

# Program Review: Leveraging Structure, Process & Virtual Reality

Brenda M. Coppard, Gail M. Jensen, Mike Pieper, Mary Ann Danielson, & Susan Hicks

Fiscal constraints and regulatory pressures demand that higher education engage in increased accountability. Administrators are challenged to implement robust and effective measures of academic accountability. Academic program review process provides an opportunity for an institution to evaluate its academic programs, reflect on and refine its mission and vision, and exchange ideas and best practices to strengthen existing programs. Creighton University implemented a structured institutional process for program review that incorporates a virtual web-based format for external reviewers. The poster will share the process, tools, and outcomes to highlight the lessons learned during the first year of new program review process.

## Program Review

Creighton University's [Academic Program Review Policy](#) arises from the University's mission and University Learning Outcomes. Creighton exists for students and learning. Creighton University, as a Catholic, Jesuit University dedicated to excellence in undergraduate, graduate and professional programs, is committed to an ongoing process of program evaluation that includes assessment of student learning, reflection, and action that is consistent with the model of Ignatian teaching and learning.

Systematic program review provides a vehicle for ensuring the following:

- Evidence of educational quality and consistency with national trends
- Documentation of student performance and achievement of stated program outcomes within the context of the University mission
- Evaluation of resources including student support, faculty, space
- Improvement of educational quality and strategies for improvement
- An evaluative process which identifies strengths and weaknesses with a forward looking projection
- Program review results should result in action

Program review assists in identifying strong programs that need to be maintained and may help identify programs that need modification, consolidation, or elimination from the University's academic portfolio.

## HLC Criteria

### Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

#### Core Components

4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

## Program Review Process

### 5 Phases:

#### Phase 1: Planning and Preparation

- Self study team established
- List of reviews is generated (6 (no more than 2 internal)
- AEA to contact and finalize reviewers (2 external & 1 internal)

#### Phase 2: Self-Study Report Phase

- Self-study submitted to AEA
- Reviewers oriented & receive self-study

#### Phase 3: Program Review

- Conduct virtual review
- Generate summary report and make an overall recommendation for the program (i.e., maintain, strengthen, monitor, discontinue)
- Report submitted to AEA and distributed to Academic Unit, Dean(s), and Provost

#### Phase 4: Summary

- Academic Unit/Dean(s) response to report & then distributed to AEA and Provost
- Wrap up letter is written by academic unit, Dean and Provost
- Self-study, report, recommendation, written response and wrap up letter is submitted to the sub-committee on Peer Review of the University Assessment Committee for review

## Phase 5: Recommendation and Action

- UAC subcommittee re-affirms the recommendations or proposes alternatives
- Summary document of Review is submitted to AEA for permanent archival
- Provost provides a summary memo and sends to academic unit, dean(s) & President
- A plan of action is submitted to Provost by the academic unit / dean(s)

## Data Sets in Program Review:

- Enrollment Trends
- Instructional Productivity
- Faculty Trends
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Program Resources

## 2013-14 Program Review Outcomes

Outcome	N =
Strengthen	3
Suspend	1
Discontinue	1
Pending finalization	2

## Lessons Learned

Templates assist the process

- Estimated cost savings for each review due to virtual external reviews is \$2,175!
- Training is required on process
- Encountered some difficulties with MAC computers accessibility to electronic system

