The National Hispanic University

Academic Program Review Guidelines

This document describes the Academic Program Review process at The National Hispanic University (NHU). The office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs is in charge of supervising this process, as well as of assuring that program reviews follow these guidelines and the established schedule for them. The Academic Program Review Guidelines were approved by the NHU Faculty Senate and by the President.

Introduction

Each academic program will engage in the program review process in order to assess its goals, program structure and operation, resources, student learning outcomes and fit with the university mission and strategic plan. Academic programs, working with the administration’s support, will make the necessary and appropriate changes needed to strengthen program quality.

This will be a collaborative process in which the department chair works closely with his/her faculty to present a high-quality Self-Study to the university and external reviewers. At the end of each periodic program review, a formal understanding will be established between the program and the administration. This formal understanding will create an action plan that will involve specific actions by the department and or the administration.

Both the External Reviewers reports and the formal understanding will be used as evidence for the subsequent program review cycle. On an annual basis, after the formal program review is accomplished, the department chair will meet with the Provost to provide an update as to how the action plan is being carried out.

Program Review Goals

The Program Review at the NHU has the following goals:

A. Evaluate program effectiveness
B. Identify priorities
C. Help faculty improve their student learning outcome assessment process
D. Serve as a tool for accountability
E. Ensure effective use of university resources
F. Maintain the fit of program goals with the university mission.
Program Review Stages

In order to have a successful program review, the department chairs and faculty, working under the supervision of the Provost, will adhere to the following program review stages.

1. Obtain statistical summary from the Office of Institutional Planning and Evaluation about the academic program to be reviewed.
2. Convene a Program Review Committee
3. Conduct the self-study
4. Present self-study to the Provost for feedback
5. Organize a visit by outside reviewers
6. Host outside reviewers
7. The department and the Provost receive report from outside reviewers, review it and prepare response (if necessary)
8. Prepare plan of action needed to address issues raised by report
9. Present plan of action to Provost
10. Seek Provost and Faculty Senate approval for plan of action

The Self-Study

The program self-study is one of the most important elements of the program review. Through it, the program review committee makes a detailed reflection on the program characteristics. The following questions will guide the self-study.

Program Mission, Goals and Objectives
1. Describe the program’s mission, role, and scope.
2. Describe the program, including name of the degree, the major, the emphases, and the purpose.
3. What are the major goals and objectives? If these have changes over the last 5 years, provide a summary of these changes. Are they likely to be changes in the near future?
4. How do these goals and objectives fit in with the NHU mission?

Program History
1. Describe the program’s history since the last program review or within the last 5 years, emphasizing major changes that have occurred.
2. Provide a summary of the recommendations from the previous program review and the program responses to those recommendations.
3. How effectively does this program utilize its existing resources? What are the major resource issues affecting the department now and into the next 5 years?
**Academic Quality**

1. Describe how the program has improved within the last five years, using evidence to support these conclusions.

2. Describe new directions in curriculum, resources, research, reorganization, staffing, or student clientele planned for the next few years and aimed at strengthening the program.

3. Discuss the use of the various modes of instruction utilized in the program such as lectures, group projects, cooperative learning, field or laboratory work, etc. Describe any innovative pedagogical approaches such as service learning, online courses, and internships. Indicate the resource issues involved in supporting these activities.

4. Describe the quality and quantity of library resources that support the program. Identify needs to be met in the next five years.

5. Provide a brief description of the program’s advisement process and identify procedures used to assess and improve it.

6. Describe the present and planned use of technology to enhance instruction. What are the most serious technological needs of the program?

7. Describe the program’s assessment efforts, including plans, student assessment goals, major student learning outcomes, and utilization of assessment information. The Self-Study will clearly describe assessment tools, assessment results, and implications for curriculum and pedagogy. Faculty will demonstrate how assessment has led to improved student learning.

8. Faculty profile: both full-time and adjunct
   a. Describe how new faculty members are mentored in teaching, advising, and working at the university
   b. Describe how the program evaluates teaching effectiveness.
   c. Describe plans for enhancing teaching effectiveness.
   d. Describe the distribution of adjunct and full-time teaching in the program.
   e. How are adjuncts assigned their courses?
   f. How are adjuncts identified, and how are their credentials evaluated?
   g. Attach faculty CV

The self-study will be organized in a binder (containing the following sections:

1. Administrative, Senate, and Department decisions
   i. All major meetings and decisions related to the program review should be well documented and all information should be kept by the department chair/coordinate.

2. External Review Reports and Program Responses
i. The latest program review documents should be available as well as the department’s response and actions.

ii. If available, an analysis of the result of actions taken and possible influence on the program review that will take place should be available.

3. Self-study

i. Cover page
   1) Name of department and program
   2) Name of department chair and/or program coordinator
   3) Official titles of approved degrees, options, minors, certificates, and credentials
   4) Date of last program review
   5) Name(s) of those responsible for the preparation of the report
   6) Signature of department chair
   7) Signature of Provost

ii. Table of contents for self-study elements

iii. Body of self-study addressing questions listed above

4. Notes from department retreats and meetings

5. Grid with dates for NHU stages of program review

6. Program statistical summary

Selection of an external reviewer
The outside reviewers selection consists of the following basic steps:

a. Submit a list of names of possible reviewers, along with a brief biography demonstrating their credentials in the discipline to the Provost.

b. The Provost will make the final selection of the external reviewers and send them an invitation.

c. Once date is set, the department chair will send self-study and instructions to reviewers.

The Provost’s Office funds the external reviewer team’s visit. The departments are responsible for making the arrangements for the visit and for keeping the Provost informed. Normally two to three external reviewers will serve. The departments submit a list of at least three names of possible reviewers and the Provost is responsible for the final decision on the make-up of the team.

External Reviewer Selection Criteria
The Department nominates at least three acceptable candidates for the external reviewer, who meet the following criteria:
- Demonstrated leader in the field (publications or creative works; reputation in instruction; active participation in appropriate scholarly and/or professional activities).

- Affiliation with an accredited academic department or program or professional organization appropriate to program being reviewed.

- No conflict-of-interest (i.e., no recent graduate of program, recent employee, friend or relative of any member of the program, recent contractual arrangements with program).

- Familiarity with academic/professional goals of the departments as well as the nature of the program being reviewed (e.g., experience with similar programs, experience with graduates of program being reviewed).

Role of the external reviewer
After the selection of the external reviewer by the Provost, the department confirms the external reviewer’s willingness to serve and sends a copy of the self-study to the external reviewer. The Office of the Provost will provide the external reviewer with a copy of NHU Program Review guidelines, a formal letter of invitation, and other relevant additional information. This material will be sent at least one month prior to the visit.

The role of the external reviewer is to bring a professional and experienced analysis of the documents contained in the self-study, as well as insightful observations during the visit. The reviewer will utilize his/her professional judgment as to how effectively the self-study has addressed the NHU Program Review Goals. The reviewer will also comment on the critical program review areas of: Program Mission, Goals and Objectives; Program History; and Academic Quality.

Reviewer’s site visit
During his/her site visit, the external reviewer will meet students, faculty, and administrators. A separate interview will be held early on the first day with the Provost, and the President, whenever possible.

At the end of the visit, the external reviewer is asked to present initial impressions and findings at an "exit meeting", to which any party concerned is invited. Those specifically invited shall include the Provost, the department chair, the faculty of the department, the Director of Institutional Planning and Evaluation, and students who are majoring in any of the programs under review. Representatives from other areas of the University may be asked to attend on request of the Provost.

Reviewer’s report
The evaluation report should be guided by information in the above section, "Role of the external reviewer." The report ought to contain recommendations based on the NHU Program Review Goals and areas of the self-study. Recommendations should be based on comparison with other programs in institutions and communities that are similar to NHU.
The length of the report should be appropriate to the complexity of the self-study and the external reviewer's assessment of their contribution to the quality of the program during the next five years.

The format of the report is left to the external reviewer's discretion. The reviewer may consider organizing the report according to the following program review areas:

1. Program Mission
2. Goals and Objectives
3. Program History
4. Academic Quality

It would be helpful to group recommendations within areas and also to number them for ease of reference.

The external reviewer's reports should be submitted to the Office of the Provost within four weeks after completion of the site visit. The Office of Provost will then distribute the report to the department chair.

Budget
The NHU has to cover the cost of air travel from outside California, not to exceed rates available from a University contracted travel agency.

The reviewer will receive a $1,000 honorarium, out of which the he/she is expected to pay all expenses (except for out-of-state airfare). If the program wishes to offer additional funds, it may do so at its own expense.

Schedule
Time: One and a half days to two days for site visit.

Important Contact People:
- Department faculty, staff, students, and Chair
- Provost
- President
- Alumni

Required Meetings
The reviewer has to have the following meetings:
- Initial interview with the Provost on the first day.
- Interview with the department chair.
- Interview at a faculty meeting, and individual faculty, as appropriate.

The reviewer has to have an exit meeting to present initial impressions, to which all interested persons are invited. The following people will be invited to the this meeting:
- the Provost
- Department chair and faculty
- Director of Institutional Planning and Evaluation
Program Review Implementation Calendar

The Program Review cycle is **five years**. All degree, credential, and certificate granting programs will conduct a program review within the next two academic years (AY 2005-2006 or AY 2006-2007), and from there start the five-year cycle.

The following program review schedule needs to be followed in order to accomplish program reviews in time for the WASC Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness visits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Spring 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Translation &amp; Interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Spring 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Math and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Computer Networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>