you for your willingness to help us improve our programs.

Sincerely,

Chair/Director

cc: APAP Office
Dean

SAMPLE PROGRAM REVIEW ITINERARY TEMPLATE

Program Name and Degree/s:

Dates of Program Review:

Contact Name and Phone Number:

Reviewers' Names and University Affiliation:

| Day One | Event | Location | Escort |
|----------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 8:00 | Initial Team Meeting: Breakfast | | Internal Reviewers |
| 9:00-9:30 | Reviewers meet with APAP and College Dean to review charge | Dean or APAP conference room | |
| 9:30 | | | |
| 10:00 | | | |
| 10:30 | | | |
| 11:00 | | | |
| 11:30 | | | |
| 12:00 | Lunch meeting with students (up to 6 students) Provide names | | |
| 1:00 | | | |
| 2:00 | | | |
| 3:00 | | | |
| 4:00 | | | |
| 5:00 | Return to hotel | | |
| 6:00 | Review Team Dinner | | |
| Day Two | | | |
| 9:00 | | | |
| 10:00 | | | |
| 11:00 | | | |
| 12:30 | Working lunch for reviewers to discuss preliminary findings | | |
| 1:30 | Exit meeting for review team with APAP and College Dean | Dean or APAP conference room | |
| 2:00 | Escort to hotel or airport | | |
| | FINAL REPORT DUE WITHIN ONE MONTH | | |

Additional Information:

Provide information on the hotel

Alternate Sample Schedule

| Day One | Event | Location | Escort |
|----------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 12:00 | Initial Team Meeting: Lunch | | Internal Reviewers |
| 1:00 | Reviewers meet with APAP and College Dean to review charge | Dean or APAP conference room | |
| 1:30 | | | |
| 2:00 | | | |
| 2:30 | | | |
| 3:00 | | | |
| 3:30 | | | |
| 4:00 | | | |
| 4:30 | | | |
| 5:00 | Return to hotel/Team Dinner | | |
| Day Two | | | |
| 8:30 | | | |
| 9:00 | | | |
| 9:30 | | | |
| 10:00 | | | |
| 10:30 | Return to hotel | | |
| 11:00 | Review Team Dinner | | |
| 11:30 | | | |
| 12:00 | Lunch meeting with students (up to 6 students) | | |
| 1:00 | | | |
| 1:30 | | | |
| 2:00 | | | |
| 2:30 | | | |
| 3:00 | Team meeting to discuss preliminary findings | | |
| 4:00 | Exit meeting for review team with APAP and College Dean | Dean or APAP conference room | |
| 4:30 | Escort to hotel or airport | | |
| | FINAL REPORT DUE WITHIN ONE MONTH | | |

Notes to Programs:

1. The program administrative unit is responsible for developing the itinerary. Meetings should be scheduled with:
 - Dean of College
 - Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (3-7648)
 - Associate Provost for Academic Programs (3-7653)Recommended:
 - Vice Chancellor for Research (3-4551)
 - Director, Extended Campus (3-4033)
 - Director, University Core Curriculum (6-5555)
 - Dean of the Library (3-2522)
 - Honors Program (3-2824)
2. Include time for reviewers to tour facilities
3. Program administrative units are responsible for coordinating and booking travel accommodations. Please visit the Accounting Services website for the reimbursement schedule and list of approved hotels in Carbondale <https://as.siu.edu/travel/index.php>
4. Program administrative units are required to provide escorts to and from meetings. Identify the escort on the itinerary/
5. There should be a room designated for the reviewers to use while on campus (e.g. conference room) with wi-fi. Programs are encouraged to have display material (e.g. Examples of student projects, senior design, creative activities; recruitment materials, textbooks, assessment data).
6. The honorarium for external reviewers is limited to \$250. Programs are not permitted to supplement this amount. Accreditation reviewers typically do not receive any honorarium.
7. With the exception of lunch with students and meals with the internal reviewer, no SIUC employee should be at meals with the reviewers. This parallels policies used for accreditation reviews.
8. The self-study should be submitted to:
 - All reviewers
 - Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - Dean of the College
 - Associate Provost for Academic Programs

SAMPLE REVIEWER QUESTIONS

Provost Meeting

- What is your background?
- Describe your university's organization and governance with respect to academic affairs.
- What are the major issues at SIUC over the last three years?
- What is your view of the role of the college (of program under review) and the program (under review) in meeting the mission of SIUC?
- What are the major challenges to the university and the program (under review)?
- How is strategic hiring of faculty determined?
- Describe the student support services that are offered by the university.
- How does the campus audit pre-requisites and degree completion?
- Describe the Provost's role in assuring assessment and continuous improvement in all academic programs

Vice Chancellor for Research Meeting

- What is your background?
- Describe the organization of the VCR office.
- What are the major challenges and opportunities for growth of the college?
- What are the major challenges and opportunities for growth of the program(s)?
- Describe major initiatives of the VCR office (note whether these include the program under review).
- Can you recommend new directions or initiatives at the state or national level that the program faculty should consider?

Dean Meeting

- What is your background?
- Describe your college organization and governance.
- What are the major challenges and opportunities for growth of the college?
- What are the major challenges and opportunities for growth of the program(s)?
- Describe the student support services that are offered by the college.
- Are there major scholarships offered to students? Do students in the college participate in the Honors Program?
- Does the college have an advisory board? How does it support academic programs?
- How is the college involved in assessment and continuous improvement of programs?
- Can you cite changes that have been done at the college level as a result of assessment? Have these changes been successful?

Director of Extended Campus Meeting

- What is your background?
- Describe the scope and organization of your unit.
- What are the major challenges and opportunities for growth for Extended Campus?

- How is the program (under review) served by Extended Campus (on-line course, on-line degrees, off-campus programs)?
- How do you assure that student learning off-campus is equivalent to on-campus? (if applicable)
- How do you assure that student learning on-line is equivalent to face-to-face? (if applicable)
- Does your office provide support for developing on-line or off-campus courses or programs?
- Describe the student support services that are offered to students that are enrolled on-line or off-campus (including advisement, handling student complaints).
- What is the process of assuring faculty qualification on off-campus sites? (if applicable)

Students

- What do you see as the major strengths and opportunities for your program?
- Are there hands-on opportunities for learning (lab, studios, internships, clinical, research)?
- Describe student support at the program, college, and university level
- Are you involved in co-curricular activities, and which ones?
- Have you been involved in any regional/state/national/inter-national competitions or professional conferences?
- In what ways does your program promote student learning and success?

SELF-STUDY TEMPLATE

Program

College

Self-Study Report

Date



SIU Mission

SIU embraces a unique tradition of access and opportunity, inclusive excellence, innovation in research and creativity, and outstanding teaching focused on nurturing student success. As a nationally ranked public research university and regional economic catalyst, we create and exchange knowledge to shape future leaders, improve our communities, and transform lives.

Overview

Provide a brief overview of the program (e.g. the year the program was started, the number of faculty and staff, delivery methods, other degrees offered in the department/school).

Provide an overview of how the student learning outcomes map to the program goals, which in turn map to the program and university mission.

Depending on the structure of your academic unit, the mission and the goals may be at the department or school level. The student learning outcomes should be at the program level.

- Mission:
- Goals:
- Student Learning Outcomes:

Points of Pride

In this section, provide rankings, awards, or notable scholarship and achievements of your faculty, program and students.

Overview of Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Provide an overview of the assessment and continuous improvement process that includes:

- Assessment tools used
- Timeline of assessment
- Constituencies involved (faculty, students, graduates, employers, and/or advisory boards)
- Mapping of program goals, student learning outcomes, and curriculum (this is a required component your program's required assessment plan)
- Assessment of on-line courses (if applicable)

Curriculum and Program Changes Since Last Program Review

Include a summary of the assessment and evaluation supporting these changes.

Faculty

Report changes in faculty since last review (tenure, promotion, resignation/retirement, new hires, etc.). Provide an overview of the impact of these changes.

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities

Report and analyze recent three years (at a minimum). Programs are encouraged to use Activity Insight. The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research provides support and access to this platform.

Cost Study Data

Report and analyze recent three years (at a minimum). Data:

Program Review Dashboard Metrics (http://iquest.siu.edu/program_review/)

Enrollment, Graduation, and Placement data

Report and analyze recent three years (at a minimum).

Enrollment and graduation data: Program Review Dashboard Metrics (http://iquest.siu.edu/program_review/)

Placement data is from various sources depending on the program (exit interview, LinkedIn, Career Services)

Surveys and Questionnaires

Report and analyze the results of Student Exit Surveys, Alumni surveys and/or Employer Surveys (including internships and co-op). How have the results been used for continuous improvement of the program?

Facilities

Briefly describe teaching labs, studios, and classrooms. Are there special features that are unique to the program? Are the facilities adequate? Does the program have a plan in place for acquiring new equipment, maintaining current facilities, or improving the student learning environment?

On Line Programs

This is an optional section for programs that have degree programs offered online.

Briefly describe the online program. Provide data on enrollment and graduation (this can be included in previous section if the data for on campus and on line is parsed). At a minimum, address the following questions:

- Does the online degree program have the same SLO as the on-campus program?
- Does the assessment process for the program include assessment of online programs?
- Is student advisement for on line students adequate?
- How are laboratory components offered (if applicable)?

Off Campus Programs

This is an optional section for programs that have degree programs offered off campus.

Briefly describe the off-campus program. Provide data on enrollment and graduation (this can be included in previous section if the data for on campus and on line is parsed). At a minimum, address the following questions:

- Does the off-campus degree program have the same SLO?
- Does the assessment process include the off-campus programs?
- Is there a process for determining faculty qualifications?
- Is student advisement adequate?
- Are the facilities adequate?

Summary

Describe the program's plan for the future growth and improvement in the next eight years (including but not limited to curricular, research, facilities, faculty recruitment and development, student recruitment and retention, diversity goals).

What opportunities exist to extend and build on the present strengths? What are the major obstacles?

Appendix

Faculty Curriculum Vitae (2-pages per faculty)

Strategic Plan for Unit

If online, provide a link instead of inserting here.

Best practice is to revise strategic plans every five to eight years.

Previous Program Reviewer Report and Recommendations

Current Assessment Plan

Assessment Reports (last three years)

Department or School Operating Paper

If online, provide link instead of inserting here.

Program Promotional Material (optional)

If online, provide link instead of inserting here.

SIUC ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

All programs are required to submit an Assessment Report annually. Accredited programs may substitute documentation that is aligned with specific accreditation standards. Submit documents to apap@siu.edu. For further information, see the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs website (<http://pvcaa.siu.edu/associate-academic-programs>) or call 453-7653.

For modality, note whether the degree program is offered face-to-face, on-line, off-campus and/or hybrid. If a program has more than one modality, provide evidence that assessment is consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations.

| | |
|--|--|
| Degree Program: | CIP Code: |
| Department/School: | College: |
| Chair/Director: | Email/Phone: |
| Assessment Coordinator: | Email/Phone: |
| Dean: | Date Submitted: |
| Modality: | Accreditation Standards (if applicable): |
| Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes | |
| Document the assessment of student learning outcomes over the last year. Reference the assessment tools used. Note any patterns and trends observed. Also note where the assessment is closing the loop on previous changes. | |
| | |
| Curriculum or Program Changes | |
| List curriculum or program changes resulting from your assessment. | |
| | |
| Changes in Faculty or Administration of the Program, Department or School | |
| Include information of the impact of change. | |
| | |

1. Provide any additional relevant information not explicitly covered above.

2. Appendices
 - a) Cost Study Data (recent three years available)
 - b) Enrollment, graduation, and placement data (recent three years available)
 - c) Assessment Tools and/or Rubrics Used (if applicable for year of report)
 - d) Surveys and Questionnaires (if applicable for year of report)
 - e) Any major updates to Assessment Plan filed with the APAP office

SIUC ASSESSMENT PLAN TEMPLATE

All programs are required to submit an Assessment Plan every four years, which is mid-cycle for the IBHE required program review. Accredited programs may substitute documentation that is aligned with specific accreditation standards. Submit documents to apap@siu.edu. For further information, see the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs website (<http://pvcaa.siu.edu/associate-academic-programs>) or call 453-7653.

For modality, note whether the degree program is offered face-to-face, on-line, off-campus and/or hybrid. If a program has more than one modality, provide evidence that assessment will be consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations.

| | |
|--|--|
| Degree Program: | CIP Code: |
| Department/School: | College: |
| Chair/Director: | Email/Phone: |
| Assessment Coordinator: | Email/Phone: |
| Dean: | Date Submitted: |
| Modality: | Accreditation Standards (if applicable): |
| Mission Statement (Mission of the Program, Department/School or College) | |
| | |
| Program Goals | |
| | |
| Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) | |
| | |
| Assessment Tools/Baselines | |
| <p>Map the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program goals to mission • SLO to program goals • Curriculum to SLO <p>Identify assessment instruments or methods for each SLO listed above and establish a baseline for attainment.</p> | |
| | |

| |
|--|
| |
| Action Plan |
| At a minimum include: 1) Strategies for addressing SLO below baseline; 2) Cycle used for assessment; and 3) Involvement of constituencies. |
| |

Provide any additional relevant information not explicitly covered above.

Appendices

- a) Mapping of program goals, student learning outcomes, and curriculum (This is a required component of your assessment plan.)
- b) Assessment Tools and/or Rubrics Used (Blank forms)

SIU Mission Statement

SIU embraces a unique tradition of access and opportunity, inclusive excellence, innovation in research and creativity, and outstanding teaching focused on nurturing student success. As a nationally ranked public research university and regional economic catalyst, we create and exchange knowledge to shape future leaders, improve our communities, and transform lives.

Glossary of Terms:

- Action Plan: Strategies and timelines for using assessment for program improvement. This should include a summary of how faculty are involved in the process.
- Assessment Tools: Methods used to measure student learning outcomes.
- Benchmarks: Established baseline measures which indicate an acceptable level of student achievement.
- Modality: Face-to-face, on-line, off-campus, hybrid
- Program Goals: The program goals are general or broad statements describing the knowledge, skills or values expected of graduates from the program. In general, these are not measurable, but they can be mapped to the mission statement and the student learning outcomes.
- Student Learning Outcomes (SLO): Statements that describe measurable knowledge, skill or values students will achieve in their program of study.

REVIEWERS' REPORT TEMPLATE

Program Name
College Name
Reviewers' Report
Date



SIUC Mission

SIU embraces a unique tradition of access and opportunity, inclusive excellence, innovation in research and creativity, and outstanding teaching focused on nurturing student success. As a nationally ranked public research university and regional economic catalyst, we create and exchange knowledge to shape future leaders, improve our communities, and transform lives.

Overview

Provide a brief description of the program strengths and/or notable achievements. Does the program have unique or innovative approaches to teaching, learning, or new knowledge creation?

Summarize the logistics of your visit, including support units or other programs you met with as part of your review. Provide the names and affiliations of the reviewers.

What are the program delivery nodes (face-to-face, online, off-campus)? Note whether a degree is offered completely online or off-campus.

Program Assessment

Provide a summary of the process of assessment and continuous improvement, touching on key elements including but not limited to:

- Are faculty involved with and aware of the content of the self-study?
- Are faculty involved with the development of the mission, goals and student learning outcomes (SLO) of the program?
- Does the process for defining the mission, goals, and SLOs involve internal or external constituencies other than faculty?
- Are the benchmarks (baselines) and assessment tools appropriate for determining the achievement of SLOs?
- Are all of the SLOs measured?
- Is the assessment cycle appropriate?
- Is assessment used for continuous improvement?

If any of these items are not reported in the self-study or demonstrated during the site visit, please note the shortcoming(s) in your report.

Classrooms, Facilities, and Laboratories

Provide an overview of the quality of the classrooms, facilities, teaching labs, research labs and studios (as appropriate).

Online Programs

Optional section for programs that have degree programs offered online. Delete this section if N/A.

- Does the online degree program have the same SLOs as the on-campus program?
- Does the assessment process for the program include assessment of online programs? If included, is the data for face-to-face and online classes disaggregated or combined? Is the data used for continuous improvement?
- Is student advisement for online students adequate?
- Are laboratory components of the curriculum offered (if applicable)?

Off-Campus Programs

Optional section for programs that have degree programs offered off-campus. Delete this section if N/A.

- Does the off-campus degree program have the same SLOs?
- Does the assessment process include the off-campus programs? If included, is the data for off-campus and on-campus classes disaggregated or combined? Is the data used for continuous improvement?
- Is there a documented process for determining faculty qualifications for the off-campus sites?
- Is student advisement adequate?
- Are the facilities adequate?

Leadership and Institutional Support

Provide an overview of the quality and effectiveness of the program's leadership and institutional support.

Recommendations

Provide recommendations for the program. Consider the following questions.

- Where do you see opportunities for growth given the current resources and faculty expertise in teaching and research?
- Where do you see opportunities for new areas of teaching, research or partnerships?
- Has the program stayed current with recent trends in the field? Consider both curriculum and scholarship.
- Do you recommend improvements in the assessment and continuing improvement processes? If so, please describe these.

PROGRAM REVIEW DEAN'S REPORT ADDENDUM

Dean's Report

1. Reporting Institution: Southern Illinois University Carbondale
2. Programs Reviewed:
3. Date:
4. Contact Person: Meera Komarraju, Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - 4.1. Telephone: (618) 453-5744
 - 4.2. E-mail: provost@siu.edu
 - 4.3. Fax: (618) 453-1478
5. Major Findings and Recommendations

The review team was comprised of:

5.1 Description and assessment of any major changes in the program:

5.2 Description of major findings and recommendations, including evidence of learning outcomes and identification of opportunities for program improvement:

5.3 Description of actions taken since the last review, including instructional resources and practices, and curricular changes:

5.4 Description of actions to be taken as a result of this review, including instructional resource and practices, and curricular changes:

IBHE GUIDELINES

FOR REVIEW OF EXISTING UNITS OF INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND PUBLIC SERVICE AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

A. Major Assumptions

1. That primary responsibility for quality and, therefore, review of existing academic programs resides with the institutions and will be carried out in a manner compatible with institutional academic planning/review mechanisms and guidelines promulgated by the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). Each institution will determine the program review process that best meets its unique needs (e.g., specialized accreditation reviews, review committees, use of external reviewers, etc.). This process will be consistent with IBHE guidelines. To avoid redundancy, institutions have the discretion to use current findings from specialized program accreditations and other reviews as the basis of the program review process. To be current, a review must be no more than two years old.
2. That academic program review is a critical and constructive process whose essential elements are documentation of learning outcomes and identification of actions for program improvement.
3. That the IBHE, occasionally, may call for a review of programs on a statewide basis for the purpose of addressing matters of statewide priority, e.g., high-demand fields, disciplines undergoing substantial change, etc.
4. That increased institutional control over the review process entails increased institutional accountability.
5. That institutions are responsible to identify and review programs targeted for priority evaluation and take appropriate action to remedy problems revealed by the review process (e.g., improvement, suspension, or closure).
6. That “the Board of Higher Education is authorized to review, periodically, all existing programs of instruction, research and public service at the State universities and colleges and to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified.” (110 ILCS 205/7)

B. Program Review Schedule

Eight-year Cycle

1. Institutional program review will occur on an eight-year cycle, with the institution determining the schedule for individual programs. Since eight years is considered the maximum time period for reviewing an individual program, some programs may be reviewed more than once within this cycle.
2. As part of the review process, institutions will prioritize programs flagged due to quality, viability, and/or other concerns.

Three-year Cycle

1. Three years after approval **and** three years after implementation of a new program, *progress reports* will be provided to the IBHE. Programs not making progress towards achieving objectives stated in the original request for approval will submit a plan for improvement.
2. Programs in which state licensure requires specialized accreditation for students to obtain professional licensure, but which have not yet achieved accreditation, will undergo full review and report to the IBHE every three years until accreditation is achieved.
3. Programs flagged for attention or improvement by the institution will report every three years until the situation is corrected or resolved.
4. Programs with institution-determined temporary suspensions of enrollment will inform IBHE of the program's status every year until the situation is corrected.

C. Program Review Components

While the institution is responsible for developing its unique program review procedures, it is expected that those processes will include the following components:

1. A statement of program goals and intended learning outcomes;
2. An end- or near-end-of-program assessment of student learning, in addition to course-by-course assessment;
3. Multiple performance measures, if necessary, that reflect the uniqueness of academic programs and disciplines;
4. Feedback from key stakeholders (current students, alumni, employers, graduate schools, etc.);
5. Evidence of a formal feedback/improvement mechanism, i.e., that the program/unit has a regular review process in place, and that the results of this review process are used to improve curriculum, instruction, and learning;
6. Improvement to its capacity to efficiently and effectively deliver programs using technological innovation and comprehensive data systems; and
7. Findings and recommendations for improvement, suspension, or closure.

D. Reporting Process

1. Institutions will report on the outcomes of the program reviews in a "Summary of Annual Program Review Process."
2. Three years after implementation of a new program, a progress report will be provided to the IBHE.

3. Programs requiring specialized accreditation for students to sit for professional licensure, but which have not yet achieved accreditation, will provide a report every three years until accreditation is achieved.
4. Programs flagged for priority review by the institution for improvement require a short interim report, which may be submitted to the IBHE three years after being flagged and must address actions taken since the last program review. Interim reports on flagged programs should:
 - (a) Delineate actions taken to resolve the issues or improve the program;
 - (b) Identify areas for further action or improvement; and,
 - (c) Describe how the program will be monitored to ensure continued improvement until the next review.
5. Upon notification by letter to the IBHE by its president or chancellor, a college or university may:
 - (a) Suspend enrollment in a program for a period not to exceed five years, for any reason;
 - (b) The enrollment-suspension notification shall include an explanation of the reasons for the action and a brief remediation plan;
 - (c) Institutions will submit a brief progress report every year until the situation is resolved; and,
 - (d) Reinstate a suspended program through a letter of notification to the Board;
 - (e) The IBHE will consider a program terminated if no progress report is received each year or if no reinstatement notice is received within the five-year period.
6. Summary reports shall include:
 - (a) Description and assessment of any major changes in the program/disciplinary context e.g., (1) in the discipline or field; (2) student demand; (3) state need; (4) institutional context for offering the degree; (5) other elements appropriate to the discipline in question; and (6) other;
 - (b) Major findings and recommendations, including evidence of student learning outcomes and identification of opportunities for program improvement;
 - (c) Actions taken since the last review, including instructional resources and practices, and curricular changes; and,
 - (d) Actions to be taken as a result of this review, including changes in instructional resources and practices, curriculum, and assessment of student learning.

PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

- 1. **Reporting Institution** _____
- 2. **Program Reviewed** _____
- 3. **Date** _____
- 4. **Contact Person** _____
 - 4.1. **Telephone** _____
 - 4.2. **E-mail** _____
 - 4.3. **Fax** _____

5. Major Findings and Recommendations

- 5.1 Description and assessment of any major changes in the program [e.g., (a) changes in the overall discipline or field; (b) student demand; (c) societal need; (d) institutional context for offering the degree; (e) other elements appropriate to the discipline in question; and (f) other].
- 5.2 Description of major findings and recommendations, including evidence of learning outcomes and identification of opportunities for program improvement;
- 5.3 Description of actions taken since the last review, including instructional resources and practices, and curricular changes; and
- 5.4 Description of actions to be taken as a result of this review, including instructional resource and practices, and curricular changes.

6. Outcome

- 6.1 Decision:
 - ___ Program in Good Standing
 - ___ Program flagged for Priority Review
 - ___ Program Enrollment Suspended
- 6.2 Explanation