

University of Mary Washington  
Academic Program Review Process  
Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness

Overview

Programs complete an Academic Program Review on a 10-year cycle. Each year, several programs will undergo review to distribute evenly the Academic Program Review effort over a 10-year period in accordance with the schedule shown as Appendix A. The Academic Program Review process, and the documents issuing there from, replaces the decennial departmental self-study that in the past has been done as part of the SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation process. An interim review will occur in the fifth year.

Tenth Year (End/Beginning of Cycle) Academic Program Review Process

**Fall** - The program faculty receive data and information (*cf.* Appendix B) from Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness and jointly produce a report which addresses each item listed in Appendix C. (In the interest of time, items 1-5, 7, 8, 10 can be “roughed out” during the spring and summer preceding the fall semester in which review process formally begins.) The program faculty then send the report to two external reviewers -- two full-time faculty members selected, whenever possible, from COPLAC institutions and/or our peer institutions (this list is on the OIAE website). Each reviewer should have the requisite experience (rank of associate or full professor, possibly a current/former chair or someone who has completed program reviews elsewhere) to review the program in a comprehensive, balanced, and competent manner (*cf.* Appendix D for more details regarding visits by external reviewers). Preferably, they are from separate institutions.

- Ideally, external reviewers visit campus October 5 through November 5.
- Program receives an individual report from each external reviewer by December 5.

**Spring** - The program faculty develop an overall report which includes:

(a) initial report (built around issues identified in Appendix C) that is sent earlier by program to external reviewers;

(b) reports from reviewers sent to program Chair;

(c) program faculty's response to the reports submitted by external reviewers;

(d) 10-year action plan which contains the issues the program plans to address over the next decade, a timetable for same, and the resources needed to attain the goals it has set for itself (*cf.* Appendix E). Overall report in electronic format should be sent to Dean of the College by February 15.

- Dean reviews overall report and makes recommendations and suggestions, in writing as needed, by March 25.
- Discussion between Dean and program, if needed to resolve any outstanding issues, takes place.
- The report (with signatures) is finalized by April 25 and forwarded to the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness.

## Fifth Year (Mid Cycle) Academic Program Review Process

*(External reviewers will not be part of any fifth-year review and will be utilized at this time only on an as-needed basis).*

**Fall** - The program faculty receive data and information (*cf.* Appendix B) from Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness. The program faculty produce an interim report built around items 1, 3, 4, and 6 of Appendix C. This report is sent to Dean in electronic format by November 30.

Interim (5<sup>th</sup>-year) report should also contain:

- (a) a review of the five year history, to date, of the 10-Year Action Plan with reference to any item that needs to be carried forward,
- (b) a review of the current plan with reference to anything that needs to be revised for the second five years,
- (c) a listing of any new action items to be worked into the existing timeline created for the original plan.

**Spring** - Dean responds to interim report with preliminary recommendations, in writing as needed, by January 15.

- Program reviews preliminary recommendations and submits response to Dean by February 25.
- Dean issues final set of recommendations and suggestions, in writing as needed, by April 7.
- Discussion of any unresolved issues occurs between program chair and Dean. Revised action plan (with signatures) for second half of the 10-year Academic Program Review cycle finalized by May 7 and forwarded to the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness.

## **APPENDIX A**

YEAR	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026	2026-2027	2027-2028	2028-2029
<b>10 YR</b>									
	Music	Computer Science		Art History	English	American Studies	Biology	Anthropology	Classics
	CCNE initial accreditation	Economics		Chemistry		History	Geography	International Affairs	Philosophy
		Environmental Science/Geology		MSGA (Geospatial Analysis)		Mathematics	Political Science	Psychology	Religion
				Studio Art		Physics		Sociology	
						Theatre			
				<b>GENERAL EDUCATION DATA REVIEW</b>					<b>GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW</b>
<b>5 YR</b>									
	American Studies	Biology	Anthropology	Classics	French/German/Spanish	Music	Computer Science		Art History
	History	Geography	International Affairs		CDS		Economics		Chemistry
	Mathematics	Political Science	Psychology	Philosophy	Historic Pres		Environmental Science/Geology		MSGA (Geospatial Analysis)
	Physics		Sociology	Religion	Women & Gender Studies (opt)				Studio Art
	Theatre								
<b>Accreditations</b>	<b>CCNE (Nursing)</b>		<b>SACS 10</b>	<b>AACSB (Business)</b>		<b>CCNE (Nursing)</b>	<b>CAEP/Educ</b>	<b>SACS 5</b>	<b>AACSB (Business)</b>

## APPENDIX B

### ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW DATA FOR DEPARTMENTS

*Data below will be provided at the beginning of the fall semester, and covers all UMW campuses and all teaching modalities, including online, relevant to that discipline. Other data is available at:*

<http://academics.umw.edu/iae/academic-productivity-information/>

- Number of graduates
- Percent of total graduates
- Number of majors
- Student Credit Hours generated by program
- Percent of total Student Credit Hours accounted for by program
- Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE
- Average class size for lower-level, upper-level, and graduate level courses
- Course enrollment by discipline
- Full-Time Faculty Workload Profiles
- Numbers of internships, writing and speaking intensive courses
- Additional items at program's request

## APPENDIX C

### ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN TENTH-YEAR REPORT

1. Descriptions of what is distinctive about the program--that is, what are its chief characteristics (*e.g.*, special emphases, distinctive delivery systems, unique features of the general education and service courses offered by the program, etc.)
2. Provisions for special academic and research opportunities for students.
3. Succinct description of the outcomes expected of students completing the major program. Specific reference should be made to the link between program outcomes and associated student learning outcomes. Program outcomes address covers all UMW campuses and all teaching modalities, including online, relevant to that discipline.
4. Description, with reference to relevant assessment data, of how assessment results have been used to improve the program.
5. Commentary on relevance/currency of program curriculum. How do the program's curriculum and instructional methodologies reflect changes in, and new approaches to, the discipline?
6. Commentary regarding patterns and/or trends (both positive and negative) as revealed in the Academic Program Review Data Set and Workload Profile reports provided annually by the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness.
7. Commentary on the adequacy of the program's staff, facilities, and equipment as these relate to program achieving curricular goals.
8. Commentary on how the program prepares majors for graduate study and for professional opportunities (included here should be the percentage of graduates who are pursuing graduate study or are employed in program-related work).
9. Succinct review of what was, and was not, accomplished in the 10-year action plan now being concluded.
10. APPENDICES to the report:
  - a) course syllabi
  - b) current *curriculum vitae* of program's faculty members

## **APPENDIX D**

### **PROCEDURES REGARDING VISIT BY EXTERNAL REVIEWER FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW**

The departments whose programs are under review, in conjunction with the Dean of the College, are responsible for selecting qualified faculty to serve as reviewers (two reviewers per program) from institutions comparable to the University of Mary Washington. These individuals should be senior faculty, usually either current or former department chairs and/or current or former deans, or otherwise have been involved in program review. Names of the reviewers and the dates of their visits should be e-mailed to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness as soon as they have been selected. Prior to a visit, the reviewers need to “Vendor Registration Application” and the department must submit a “University of Mary Washington Request for Travel Form” (accessed electronically at <http://adminfinance.umw.edu/ap/forms/>). Any out-of-pocket expenses (travel, lodging, meals) will be paid through the IAE budget; in this regard, be aware that any expenditures for meals and lodging must be within State guidelines current at the time of the visit. An initial stipend of \$500 will be paid to the reviewer at the conclusion of the visit, or as soon thereafter as possible. Later, when a report by the reviewer has been sent to, and deemed acceptable by, the department chair, the reviewer will be paid another stipend of \$500. At such time, the Provost office should be notified that payment for the report can be made.

Each department is responsible for making/coordinating necessary lodging and travel arrangements for each reviewer. However, the office managers in Provost’s office is also available to help with the arrangements. The department chair should contact the Provost’s office in order to get the necessary FOAPAL numbers to complete all needed approvals. The department must also request the University credit card and complete request for meals as needed. Again, State guidelines must be adhered to for all necessary expenditures.

As soon as the date for the visit by a reviewer has been set, the department chair should arrange for a meeting with the Dean of their College or/and the Assistant Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness. It is best to have this meeting scheduled as early in the review visit as possible.

## APPENDIX E

### 10-YEAR ACTION PLAN

**PROGRAM:** \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Year 1 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 2 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 3 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 4 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 5 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 6 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 7 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 8 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 9 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 10 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

The above plan has been jointly agreed to by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the College

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



**APPENDIX F**

**REVISIONS TO THE SECOND-HALF OF THE ORIGINAL  
10-YEAR ACTION PLAN**

**PROGRAM:** \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Year 6 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 7 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 8 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 9 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

Academic Year 10 (specify actual year)  
List activities/goals

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the College

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date