

PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDE

The purpose of a periodic program review is to provide an opportunity for the program to evaluate the status and progress of its programs for continuous improvement in support of student learning and success within the context of the College's mission as well as current emerging directions in art and design. The *Program Review Guide* provides a framework for conducting a thorough, evidence-based analysis of a program in order to understand its strengths, identify key areas of improvement, and create a plan for achieving desired improvements. Program review is an opportunity to invite colleagues from peer institutions and relevant professional practices to review and assess the performance and operations of the programs of the College and to satisfy a major accreditation requirement.

The primary purpose of program review is to improve the program by thoroughly and candidly evaluating:

- The mission and goals of the program and their relation to the mission and strategic priorities of the institution,
- The curriculum through which program mission and goals are pursued,
- The assessment of student learning outcomes, program revisions based upon those outcomes, and plans for future assessment activities,
- The range and quality of instructional activities,
- The quality and diversity of faculty and staff, and their contributions to program mission, goals, and student learning and success,
- Educational resources and physical facilities, and
- Service and contribution to the community.

Three features of program review that are expected for accreditation are:

- Outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development,
- Evidence-based claims and decision-making, and
- Use of program review results to inform planning and budget.

The three major parts of program review are the self-study, external review, and program response and action plan.

I. THE SELF-STUDY

The purpose of the self-study is to provide a thorough, evidence-based self-analysis of the program in order to understand its strengths and identify key areas of improvement. The Self-Study Report is broken into four key areas: the Introduction, Analysis of Evidence about Program Quality and Viability, Summary Reflections, and Future Goals for Planning and Improvement. Each area is described below. A separate document, Assessment Methods and Types of Data for the Self-Study, may also be consulted. The

Self-Study Report and any additional information should be submitted to the Provost at least 45 days before the external review campus visit.

1. Introduction

This section of the Self-Study Report provides a context for the review and, in contrast to the rest of the Self-Study Report, is primarily descriptive. The introduction should:

- State why the program exists and what it hopes to achieve.
- Provide specific goals for what the program hopes students achieve connected to: the College's mission; the program's mission, goals, and outcomes (Program Learning Outcomes, or PLOs); the Strategic Plan; and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Outcomes could relate to student learning, growth of the program, and/or faculty development.
- Outcomes should be established that can be observed if the learning objectives are being met. Outcomes should be measurable—for example, student work, specific growth in enrollment or number of majors, number of students fulfilling the ILOs and PLOs through program courses; growth in program-specific knowledge over the course of a class; certain levels of achievement in terms of both PLOs and ILOs in periodic review of student work; Annual Exhibition, thesis, capstone, and other senior projects. These may be indirect and direct outcomes.
- Describe how the program fits into the institutional structure and its relationship with programs at Otis. This description may include a *brief* history of the program and any changes since the last review.

2. Analysis of Evidence about Program Quality and Viability

This section, which forms the bulk of the Self-Study Report, presents evidence indicating the quality and sustainability of the program.

- *Students*: What is the profile of the students related to the mission and goals of the program? Is the program attracting, retaining, and graduating the mix of students the program seeks (target markets, demographic mix, qualifications, etc.)? How effective are recruitment and admission processes?
- *Curriculum and Learning Environment*: How well does the program offer sufficient opportunities for students to learn relevant disciplinary and professional knowledge, skills, competencies, etc. (at relevant beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels) for the type and level of degree/certificate conferred? How well does the curriculum interface and build on student learning in Liberal Studies and Creative Action/Integrated Learning courses? How effectively does the curriculum use instructional technology when appropriate? How is student success regularly assessed

for improvement? How well do the curriculum (Course Learning Outcomes, or CLOs) and PLOs scaffold or build in a progressive and intentional way, and does scheduling of courses support the recommended sequence?

- Evidence could include the breadth and depth of the curriculum and its alignment with PLOs; a curriculum map or flow chart that describes how (and when) the sequence of courses meets goals for learning outcomes; a comparison of the program's curriculum with those at other comparable institutions; measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g. course evaluations, peer teaching evaluations, faculty professional and pedagogical scholarship, etc.); other learning experiences relevant to program goals and numbers of students participating (e.g. internships, community-based learning, research, etc.); a narrative description of how faculty's pedagogy responds to various learning modalities.
- *Assessment*: What are the methods of assessment used by the program? How are student work used as evidence of student learning at various levels? How is closing the loop using the results of the assessment to improve student learning and success achieved?
- *The Co-Curriculum*: Are there opportunities for students to be engaged and involved in their education outside of the classroom? How well do these experiences complement the mission and goals of the program and College? The ILOs?
 - Evidence could include data on co-curricular events and opportunities that relate to the academic program; number of students involved in campus clubs and organizations; relevant faculty-or student-initiated campus or residential life programming; relevant community-based learning experiences, etc.
- *Student Learning and Success*: How well do the PLOs represent the scope and depth appropriate to the degree offered? To the standards of the discipline or profession? Are students being retained and graduating in a timely fashion? What does the program do to improve retention, and graduation rates? What changes might be necessary to improve students' enrollment, retention, and graduation rates? To what extent are graduates succeeding in relevant careers, graduate programs, community service, creative endeavors, ways of living, or others indicators of graduate success?
 - Evidence could include annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning in the program; ongoing efforts to "close the loop" in assessment responses; student retention and graduation rates disaggregated by demographic categories; placement into jobs or graduate schools; graduating student satisfaction and/or alumni surveys; employer critiques of student performance; trends within the profession; data from AICAD/NASAD institutions or the region/nation that identify future trends for art and design programs;

students' perceptions about attaining their personal and professional goals; information from employers, graduate schools, and other external sources to assess graduates' degree of success.

- *Faculty*: What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty in relation to the program mission and goals? How do their backgrounds and expertise contribute to the quality of the program and student success?
 - Evidence could include list of faculty specialties and how they align with program curriculum; teaching quality (e.g. course evaluations, peer evaluations, faculty self- review); record of professional achievement; participation in professional development related to pedagogy and/or assessment; external funding and other awards; faculty service; faculty distribution across the ranks; and faculty diversity.
- *Allocation of Resources*: Are resources sufficient to support program quality and student success?
 - Evidence could include an evaluation of faculty (student-faculty ratio, faculty workload, faculty review processes, professional opportunities and resources, etc.); student support (academic and career advising, tutoring, remedial resources, support for community and campus engagement, etc.); information & technology resources (for both faculty and student needs); facilities (classroom space, labs, office space, student space, etc.).
- *Societal and Professional Demand*: How does this program address societal and professional needs? In your discussion include how this program meets current and potential future trends within the art and design labor market. How does this program differentiate itself from other art and design competitors?

3. Summary Reflections

This section of the Self-Study Report provides an interpretation of the findings that will determine a program's strengths, weaknesses, and areas to target for improvement. Whenever possible, findings should be interpreted in the context of professional benchmarks and the standards of aspirant peer institutions. Questions to address include: Is the curriculum aligned with the PLOs? Are the PLOs aligned with the goals of those students the program serves? Is the level of program quality aligned with the institution's acceptable level of quality? Are program goals being achieved? Are student learning outcomes (SLOs) being achieved at an acceptable level at a level appropriate to comparable BFAs?

4. Future Goals and Planning for Improvement

The concluding section of the Self-Study Report is devoted to future planning and improvement. The findings and their interpretation serve as the foundation for an *evidence-based plan* for improvement. This section might identify future goals in the period before the next review, how to address weaknesses that have been identified, how to build on program strengths, what improvements are possible with existing resources, what improvements can be addressed only with additional resources, and how collaborations (with other programs, co-curriculum, offices, community organizations, etc.) can improve program quality.

II. THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The external review involves a campus visit normally by two reviewers from peer institutions and results in a written External Review Report. The external review occurs 45 days after the program submits the Self-Study Report to the Provost and should be arranged well in advance of the target date for the visit. When appropriate, programs are paired and have one reviewer in common.

1. Selection of External Reviewers

The purpose of a Program Review is to provide an external perspective which provides constructive, expert analysis of a program's quality and recommendations for future planning and improvements. The external reviewers must have the qualifications to provide that analysis and input. When submitting candidates for Program Review, please consider:

Expertise

Candidates have appropriate degrees, years of experience in teaching, administration, and/or discipline professionally related work. All candidates should currently be in an administrative oversight position that gives them a "big picture" perspective.

Assessment Experience

Candidates have experience preferably with Program Review or assessment, student learning outcomes assessment, institutional effectiveness/perspectives, and/or accreditation. They also should be a good fit overall for your program.

Conflicts of Interest

Candidates are ineligible if they have worked at or graduated from Otis in the past five years, are a prospective candidate for employment, are related to an Otis employee, or other conflicts of interests. If you are unsure, please be sure to disclose this to the Provost.

Location Logistics

Consider budgetary limitations.

2. Campus Visit

The campus visit by the external review team may be held in either Fall or Spring; if in Spring, preferably prior to Spring Break. The visit usually lasts one day, during which the review team meets with the Provost, program administration, faculty, and Assessment Committee representative(s). The visit is normally preceded by an orientation dinner the evening before with key academic personnel.

The program will provide the review team with an office for use during the visit, as well as a computer and printer. In addition, space will be provided for scheduled meetings of the team with various groups. It is the program's responsibility to arrange a tour of its facilities and the College, a time for reviewing student work, appropriate meetings with faculty and students, and separate exit meetings with the program Chair/Director and the Provost.

3. External Review Report

The review team submits the External Review Report to the Provost within 30 days of the visit. The Provost reviews the report and forwards to the program and the Assessment Committee. Reviewers may be asked to revise; they receive their stipends upon submission of the final External Review Report.

4. External Review Budget

Each program can spend up to \$3,000 total for the external review. The cost breakdown is as follows. Each reviewer is paid a \$750.00 stipend (honorarium), for a total of \$1,500 (for 2-person team). Travel, accommodations, meals, and/or an orientation dinner with the Chair/Director, Associate/Assistant Chair (and /or faculty), Provost and external reviewers should total no more than \$1,500. The budget is available in the department account once review date is set.

III. PROGRAM RESPONSE AND ACTION PLANS

1. Corrections of Fact and Misperception

The program reviews the report for factual errors and misperceptions in writing, and this document becomes part of the review record. In response, the external review team may be asked by the Provost to revise. The final External Review Report is distributed to the program and the Assessment Committee.

2. Findings and Recommendations Discussion

The program meets with the Provost and the Director of Assessment to discuss major findings and recommendations.

3. Program Response and Action Plan

The program reviews and distributes all relevant documentation to the faculty, staff, and, where appropriate, students. The program collects input and prepares a detailed Program Response, outlining an action plan, including timeline and budget, for implementing recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. The Program Response is submitted to the Provost and Assessment Committee within 45 days after the external program review report is received for consideration and approval. Programs are strongly encouraged to share results with their faculty and staff.

4. Tracking Action Plans

To facilitate and track implementation of action plans, each year the Provost and Assessment Committee review the progress of programs reviewed in previous years. If a program is not successful in implementing its action plan, the program will submit a brief report to the committee.

All files are archived in the Provost's office and are used for accreditation.