

University of Maine at Presque Isle
Program Review Procedures
Revised October 24, 2018

Program review at the University of Maine at Presque Isle (UMPI) is part of the ongoing process of accountability and improvement of the academic enterprise. It provides an opportunity for all academic programs at UMPI to reflect systematically on internal and external departmental and individual achievements, examine relationships with other parts of the university, and set goals for continued improvement. Program review provides a context for examining how the program presents itself within the university community and to the outside world; thus, review serves as an accountability measure to both internal and external constituents and stakeholders. However, the primary focus and purpose of academic program review is on maintaining and continually improving the quality of programs through self-reflection, analysis, and future goal-setting.

Program review is governed by both University of Maine System (UMS) and national accreditation standards. Per UMS standards, all academic programs will be reviewed at least every 7 years. Newly formed academic programs will be reviewed no later than 5 years following inception. This document describes the context and procedures of program review through the following sections:

- UMS and National Accreditation Standards
- General Guiding Principles
- Overview of the Process
- The Self Study
- The External Review
- Post Review Process

University of Maine System and National Accreditation Standards

Two sets of standards guide the University of Maine academic review policy: the policies and procedures of the University of Maine System and the standards of the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE).

The University of Maine System (UMS) Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures can be found at <http://www.maine.edu/system/asa/adminprocman.php#Review>. All reviews must conform to those policies.

The New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE) standards can be found at <https://cihe.neasc.org/standards-policies/standards-accreditation> . All reviews must conform to these standards as well as to the UMS standards. This document was designed to address both sets of standards.

The NECHE Standards govern all aspects of the university. We recommend that programs review them at the beginning of the process and take this opportunity to plan improvements to bring the program into full compliance with the standards. The following standards relate directly to academic program review and student learning outcomes assessment, a required element.

2.1 Planning and evaluation are systematic, comprehensive, broad-based, integrated, and appropriate to the institution. They involve the participation of individuals and groups responsible for the achievement of institutional purposes and include external perspectives. Results of planning and evaluation are regularly communicated to appropriate institutional constituencies. The institution allocates sufficient resources for its planning and evaluation efforts.

2.6 The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the achievement of its mission and purposes, giving primary focus to the realization of its educational objectives. Its system of evaluation is designed to provide valid information to support institutional improvement. The institution's evaluation efforts are effective for addressing its unique circumstances. These efforts use both quantitative and qualitative methods.

2.7 The institution's principal evaluation focus is the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of its academic programs. Evaluation endeavors and systematic assessment are demonstrably effective in the improvement of academic offerings, student learning, and the student experience. Systematic feedback from students, former students, and other relevant constituencies is a demonstrable factor in institutional improvement.

4.5 Through its system of academic administration and faculty participation, the institution demonstrates an effective system of academic oversight, assuring the quality of the academic program wherever and however it is offered.

4.6 The institution develops, approves, administers, and on a regular cycle reviews its academic programs under institutional policies that are implemented by designated bodies with established channels of communication and control. Review of academic programs includes evidence of student success and program effectiveness and incorporates an external perspective. Faculty have a substantive voice in these matters.

4.7 The institution undertakes academic planning and evaluation as part of its overall planning and evaluation to enhance the achievement of institutional mission and program objectives. These activities are realistic and take into account stated goals and available resources. Additions and deletions of programs are consistent with institutional mission and capacity, faculty expertise, student needs, and the availability of sufficient resources required for the development and improvement of academic programs. The institution allocates resources on the basis of its academic planning, needs, and objectives.

General Guiding Principles

Following are some general guiding principles for the review process.

1. Both the self study and the external review should consider the program as it currently stands and with its current budget. Considering the economic challenges of the state and campus, reviews should not be used primarily as ways to request more resources. Rather, they should illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of the program in its current state. It is understood, however, that such critical examination may suggest the need for new resources.
2. The self study should be candid and critical. It should feature reflection on and analysis of the program. It should also highlight how the accomplishments of the program contribute to the strategic plan of the campus.
3. The external visit should be used strategically to gain constructive criticism for program improvement.
4. In some cases, the standards of national accrediting bodies may stipulate different processes. In those cases, deans will review the differences in standards and processes with the provost

and agree on a hybrid review process. It is expected, however, that Part A of the self study as described in this document will be accomplished for all reviews.

Overview of the Process

The review process involves six stages: the self study, the external review, the unit response to the external review, the Curriculum Committee's review and recommendation, the dean's evaluative report to the provost, and the institutional report of the review.

Self Study

The self-study should include the following sections.

- A. Program Information, including the following
 - Overview of the unit
 - Rationale, goals, and student learning outcomes for all degree programs in the unit
 - For each degree program, (a) the assessment plan for student learning outcomes, (b) the results of assessments, (c) evidence of review of assessment results by the unit faculty, and (d) evidence of the use of assessment results for program improvement
 - Evidence that curricula are periodically reviewed and revised as needed to maintain currency in the discipline and program quality
 - All course syllabi (Note that syllabi should explicitly list the student learning outcomes associated with the course) and indication of where syllabi are electronically archived
 - A matrix for each degree program showing the relationship of courses in the program to the program's student learning outcomes and, if applicable, to general education student learning outcomes.
 - The two year schedule of course offerings
 - Study plans for each degree program (i.e., four-year plan of courses a student would take to complete the degree on schedule)

- B. Commitment to Student Learning
 - List the learning objectives for students majoring in the program. Referring to annual program assessment updates, describe how achievement of each of these learning objectives is evaluated and documented through both indirect and direct methods. (Append annual assessment reports and curriculum map that aligns core courses with program goals, student learning objectives, assessment methods, instructional emphasis, and primary assessment methods.)
 - Based on the institutional research data and the data collected through annual program assessment, describe successful outcomes and any changes the program faculty have made and/or plan to make for improving student learning, curriculum, instructional delivery, and other elements of program effectiveness.

- C. Data Trends for the most recent five years, articulated by semester and degree (BA, BS, AA), including the following:
 - Individual course enrollments
 - Program enrollment, retention, and graduation rates: new students per semester, total majors per semester, total graduates per graduation reporting period (December, May,

and August graduates); year-to-year retention; and four, five, and six year graduation rates

- External research dollar production, listed by project and indicating faculty involved
- Departmental budget and expenditure totals for the most recent 5 years broken down by expense category (travel, salaries, etc.)
- Entering placement scores/results (as applicable) for undergraduate students for most recent 5 years

D. Faculty and Staff

- A roster of faculty and staff for the past five years, including any faculty members who have left with the reported reasons for their departure, indicating by semester faculty load (including overload and/or release time, with reasons specified for release)
- Appendix containing full curriculum vitae for all current faculty members and identification of where vitae are electronically archived.
- A summary of the department's post tenure review process and schedule of reviews.
- Departmental peer committee guidelines for tenure and promotion.
- A summary of faculty productivity and recognition for the past 5 years, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Creative and scholarly productivity
 - National and international recognition

E. Students and Graduates

- Surveys of current students to address perception of advising and program quality
- Survey graduates of last 5 years regarding current employment and the quality of the program
- Summary of specific student achievements (research, significant internships, etc.) for last 5 years

F. Service to the State and Beyond

- Summary of major service activities of the unit. (This may include service at the local, state, national, and international level. It may also include co-curricular service learning. Service learning connected directly to the curriculum should be described with Program Information in Section A).

G. Summary and Analysis

- Discussion of the recommendations of the last program review and changes that have been made since that time
- Analysis of the unit's current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT analysis)
- Summary of the unit's contributions to the campus mission and strategic plan
- Additional specific questions to be posted to the external reviewers

The self-study process will usually take between one semester and one year. It should have some form of steering committee, which includes critical stakeholders, including faculty, staff, and students. The steering committee should work with the Director of Program Planning and

Assessment to ensure that articles A through G are appropriately addresses and assessed. In addition, the committee should involve campus constituents external to the unit, and, where relevant, community stakeholders.

The self-study process is as much about internal evaluation and reflection as it is about the product. Ideally, insights gained in this process will facilitate unit improvement plans.

The External Review

When the self study is complete, it will be submitted by the Program Director or Coordinator to the Provost who will review it for adequacy. The Director will also submit to the Provost a list of five potential external reviewers with a rationale for each. In conjunction with the Director, the Provost will choose two external reviewers.

The Director will invite the external reviewers, provide the reviewers with a copy of the self-study report at least one week in advance of their visit, and schedule the review visit. The visit should include a tour of the unit's facilities and meetings with faculty members, students, relevant campus stakeholders, the Director, and a joint meeting with the Provost, Dean of Students, and President.

The review team will then send their draft report to the unit Dean for an accuracy review. After the accuracy is assured, the review team will be asked to send the review to the Office of Academic Affairs (Provost).

Unit's Response to the Review

After the final report is forward for review by the Dean, the unit will then have 30 days to submit a response to the review to the Provost, if they so desire.

Curriculum Committee Review

Upon receipt of the final report and any unit response, the Dean shall submit the entire report to the Curriculum Committee for evaluation and recommendation. The Curriculum Committee shall then submit the report and its recommendation to the unit's Dean and the Director of Program Planning and Assessment.

Dean's Evaluative Report

The Dean of the unit will then write a brief evaluative report to accompany transmittal of the self-study, the external review, Curriculum Committee review, and any unit response. Recommendations concerning any resource allocation should take into consideration program quality as illustrated by the review and other indicators.

Director of Program Planning and Assessment's Report

The Director of Program Planning and Assessment may also write a brief evaluative report to accompany transmittal of the self-study, taking into consideration recommendations specific to planning and assessment.

Institutional Report of the Review

Upon completion of the Evaluative Report from the Dean and Director of Program Planning and Assessment, the Provost will write a brief summary of the review. This summary will also be

transmitted to the University System, typically in the summer. The Dean of the unit shall be responsible for incorporating agreed upon action items following the review into the College's academic planning and/or budget planning process.

Timetable for Academic Program Review

Dates are for guideline purposes only and will vary according to program review requirements.

Activity	Date
Director/Coordinator meets with program faculty regarding upcoming review and establishes self-study committee; Director establishes timetable for overall program review with Dean	September 15
Program faculty submits external reviewer recommendations to Provost	October 15
Program faculty prepare self-study documents and forms	October - January
Curriculum review forms are submitted to Curriculum Committee	February 1
Curriculum Committee provides written review of curriculum and assessment plans. Program faculty incorporates curriculum review into self-study report.	February 15
Self-study report and materials are reviewed by Dean and Director of Planning and Assessment	February 20
Self-study report and material sent to external reviewers	February 20
External reviewer(s) perform site visit 10 or more days after receiving the self-study report	February - March
External reviewer(s) submit report to unit Dean and program faculty	April 1
Program faculty incorporates external report and submits self-report to unit Dean	April 15
Unit Dean completes executive report and forwards all to Director of Program Planning and Assessment	May 30
Director of Planning and Assessment produces an internal memorandum for record and recommendation and forwards all materials to the Provost	May 31
Provost reviews Executive, Self-study, and External Reports and submits, along with an executive memorandum, to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	July 30