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 efforts in accordance with the schedule shown as Appendix A. The Academic Program Review process, and the documents issuing there from, is completed as part of the SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation process. An interim review will occur in the fifth year of the 10-year cycle for each individual program. As the full process lasts an entire year, with many parts intertwined and involving many individuals on campus, it is important to read through this entire document before starting the process.

Tenth Year Academic Program Review Process

Fall - The program faculty receive data and information (Appendix B) from Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness and produce a self-study 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 summer preceding the fall semester in which the review process formally begins.) The program faculty then send the report to two external reviewers – faculty members who 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 (see Appendix D for more details regarding visits by external reviewers). Preferably, the reviewers are from separate institutions, and the selection of reviewers must be approved by the Associate Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness.

- Ideally, external reviewers visit campus October 1 through November 30.
- Program receives an individual report from each external reviewer by December 31.

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

- Initial self-study report sent to external reviewers
- Reports from reviewers sent to department/program chair
- Program faculty's response to the reports submitted by external reviewers
- 10-year action plan which contains the issues the program plans to address over the next decade, with a timetable and the resources needed to attain the goals it has set for itself
  - Format: Academic Year 1-10 (list actual year) with activities and goals

The overall report in electronic format should be sent to the Dean of the College and the Associate Provost for IAE by February 15. The Dean reviews the overall report and makes recommendations and suggestions, in writing as needed, by March 31st. A discussion between Dean and program, if needed to resolve any outstanding issues, takes place after this. The report (with signatures) is finalized by April 30th and forwarded to the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness and the Office of the Provost.

Fifth Year (Mid Cycle) Academic Program Review Process

(*External reviewers are not part of any fifth-year review but can be utilized on an as-needed basis*).

Fall - The program faculty receive data and information (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 and OIAE in electronic format by November 30th.

Interim (5th–year) report should also contain:

- 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
- a review of the current plan with reference to anything that needs to be revised for the second five years
- 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 15th.

- Program reviews preliminary recommendations and submits response to Dean by end of February.

- Dean issues final set of recommendations and suggestions, in writing as needed, by April 1.

- 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 April 30th and forwarded to the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness and the Office of the Provost.

Appendix A

Academic Program Review Calendar									
YEAR	**2020-2021**	**2021-2022**	**2022-2023**	**2023-2024**	**2024-2025**	**2025-**	**2026-2027**	**2027-2028**	**2028-2029**
10 YR									
	Music	Computer Science		Art History	English	American Studies	Biology	Anthropology	Classics
	CCNE initial	Economics		Chemistry		History	Geography	International Affairs	Philosophy
		Environmental		Studio Art		Mathematics	Political Science	Psychology	Religion
						Physics		Sociology	
						Theatre			
			SACS-COC 10 Year	**GENERAL EDUCATION DATA**				SACS-COC 5 Year	**GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW**
5 YR									
	American Studies	Biology	Anthropology	Classics	French/German/Spani	Music		SACS	Art History
	History	Geography	International Affairs	Philosophy	CDS		Economics		Chemistry
	Mathematics	Political Science	Psychology	Religion	Historic Pres		Environmental		Studio Art
	Physics		Sociology		Women & Gender Studies				
	Theatre								
Accreditations	**CCNE**			**AACSB**		**CCNE**	**CAEP**		**AACSB**

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 (if relevant) and all teaching modalities, including online, relevant to that discipline.

Other data is available for chairs via Sharepoint and at:

https://academics.umw.edu/iae/looking-for-data/academic-productivity-information/

- Number of majors (at least 5-year trend)

- Number of graduates (at least 5-year trend)

- Graduate tracking and data (exit, alumni, and departmental surveys), job placement

- Student Credit Hours generated by program (at least 5-year trend)

- Percent of total Student Credit Hours accounted for by program (at least 5-year trend)?

- Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE (at least 5-year trend)?

- Breakdown of majors by race/ethnicity and gender

- Comment on faculty service, research, other commitments

- Additional items at program's request
  Examples:

  - Numbers of internships and independent studies, URES
  - Enrollments in writing and speaking intensive courses
  - Average class size for lower-level, upper-level, and graduate level courses
  - Specific course enrollments
  - CE, DI, HN, WI, SI enrollments

Appendix C

Issues to be addressed in Ten-Year Report

[expected # pages – average is 40, ranges from 15-70, excluding appendices]

Overview:
Support for the university's key mission/core values/strategic plan
Program mission statement

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.)

Including, but not limited to: features unique to the discipline, community engagement or involvement, composition of faculty and students, social media presence, recruitment strategies, faculty scholarship, student research, faculty pedagogy efforts, internal and external funding, faculty service, on line course development, local or national recognition, faculty recognitions and awards

2. Provisions for special academic and research opportunities for students.

Connection of assessment to a larger professional organization's expectations
Curriculum map, if done
3. Succinct description of the learning outcomes expected of students completing the major program. Specific reference should be made to the link between program outcomes and associated student learning outcomes. Make sure to cover multiple UMW campuses (if relevant) and address all teaching modalities, including online, relevant to that discipline. How are differences in learning outcomes between different populations of students addressed, if relevant?

4. Description, with reference to relevant assessment data, of how assessment results have been used to improve the program over the last five years. How was assessment data used to make changes? Be specific regarding curricula, technology, hires, pedagogical, assignment or syllabi changes, etc.

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 and other data sets provided by the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness.

7. Commentary on the adequacy of the program's staff, facilities, access to library holdings, student support, and technology, and any other equipment as these relate to the program achieving curricular and other goals.

8. Commentary on how the program prepares majors for graduate study and for professional opportunities (included here could 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. Goals accomplished, curriculum revised, faculty hires and retirements.

10. APPENDICES to the report:
     a) current course syllabi
     b) current *curriculum vitae* of program's faculty members
     c) assessment reports
     d) others of your choice

Appendix D

Procedures for Visits by External Reviewers for Academic Programs

Selection: The departments whose programs are under review, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research, are responsible for selecting qualified faculty to serve as reviewers (two reviewers per program) from institutions comparable to the University of Mary Washington. Faculty members should be selected, whenever possible, from COPLAC institutions and/or our peer institutions (these lists are on the OIAE website). If possible, 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. Email the names of the reviewers and the dates of their visits to the Associate Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness at as soon as they have been selected.

Expenses: Any out-of-pocket expenses (travel, lodging, meals) will be paid through the IAE budget; any expenditures for meals and lodging must be within State guidelines current at the time of the visit. Prior to a visit, the reviewers will need to complete the "Vendor Registration Application." Each department is responsible for coordinating necessary lodging and travel arrangements for each reviewer but work with the Administrative Assistant to the Provost to complete the Travel Pre-Approval and Reimbursement forms in Chrome River. The department should also request the University credit card and complete requests for meals as needed.

Payment: 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 that time the Provost's office should be notified that payment for the report can be made.

Schedule: As soon as the dates 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 Associate Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness. It is best to have this meeting scheduled as early in the review visit as possible. The reviewers should also meet with the chair, administrative assistant, department members, students in the program, and any other relevant staff that can help provide information about the academic program and its relationship to the campus.

<div align="center">

Appendix E (Sample)

External Review of the _____ Program

Department of _____

University of Mary Washington

Fredericksburg, VA

</div>

External Reviewer: [name, title, affiliation]

Date of visit, date of report

[Expected Length: approximately 10 pages]

[List the materials reviewed and individuals met]

Department/Program overview

Please share your perspectives on the department overall. How does this department or program compare with programs at similar institutions? This section is about your broad impressions of the department. Specific strengths or areas of concern should be pulled out and addressed separately in the next two sections.

Strengths

This is where we ask you to identify the areas of this program that truly rise above what you perceive to be the standards in the industry across similar institutions. Where does this program truly shine? This could include facilities, faculty/student accomplishments, innovative curricula or pedagogies, etc. Please help the institution to understand what makes this program strong.

Areas of concern

As above, please share your impressions of areas that concern you. What is holding this program back? Do you see barriers to student completion, faculty advancement, or curricular innovation? How can the university administration better support this program to reach its full potential?