



Title: Academic Program Reviews
Effective Date: November 1, 2003

1. The Self Study

University regulations require that every academic major program be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis every five years. 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 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.

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. Requests should be made via the Dean to the Senior Vice President.

2. The Program Review Team

After review at the College level, by the Academic Affairs Committee and the Dean, the self-study with transmittal form appropriately signed and with all recommendations attached shall be forwarded to the Academic Committee on Undergraduate Curricula (ACUC).

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

3. Program Review Team 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.



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 discuss 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 of the Senate, the report, all responses, and final recommendations are forwarded to the Senior Vice President for action.

4. **Final Response to Program Review**

The normal period of approval for a program undergoing review is five 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 must include either:

- 1) Approval for five years from when the review was submitted, or
- 2) Approval for a period of less than five years, subject to the fulfillment of specified conditions. The report must specify the actions required to allow full approval.

Reasons for less than five year approval

Under some circumstances, a situation may evolve sufficiently rapidly to raise concerns about the wisdom of approving a program for the full five 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 lacking. (Students are not advised and have difficulty in their senior year? No advisement procedures? Lack of student satisfaction with advisors?)



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.
- 5) A structure to the major 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**

Attached is the Undergraduate Program Review Self-study Outline Pilot Phase. This outline will be used until revised and reissued by the Office of the Senior Vice President.

6. **Self-Study Administrative Procedures**

Transmittal Forms, the self-study outline, and types of recommendations are attached to this document.

University of Guam Undergraduate Academic Degree Program Review

Administrative Procedures

November 2003

1. Preamble

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

2. Definitions of Academic Programs

2.1. Academic Degree Program

An academic degree program is a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective, consistent with the mission of the University of Guam, which upon completion, results in a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree.

2.2. Academic Minor Program

An academic minor program is a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective, consistent with the mission of the University of Guam, which upon completion, results in a minor, identified on the transcript or a certificate. For the purposes of review, minors that are part of a major will be reviewed with the major.

2.3. Academic Support Program

An academic support program is a structured grouping of course work designed to support a degree program.

3. Purpose of Undergraduate Program Review

The primary purpose of program review at the University of Guam is to assess and strengthen the quality of its academic programs. The assessment elucidates the contributions of programs toward the achievement of the local and regional mission of the University of Guam and ensures that all programs meet the standards set by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, by 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 of other universities. The process and outcome of all program reviews is 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 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

The faculty members of undergraduate programs must make student outcome assessment and evaluation of program goals and objectives an integral part of the life of their programs. The faculty work collectively to implement decisions and recommendations of the most recent program review and, in consultation with the Administrative Chair 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.

4.3. Administrative Chair

The Administrative Chair of the program ensures that program faculty clearly understand the schedule of program reviews and provide opportunities for faculty development pertaining to the development of student learning outcomes, assessment of student learning outcomes and program evaluation. The Administrative Chair also works collaboratively with the program faculty during the process of writing the self-study.

4.4. College Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)

The College Academic Affairs Committees (AAC) play critical roles in the undergraduate program review. Program faculty submit their self-study to the Academic Affairs Committee 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 undergraduate program review guidelines for the self-study?
- Do the program faculty members adequately describe the program and its relations with other academic programs of the college?
- Does the self-study of the undergraduate program adequately reflect the context of the college mission and existing academic, financial, and physical master plans of the College?

The chair of the AAC signs the Undergraduate Program Review Transmittal form and forwards it to the Dean of the College.

After the AAC has approved the self-study the Administrative Chair:

- (a) provides a short report with recommendations to the Dean
- (b) forwards one copy of the self-study to the Dean for review
- (c) places three 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 Undergraduate Curricula, the Faculty Senate, and the general public
- (d) sends two copies of the self-study to the Academic Committee on Undergraduate Curricula (ACUC). If the review is other than that of an academic degree program, the report is sent directly to the Senior Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs (SVP).

4.5. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library

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

During the review process of a program, three copies of the self-study are kept on reserve at the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library. After the program review is completed, one copy of the self-study is returned to the undergraduate program, one copy remains in the office of the Senior Vice President, and one copy remains 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 evaluates the self-study, formulates recommendations and reports his/her findings to the ACUC and signs the Program Review Transmittal Form. After the program review cycle is completed, the Dean ensures the program review decisions and recommendations of the SVP are implemented in consultation with the Administrative Chair and the faculty of the program.

4.7. Academic Committee on Undergraduate Curricula (ACUC)

Members of ACUC play a critical role in the program review process. Before the due date of the self-study of an academic degree program, the Assessment Officer in collaboration with the members of ACUC convenes an ad hoc Program Review Team (PRT) consisting of four members; one selected by the faculty of the program under review as an external reviewer, two members selected by the ACUC (one who will chair the Team), and one member selected by the Faculty Senate. At the beginning of each academic year, the ACUC will send a request to the Senate for faculty members to be named for each review team. The ACUC is also available for consultation and advice to the Program Review Team if the chair requests it. During the review process, a copy of the self-study of the program is available at the RFK Memorial Library to all members of ACUC.

4.8. Faculty Senate

Before the due date of the self-study of an academic degree program, the members of the Faculty Senate identify one member of the University of Guam faculty to be a member of the Program Review Team for the review of the academic program. During the review process, a copy of the self-study of the program is available at the RFK Memorial Library to the Faculty Senate. Members of the Faculty Senate may review the self-study of the program and bring the comments to the attention of the Program Review Team member who they selected.

4.9. Program Review Team (PRT)

Members of the Program Review Team review the self-study of the program, the recommendations of the AAC and the Dean and make recommendations to the SVP.

This PRT has four members:

- (1) The chair is selected by the Academic Committee on Undergraduate Curricula. S/he facilitates the review process and writes the final report. Before the report is submitted to the SVP, the chair provides an opportunity to 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 also selected by ACUC.
- (3) The third member of the Program Review Team is selected by the Faculty Senate.
- (4) The fourth member of the Program Review Committee is nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean. This member is a tenured faculty member from another regionally-accredited University and works in the same academic discipline as the program under review. This member 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.

4.10. Assessment Committee

The Assessment Committee is chaired by the SVP or the Assessment Coordinator and 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 program review of individual programs.

4.11. Assessment Coordinator

The Assessment 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 facilitates the establishment of the Program Review Committees as described in 4.9. 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 for Academic and Student Affairs reviews all documents and recommendations generated during the program review process and makes the final decisions on the program review. S/he completes the review process by writing a letter to Dean and faculty of the program outlining these final decisions.

4.13. Program Stakeholder Groups

Members of stakeholder groups of the program participate on two levels as well. First, the self-study of the program requires documentation of program evaluations by stakeholder groups. 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 Committee.

5. Timing

In general, undergraduate programs are reviewed every five years. However, the SVP may change the due dates for program reviews in collaboration with the Dean and faculty of a program based on specialized accreditation review timetables. The Assessment Coordinator updates, maintains, and announces the schedule of due dates.

6. Action Sequence and Timing

Action	Persons in Charge	Time
<p>Implementation of decisions and recommendations: Program Faculty and Administrators implement the decisions and recommendations of the previous program review.</p>	Program Faculty and administrators	
<p>Establish Program Review Team: Before the due date of the self-study, the Chair and members of this committee are selected and provided with the guidelines to conduct the review of the self-study.</p>	Assessment Coordinator, Faculty Senate, ACUC, Program Faculty	
<p>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</p>	Program Faculty, AAC	Due date of self-study
<p>Forward AAC approved self-study: The Administrative Chair forwards self-study with AAC recommendations to the Dean, members of Program Review Team, and to JFK Memorial Library</p>	Administrative Chair	Within 5 working days after AAC approval
<p>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.</p>	Dean	
<p>Review and Provide Recommendations: The Program Review Team reviews the self-study, including report and commendations made by the Dean, and submits recommendations to SVP. A copy of the report is also sent to all members of ACUC and FS</p>	Program Review Team	Within 2 months after AAC approval
<p>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.</p>	SVP	Within 2 months after receipt of reports



University of Guam
Academic Degree Program Self-Study Outline
November 2003

Introduction
<p>1. Past Program Review: The first part of the introduction should summarize the decisions and recommendations of the past program review. It then should briefly outline when and how these decisions and recommendations were implemented.</p>
<p>2. Executive Summary of Self Study: The second part of the introduction should contain an executive summary of the self-study and recommendations.</p>

Components	Evaluative Criteria
A. Mission of Program	
<p>1. Mission and Goals: This section should describe the basic mission statement and goals of the program in relation to students, faculty, and external constituencies. The Mission and goals constitute the overall educational objective of the program. It also should describe how program mission and goals relate to the missions and goals of the college and UOG.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) program mission supports the mission of the College and the University of Guam. (b) program goals are clearly defined, interrelated, and as a whole, constitute the program mission. (c) program goals are well integrated into the college goals (d) program goals demonstrate the programs contribution to meeting UOG's mandate as Land Grant Institution (e) program goals support the General Education of students
<p>2. Evaluation: The criteria and methods of how program goals are evaluated should be described in this section.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) methods for evaluating the achievement of goals are clearly identified and appropriately implemented (b) the results of the evaluation of goals are clearly illustrated and analyzed (c) the analysis of results examines the institutional fit of program with college and UOG
<p>3. Accreditation: In this section, programs faculty should describe their status in relation to national/international accrediting bodies (if they exist).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) program is accredited by appropriate national/international accrediting bodies (if they exist) (b) program meets or exceeds accreditation standards of national/international accrediting bodies (if they exist)
<p>4. Discussion: This section should provide a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the program performance in light of its mission. It also should describe plans of future program developments and changes pertaining to mission, goals, and institutional environments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the level of achievement of program goals is critically discussed (b) strength and weaknesses of program pertaining to mission and goals are identified and discussed (c) opportunities and threats in institutional environments are identified and discussed (d) plans for the future are evidence based and

	appropriate for the institutional context of the program
--	--

Components	Evaluative Criteria
B. Program Curriculum and Student Outcomes	
<p>1. Student Learning/Curriculum: This section should provide the nexus between program goals and program objectives (the expected student learning outcomes) . It should describe how the curriculum is designed to meet the objectives of the program. It also should describe the responsiveness of the curriculum to changes in the academic discipline of the program and in the societal environment of the University of Guam.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) program objectives (expected student learning outcomes) are established and clearly aligned with program goals (b) curriculum is designed to meet the program objectives (expected student learning outcomes) (c) curriculum supports General Education of students (d) learning outcomes of individual courses are clearly articulated and related to program objectives (e) learning outcomes of students are assessed and used to measure achievement of program objectives (f) program meets self-established program objectives (g) curriculum provides opportunities for synthesis and integration of knowledge taught in different courses, as well as with bodies of knowledge of related academic disciplines (h) curriculum is flexible to allow students to pursue individual interests within the program’s academic field (i) curriculum provides opportunities to students to pursue interests outside the Program (j) curriculum is current in content and modes of instructional delivery (k) curriculum reflects a responsiveness to the needs of local and regional communities
<p>2. Learning Environment: This section should provide an assessment of the learning environment of students and should describe the support, stimulation, and promotion of critical thinking of students. It also should examine the level of integration of scholarship and teaching.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) program provides a variety of modes of instruction and accommodates different learning styles (b) program integrates scholarship and teaching (c) scholarly work of faculty enhances learning environment of students (d) instructional methods and underlying values of Program are consistent with its missions and goals (e) approaches to teaching and students reflect cultural and political sensitivities to local and regional circumstances (f) students know program mission and goals

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (g) students are involved in evaluating the achievement of program goals and objectives (h) students actively participate in the assessment and development of program policies (i) program encourages and supports student organizing (j) program demonstrates ability to accommodate students with special needs (k) program provides appropriate academic advisement to students (l) sufficient courses are offered for students to complete program in the normally expected time
<p>3. Student Outcomes: This section should provide an assessment of the program outcomes pertaining to student demands, student satisfaction, usefulness and applicability of completion of program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) student enrollment and number of graduating students legitimize the Program (b) program attracts high quality students (c) students are satisfied with contents and modes of instruction (d) program meets personal intellectual and academic expectations and needs of students (e) students graduate within the scheduled time frames (f) students are prepared to enter graduate school (g) graduates of program find employment and/or utilize their academic training in activities outside formal employment (h) students succeed in taking national/standardized exams (if they exist) (i) subsequent graduate schools and/or employers are satisfied with the performance of graduates of the program
<p>4. Discussion: This section should provide a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the program performance pertaining to curriculum, learning environment, and student outcomes. It also should describe plans of program faculty to develop areas related to students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the level of achievement of program objectives and students satisfaction is critically discussed (b) strength and weaknesses of program pertaining to curriculum, learning environment, and student outcomes are identified and discussed (c) plans for the future are evidence based and appropriate for the institutional context of the program

Components	Evaluative Criteria
C. Faculty	
<p>1. Faculty Qualifications: This section should describe the qualifications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) faculty have appropriate academic and/or professional qualifications

and characteristics of program faculty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) the number of faculty is sufficient to achieve program goals (c) the ratio of full-time and part-time faculty is appropriate to achieve program goals (d) faculty represent sufficient diversity of academic specialization to cover all relevant areas of academic discipline of program (e) faculty are sufficiently diverse (regarding gender, age, ethnic/national origin) to meet program and broader institutional needs
<p>2. Faculty Performance and Development: This section should illustrate the performance of program faculty appropriate to the needs and structure of the program. This section should also include faculty involvement in appropriate professional organization and public service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) faculty demonstrates commitment to ongoing assessment and improvement of instruction (b) faculty produces scholarly work that contributes to the development of knowledge in their disciplines (c) faculty actively and constructively participate in the governance of the program and the assessment of program performance (d) faculty participate in academic/professional organizations to continuously update their knowledge and skills (e) faculty provide community services to the University of Guam and to local and regional communities
<p>3. Discussion: This section should provide a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of program faculty. It also should describe plans pertaining to faculty matters.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) faculty qualifications and performance is critically discussed (b) strength and weaknesses of collective and individual program faculty are identified and discussed (c) plans for the future are evidence based and appropriate for the institutional context of the program

Components	Evaluative Criteria
D. Extra-University Linkages	
<p>1. Links with Other Universities: This section should describe the contacts of the program with similar programs of other universities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) faculty engage in academic discourse and joint endeavors with professional peers of similar programs of other universities (b) faculty compare program characteristics and performance with similar programs of other universities
<p>2. Links with Local and Regional Community Organizations: This section should describe the linkages of the program with appropriate community and/or public organizations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) program provides opportunities for stakeholder groups of the program to participate in the development and evaluation of the program (b) program faculty and students engage in local and regional community service

	<p>activities</p> <p>(c) program maintains appropriate relations with other organizations in local and regional communities</p>
<p>3. Links with Program Alumni: This section should describe the extent and type of contacts the program maintains with program alumni.</p>	<p>(a) program maintains contact with alumni</p> <p>(b) program provides opportunities for alumni to participate in the evaluation of program goals and objectives</p> <p>(c) program provides opportunities for alumni to assist in the generation of resources needed to maintain and develop the program</p>
<p>4. Discussion: This section should provide a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of program linkages with similar programs of other universities, local and regional community services, and alumni relations. It also should describe plans of future developments pertaining to such linkages.</p>	<p>(a) extra-university linkages are critically discussed</p> <p>(b) strength and weaknesses of extra-university linkages are identified and discussed</p> <p>(c) plans for the future are evidence based and appropriate for the institutional context of the program</p>

Components	Evaluative Criteria
E. Resources and Physical Facilities	
<p>1. Program Resources: This section should describe the available resources for the program to achieve its goals and objectives. This includes support staff, equipment, supplies, and library resources.</p>	<p>(a) sufficient and appropriately qualified staff is available to support the program</p> <p>(b) computer and other information technology resources are adequate and appropriate</p> <p>(c) other appropriate teaching equipment is sufficient for the achievement of program goals and objectives</p> <p>(d) library resources are sufficient for the program to achieve its goals and objectives</p> <p>(e) scholarships for needy students are available</p>
<p>2. Physical Facilities: This section should provide an assessment of the physical facilities available to the program.</p>	<p>(a) sufficient and adequate classrooms are available to the program</p> <p>(b) office space for faculty and staff is sufficient and appropriate</p> <p>(c) work-space and meeting areas for students are sufficient</p> <p>(d) other physical facilities for particular program needs are sufficient</p>
<p>3. Discussion: This section should provide a discussion pertaining to the needed and available resources of the program. It also should describe anticipated future needs of resources and/or physical facilities.</p>	<p>(a) needed and available resources and physical facilities are critically discussed</p> <p>(b) demonstration of future needs are evidence based and appropriate for the institutional context of the program</p>

**UNIVERSITY OF GUAM
ACADEMIC POLICIES AND REGULATIONS
Undergraduate 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. UCRC Liaison _____

5. Program Review Document Transmittal

Attach to this form

1. Original Program Review with attachments/data forms
2. Minority Reports (if any)
3. Recommendations made at each level

UNIT	SIGNATURE (use BLUE pen please)	DATE
Faculty Program Review Coordinator	_____	_____
Chair, College AAC/CC	_____	_____
Dean of College	_____	_____
Chair, UCRC	_____	_____
President, Faculty Senate	_____	_____

REVIEWED and letter to implement approved recommendations sent:

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT DATE