

Monday, 20 February 2012, 10:45-11:45 a.m.
CS 1.2

Academic Program Review: Creating Success from the Ground Up
Peggy Burke, Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, St. Bonaventure University, and
Ann Lehman, Registrar and Director of Institutional Research, St. Bonaventure University

Published Program Abstract (page 21):

Prior to undertaking program review in the summer of 2009 there was little in the way of institutional experience in, or any institution-wide history, of program evaluation. While two schools at the institution are nationally accredited the use of data to evaluate programs and inform decision-making was still a foreign concept to many. In an effort to provide a demonstrable link between enrollments, student learning, faculty productivity and strategic planning the University created a faculty group charged with program evaluation. The presentation will discuss what worked, what didn't, and the ways in which support for the program was built.

- There was creation of a university-wide committee to address program review and evaluation.
- Members of the committee included academic deans, faculty senate representatives, representatives from each school, etc.
- The university hired a consultant, but they found this was of limited help due to the university's unique core curriculum (with its heavy emphasis on philosophy).
- The president hired a private consultant but they did not feel this was helpful.
- A committee on campus did the best work on the review process. The members agreed to collaborate. They decided to keep discussing until everyone agreed. They agreed that all discussions stayed with the group.
- At the first committee meeting, it was determined which academic programs would be assessed. Six departments volunteered to be the first pilot programs.
- The most difficulty came in figuring out what to do with the interdisciplinary programs.
- The committee developed a protocol for the review process and developed a timeline.
- They agreed to work in the summer months.

Timeline (in 2009):

- 5/7 first committee meeting
- 5/26 second meeting. Pilot programs identified

- 6/11 third meeting. Rubrics developed
- 6/15 fourth meeting. An online resource site for the programs went “live”
- 6/17 fifth meeting. Pilot programs gained site access
- 8/3 sixth meeting. Pilot program reports due
- 8/19 seventh meeting. The process and protocol were tweaked. Based on what was learned, it was felt that implementation of the program was now ready for the whole campus.
- 9/1 All program directors on the campus were given training, data, and access to the website
- 11/1 All program reports due to the committee
- 11/20 After review of drafts of the reports by APEC (the committee), the drafts were returned to the programs/departments
- 12/4 Rejoinders due. Departments and programs used the “rejoinder” to respond to the committee’s comments.
- 12/18 Final, formal report due to the president and provost. The report should show alignment of the program/department with the institutional mission. It should also show the demand for the program and the demand for its graduates. The report also described the resources needed (and these were ranked as high, medium, or low need).

The Registrar’s Office would verify enrollment (for classes/courses) and verify the number of majors in a department.

Every single department chair had to be present at all meetings and all deadlines had to be met. If not, the penalty was that there would be no consideration given to any requests for resources.

The tenor of the first training session was not very friendly but that has changed.

Everything was filed electronically.

Pre-populated data forms were provided to department chairs from earlier reports to show what to do.

Programs reviewed on these metrics:

- Alignment with university mission
- Demand for program and number of graduates
- Student quality
- Faculty quality and productivity
- Quality of assessment within programs
- Student learning outcomes assessment
- Cost per student credit hour

Advising—St. Bonaventure has an on-line campus-wide advising questionnaire.

There is a common course evaluation across campus.

Members of this committee (the APEC) were elected.

This assessment (in 2009) started an annual reporting process.

The final report from each department/program was due to the President and Provost on December 18, 2009. It showed how the mission of the program/department is in alignment with the institutional mission. It also showed student “demand” for that department/program, and indicated what its graduates did. High-, medium-, and low-need resource requests were made.

With the first round of reports, departments/programs put forward requests for resources and these were ranked. By the end of the first year after those first requests, ten of the eleven high-need items were met.

The results of the assessment were not meant to be punitive but were to be of help in improving programs.

At the end of the first year, departments/programs were invited to do the process again. One realization at that time was that minors had not been tracked (and this was especially important for departments that did not have many majors but which had more students completing minors. It was also found that students don’t always declare minors. Now faculty members try to track the number of students who may be pursuing minors.

The second round of reviews was due in the fall of 2010.

Institutional data were available from some office on campus; these data are not available until after May graduation.

A discussion was held with program directors and department heads about due dates for all of the completed reports in the second round.

APEC membership was reconstituted.

A new dean came on board and was placed in charge.

The third round of reviews was started in summer and fall of 2011.

Summer work was again involved.

There were further discussions on due dates.

Some departments/programs had changes in department/chair head position and new deans were involved.

There were changes in the membership of APEC.

Data are centrally collected and distributed.

Previous studies have been used to clarify programs and this was used to more narrowly define academic programs.

One program was terminated but that was the decision of the program itself—it was realized that it had few students and they were poorly served by the program.

Data on minors were included.

The program has become more transparent over time.

Process for summer/fall 2012

- There will be a possible split in the forms—one for programs and one for departments.
- Not every program will be up for review this year. The university does not want to get to assessment “burnout.” How will the APEC decide which department/program will be up for review?
- Everything in the reports will now be going public and will be up on a website.
- There has been some discussion of the problem, sometime, in deciding on what a program is and what a department is.

Statement of Distinction (from the university)

At St. Bonaventure, we strive to foster the development of knowledgeable, skilled, compassionate, and ethical individuals by mentoring students within vitally engaging environments ever mindful of such Franciscan values as individual dignity, community inclusiveness, and service to others.

- In the first year, there were 29 rejoinders filed.
- In the second year, there were eight rejoinders filed.
- In the third year, there were three rejoinders filed, and these concerned minor matters.
- Requests for resources were rated as high-need, medium-need, low-need. These ratings were based on the use of data and on how the requests fit the university vision. They were examined in relation to requests from other departments. (One example was given concerning the Classics department. This department provides service to the university [since many students take their courses] but there is only student doing this major. A request for more faculty was made by the Classics Department, but this was turned down.)
- Automatic challenge of APEC’s assessment occurred in the first year.
- This process prepared them for the next round of accreditation in 2014.
- There are 15 members of the APEC. They often had difficulty finding meeting times, and they often met on Saturdays and Sundays.

- One thing they discovered that sometimes people in departments or programs had an “inflated sense of accomplishment” about their department or program.
- The reports have generated a wide range of discussion.
- Within a year, there will be documents online and it will also show scholarly activity and professional activity of faculty.
- Members of the APEC received a \$25 gift card. There was no additional pay for summer work and department chairs did not get any additional compensation.
- One argument was that department chairs would have reduced work in the future based on what they were doing now.
- When the faculty member runs for membership on the APEC, he/she knows that there will be work during the summer.
- Forums would be held in which the APEC would give sample tips on what sorts of information would be required.
- They are also interested in surveying the alumni about programs.
- The data were a bit scattered in the first year, but reports have become more focused over time.
- After the first two rounds, departments have been given more resources to get the reviews accomplished. These additional resources have served as incentives for gathering data. Data include student course assessment.
- One practice in the past was that when a faculty member retired or died the university would replace that person. Now, as part of the review process, a department must justify the position in order to replace the faculty member.
- There are 49 programs (including graduate programs) at St. Bonaventure.

Handout—St. Bonaventure University Program Review Form (APEC)

St. Bonaventure University Program Review Form (APEC)

Program:

Review prepared by:

Directions: The comment boxes provide an opportunity for each program to “tell its story”. Please complete each box. Since Word has the capacity to check spelling and grammar, but there is no spell check or formatting capacity in the form, you are advised to work in a separate Word file outside of this form while developing your responses. There is a hard character limit (spaces included) for each entry. Word will allow you to count the characters as you progress. You can then copy and paste your edited copy directly into the form. Please note that there is no spell check or formatting capacity within the form. You may save the document and return to it later for additional entries or editing. You may refer to links on the resource list for tools and information that will be helpful.

1. Program Alignment with Institution Mission, Values and Vision Statement and Statement of Distinction (See resource list)

Describe how your program is aligned with St. Bonaventure’s Mission, Values and Vision Statement and Statement of Distinction. [character limit -4000]

2a. Demand for Program (undergraduate) Include dual degree candidates in this count. (See resource page for global SBU data)

Academic Year	# of Inquiries	# of Apps	# of Admits	# of Matriculants (3 rd week count freshmen enrolled)	Total enrollment in program		Number of degrees/certificates awarded	Number of 2 nd majors completed	Number of minors completed
					Majors	Minors			
<i>Using the data above, please comment on the demand for this program. [character limit 2000]</i>									

3a. Profile of majors – Undergraduate programs only

Academic year	Number of Admits & Average GPA of SBU Entering Freshmen	Number & Average GPA of Freshmen Entering Program	Average SAT of all entering Freshmen		Average SAT Program Entrants		Average SAT Program Completers		Average GPA Of completers		
			(m)	(v)	(w)	(m)	(v)	(w)	(m)	(v)	(w)
<i>Comment on the quality of students entering and completing your program. [character limit 1500] If you have external benchmarking data for your program, please cite this data in your response.</i>											

4. Demand for Program and Graduates

Narrative: a) Describe the opportunities and projected demand for graduates of your program including both employment and graduate school placement. (See resources page for links to Department of Labor and other career projection websites.) b) What data indicate the level of demand and/or success for your program graduates? [character limit 4000]

5. Program Advantage

What are the points of pride for your program? Its unique characteristics? What advantages does your program have compared to competitor programs? Factors may include but are not limited to accreditation status, location, unique program characteristics, etc. [character limit 4000]

6. 2010-2011 Academic Year Staffing Level

Number of Full Professors		Number of Associate Professors		Number of Assistant Professors		Number of Lecturers		Number of Adjuncts (head count)		Number of Adjuncts (In FTE -8 sections ug=1 FTE; 6 sections grad = 1 FTE)		# of Visiting Profs (full time)		Number of TAs or Graduate Fellows as Teacher of Record (in FTE -8 sections = 1 FTE)	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F						
Full time tenured															
Full time non-tenured, tenure track															
N =															
Full time non-tenure track															
N =															
Please identify any special circumstances, or changes that have had an impact on staffing, e.g. course load reduction, sabbaticals. What do these data tell you about your program? Please comment on the diversity of your faculty. Note also if any faculty members are shared with other programs by indicating # of sections/year being provided to the other program. [character limit 4000]															

7. Faculty Scholarly /Professional/Creative Productivity Profile Insert number in cell. Do not double-count co-authored publications within program; see Faculty Productivity planning grid on resource sheet for data work up. Count only completed works (published, presented, etc); do not include research or publication underway.

	Number 2006- 5/2009	Number 5/2009 – 5/2010	Number 5/2010 – 5/2011	Comments (Please explain any special circumstances, events or other factors having an impact on faculty scholarly activity.) [Character limit- 4000]
Books published –Edited				
Books published –Authored				
Monographs, chapters				
Peer-reviewed articles				
Non –peer-reviewed publications				
Peer reviewed exhibits/performances				
Grants written				
Number of externally funded projects				
Dollar amount of externally funded projects				
Number of internally funded projects				
Dollar amount of internally funded projects				
Papers presentations at conferences (national & international)				
Papers presentations at conferences (regional , state and local)				
Conferences attended				
Number of consultancies				
Software applications designed, created				
Discipline related media activities				
Honors projects, theses, student research projects mentored				
Editorship/editorial board service				
Professional reviewer for other programs/institutions				
Book, journal reviews				
Invited talks				
Officer ship in professional				

organizations				
Other:				

8a. Major Productivity – in program (Note: Graduate programs may omit this item.)

Year	Number of Majors	Number of Credits with Major Prefix	Number of Credit Hours Generated by Majors
Comments: [character limit 1000]			

8b. Credit hour Productivity

	# credit hours offered	# of sections	Total enrollment	Student Credit Hours Generated	% Student Credit Hours Delivered by Adjunct Faculty	% of courses taught with fewer than 10 students (not including Independent Study or Tutorials)	% of courses taught with more than 25 students
Please comment on program credit hour productivity including service courses to other majors and Clare. (Do not include any courses with Clare prefix in this discussion.) [character limit 4000]							

8c. Credit Hour Productivity –Service with Clare Prefix

Semester	# credit hours offered	# of sections	Total Enrollment	Student Credit Hours Generated	% student credit hours delivered by adjunct faculty
Comment: [character limit 4000]					

9 . Faculty Effectiveness Indicators

9a. Advising:	Total # Program Advisees:
Narrative: <i>What data do you have that address the quality of advising within the program?</i> [character limit 2000]	

9b. Syllabi:
Comments: <i>How does the program ensure syllabi are current, complete and consistent across multiple sections?</i> [character limit 1000]

9c. Student Course Evaluations:
Comments: <i>How do course evaluation data address the quality of the faculty and teaching? What other data indicate student satisfaction with teaching within the program?</i> [character limit 2000]

9d. Alumni Feedback:
Comments: <i>What alumni indicators address the quality of the faculty and teaching?</i> [character limit 2000]

9e. Faculty Distinctiveness:
What are the distinctions of program faculty? [character limit 4000]

10. Program Completer Profiles

Program Completer Satisfaction:

Program Exit Data:
<i>What data speak to the degree of satisfaction your graduates have with your program?</i> [character limit 2000]
Graduate school admission:
<i>Discuss graduate school placement success for your majors.</i> [character limit 2000]

Employment:
<i>Discuss data providing feedback from employers of your graduates relative to your program. [character limit 2000]</i>

11. Student Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes
<i>Identify your program learning outcomes. [character limit 4000]</i>
<i>Describe how learning outcomes are assessed. [character limit 4000]</i>
<i>What do learning outcome assessment data tell you about your program? [character limit 4000]</i>
<i>How have you allocated resources and/or adjusted the curriculum to achieve your goals/learning outcomes? [character limit 4000]</i>

12. Program Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary/Collaborative /Outreach Activities

<i>How/to what extent is the program involved in interdisciplinary or collaborative activities? [character limit 4000]</i>

13. Program Vision/Needs

<i>What is your program's vision for the future and the action plan and resources needed to accomplish the vision? [character limit 4000]</i>

14. Additional Information

Comments: What other information is important to your program and has not been requested elsewhere in this form? [character limit 4000]
