

# Program Review: Instructions for Self-Study Report

The Program Review Process - By mandate of the State Regents, all degree-granting programs undergo periodic review. At OU, the review is a three year, three-step process conducted on a seven-year cycle. In the first year, the program completes a self-study. In the second, the Campus Departmental Review Panel (CDRP) uses the self-study, along with reports from two offsite reviewers, as the basis for further inquiry. The CDRP then conveys its recommendations to the unit, the dean, and the Provost. On the basis of those recommendations, the Dean develops an action plan which is approved by the Provost. In the third and subsequent years, the department executes the plan. The result of the entire process is reported to the State Regents. For background, see OSRHE Policies & Procedures II-2-17 (1999) and OU Faculty Handbook § 5.37.

The Self-Study Process - Typically, the chair or director, in consultation with Committee A, will appoint a committee to organize the self-study process. The committee will organize itself and collect information in the year prior to the review. The Office of Institutional Research will provide the committee with the "Departmental Profile", a compilation of statistics on enrollment, budget, faculty, and diversity. In addition, the Provost's office will provide the results of its online survey of faculty satisfaction with the program. The committee should draft, discuss, and finalize the report in the spring and summer, ideally with input from the entire faculty on the final version. The budget dean for the unit reviews the draft and provides comments to the unit. The budget dean will set a deadline for initial submission that will allow timely submission to the Provost's office for distribution to the CDRP. **The deadline for submission of the self studies to the Provost for the units under review in 2009-2010 will be the second Friday of the fall (09) semester.**

Overview of the Self-Study Report - The self-study report consists of two parts: a narrative and appendices. The *narrative* should be limited to no more than 22 single-sided, double spaced pages. It should be able to stand alone as a document, so that a reader can grasp the essence of the unit's self-evaluation by reading the narrative alone. To present its arguments concisely, the unit should draw selectively from the data and other documents provided in the appendices, but should not repeat large segments of information that can be found elsewhere. The unit should feel free to present data that are not included in the appendices but which address issues being considered in the self-study. **Peer group information not available to Institutional Research would be particularly valuable.** The unit should identify the source of any data it provides in the narrative. The *appendices* support the narrative's conclusions. Most of the documents and information required in the appendices will be readily available in the department, with the exception of the departmental profile provided by the Office of Institutional Research and the faculty satisfaction survey provided by the Provost's office.

Report miscellanea - Please provide a table of contents for the self-study, labeled section dividers, and some form of pagination for the document. The self study should be bound in some way – spiral, three-ring, etc. – either as one volume (preferred) or two volumes. Twelve copies should be provided to the Provost: one for each member of the CDRP plus two external reviewers.

External reviewers - Two external reviewers will be chosen to review the self-study and provide an evaluation of the unit's assets, challenges, and needs. The reviews will be based on the self-study (plus any additional material requested) and will not involve a site visit. Reviewers should be senior faculty from comparable units around the country. *When you forward the self-study to your dean, please include a list of at least six potential reviewers plus contact information (email address, phone numbers, and addresses).*

## Outline for the Self-Study Report

The report narrative and appendices should be organized according to the outline presented below. In some cases, a section may be irrelevant to your unit (for example, you may not have a graduate program). In such cases, simply indicate that the section does not apply and proceed to the next section. You may find it necessary to deviate somewhat from the page limits suggested for individual sections, but please do not exceed the 22-page overall limit.

### **Narrative**

- I. Executive Summary (2-3 pages)
- II. Background (2 pages)
- III. Undergraduate Program (4 pages)
  - A. Degrees and Programs
  - B. Students
- IV. Graduate Program (4 pages)
  - A. Degrees and Programs
  - B. Students
- V. Faculty (4 pages)
  - A. Teaching
  - B. Scholarly and creative activity
  - C. Work environment
- VI. Staff (1 page)
- VII. Administration (1 page)
- VIII. Financial Support (1 page)
- IX. Conclusions (2 pages)

### **Appendices**

- I. Previous reviews and plans
  - A. Most recent strategic plan
  - B. Previous CDRP report
  - C. Dean's recommendations based on program review
  - D. Most recent external accreditation team report (if applicable)
- II. Undergraduate plans
  - A. Undergraduate major assessment plan
  - B. Most recent yearly undergraduate assessment report
- III. Undergraduate student accomplishments
- IV. Undergraduate student handbook

- V. Graduate student handbook and most recent yearly graduate assessment report
- VI. Graduate student accomplishments
- VII. Faculty member honors and awards
- VIII. Refereed publications or activities for each faculty member for the last five years.
- IX. Significant faculty service activities
- X. Professional criteria
  - A. Unit's tenure and promotion document and when it was last revised
  - B. Criteria for Graduate Faculty appointments
  - C. Other operational faculty development or related documents
  - D. Unit's document(s) describing administrative structure and policies
- XI. Departmental profile – supplied by Institutional Research
- XII. Program Review survey results – supplied by Provost

### Elements of the Self-Study Report Narrative

- I. Executive Summary (2-3 pages) - The executive summary should concisely convey the unit's perception of its mission, its goals, and the strengths and weaknesses of its programs. It should assess developments since the last program review in the context of the previous CDRP and Provost recommendations for the unit and any applicable external accreditation review recommendations. It should convey how the unit is forward-looking and what is being done to improve the program. It should include the unit's priorities for the future and cite specific actions intended as a result of the self-study and other planning efforts.
- II. Background (~2 pages) - This section should briefly review the historical context of the unit. It should assess the unit's mission in terms of its college's and the University's missions. It should assess, where significant, interactions with and contributions from non-credit-generating units such as the Carl Albert Center, the University Libraries, the Biological Survey, etc., as they relate to the unit's mission. It should assess the unit's mission vis a vis national norms in the discipline. If the unit has been restructured since the last program review, reasons for the restructuring should be provided. *Please provide, as Appendix I, you're most recent strategic plan, the previous CDRP report, the Provost's recommendations based on program review, and the most recent accreditation report, if one exists.*
- III. Undergraduate Program (~4 pages)
  - A. Degrees and programs - This section should provide an overview of the undergraduate program. It should describe the degrees and programs, analyze their strengths and weaknesses, and point out unique features. It should describe undergraduate programs offered off-campus, indicate how they are staffed, and analyze the effect of such programs on Norman campus offerings. In particular, if adjuncts are used to teach courses, the selection and evaluation criteria should be described. It should describe the unit's mechanism for curriculum review and analyze its methods of instruction to identify modes of teaching that might be more effective in the future. It should describe any curricular changes made since the last review to incorporate issues of gender and multiculturalism. It should describe the capstone course or courses approved by the

general education committee. It should point out changes since the last program review and how they relate to the previous CDRP and Provost recommendations. The report should also address what is being done in terms of assessment of learning outcomes and how service learning is incorporated into the curriculum. The narrative should also discuss who advises the students and the adequacy of the advising. Are faculty members involved in the advising, and if they are, how are they rewarded for advising?

- B. Students - This section should analyze the unit's undergraduate majors. It should discuss trends in their numbers and quality. For example, given the size of the faculty and other resources, what is the target number of undergraduate majors? The report should assess the diversity of its majors relative to the unit's and the University's strategic plans. It should cite any minimum requirements for entry to the unit's programs that differ from college and University standards. It should describe any special efforts the unit makes to attract high quality undergraduates. It should describe what is done to encourage students to have international experiences. It should describe the assessment program for majors, indicate the extent of implementation of the plan, and analyze the results of the assessment. *Please provide your undergraduate major assessment plan and the most recent assessment report as Appendix II.* This section should also analyze student performance on certification and other exams, and provide evidence of quality in terms of student accomplishments in winning national awards and fellowships, earning entry into quality advanced degree programs, and achieving employment in desirable jobs. It should address what is being done to track undergraduates after they graduate. *Please attach a listing of such accomplishments by name of student, concentration area in your program (if relevant), and achievement for the past three years as Appendix III. In the appendix, also indicate, to the extent possible, the percentages of students who pursue advanced degrees in the major or a similar field who enter a different professional field of study, and who enter the job market.* Discuss the survey results for undergraduates as they relate to student satisfaction with the program. Describe any changes in teaching, curriculum, advising, or other aspects of the program that are planned as a result of input from the survey or other aspects of the self-study. *If there is an undergraduate student handbook, attach it as Appendix IV.*

#### IV. Graduate Program (~4 pages)

- A. Degrees and programs - This section should provide an overview of the unit's graduate program(s). It should describe the degrees and programs, analyze their strengths and weaknesses, and point out unique features that attract students to the program. It should describe any programs offered off-campus, indicate how they are staffed, and analyze the effects of such programs on Norman campus offerings. It should describe the unit's mechanism for curriculum review and analyze its methods of instruction to identify modes of teaching that might be more effective in the future. It should describe any curricular changes made since the last review to incorporate issues of gender and multiculturalism. It should assess whether the size of its graduate program is reasonable considering the faculty size and unit resources. Indicate any plans for changing areas of emphasis in the future. It should point out changes since the last program review and how they relate to the previous CDRP and Provost recommendations.
- B. Students - This section should analyze the unit's graduate students. It should discuss trends in their numbers and quality, the graduation rate, the proportion of part-time and full-time graduate students, and the length of time typically required to earn the degree. It should assess the diversity of its students relative to the unit's and the University's strategic goals. It should describe how admission to the program is determined if the

unit has a recruiting plan. If attrition is high, it should analyze the reasons for dropout and propose solutions. It should cite any minimum requirements for entry to the unit's programs that differ from college and University standards. It should indicate how the unit plans to increase the quality of its graduate students. It should describe the assessment program, indicate the extent of implementation of the plan, and analyze the results of the assessment. *Please provide your graduate major assessment plan and the most recent assessment report in Appendix V.* It should describe how teaching and research appointments are determined and how long a good student can expect to have continuous support. This section should also provide evidence for the quality of its graduates. This section should also provide information on how the students are integrated into the research/creative activity activities in the unit. For example, do graduate students make presentations at meetings and do they routinely publish refereed papers. *Please attach, as Appendix VI, a listing of those students who have graduate in the last five years, any national awards or fellowships they have received, their first appointment upon leaving your program, any presentations they have made at regional or national professional meetings, and any refereed publications they have authored or coauthored based on work in your program. (Please include full citation for all articles and expected publication date for articles in press).* Discuss the survey results for graduate students as they relate to student satisfaction with the program. Describe any changes in teaching, curriculum, advising, or other aspects of the program that are planned as a result of input from the survey or other aspects of the self-study.

V. Faculty (~4 pages)

This section should discuss the quality of the faculty in terms of teaching, research, and service as indicated by publications, external funding, peer national ratings, student quality, diversity of faculty, as well as other indices.

- A. Teaching - This section should analyze survey, college, and other information regarding the quality of teaching in the unit. It should assess whether the unit can adequately provide its programs with the current numbers of faculty and their graduate faculty status (if relevant). It should assess whether its utilization of fulltime faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate students is providing an optimal level of instruction and propose changes if it is not. The teaching load for the faculty should be provided. If the unit has ranked renewable terms faculty members, the policies regarding these faculty should be mentioned in the narrative and the policy provided in Appendix 10C.
- B. Scholarly and creative activity - This section should provide an overview of the scholarly and creative activity in the unit. It should identify strengths and weaknesses and areas it plans to emphasize or de-emphasize. It should point out changes since the last program review and how they relate to the previous CDRP and Provost recommendations. To the extent possible, the unit should compare its scholarly activity with peer groups and assess its standing relative to the peer group. If the peer group is different from other units in the Big 12, this should be clearly indicated and explained. It should highlight significant national awards and fellowships that have been won by the faculty (these should be in addition to the publications and external research awards cited in the Departmental Profile). *Please provide, as Appendix VII, a listing by faculty member of national or internationally significant awards, fellowships, or honors. These could include book awards, invitations to present lectures, performances, or showings at prestigious sites and competitive fellowships such as Guggenheims or Rockefeller or highly regarded awards in the profession. In Appendix VIII, provide a list of faculty publications and/or creative activities for the last five years for each tenured, tenure-*

*track, and ranked renewable term faculty member. Do not include abstracts and conference publications. These should involve work done at OU and should not involve work with doctoral or postdoctoral supervisors.*

The narrative should also discuss how the unit encourages their faculty and researchers to seek external support for their research/creative activities. How has external support changed since the last CDRP review. This section should also include a discussion of how SRI is used in the unit. For example, are the SRI and other funds used strategically?

- C. Service - Assess the level of service for faculty in the unit and whether it is appropriate. *In Appendix IX, cite the significant national-level service activities for the faculty by faculty member. Also cite significant University-level service activities (chair of task forces or councils, Faculty Senate Chair, etc.) for the past three years.*
- D. Work environment - This section should assess the quality of the work environment, including the climate for women and minorities. It should point out changes since the last program review and how they relate to the previous recommendations of the CDRP and Provost. It should assess the diversity of its faculty relative to the unit's and the University's strategic plans, with particular attention to the status and success of efforts to recruit and retain women and minorities. For example, the unit should describe efforts made in the recruitment process to encourage women and minorities to apply; describe efforts or incentives to enhance the retention of women and minorities; provide data on the number of women and minority faculty members who have left the department for reasons other than retirement during the past five years; and specify actions taken within the past five years to improve the climate for women and minorities. This section should also describe how faculty are mentored, evaluated, and rewarded, including how the teaching, scholarship, and service components contribute to the evaluation. *As Appendix X attach the approved tenure and promotion documents and when they were last revise. (If the unit is using more recent documents that have not been approved at all levels, attach them also and state the level at which approval has been obtained). Also include yearly faculty evaluation documents for and your approved criteria for Graduate Faculty appointments. Finally, attach any other documents that relate to recruiting, mentoring and faculty development policies for faculty.* This section should also assess any shortcomings of the policies in Appendix X and propose changes to improve them. It should utilize survey and any other information to assess the morale of the faculty and describe the factors that appear to affect it. Where problems are identified, such as by an absence or decrease in the number of women and minorities or by frequent faculty or student complaints, it should propose possible solutions. It should describe any limitations in the physical environment that seriously inhibit delivery of the unit's program, indicate what changes are needed, and suggest what strategies could effect the changes.
- VI. Staff (~1 page) - This section should address the quantity and quality of staff. It should assess the qualifications of the staff relative to their tasks and evaluate whether the duties of the staff are appropriate to the current situation in the unit and its future goals. It should cite any changes that might improve performance.
- VII. Administration (~1 page) - This section should describe the administrative structure in the unit and evaluate its effectiveness. It should list the chair and any vice-chairs and their duties, describe how departmental committees are organized and appointed, and how they function. It should indicate how these duties are taken into account in determining the overall workload of the faculty involved (e.g., are course reductions given?). It should identify any problems with the administration of programs and propose

possible solutions. It should describe how policies for administration of the units are made known to faculty, staff, and students. *As Appendix XI, attach any documents that describe the unit's administrative structure and policies.* Other questions that should be addressed include: Does the department have a board of visitors? If so, who are the members? If not, why not?

- VIII. Financial Support (~1 page) - This section should provide an overview of how the unit supports its programs financially. It should analyze salary support levels for faculty, staff and graduate students, using comparisons with peer groups. It should identify significant areas of financial need, describe how they affect the program, and propose possible solutions based on funds within its control. It should analyze the various components of its financial support structure: E&G funds, grant funds, college funds, OU Foundation funds, funds from AP courses, etc., as they relate to its mission and identify possible areas under its control that could be augmented. It should describe what is being done to solicit funds from donors.
- IX. Conclusions (~2 pages) - This section should provide an overall assessment and analysis of the unit's programs. It should indicate whether the unit regards itself as a nationally, regionally, or locally competitive unit in its discipline, the level of recognition to which it believes it can reasonably strive, and the steps it needs to take to achieve its goals. It should assess its level of quality relative to identified peers. Areas of excellence should be noted. It should convey how the unit is forward-looking and what is being done to improve the program. For example, the ways in which the unit could reorganize its resources in the near and long term to improve its performance should be cited. The unit should indicate the level of priority for the action items it proposes.