Graduate Program Review Handbook

Academic program review at the University of Guam is an important component of the ongoing academic and administrative planning and assessment process.

Commitment to Assessment

The University of Guam is committed to the assessment of all the academic, administrative and co-curricular services, which it provides for its stakeholders. Assessment denotes the continuous collection of data concerning the effectiveness of services in achieving their stated short-term and long-term goals. This commitment to assessment also applies to research, outreach projects and auxiliary services. The University accepts the responsibility for clarifying and communicating the University's goals and for using its resources to enable stakeholders to achieve their goals. When assessment reveals that goals are not being met or are no longer meeting stakeholders' needs with reasonable success, improvements will be made in the way the University prioritizes and provides those services so as to increase to acceptable levels their effectiveness and value to its stakeholders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I: Graduate Program Review Executive Summary

Title: **Academic Program Reviews (Graduate)**
Effective Date: **August 15, 2005**

1.   **The Self Study**
     University regulations require that every academic major program be reviewed on a
     regularly scheduled basis. For this review each major program prepares a self study
     of the curriculum, student outcomes, and supporting areas such as the library and
     registrar's office. These self studies are to conform to a common format and utilize
     data for program planning and evaluation supplied by the Registrar's Office through
     the University Planning and Assessment Office.

     The self study is reviewed at two levels, the College level and the University level
     before being forwarded to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic and
     Student Affairs for final approval.

     Programs preparing for a program review that have had a recent (within two years)
     national accreditation review may be permitted to use all or parts of the accreditation
     self study for the University program review. If all areas of the self study are covered
     by the professional accreditation review, the faculty should attach the University
     requirements listed in the GPSSO to the professional accreditation review with a
     table of contents indicating where each requirement is addressed. A cover letter
     should also be included with information about the timeline for the next review and a
     copy of the letter conferring professional accreditation. In such cases, the external
     review requirement may be waived by the Dean.

2.   **The Program Review Team**
     After review at the College level by the faculty, the College Academic Affairs
     Committee (or Curricular Committee) and the Dean, the self-study with transmittal
     form appropriately signed and all recommendations attached, shall be forwarded to
     the Academic Committee on Graduate Curricula (ACGC).

     The ACGC will appoint a program review team (PRT), consisting of three full-time
     members of the graduate faculty of the University of Guam and an external reviewer.
     The PRT Chair shall be a member of ACGC. A second reader shall be appointed by
     and from ACGC. The Faculty Senate shall appoint a third member. The fourth
     member of the team is an external reviewer nominated by the program faculty and
     approved by the Dean. This external reviewer must be chosen from a regionally
     accredited university and be a tenured faculty member in the same academic
     discipline as that under review. The external reviewer is not expected to attend
     meetings of the committee but will review the self-study and provide his/her
     evaluative comments to the Dean and the chair of the committee.   The Dean in

consultation with the Program Faculty under review will provide a set of questions to assist in framing the reviewer's input.

3.   **Program Review Procedures**
     The Program Review Team examines the program's self study and other relevant materials, gathering additional information including the comments of the external member. The Team prepares, originally in draft form and then in final form, a report reflecting both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the major program. The review shall include an evaluation of the program's advising processes and how the current self-study has addressed recommendations from previous self-studies.

     The Chair of the Program Review Team is responsible for the preparation, submission and interpretation of review reports, including minority findings. It is the responsibility of the chair to confer with team members and share the contents of the report with team members, program faculty, and the Dean prior to final editing and subsequent submission to the Faculty Senate. The draft report containing recommendations is forwarded to the Dean and the program faculty. The team allows the faculty and Dean two weeks to respond to the report, correct inaccuracies in fact or data, and take reasoned exception to judgment or conclusions drawn. All such input shall be appended to the self study.

     After endorsement by the Senate, the report, all responses, and final recommendations are forwarded by the Senate President to the Senior Vice President for action.

4.   **Final Response to Program Review**
     The normal time period of approval for a program undergoing review is six years. A number of circumstances may lead to approval for a reduced length of time. Some of these circumstances may be related to the quality of the program, but not all circumstances are related to quality. A formal set of recommendations from the Faculty Senate includes:
     1)   Recommendation for approval for six years from when the review was submitted, or
     2)   Recommended approval for a period of less than six years, subject to the fulfillment of specified conditions. (The report must specify the actions required to allow full approval); or
     3)   Recommended phasing out or consolidating the program; and
     4)   Any other recommendations

Reasons for less than six year approval

Under some circumstances, a situation may evolve sufficiently rapidly to raise concerns about the wisdom of approving a program for the full six years. Such concerns do not necessarily reflect a negative view of the quality of the program, but the team may consider that it is important to monitor the situation. Some examples of such situations are:

1) Declining enrollment (too many options for too few students? Repeated low enrollment in some classes? Is the program still viable?)
2) Rapidly increasing enrollment. (sufficient support? Facilities adequate?)
3) Inability to retain adequate faculty. (reevaluate mission and goals before new hiring? Can the current faculty adequately staff the program?)
4) External changes. (No longer current or needed? Significant new developments in the discipline? Lack of response to previous recommendations.)
5) Advisement. (Students are not advised and have difficulty in their senior year? No advisement procedures? Lack of student satisfaction with advisors?)
6) Assessment. (Assessment plan or learning outcomes inadequate? Plan in place but no implementation of recommendations?)

Problems identified by the Program Review Team may also include some of the following areas:

1) Course syllabi which reflect a lack of rigor (e.g. currency in course material, simplistic exams, inappropriate grading methods, inadequate reading and writing requirements).
2) Faculty teaching courses for which they are not sufficiently prepared or qualified.
3) Course syllabi and materials that do not require the quantity and quality of student work typically expected by normal practices in the academy.
4) Lack of clarity or agreement among the faculty of the program with respect to departmental goals and objectives, including student learning outcomes.
5) A structure to the gradate program which is inconsistent with similar major programs at other institutions or inconsistent with typical practices, unless justified.
6) A loss of professional or specialized accreditation.

(This list is not exhaustive.)

5. **Self Study Guidelines, Components, and Evaluative Criteria**
In the next section is the Graduate Program Self-study Outline (GPSSO) as recommended by the Faculty Senate. This outline will be used until revised and reissued by the Office of the Senior Vice President. (It will be reviewed in AY 06-07)

6. **Self-Study Administrative Procedures.** Section III includes the Graduate Program Review Administrative Procedures (GPR-AP)

7. **Transmittal Forms.** The transmittal forms are found in section IV.

Effective August 2005

Section II: Graduate Program Self Study Outline (GPSSO)

The following graduate program self-study outline includes guidelines recommended by ACGC on May 13, 2004 and subsequently endorsed by the Faculty Senate. The ACGC has promised to conduct reviews of half of all graduate programs by the end of AY 2005-2006. The Dean, in consultation with the program faculty, will meet with the program coordinator of each graduate degree program to clarify the timelines for an initial review. As the University of Guam moves towards evaluation of outcomes, the focus will be on student learning and scholarship.

University of Guam Graduate Self Study Guidelines

These guidelines are for use by graduate programs in preparing their graduate program self-study document. It is understood that these reviews will be done every six (6) years after the initial review on a rotating basis, with deadline for the subsequent reviews specified in the SVP letter to the program faculty at the conclusion of each cycle. An expectation is that all reviews will include an external peer review.

The program self-study narrative should be kept to a maximum of 20 pages. The body of the self-study will be light on narrative description, and primarily address the Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators of the program (Items II and III below). Should the program faculty members feel the need to add further narrative detail as the self-study progresses through the review process, they may do so in Section V, but they should limit that narrative to an additional five (5) pages. Before beginning the review process the program faculty or the self-study coordinator must meet with the Dean or appropriate administrator to agree on a plan for completion of the self-study with timelines.

Outline of the Self Study
In general, each self-study will consist of the following sections:
   I.   Introduction and program mission. (An introductory section that addresses the level of success in the implementation of the goals of the previous program review recommendations and sets the context for the program.)
   II.   Student Learning Outcomes for the Program. (What do you expect the students to know, do and understand at the end of this course of study and how is it assessed? Briefly….)
   III.   Graduate Program Performance Indicators (Review and analysis of the key indicators—see table below)
   IV.   Future Plans and Budget Implications (program response to lack of progress in certain areas and implementation plans, recruitment plans, implementation of assessment plan, program revision plans, etc.)
   V.   Further Information. (Any responses to reports or recommendations at any level may be added to the report by the program faculty via the program coordinator by notifying the PRT Chair. The Chair will then attach the document to the transmittal sheet and send a copy to the Dean.)
Please refer to the Graduate Program Review Executive Summary in Section I for further details.

Graduate Program Self Study outline, Fall 2005

Graduate Program Performance Goals

During the self-study review process, each program will conduct a self assessment, using qualitative and quantitative data, to determine the overall performance of the program.

Indicators	Guidelines for data-gathering and reflection
1. There is a cadre of faculty who demonstrate currency in their field, sufficient in size to support students in their culminating activity.	How does this discipline define "currency in the field"? Describe the culminating activity. List program learning outcomes expected of all students. How does this activity demonstrate the integration of program outcomes?
2. Key performance indicators are collected, calculated and analyzed.	Display the following data for the period under review, and briefly analyze what these data mean for the future of the program. a) Number of full and part time faculty b) Number of majors c) Graduation rate. d) Persistence/retention rate. e) Credit hour production. f) Alumni data; postgraduate survey. (If possible include employer satisfaction.) g) Number of major and elective courses taught in the program. h) Faculty FTE /student FTE ratio i) Results from student learning outcome assessment projects. j) Data from assessment of the major *e.g.* an open house report; input from external (off campus- maybe electronic) review; senior survey, etc. k) Further graduate work completed or currently underway by graduates of the program.
3. There is appropriate physical space, library resources, equipment, and/or materials and supplies to provide support for graduate students.	Evaluate the adequacy of space available. Explain program plans to remedy any deficiency.
4. The program provides students with opportunities for financial support in terms of scholarships, assistantships, and/or internships.	What scholarships or programs are in place to support graduate students in this program? What plans are there to increase these programs? Include a summary of internships or capstone activities.
5. There are program-specific admission standards and an assessment process routinely employed that includes exit interviews, alumni surveys, and a minimum of one outside source of validation (e.g., accreditation, a licensing examination, an advisory committee, or professional degree program placements, or employer surveys).	List the program-specific admissions criteria and how they are applied. Provide details of the assessment process that tracks student learning outcomes from admission to graduation. Refer to the WASC booklet "Good Evidence Guide" available on line at www.wascsenior.org/ At this point or earlier, the thesis or special project advisement process should be explained.

Graduate Program Self Study outline, Fall 2005

Section III: Graduate Program Review Administrative Procedures (GPRev-AP)

Administrative Procedures

August 2005

1. Preamble

The University of Guam is committed to high quality academic programs that serve its mission and meet or surpass accreditation standards. The University of Guam requires a regular academic quality review of all graduate programs. Graduate program reviews reflect and support the mission of the University of Guam. Regular graduate program reviews are conducted on a six-year cycle.

2. Definitions of Academic Programs

2.1. Academic Degree Program (Graduate)

An academic degree program at the graduate level is a structured grouping of course work and educational experiences designed to meet an educational objective and defined learning outcomes, consistent with the mission of the University of Guam, which upon completion, results in a post-baccalaureate degree. All graduate programs have as their academic home one of the three colleges, the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, the College of Natural and Applied Sciences and the College of Professional Studies.

3. Purpose of Graduate Program Review

The primary purposes of program review at the University of Guam are to assess whether learning outcomes are being achieved and to enhance the quality of the graduate academic programs. The review elucidates the contributions of a program toward the achievement of the mission of the University of Guam and ensures that all programs meet the standards set by the Board of Regents, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, United States Land Grant Institutions, and by program-selected professional accrediting bodies, as available and appropriate.

In recognition of these accrediting standards, the program review process serves the purpose of ensuring continuous growth while benchmarking academic programs of the University of Guam with similar programs from other universities. The process and outcomes of all program reviews are structured to encourage faculty, student, and program development, thus guiding overall programmatic improvements.

Therefore, all information gathered, analyzed, and interpreted during the review process should inform faculty and facilitate administrative data-based decisions regarding student learning outcomes and such diverse yet related issues as program refinement and resource allocation. The review process provides the necessary documentation to assure our region's present and prospective stakeholders of academic program quality and prudent stewardship of public

resources. In addition, organizational learning occurs when the institution reflects on progress made toward goals and thinks strategically about future goals.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

4.1. Program Faculty

All faculty members of graduate programs have student outcome assessment and evaluation of program goals and objectives an integral part of their programs. The faculty work collectively to implement decisions and recommendations of the most recent program review and, in consultation with the administration and the Dean, plan and conduct the self-study for the next scheduled program review.

4.2. Office of Planning and Assessment

The Assessment Coordinator uses the resources of the Computer Center and units responsible for providing information (such as the Registrar's office and HRO) to assist the program faculty in generating program-specific and institutional data necessary to write the self-study.   The Graduate office or Registrar's office provides reports at the end of each semester summarizing credit hour production and listing all declared majors. Information for analysis is provided through the institutional research office.

4.3. Chair/Program Administrator

The Administrative Chair or Associate/Assistant Dean responsible for each program ensures that program faculty members clearly understand the schedule of program reviews and provides opportunities for faculty development pertaining to the development of student learning outcomes, assessment of student learning outcomes and program evaluation. The administration works collaboratively with the program faculty during the process of writing the self-study and analyzing data.

4.4. College Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)

Program faculty members submit their self-study to the Academic Affairs Committee or Curriculum Committee of the appropriate college for review and approval. Members of the AAC examine particular questions, such as the following:

➢ Does the format and substance of the self-study meet the graduate program review guidelines?
➢ Do the program faculty members adequately describe the program and the learning outcomes required for graduation?
➢ Does the self-study adequately support the University and college mission as well as any existing academic, financial, and physical master plans of the College?
➢ Are enrollment and graduation trends appropriate for the type and level of degree awarded?
➢ Does the self-study provide evidence of academic quality?

The chair of the AAC signs the Graduate Program Review Transmittal form, attaches AAC recommendations and forwards it to the Dean of the College, with a copy to the program coordinator.

After the AAC has approved the self-study the Dean:

(a) provides a short report with recommendations to the ACGC and program coordinator
(b) sends a copy of the self-study to the external reviewer, including a list of evaluative questions for reviewer response
(c) places two copies of the self-study in the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library at the reserve desk for review by members of the Academic Committee on Graduate Curricula, the Faculty Senate, and the general public
(d) forwards two copies of the self-study to the Academic Committee on Graduate Curricula (ACGC).

4.5. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library

The faculty of the RFK Memorial Library, in collaboration with the Assessment Coordinator, develops and maintains a resource and reference desk pertaining to student learning assessment and academic program review.

During the review process, copies of the self-study are kept on reserve at the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library. After the program review process is complete, one copy of the self-study is returned to the program, one copy remains in the office of the Senior Vice President, and two copies remain in the RFK Library as reference for future reviews of the academic program.

4.6. College Dean

After the AAC has approved the self-study, the Dean completes the college evaluation of the self-study, formulates recommendations and reports his/her findings to the ACGC and signs the Program Review Transmittal Form. The Dean's office is responsible for forwarding the self-study to the reviewer (electronically if possible and receiving the external reviewers report). After the program review cycle is completed, the Dean ensures the program review decisions are implemented in consultation with the faculty of the program. The Dean works closely with the Graduate Dean in preparing the review and response.

4.7. Academic Committee on Graduate Curricula (ACGC)

Before the due date of the self-study, the Chair of the ACGC, in collaboration with the members of ACGC convenes an ad hoc Program Review Team (PRT) consisting of three full-time graduate faculty members; one selected by and from the ACGC (who will chair the Team), one selected by the ACGC and one member selected by the Faculty Senate. An external reviewer, nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean will provide written input to the PRT. At the beginning of each academic year, the ACGC will send a request to the Senate for faculty members to be named for each review team for that year. The ACGC is also available for consultation and advice to the Program Review Team if the chair so requests. During the review process, two copies of the self-study of the program is available at the RFK Memorial Library for review.

4.8. Faculty Senate

Before the due date of the self-study of a graduate degree program, the members of the Faculty Senate identify one member of the University of Guam full-time graduate faculty to be a member of the Program Review Team for the review of a specific graduate program. Members of the Faculty Senate are invited to review the self-study of the program and bring comments to the attention of any Program Review Team member.

4.9. Program Review Team (PRT)

Members of the Program Review Team review the self-study of the program, the evaluative comments of the external reviewer, and the recommendations of the AAC and the Dean and make recommendations to the SVP for endorsement by the Senate.

The PRT has three members and, normally, one external reviewer provides input:
(1) The chair is selected by the Academic Committee on Graduate Curricula from among the ACGC members. The representative from the program under review may not chair the PRT for his/her program. The chair facilitates the review process and writes the final report. Before the report is submitted to the Senate for endorsement to the SVP, the chair provides an opportunity for the faculty of the program and the Dean to read the report and correct possible factual errors.
(2) The second member of the Program Review Team is selected by the ACGC from among all full-time graduate faculty.
(3) The third member of the Program Review Team is selected by the Faculty Senate from among the graduate faculty.
(4) The external reviewer for each program is nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean. This member should be a tenured faculty member from another regionally-accredited University in the same academic discipline as the program under review. This reviewer is not required to attend meetings of the committee but only to read the self-study and provide his/her evaluative comments to the chair of the committee, in response to a set of questions provided by the Dean and program.

4.10. Assessment Committee

The Assessment Committee oversees the development of policies and procedures for institutional assessment. It discharges this function in close consultation with the various stakeholders involved: the Vice Presidents, Deans, Staff Council, Student Government Association, the Faculty Senate, and all others involved in providing a quality learning experience. Members of the Assessment Committee do not directly participate in the review of individual programs.

4.11. University Assessment Coordinator

A University Assessment Coordinator may be appointed from the faculty by the SVP on a load assignment for service. The Coordinator ensures that the calendar for program reviews is regularly updated and published on campus. S/he also keeps the general University of Guam community informed about the progress and outcome of program reviews.

When programs are in the process of completing their self-studies, the Assessment Coordinator may facilitate the establishment of the Program Review Teams. S/he monitors the program review process and provides assistance to any party involved whenever the process requires it. However, the Assessment Coordinator does not directly review individual programs.

4.12. Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (SVP)

The SVP reviews all documents and recommendations generated during the program review process and makes the final decision on the program under review. S/he completes the review process by signing the transmittal form and forwarding a letter to the Graduate Dean, College Dean and faculty of the program outlining these final decisions and specifying the date for the next review.

4.13. Program Stakeholder Groups

Members of stakeholder groups of the program participate on two levels. First, the self-study of the program requires documentation of program evaluations by stakeholder groups, the most obvious group being students. Second, members of stakeholder groups may read the self-study placed for review at RFK Memorial Library and may direct their comments to the chair of the Program Review Team.

5. Timing

In general, graduate programs are reviewed every six years. However, the SVP may revise the due dates for program reviews in collaboration with the Dean and faculty of a program based on a request from the faculty via the Dean, in line with specialized accreditation review timetables or for other reasons. The Assessment Coordinator updates, maintains, and announces via the website the schedule of due dates during the fall semester of each academic year.

6. Action Sequence and Timing

Action	Persons in Charge	Time
Implementation of decisions and recommendations: Program Faculty and Administrators implement the decisions and recommendations of the previous program review.	Program Faculty and administrators	6 years
Establish Program Review Team: Before the due date of the self-study, the Chair and members of this committee are selected and provided with these guidelines to conduct the review of the self-study.	Assessment Coordinator, Faculty Senate, ACGC, Program Faculty, Dean	1 semester
Submit self-study to College Academic Affairs Committee: Program faculty send self-study to AAC for review and approval. The self-study must be ready for review by the AAC no later than the due date of the self-study	Program Faculty, AAC, Dean	Due date of self-study
Submit self-study to External Reviewer and provide a timeline for return of documents and review (one month, normally)	Dean	As soon as review is prepared.
Forward AAC approved self-study: The Chair forwards self-study with AAC recommendations to the Dean, members of Program Review Team, and to JFK Memorial Library	Administrative Chair	Within 5 working days after AAC approval
Review and Provide Recommendations: The Dean reviews the self-study with recommendations made by AAC and Administrative Chair and forwards her/his report and recommendations to the chair of the Program Review Team.	Dean	Within 2 months after AAC approval
Review and Provide Recommendations: The Program Review Team reviews the self-study, including report and commendations made by the Dean, and submits recommendations to the Senate for endorsement to the SVP. A copy of the report is also sent to all members of ACGC and the Dean	Program Review Team	
Decisions and implementation: The SVP reviews all recommendations and information generated during the Program review process and formulates decisions in a letter to the faculty of the program and the Dean for implementation.	SVP	Within 2 months after receipt of Senate endorsement of reports

UNIVERSITY OF GUAM
ACADEMIC POLICIES AND REGULATIONS
Graduate Program Review Transmittal Form

1.   Program: _____

2.   Dates covered by Review:_____

3.   Date of Last Program Review: _____

4.   Today's Date: _____   Contact person for questions: _____
                                                                   i. Phone: _____
                                                                   ii. Email: _____

5.   Program Review Document Transmittal

            Attach to this form   1:   Original Program Review with attachments (One attachment

                                               must be the previous Program Review's recommendations)

                                        2.   Minority Reports (if any)

                                        3.   Recommendations made at each level

UNIT	SIGNATURE (use BLUE pen please)	DATE
Program Coordinator		
Administrative Chair indicating unit review		
Chair, College AAC/CC		
Dean of College		
Chair, Academic Committee on Graduate Programs		
President, Faculty Senate		

APPROVED:

_____   _____
  SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT   DATE
ACADEMIC & STUENT AFFAIRS