

Academic Program Review Procedures, Guidelines, and Materials

**Revised April 2017
OBU Curriculum Committee**

Academic Program Review

Background

In the fall semester 2007, the SVPAA articulated the goal of having academic units achieve program review on a regular basis. To accomplish this goal, Dr. Bosch charged the Curriculum Committee with developing a plan to present to the faculty and administration. In conjunction with this charge, the Deans Council developed a rotating five-year plan (with some exceptions) for academic units to achieve program review and presented this and some suggestions to the Curriculum Committee.

What follows is the Curriculum Committee's proposal to achieve this goal. Since 2004, academic units have been under nearly continuous pressure to do program reviews of one form or another. It is essential, in the view of the Curriculum Committee, that this proposal replaces future models of such reviews and that University administration will adapt future models of academic review to integrate smoothly with the faculty-driven model being presented. The Committee feels the proposal below is comprehensive; it should be available to those who need to assess academic units in a variety of ways. It is also streamlined in order to make the process as efficient as possible for academic units to accomplish.

Overview

The Academic Program Review (APR) process is not just a report written every five years or so. It is a period of in-depth self-study and pursuit of excellence that culminates in a report that explains to the outside reader how the academic unit has measure up against its goals in the past and how it will continue to improve in the future. This process is part of an overall culture of assessment at OBU that is designed to identify strengths, improve resource allocation, and encourage the self-awareness and engagement that helps avoid problems.

Purposes of Academic Program Review at OBU

To enhance the effectiveness of academic offerings at OBU, the instructional faculty seeks to evaluate academic units on a regular basis in order:

- 1) To ensure the quality and continuous improvement of academic programs.
- 2) To refine and define the University's academic directions and program priorities which shape resource allocations and other governing decisions.
- 3) To assist academic units in ongoing assessment and strategic planning.

This faculty-driven evaluation will be governed and administered by the Curriculum Committee, which will work with academic units to create an effective and comprehensive process. This process strives to establish continuity and consistency in reviewing programs, in allocating resources, and to ensure an acceptable level of workload on academic units in such review and long-range planning models.

The APR Process

The Academic Program Review Process is an opportunity for a thorough, in-depth look at (1) whether the program is achieving its goals and (2) whether the program can do so in the future.

An Academic Program Review is much more than a simple report, it is a process of collaborating with colleagues to evaluate how things are, ask how things should be, and establish a plan for how to get there. As such, this is a process that must begin well before the report's due date.

Another way to look at it is that the Academic Program Review is a mixed-methods study of what an academic unit is doing. Many types of data should be considered: direct and indirect feedback; qualitative and quantitative data; and internal and external information. Often these sources of data will require months of lead time to collect, so a good review process begins long before the first draft of the report is begun.

Some possible sources of data for the APR:

1. SWOT analysis – A representative group of faculty within the unit gather to ask what the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. This is the recommended place to start the review process.
2. Faculty feedback – Formal or informal feedback can be solicited from the faculty based on the categories of investigation for the APR.
3. Student feedback – Course evaluations, formal and informal surveys, student interviews and more are all useful ways to measure student satisfaction and whether a program is meeting their needs.
4. Alumni feedback – Interviews and surveys provide important information about the relative success of graduates, how they feel they were prepared by the program, and may offer leading indicators for determining programmatic changes.
5. Market data – Statistical trends from news outlets, professional organizations, proposed regulations, and scholarly articles can all indicate what future changes an academic program may need to make to be competitive and meet the needs of future students.
6. Accreditation Reports – Previous comments from accreditors and self-studies can be valuable for this report. Make use of work that has already been done, if possible.
7. Benchmarking – Peers at other institutions and internet research can help uncover trends within the discipline, best practices, and creative ideas that may be worth considering for the program.
8. Graduation and Enrollment Trends – The number of students that complete the program and new students enrolling in the programs offer indications of its viability in the near- and long-term.
9. Placement Rates, Grad School Acceptances
10. Academic Assessment Data - Looking at five years of academic assessment data gives a look at how the program is doing over an extended period and may uncover previously unnoticed trends.

The APR process should involve as many faculty of the program as possible. This does not mean that a series of meetings with a large group are necessary, though beginning with a brainstorming session during a group SWOT analysis is a good place to start. However, the process will likely work best if work is divided to a number of individuals with a clear plan for data to be pursued and dates of completion. A central point of contact for the report and leader of the review process should coordinate and help plan data gathering and analysis activities.

One way to divide the review process work is to take each of the required sections of the report (see below) and assign a responsible individual for each. This helps provide ownership of the process by many, increases the likelihood of buy-in to the finished product, and will help bring the benefits of multiple perspectives to bear on the issue.

Ultimately, there is no single way to run the review process, but thinking ahead, developing a plan, and working collaboratively are importance steps in attaining to success.

The Report

Academic units will, according to the published schedule (see Appendix A), complete and submit Academic Program Review (APR) reports to the Curriculum Committee; they will then be forwarded to the Provost for review. The Provost will ensure the information is made available to the Executive Leadership Team.

All academic programs (i.e., major or concentration), must be included under an APR, but the APRs may be written at the department or division level. Academic Assessment for each academic program will be summarized in the body of the APR.

For those programs or colleges that have a professional accreditor, the regular report (i.e., self-study) written in anticipation of the professional accreditor's visit may be use in lieu of the APR format discussed here. However, an executive summary of the specialized report should be drafted that (1) summarizes the location of responses to the five areas detailed below within the report (this may be done by page number or with reference to criteria or standard numbers), (2) answers the "significant question" (bolded in each of the five areas) regarding the OBU specific APR. This executive summary should be 2-4 pages; the intent is to create an abbreviated reference for the curriculum committee's review, not to create an additional burden on the college or program under review.

The APRs should address the following items:

1. **Academic Assessment:** units must address the following items for each major or concentration (i.e., a summary for each of the Academic Assessment Plans):
 - a. Relationship between the division, department, and program (i.e., major or concentration) missions and the OBU Mission Statement.
 - b. Relationship between the program SLOs and the University Educational Goals (see Appendix B).
 - c. Examples of changes made and improvements realized due to the Academic Assessment process.

- d. Summary of open action plans based on Academic Assessment for each program.
 - e. Student job and graduate program placement rates.
 - f. **This section must answer these significant questions:** How has Academic Assessment been used to improve this program?
 - g. Note: The annual Academic Assessment reports from WEAVE for each of the programs will be attached as appendices (1 appendix per program with multiple years of data in each appendix) for all years since the last APR. Therefore, it is not necessary to exhaustively detail each year's results. This section represents the highlights of the Academic Assessment process. Rubrics and other assessment tools used should be included in the appendices as available.
2. **Environmental Analysis** – units should indicate how the educational environment is or is not adequate to support the mission of the program. Both strengths and weaknesses should be identified. Areas of environmental concern which should be addressed are:
- a. *University Catalog information and other published materials, including e-materials* – Are these materials adequate? A detailed list of discrepancies and necessary updates should be included as an appendix.
 - b. *Facilities* – Are current facilities sufficient? What enhancements could be made to improve the quality of instruction or ensure sustainability?
 - c. *Library holdings and resources* – Even if current resources are deemed sufficient, faculty should develop a prioritized list of new or standard works for future library acquisitions as an appendix to the APR report.
 - d. *Administrative Staffing*
 - Is sufficient staffing available?
 - What specific needs, if any, are not being met?
 - e. *Instructional Staffing*
Units should indicate the appropriateness of instructional staffing to the mission of the program. Specifically, units should include the following information as part of their review of this section:
 1. Within the body of the report, state whether faculty are academically qualified in accordance with the HLC guidelines for faculty qualification and any applicable professional accreditors. State whether current staffing is adequate, what particular strengths or weaknesses exist, and what future staffing needs exist and why.
 2. In the body of the report, the author should outline plans to maintain instructional staffing over the next review period regarding known departures and retirements, or changes in staffing configurations based on evaluation and long-range planning within the unit
 3. In an appendix, include a listing of faculty, including specific areas of teaching and/or administrative duties, & degrees held. Adjunct faculty should be listed as appropriate. This should include an explanation of why the faculty are qualified based on applicable accreditor standards.

4. In an appendix, detail teaching load data in support of the instructional staffing, including (but not limited to) general information about teaching load reports and chronic overload or under-load issues. This supports the assertion that staffing is or is not adequate.
 5. In the body of the report, a synopsis of faculty development activities (including, but not limited to publications, presentations, performances, awards, attendance at academic conferences and events and membership and offices held in professional societies. Use of year-end reports by department/division chairs and deans is of sufficient quality for this part of the review (see Faculty Handbook 1.7.2.3.d). A detailed list should be included in an appendix.
- f. *Student Work Staffing*
 - g. *Technology* – Is available technology sufficient? What new tools would enhance the instructional quality of the program(s)?
 - h. *Enrollment Trends, including majors, second majors, and minors* (This includes graduation rates as well as number of students enrolled.)
 - i. **This section must answer this significant question:** Are the resources available for this program sufficient for its continued operation?

Environmental analysis does not have to be restricted to the listing above. The unit is encouraged to identify, investigate, and evaluate any internal or external source of influence on its program. Units are encouraged to work with the Office of the SVPA, the Office of the CFO, the Office of Enrollment Management, IS&S, Physical Plant, and other campus entities to determine environmental needs which impact the program.

3. ***Standards and Trends*** – units should describe their program in the context of the current and future state of their discipline. This section of the report should focus on external benchmarks of other institutions, working from similar institutions (like size, like mission), to regional institutions, to discipline leading institutions. Data on some of the institutions that were considered should be included in an appendix as supporting material but it is not intended for this section to be comprehensive. Data in this section should include:
 - a. Standards used by the program (This may refer to a professional accreditation bodies documents in addition to addressing applicable standards in HLC Accreditation Criteria 3.A and 3.B.)
 - b. Trends relative to the discipline(s) associated with the program.
 - c. Trends relative to the University which impact the program
 - d. If a professional accreditation is available for one or more programs and has not been obtained, this section should note the plans to pursue that or justification for not pursuing it.
 - e. **This section must answer this significant question:** Is the curriculum of this program at or above the standard of similar programs in the U.S. or the standard of the professional accreditor?

Units should use professional organizations and other data-collecting entities to assist them in putting their program in the context of like programs in our state, region, and country. In addition, putting the unit's academic program in the context of impact to the University, as

well as important University trends which affect the program, is an important part of the review.

Units which have standing outside accreditation may use criteria developed by such bodies to determine program standards for the unit; those without outside accreditation may research and use standards which are common to programs of like content, size, and scope. Units may also investigate and determine whether outside accreditation for their program is desired and/or feasible as part of its review.

4. **Review Previous Recommendations**—units should describe their program relative to past reviews, accreditation reports, and other materials and discuss:
 - a. Past recommendations and goals
 - b. Report on completion of previous recommendations and goals
 - c. Basis for retiring previous recommendations and goals. If they are not retired, then they should be included in the priorities in section 5.
 - d. **This entire section must answer this significant question:** How have previous concerns been addressed since the last report?

5. **Priorities** – units should strategically develop priorities for the future, including:
 - a. Develop priorities for the following five (5) years, until the next scheduled APR. These priorities should include measurable goals with the means of measurement and due dates identified.
 - b. Relative to priorities, develop a recommended action plan. These should address each weakness identified in the report or continued priorities from the previous report, steps necessary to resolve them, timeline, and responsible organization.
 - The report should focus on no fewer than three and no more than ten priorities that address significant areas for improvement or offer significant opportunities for enhancement. The priorities should be ranked in order of their importance to the unit.
 - c. Provide input into the University’s Strategic and Long-Range Planning as needed
 - d. **This section must answer this significant question:** In what ways will this program seek to improve in the future?

The culmination of Academic Program Review will be the development of unit priorities for the future. The unit should plan to use these priorities, as well as the complete findings in the APR, to develop action plans which guide the unit through the next five (5) years. Other campus areas, such as the Office of the CFO, the Office of the Provost, and others will use this section to both develop their own action plans based on unit and University priorities, as well as hold the unit accountable for the implementation and evaluation of these priorities.

This section helps to tie assessment efforts to planning and budgeting.

Process Output

It is desired that APR is a positive and change-inducing process which allows academic units the opportunity to adequately, efficiently, and effectively assess their programs and ensure

the quality and continuous improvement of their program. To that end, the Curriculum Committee envisions the following outputs for APR:

1. *Involvement of the University and academic communities*

It is vital that multiple components of the University and academic communities are involved in developing each unit's APR. Each review could involve:

- a. Other academic units
- b. Curriculum Committee
- c. Deans
- d. Office of the Chief Academic Officer
- e. Office of Academic Research (see proposal)
- f. Office of the Chief Financial Officer
- g. Alumni Office
- h. Development Office
- i. Academic Center
- j. Students
- k. Office of the President
- l. Outside Reviewers (see Appendix D)

2. *Academic Program Review Evaluation*

It is important that the APR process be developed by, maintained by, and reviewed by faculty. In addition, each unit's APR will be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee (or Graduate Council), the Dean of the appropriate school or college (where necessary), the SVPAA, and the President. Each review of a unit's APR will result in written feedback from each reviewer. Appendix A of this document outlines the specific processes by which evaluation and feedback is maintained.

3. *Impact on Resource Allocation*

Each unit's APR will state strategic goals and needed resources as part of the document.

The APR should be used for setting priorities for funding of academic units, including the possible establishment of new programs, the possible need for additional faculty, the possible reallocation of other faculty resources, and the determination for other funding needs.

Academic units need to be aware that University administration will use the APR as a guideline for resource allocation for the life of the review, as units incorporate any Strategic Planning or Long-Range Planning assessments based on the APR.

Even prior to final approval, the APR should be used to shape budget proposals.

4. *The Role of the Curriculum Committee*

- The Curriculum Committee will serve the process of APR in a variety of ways:
- a. To develop, maintain, and update APR procedures, including evaluating the effectiveness of the reviews and the schedule
 - b. To assist units in preparing and completing APR
 - c. To review each unit's APR as scheduled and provide initial feedback to the unit in preparation for submission to University administration
 - d. To assist both the academic unit and University administration in agreeing on final APR language, documentation, and focus.

5. ***Time-Line for Academic Units***

Appendix A contains the schedule for each academic unit to follow in preparing their APR. In addition, this appendix includes a detailed outline of the time-frame for the following:

- a. Curriculum Committee informing units of their scheduled APR
- b. Curriculum Committee meeting(s) with units to assist with procedures and process
- c. Submission of APR to Curriculum Committee
- d. Return of APR to units for comment and modification
- e. Final submission of APR

Each aspect of the time-frame is explained as part of Appendix A.

6. ***Change of APR Schedule***

If, for some reason, the long-range schedule for APRs needs alteration, a written request should be submitted to the chairperson of the Curriculum Committee through the applicable Dean of the college. Scheduled APRs should not normally be postponed by more than one year. The request should include justification for changing the APR schedule as well as approval from the college's Dean. Examples of reasons for changing the APR schedule include:

- a. Moving an assessment up to support a professional accreditation cycle. (This is highly encouraged.)
- b. Postponing due to turnover of significant personnel within a department or division.

Structure of the Report

There are a wide variety of ways that an Annual Program Review report can be structured. As long as the five components above are addressed, the workgroup doing the assessment may structure the report in the manner that more clearly represents their data to the reader.

However, a template is available from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and on the Assessment Resources webpage, which is designed to simplify the investigation and report presentation. This is also beneficial in that it provides a standard format for those reviewing the APRs.

Tips for Writing the Report

1. *Begin with a thesis in mind.* Since the review process should already be underway and data should be coming in, there should be enough information for the report writer(s) to be able to assess whether a unit has long-term viability. Thus the writer(s) should begin the report with the intention to argue their case and provide evidence that supports that.
2. *Provide evidence for your claims.* What is written in the report may be absolutely true, but any claims should be supported. For example, it isn't enough to say that enrollment is growing; the report should provide data that demonstrates that is true. Sometimes evidence is anecdotal; for example, community engagement may be evidenced through student participation in volunteer activities; it is not necessary to find numbers to support that claim, but there should be several specific examples in the text if numbers are not available.
3. *Remember your audience.* This report will be read by individuals inside and outside of your unit. It will be read by people inside and outside of the institution (peer review, accreditors, etc.). Therefore, write for a person that is intelligent, but not an expert in your discipline. Explain terms and abbreviations so that outside readers who are unfamiliar with your programs and processes can follow the explanation.
4. *Be clear and concise.* This report is written about every five years. Therefore, it will be longer than the annual Academic Assessment report. However, if the body of the report gets over 30 pages, it is probably too long. Since every unit has a different number of programs, it is impossible to give an exact rule for how long a report should be, but longer does not equal better.

Assessment to Budgeting Linkage

The APR process provides a strong link between assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. This is the forum designed to raise opportunities for improvement and resource needs to the highest levels of the organization. Report authors should make every effort to link assessment of student learning to the budget expenditures, both past and future.

**Appendix A
Schedule of Academic Program Reviews**

In consultation with the Deans' Council, the Curriculum Committee has developed the following schedule for OBU academic units to achieve APR.

Program Review Timeline						
2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Music	Teacher Educ	Nursing	Social Entr	Finance	Intern'l Business	Business Core
Philosophy	Comm Arts	Comp Info Sys	Behav. Sciences	Accounting	Philosophy	Comm Arts
Mathematics	Literature	Computer Sci	Kinesiology	MBA	Mathematics	Literature
Nursing	Hist/Anth/PoliSci		Marketing	Hobbs College (except Phil.)		Hist/Anth/PoliSci
	Leisure Studies	Art		Language		Leisure Studies
		Science		Core Curriculum		
				MFT		
2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25		
Nursing	Marketing	Finance	Intern'l Business	Business Core		
Comp Info Sys	Social Entr	Accounting	Music	Teacher Educ		
Marketing	MBA	Hobbs College (except Phil.)	Philosophy	Comm Arts		
Computer Sci	Teacher Educ		Mathematics	Literature		
Art	Psyc/Soc/FamSci	Core Curriculum		Hist/Anth/PoliSci		
Science	HHP	MFT		Leisure Studies		

NOTE: Highlighted programs have external accrediting bodies to which they submit program reviews. Business programs are reviewed every five years; teacher education is reviewed every seven years; and music is reviewed every ten years. In 2013-14 and 2014-15 Business is moving from a three year rotation to a five year rotation. This plan follows their accreditation plan.

The Graduate Council will conduct reviews of those programs in the CGPS using the same standards.

The Curriculum Committee recommends the following annual schedule for APR:

1. Curriculum Committee informing units of their scheduled APR **by April 1 prior to the year the unit is scheduled for review**
2. Curriculum Committee meeting(s) with units to assist with procedures and process **by May 1 prior to the year the unit is scheduled for review**
3. Units should inform Curriculum Committee of intended outside review choice **by September 1 of the year the unit is scheduled for review** (see Appendix C)
4. Submission of APR to Curriculum Committee **by February 1 of the year the unit is scheduled for review**
5. Return of APR to units for comment and modification **by March 1 of the year the unit is scheduled for review**
6. Unit presents APR revisions to the Curriculum Committee **by April 1.**
7. Unit presents APR to the Provost prior **in April or May.**
8. Final submission of APR **by June 1 of the year the unit is scheduled for review**
9. Approval and Publishing of APR **by June 30 of the year the unit is scheduled for review**

Appendix B

University Academic Goals

University Undergraduate Educational Goals:

A graduate from OBU will:

1. Demonstrate proficiency in an academic or professional discipline in a liberal arts context and engage in the process of academic discovery as a life-long learner.
2. Think critically and creatively about complex problems in order to develop, communicate, implement and evaluate innovative solutions.
3. Integrate Christian faith and worldview in broad and discipline-specific contexts in a diverse world by analyzing, evaluating, and engaging in issues of local, regional, national, and global importance.

University Graduate Educational Goals:

Upon graduation students should demonstrate:

- Effective written and oral communication skills
- Capacity to solve problems creatively by applying discipline-specific knowledge and critical thinking skills through research and scholarship
- An integration of Christian faith into discipline specific roles and decision making
- Leadership skills that enhance the ability to engage and transform a diverse world

Appendix C

Elaboration on the Purposes and Elements of the Review

Purposes

As stated previously, the primary purposes of Academic Program Review at OBU are:

1. To ensure the quality and continuous improvement of academic programs
2. To refine and define the University's academic directions and program priorities which shape resource allocations and other governing decisions
3. To assist academic units in ongoing assessment and strategic planning

To elaborate:

1. The instructional faculty at OBU are dedicated to periodic review and assessment of the academic programs. OBU has a long heritage of quality instructional programs, and boasts student success and post-undergraduate success due to these programs. By developing a regularly-scheduled, systematic and fluid process by which APR may be accomplished, academic units may achieve reviews which give them the information needed to plan for the future, to adjust programs to fit student needs and desires, and to accommodate changing faculty forces, economic shifts, and educational trends.
2. Because funding of academic programs is a vital part of their existence, systematic plans by which units seek on-going and new funding mechanisms are important. These plans are important not just to the units, but to those who do budget planning, those who assist in finding resources for such plans, and those advocating for units' mission and goals both on and off the OBU campus. It is logical and reasonable to state that by planning units' resource needs both the unit and other related entities may more effectively plan to achieve the goals the unit is seeking to achieve. By doing such planning, units prioritize their work and their resource needs, and give advocates for unit mission and goals better information to use in a variety of settings. Budget planners, from individual faculty to the University CFO, can better-predict and better manage University resources, and units are more likely to both establish rationales for new funding and obtain such funding with detailed, systematic, and prioritized plans.
3. In a world where the assessment of student outcomes is becoming increasingly important, both to the University and the outside world (accreditation societies, constituents, and Trustees), units which systematical and periodically adopt, review, and evaluate assessment plans are more likely to (a) meet their objectives regarding student success, and (b) satisfy the myriad of Oklahoma Baptist University: Academic Program Review assessment reporting likely to be required. In addition, OBU operates with a structure of *Strategic Planning*, by which units adopt short-term and long-term goals which administration uses for a variety of uses. Through APR, units should be able to have better information to complete such *Strategic Plans*, units should be better equipped to identify needs, determine resource needs, and adopt goals and objectives to meet those needs, and more effectively advocate through the *Strategic Planning Process* units' success, concerns, needs, and mission. If done properly, APR should be the mechanism which governs units' five-year plans and objectives; in this way, *Strategic Planning* is accomplished, and units will no longer have to develop such needs analysis on separate tracks.

Academic Program Review is an opportunity. Units which view APR as such will find it more efficient to do their planning, both short-term and long-term. Units will also have the opportunity to do strategic planning assessments of their faculty, their students, their resources, their courses, offerings, facilities, and equipment and determine how their unit fits best in the University structure, and with the University mission.

Appendix D

Use of Outside Reviewers

In order to bring more accountability to the process of APR, units will plan to access university funding to utilize the services of an outside reviewer. Units should identify three (3) potential reviewers who are faculty, deans, or administrators from like institutions in close proximity to the OBU campus (especially for Options 1 and 2 below) who have significant knowledge of the program to be reviewed. Names, rationale for their nomination, contact information, and any other pertinent data about the proposed outside reviewers should be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee, in consultation with the unit, will make arrangements for one reviewer to assist the unit in APR.

The unit may choose one of three (3) options of using an outside reviewer:

- Option 1) An outside reviewer to visit campus to advise and evaluate the program prior to the writing of the APR document. The primary goal of this method is for the reviewer to provide insight that will guide the writing of the APR document.
- Option 2) An outside reviewer to visit campus to advise and evaluate the program at (or near) the completion of writing the APR document. The primary goal of this method is for the reviewer to provide insight regarding the completeness and accuracy of the APR document.
- Option 3) An outside reviewer to read the APR document without a campus visit. The primary goal of this method is for the reviewer to provide insight regarding the completeness and accuracy of the APR document.

Units will be advised of the available funding for such reviews by **February 1** prior to the year the unit is scheduled for review. Although any option may be selected, Options 1 or 2 are recommended if funds permit. Units should inform the Curriculum Committee of their preferred option, and provide the list of names of potential reviewers, by **May 1** prior to the year the unit is scheduled for their review.

The Curriculum Committee will, in consultation with the unit, make all necessary arrangements for outside reviewers, including travel arrangements, payment for services, and communications regarding the review.

Programs accredited by outside accrediting bodies are exempt from this external reviewer requirement, provided that the accreditation process already includes an outside reviewer.

Appendix E
APR Evaluation Rubric

Date: _____ Program Being Reviewed:

Reviewer: _____

Instructions for Reviewers:

Complete the following checklist by responding to each of the following questions based on a reasonable standard of evidence for someone not intimately involved in the program. In other words, it is not necessary to validate the data that is presented, the evaluation process is designed to assess the quality of the report with the assumption that the author(s) are accurately presenting the data.

Yes – In your opinion, the standard in the question is adequately addressed. Comments may be added for enhancement or praise.

No – In your opinion, the standard in this question is not adequately addressed. Specific comments to guide improvement are required.

If additional or lengthier comments are required put a numeral in the “Comments” block and include the comment with the corresponding number on a separate page.

Note: It is not necessary for all reviewers to agree on the quality of the report in order for the process to continue. This is a process intended to improve the overall report quality, not to introduce a series consecutive approvals.

Prompts	Yes	No	Comments
Academic Assessment			
Are the relationships between the division, department, and program missions and the OBU Mission clear?			
Are the program SLOs clearly related to the University Educational Goals?			
Is there evidence of changes made and improvements realized due to the Academic Assessment process?			
Is the summary of the open action plans related to Academic Assessment clear and sufficient?			
Are the Academic Assessments for each program from the years since the last APR attached to the report in the appendices?			
Environmental Analysis			
Is it clear what published materials were reviewed and whether any errors were found?			

Prompts	Yes	No	Comments
Were the facilities adequately reviewed?			
Is the method used to review library resources clear and sufficient?			
Is a prioritized list of acquisitions for the library included as an appendix?			
Is the sufficiency of administrative staffing addressed?			
Does the report clearly explain the status of instructional staffing and the plan to correct any weaknesses?			
Is ongoing faculty professional development discussed and sufficient evidence provided?			
Are trends in faculty over- and under-load addressed with evidence?			
Is the sufficiency of student work staffing adequately addressed?			
Does the report outline the current and future technology needs?			
Are enrollment and graduation trends provided and explained?			
Standards and Trends			
Is there a clear set of standards referenced for the program(s)?			
Does the report provide evidence that supports the claims that the standards are or are not being met?			
Is a clear action plan or explanation provided for any standards that are not met?			
Are trends within the discipline(s) discussed?			
Are trends related to the program(s) and the University discussed?			
Is the status of the program(s) relative to professional accreditation adequately explained and supported?			
Are action plans for achieving professional accreditation established as necessary?			

Prompts	Yes	No	Comments
Review Previous Recommendations			
Does the report explain the status of recommendations from the previous APR?			
Are all previous recommendations retired or continued?			
Priorities			
Are 3-10 reasonable priorities for the next 5 years established and explained?			
Do the priorities have measurable goals and reasonable targets established?			
Are clear action plans for each of the priorities outlined with feasible due dates and responsible organizations identified?			
Overall			
Does the APR report address all five required topics? (Academic Assessment; Environmental Analysis; Standards and Trends; Previous Recommendations; Priorities)			
Is the APR report clear and concise?			
Does the APR report raise any significant problems that are not addressed with an Action Plan in the Priorities section?			
Are all Previous Recommendations either retired with adequate justification or continued with an Action Plan in the Priorities section?			
Overall, are the conclusions of the APR report justified based on the evidence provided?			

General Comments (use additional pages as needed):