

## **UND ACADEMIC UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW AY 2021-2022**

### **PURPOSE**

Academic Program Review (APR) at the University of North Dakota (UND) provides an opportunity for all academic programs to document, examine, and assess the achievement of their goals and objectives over time and is founded on principles of continuous evaluation and improvement and institutional quality.

APR also facilitates UND's demonstration of accomplishment that aligns with North Dakota University System and North Dakota Board of Higher Education goals, as well as those of the Higher Learning Commission's Criteria for Accreditation.

The results of the APR process inform planning; budget, time, space, and other resource allocation decisions; curriculum change; professional development; and more. For programs that undergo professional or other specialized types of accreditation, APR fundamentally accompanies those accreditation efforts.

The UND APR is expected to occur for all programs every five years, although exceptions to this timeline may be requested to the VPAA office to align APR with accreditation cycles. See the VPAA website for the schedule of program reviews.

### **APR PROCESS OVERVIEW**

1. In consultation with the dean, the program under review will identify a PROGRAM REVIEW LEADER who is responsible for developing the responses to the PROGRAM REVIEW PROMPTS. For undergraduate programs, this will typically be the Department Chair or the departmental assessment coordinator. A different Program Review Leader could be named for graduate programs (e.g., Graduate Program Director) as a separate response to the Program Review prompts must be completed for graduate programs. The Program Review Leader will submit responses to program review prompts in [Taskstream](#).
2. The dean of the program under review will identify a College-level review team. This team will provide a college response/report to the program's submitted APR in Taskstream.
3. Program reviews will be connected to the program in Taskstream by Watermark. Program reviews contain the same questions (with a few additional questions for graduate programs). Please make sure the data included is program specific but if the response is the same for the department regardless of program, feel free to copy and paste to multiple reviews should you have them.
4. Quantitative information will be provided by UND Office of University Analytics and Planning in the form of the Academic Program Review dashboard for program reviews. Programs should USE THIS DATA ONLY as the basis for their Program Review responses, supplemented, as appropriate, with additional information (e.g., data included in accreditations reports reflecting

industry or discipline standards). Likewise, college review teams should also use this data when providing a college level response.

5. The PROGRAM REVIEW LEADER should involve departmental/program faculty in the process of creating, reviewing, and finalizing the responses to Program Review prompts. At the discretion of the Program Review Leader, the process may also provide opportunities for staff, students, community stakeholders, and alumni. At the graduate level, inclusion of graduate students and graduate alumni in the review process is strongly recommended.
6. Following submission of the COLLEGE/SCHOOL REVIEW TEAM REPORT in Taskstream, the PROGRAM REVIEW LEADER may submit a PROGRAM REJOINER, if desired.
7. External evaluators, outside of UND, may be invited at the discretion of the Dean, VPAA, and Dean of SGS to provide an independent discipline-related perspective. If an external reviewer is decided upon, the Dean, VPAA, Dean of SGS and Department Chair will determine the materials and issues to present to the external evaluator. The Program Review Leader, in consultation with the program faculty, will recommend names of potential external evaluators and rationale for their selection to the Dean. The Dean may also identify additional external reviewers. The dean, in consultation with the VPAA and the Dean of SGS, will name the external evaluator. Typically, an external evaluation will be conducted without a campus visit. At the discretion of the VPAA and Dean of SGS, more than one evaluator or a campus visit may be deemed appropriate and will be funded by the College and/or Program under review.

The Dean is responsible for assuring that the external evaluator receives appropriate materials in a timely manner. It is also the Dean's responsibility to assure that adequate communication takes place between the external evaluator, the program faculty, the Program Review Leader, and the Dean. Any decisions on remuneration or other recognition of the evaluator are the responsibility of the Dean.

External evaluators will be asked to provide an EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT, which is a clear and objective analysis of the program being reviewed, similar to the College Review Team Report.

Upon completion of the program's responses to Program Review prompts, the College Review Team Report, and the Program Rejoinder (if any), and external reviewer (if any), the Dean and the Dean of SGS, where applicable, or their designee(s) will prepare a DEAN'S SUMMARY REPORT. The Dean's Summary Report will include specific recommendations for future action and follow-up.

8. The Dean or their designee will submit the summary report in Taskstream. After this submission a meeting will be scheduled with the Dean or their designee, the Dean of SGS, the Department Chair, and any others the VPAA deems appropriate to discuss and respond to the recommendations. The VPAA will prepare a VPAA SUMMARY REPORT following the meeting and submit the report in Taskstream.
9. If a program has generated a self-study report for purposes of external accreditation, that report may be used as the basis for UND's Program Review process. The Program Review Leader must enter content from accrediting reports in conjunction with or in place of a response to prompts, but may do so by appending the accreditation report and providing a reference to the relevant

section of the accreditation report under each Program Review prompt, as in “See Section One, paragraph two of Accreditation Report”. **If utilizing responses from accreditation reports, be sure to specify how the response answers the question for program review.** Any APR questions/sections not addressed by the accreditation report must be answered in the submission. Programs should check with their respective Dean for guidance.

## **CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW (APR)**

All responses to prompts are expected to consider the data in the Program Review Dashboards posted by University Analytics and Planning. Here is the link to the [Academic Program Review](#). This link will take you to the login within PowerBI.com. Use your UND information (e.g., firstname.lastname@ndus.edu) to log in.

Please review your most recent assessment plan. The Chair should have access to this in Taskstream and should be able to provide a copy to you. If your most recent assessment plan is not submitted in Taskstream, please ask the Chair to submit the [annual report in Taskstream](#).

### **STEP 1: Program Review Leader submits responses to the following in Taskstream**

#### *Criterion 1. Introduction to Department and Program*

Using the Academic Program Review dashboard data, please complete the following information.

The <Program/Degree granted> is administered by the Department of <Name of Department>, in the College of <Name>. There are <Number> full-time and <number> part-time faculty members in the Department. <Number> faculty in the Department contribute to this program. Enrollment in this program has been <increasing/steady/decreasing> over the past five years with a current enrollment of <number> primary majors. Over the past five years, <number> degrees have been conferred. <Percentage> of first-time, full-time and transfer students in the <year> cohort graduated in four years, and <percentage> graduated in six years.

#### *Criterion 2. Program Goals & Curriculum*

The program should have a stated mission and learning goals for each program on their assessment plan (see link above) and demonstrate how the goals align with the vision and mission of the program and with the strategic priorities of the college and university (differentiate by program where appropriate). The program should demonstrate the relevance and impact of the curriculum associated with the program. Responses to each prompt should be direct, specific, and as brief as possible.

- 2A. What are the program’s major successes in achieving its goals since the last APR?
- 2B. Summarize significant curricular actions taken as a result of the previous APR.
- 2C. Briefly describe if and how the program’s curriculum and requirements have responded to changes in the discipline and employment outcomes.

#### *Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Continuous Improvement*

The program should demonstrate that it supports innovative and creative teaching and learning, assesses student learning, and uses assessment to make program improvements. In this section, the program should reference and provide evidence of the program's assessment plan(s) and annual program assessment records/reports. (Differentiate for each undergraduate and graduate degree/certificate program and concentration offered by the program.)

- 3A. Briefly describe how faculty in your program use innovative and creative teaching and learning activities and how these activities support desired learning outcomes and student professional development.
- 3B. Consider the program's current mix of online, hybrid, and traditional classroom modes of instructional/degree delivery. Briefly describe how the current program's delivery methods meet student and/or market demand. Also, describe if there is any evidence of unmet demand (e.g. declining enrollment; student inquiries about the availability of online degree delivery of your traditional on campus degree(s)).

#### *Criterion 4. Students*

The program should have appropriate processes in place to recruit, retain, and graduate students in a timely manner. Some questions are appropriate for graduate programs only. *Please use the data provided in UAP Program Review Dashboards to inform responses to these questions.*

- 4A. Review and analyze the program data over the past five years. Based on this data, is the program operating at capacity (i.e., does your program have as many students/enrollment as it can handle)? If the program is not at capacity, identify and evaluate program strategies for recruitment and retention, including any existing barriers that hamper recruitment and retention of students.
- 4B. Evaluate the success of graduates of the program by assessing the research and professional development opportunities or training your program offers. Does your program track where graduates are typically placed in the workforce, or in graduate/professional programs? If yes, how do these opportunities/training align with successful graduate outcomes? If no, what methods might your program employ to measure the success of graduates?
- 4C. Describe the program's efforts to graduate undergraduate and graduate students in a timely fashion. Do these efforts align with best practices in your discipline and/or undergraduate/graduate education more broadly? How do these efforts compare to those of your competitors, whether regionally, nationally, or internationally?
- 4D. For graduate programs only: Using number of graduate students funded by tuition waivers and amount of funding, and any other relevant department data, describe the rationale your program uses to distribute funding to graduate students. *(For example, what percentage of available funding goes to Master's students versus PhD and why? How does the current allocation of funding align with the program's and/or college's goals? How does it align with UND's strategic plan goals?)* Does (or could) your program attract paying graduate students? If so, what is the mix of funded versus non-funded students? What is the degree of growth potential in each population?
- 4E. For graduate programs only: Examine admissions criteria and how these criteria affect the kinds of applicants and admits typical to each program. Describe how the program identifies and recruits its most talented graduate students, as well as how you recruit

locally, regionally, nationally, internationally. Describe any specific efforts to recruit underrepresented students.

*Criterion 5. Resources. Research and Planning*

The program is efficient and sufficiently resourced to carry out its mission and achieve its goals.

- 5A. Consider the program's budget, including support received from the institution as well as external funding sources, and any budgetary changes that may have occurred over the past five years. Evaluate any budgetary efficiencies or reallocation efforts undertaken within the program and the effects of those efforts on the program's ability to meet its expectations and goals. Does potential exist for further external and/or donor funding opportunities? See Chair for current balances of alumni funds.
- 5B. Using data pulled from Digital Measures (see Chair for data/reports) and any relevant additional program data (please attach to submission if supplying additional data)—briefly describe how the programs' faculty members' research and scholarly activity directly enhances undergraduate and graduate education. Also, briefly describe how graduate students enhance the research productivity of program faculty.

*Criterion 6. Future Directions*

The program engages in prioritization in order to achieve its mission and vision and align with the strategic priorities of UND.

- 6A. Provide a specific list of prioritized actions for continued program development and improvement and a reasonable timeline for implementation. If these actions were carried out, how would that affect program quality and outcomes over the next 5 years?

**STEP 1A:** *Optional* external reviewer (grad programs only) report attached.

**STEP 2: College Review Team submits responses to the following:**

1. Does the information provided in the responses demonstrate that the program's direction is in alignment with the College/school goals? Please explain.
2. Assess the strengths of the program on the basis of the data and responses provided. What are some examples of what the program is doing really well?
3. Assess areas for improvement of the program on the basis of the data and responses provided.
4. Make recommendations for future actions of the program that will help them move toward or achieve their stated goals. Are there things that the program no longer needs to do? Are there things they should be doing they currently are not?
5. Provide any additional feedback or information the College Review Team deems relevant to the program review.

**STEP 2A:** *Optional* rejoinder response submitted by Program Review Leader. If you have a rejoinder to the reviews provided by the College Review Team please enter that here. Your rejoinder might be a point of clarification, disagreement, or further elaboration.

**STEP 3: Dean submits summary.** Please provide your evaluation of the academic program under review with respect to its strengths, weaknesses, goals, and action steps; in doing so, please consider both the Program Review itself and the College Review Team's evaluation.

**STEP 4: Following APR meeting, VPAA Final Report will be submitted in Taskstream.**