PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK

5th Edition
Spring 2023

Guiding Documentation of the Program Review Process at University of Hawaiʻi West Oʻahu

Approved by UH West Oʻahu Faculty Senate Resolution 2018-8, May 4, 2018
Faculty Senate Resolution 2022-02 (approved 4/8/22)
Faculty Senate Resolution 2022-07 (approved 8/6/22)

Contents

I. Framing Concepts

A. Definition and Purpose of Program Review

According to University of Hawaii Executive Policy 5.202: "All degree/certificate programs that have been approved by the Board of Regents as continuing programs and all instructional areas that utilize substantial University resources are subject to review at a minimum of every seventh year." It is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to assure that programs are reviewed in a timely fashion and that there is appropriate dissemination of information and recommendations.

A program review is a cyclical process for evaluating and continuously enhancing the quality of programs. The evaluation is conducted through a combination of self-evaluation, followed by external peer-evaluation. It is a comprehensive analysis of program quality, analyzing a wide variety of data about the division and its concentrations. The results of this evaluation process are then used to inform follow-up planning and budgeting processes at various levels in the institution—concentration, division, university—and incorporated into the institution's overall quality assurance system. UHWO's program review occurs on a regular cycle of seven years: each division/certificate is reviewed every seven years.

Program review is a required element in the accreditation process. Institutions are expected to have processes that assure program currency, quality, and effectiveness. When implemented effectively and followed up deliberately, program review is a powerful means of engaging faculty in evaluating and improving programs in the university. The primary utility of program review is internal. It provides a structure to foster continuous improvement that is aligned with concentration, division, and institutional goals.

B. Distinction Between Types of Accreditation Review and an Institution's Program Review Process

Colleges and universities engage in a variety of review processes, including regional accreditation, specialized program accreditation and state licensure, and institutional program review.

1. **WASC Senior College and University Commission's (WSCUC) regional accreditation** review evaluates whether the institution as a whole meets the WSCUC criteria. This institution-wide review focuses on the capacity (personnel, curricula, student learning, finances, infrastructure, organizational processes, etc.) and effectiveness of the university to meet its particular mission and its documented results in fulfilling its educational goals and outcomes. WSCUC expects each institution to have its own ongoing system of quality assurance and improvement: program review and assessment of student achievement are key components of this system. The forms of external review described below are part of such a system, not a series of separate, disconnected activities.
2. **Specialized program accreditation** reviews are conducted by outside agencies which certify the professional quality of particular programs. Specialized accreditors

evaluate whether or not a program meets the standards set by the disciplinary or professional body or a state licensing agency. Examples of this type of accrediting body include the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), and the Hawai'I Teacher Standards Board (HTSB).

3. **An institutional program review** evaluates degree programs in a division or across disciplines (such as General Education) within the institution. This type of review is usually conducted as a formative assessment to assist with ongoing planning and improvement of programs. Such institutional program review is required by WSCUC criteria (CFR 2.7) and is the type of review addressed in this handbook. The program review process must include an assessment of student learning outcomes, an external review of the division (of which a specialized accreditation is one form), and the use of program review results in continuous improvement. The specialized program accreditation process (e.g., AACSB, CAEP, etc.) can be coordinated with the institutional program review process to avoid duplication of labor, but must meet internal program review demands.

   a. Evidence-Based Claims and Decision-Making
   Any conclusions drawn within a self-study report or decisions made as a result of a program review are to be informed by evidence. That is, all claims within a self-study report about a program's strengths, weaknesses, and proposed improvement plans are to be supported by relevant qualitative and/or quantitative evidence. This contrasts, for instance, with program review self-studies that are largely descriptive and based on advocacy. Hence, the section of this guide describing the components of a self-study report identifies types of evidence useful for answering questions about various aspects of a division's quality or viability.

   b. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
   Evidence-based program review includes the ongoing evaluation of how well the student body (in the aggregate) is achieving the stated learning outcomes for that division and concentration. While such assessment of student learning outcomes is independent of program review and part of ongoing faculty processes for program improvement, program reviews need to incorporate an analysis of division and concentration assessment of student learning. This includes: a review of division and concentration learning outcomes; evaluation of the methods employed to assess achievement of these outcomes; and analysis and reflection on learning results.

   c. Integration of Results with Planning, Budgeting, and Institutional Quality Assurance Systems
   The results of program review are to be used for follow-up planning and budgeting at various decision-making levels within the organization (concentration, division and institution). In addition, the program review is to be incorporated into the institution's broader quality assurance/ improvement efforts. For example, problems found across several program

reviews might be addressed institutionally as well as within individual divisions.

II. Conducting a Program Review

A. Governance of the Process – Guiding Principles

The guiding principles governing the process are:

1. Academic program review is a faculty-driven process; that is, the program review process is codified by the Faculty Senate policy, based on WSCUC best practices, and implemented by a committee that includes faculty and administration. Formative assessment "by faculty, for use by faculty" is more effective in improving student learning and other program aspects than is assessment by administration.
2. Program Review occurs on a seven-year cycle.
3. Program Review includes an internal review, where concentration faculty and administrators collectively engage in inquiry and analysis. It is suggested that one member of the division-level committee be appointed who was a member of the most recent program review work. A mix of senior and junior faculty are adjudged to be optimal. The self-study process and report include, as one element in the comprehensive review of the division, an analysis of the ongoing assessment of student learning.
4. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) will determine the number of shared credits of overload or course reductions allotted to the Division-level Program Review Committee working to produce the Internal Review. In keeping with UHWO Faculty Senate Resolution #2015-10, the stipends available include a) 10 – 12 credits for preparing a Division Internal Review; b) three overloads or course reductions (nine credits) for preparing an Internal Review that addresses three or more concentrations or certificate programs; c) two overloads (six credits) for preparing an Internal Review that addresses one or two certificate programs. It is understood that these credits will be shared across faculty in the division as the self-study is a collaborative process. The VCAA is the one to monitor the effectiveness of the teaching reductions and may withhold payment of overload to individuals if tasks assigned by the Chair are not effectively completed.
5. The program review process includes an external review and written report, including recommendations for improvement. Meeting with an external evaluator helps to secure buy-in for change and improvement, as well as to ensure alignment with institutional goals and resources.
6. Agreed-upon recommendations emanating from program review are the result of deliberations between the division, the Faculty Senate Program Review committee, and senior administrators with decision-making power regarding priority setting and resource allocation.
7. Follow up on those recommendations is conducted annually by the division faculty leadership so as to inform the continuous efforts to improve division and concentration quality.

8. Collaborative involvement of administration in various steps of the program review process assures that program review results are integrated into university and institutional planning, curriculum review, and budgeting.

B. **Governance of the Process – Steps and Responsibilities**

Different constituencies within the university are responsible for carrying out different steps in the program review process. The following steps are broad outlines of the various constituencies' responsibilities. The governance process for program review is organized in the following manner:

1. The Faculty Senate defines the program review process through this formal written program review policy.
2. Academic Affairs maintains a timeline for all academic program reviews and assists divisions with the steps involved in the process.
3. While faculty, as experts in their field, are in the best position to carry out the internal program reviews, they oversee the evaluative aspects of program review. The process is implemented in collaboration with administrative leaders.
4. The body tasked with carrying out program reviews on campus—the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee—notifies the division of an upcoming review in accordance with the established timeline for review. Special issues for the review are also identified in advance and agreed upon, such as alignment with specific division or institutional goals, or special issues relating to a particular concentration. However, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs officially charges the given Division with the task of conducting the self-study and producing the corresponding report, in accordance with the UH Executive Policy 5.202 and the Board of Regents Policy 5.20L.
5. The Division Chair is responsible for coordinating the initial meeting. At the initial meeting, the Division Chair, the Faculty Senate Chair, the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chair, and the VCAA or representatives from the OVCAA must be present. A specific timeline for carrying out these tasks shall be agreed upon at the initial meeting communicating this charge.
6. The FSPRC should have one representative from each academic division and always include a member from the division under review to serve as a liaison with the division and give voice to divisional concerns and perspectives. The Faculty Senate Program Review Committee members are appointed by the division chair [major academic divisions within the university (to represent each division)] but may include members of the administration as well in an ex officio capacity. The Faculty Senate Program Review Committee is encouraged to consult with the UHWO Assessment Office throughout the program review process.
7. The Office of Institutional Research provides the division with a program review data packet that contains relevant/available program data that will be analyzed in the self-study (additional data can be provided).
8. Division faculty conduct a program self-study within guidelines provided in this program review handbook. It is important that these guidelines include very specific requirements for division as well as concentration-level assessment.

Source: UH System Executive Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs, May 2017; Board of Regents Policy 5.201 III.E. Review of Established Programs, January 2016; UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan, April 20, 2017.

9. The self-study identifies program strengths and limitations and suggests solutions to identified problems. These limitations and suggestions are supported by qualitative or quantitative data collected during the review process.
10. This institutional program review policy describes how to secure qualified, objective external reviewers, including those with understanding and experience in addressing student learning outcomes assessment. Once the self-study is completed (and approved), the visit from the external reviewer is organized. The typical reviewer visits for one or two days.
11. The external reviewers read all relevant documentation, including: the self-study report; relevant data from institutional research; course syllabi; course evaluations; examples of student work, such as senior capstone projects; division reports on annual assessment of student learning outcomes; curriculum maps; faculty CVs; and examples of faculty research.
12. External reviewers prepare a written report of the review, which may include recommendations not cited in the division faculty's own self-study process. The written report addresses the items identified in the external review template found in Appendix B.
13. The Faculty Senate Program Review Committee examines all reports and writes a final Commendations and Recommendations Report that is submitted to the division for review, comment, and clarification, then to the division chair and to senior campus administrators (VCAA).
14. The final product of the program review—an Action Plan—between the VCAA and the Division Chair, places the Commendations and Recommendations in the context of program improvement and resource allocation decisions.

C. **Components in the Self-Study Report**

The self-study consists of evidence-based inquiry and analyses which are documented in a comprehensive self-study report. The components of this internal report are described below and are outlined in Appendix A.

The bulk of a self-study report consists of a presentation and analysis of evidence about the quality and viability/sustainability of a division and its concentrations. This major portion of the report addresses the extent to which division and concentration goals are being met by using evidence to answer key questions related to those goals. The program review guidelines identify the precise evidence to be analyzed in the self-study and the Institutional Research Office will provide the Baseline Quantitative Indicators (as described in this section) and any supplemental data that may be requested and is available.

To facilitate meaningful analysis of the evidence, guiding questions are provided below to structure the self-study inquiry and report. These questions often produce deep discussions among faculty and are considered the most important aspect of the self-study process. Parenthetical materials suggest the kinds of information that may be relevant in answering each question. The specific information included in self-studies varies with program circumstances.

1. **Introduction/Context**

   Begin with a section that provides a context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study report, this portion is primarily descriptive and may include:

   a. The internal context – In what division does it reside? What degrees/certificates does it grant? What concentrations are available?
   b. The external context – How is the program responsive to the needs of the region or area in which it serves?
   c. Include a brief history of the division or a description of changes made in the division and concentrations since the last review (if relevant).
   d. A key component in providing the context for the review is a description of the division's mission, goals, and outcomes.
   e. A mission statement is a general explanation of why your division exists and what it hopes to achieve in the future. It articulates the division's essential nature, its values and its work.
   f. Goals are general statements of what your division wants to achieve.
   g. Outcomes are the specific results that should be observed if the goals are being met and students possess the skills upon graduation from the program.

   Note that goals typically flow from the mission statement, and outcomes are aligned with goals. In addition, concentration mission, goals and outcomes should relate to the mission and goals of the division and institution

2. **Most Recent Action Plan**

   The Action Plan contains recommendations that the division is expected to fulfill by the next review, including a timeline with progress milestones.

   After the introduction, the self-study should report on the progress made to date in regards to the recommended actions contained in the Action Plan since the last program review. This most recent Action Plan should be included in an appendix to the self-study along with a compilation of the annual Action Plan progress reports. Thus, most of this section comes from the corresponding annual reports. The division/concentrations are asked to reflect on the Action Plan's progress going forward.

3. **Analysis of Evidence About Program Quality: Data Gathering, Summary, and Analysis**

   As noted earlier, the bulk of a self-study report consists of a presentation and analysis of evidence about the quality and viability/sustainability of a concentration and the division. This major portion of the report addresses the extent to which division goals are being met by using evidence to answer key questions related to those goals. The program review guidelines identify the precise evidence to be analyzed in the self-study and the Institutional Research Office will provide the Baseline Quantitative Indicators for Program Reviews (as described in this section) and any supplemental

data that may be requested and is available.

To facilitate meaningful analysis of the evidence, guiding questions are provided below to structure the self-study inquiry and report. These questions often produce deep discussions among faculty and are considered the most important aspect of the self-study process. Parenthetical materials suggest the kinds of information that may be relevant in answering each question.

The specific information included in self-studies varies with division and concentration circumstances. The specific requirements of this section are detailed in:
   a. [UH System Executive Policy 5.202, Appendix A: Guidelines for Assessment of Established Programs (May 15, 2017)](#)
      1. **Is the program organized to meet its outcomes?** (Discussion of curriculum, requirements, admissions, advising and counseling, and other aspects of the program, with reference to its program outcomes.) Examples of guiding questions include: How current is the program curriculum? Does it offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular degree? How well does it align with learning outcomes? Are the courses well sequenced and reliably available in sequence? Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar programs?

         Evidence in this category might include:
         a. A curriculum map and description of how the curriculum addresses the learning outcomes of the program
         b. A comparison of the program's curriculum with curricula at selected other institutions and with disciplinary/professional standards. The Institutional Research Office will provide a list of peer and aspirational institutions. The division is welcome to supplement this list.
         c. Measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, faculty scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty)
         d. A description of other learning experiences that are relevant to program goals (e.g., internships, practicums, research experiences, study abroad or other international experiences, community-based learning, senior projects, etc), as well as how many students participate in those experiences.
      2. **Are program resources adequate?** (Analysis of number and distribution of faculty, faculty areas of expertise, budget and sources of funds, and facilities and equipment.)
      3. **Is the program efficient?** (Assessment of productivity and cost/benefit considerations within the overall context of campus and University "mission" and planning priorities. Include quantitative measures comparing, for example, SSH/faculty, average class size, cost per SSH, cost per

Source: UH System Executive Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs, May 2017; Board of Regents Policy 5.201 III.E. Review of Established Programs, January 2016; UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan, April 20, 2017.

concentration with other programs in the division, on the campus and, as appropriate, similar programs on other UH campuses.)

4. **Evidence of Student Learning and Success**. (Assessment of whether or not students are meeting the program objectives and a summary of the evidence used to reach this conclusion. Data on time to degree trends, retention and actions to increase retention and on time graduation. Indicators of program quality, e.g. accreditation or other external evaluation, student performance on external exams, student employer satisfaction, alignment with Hawaiʻi economic demand, employment/graduate school trends of graduates, awards to faculty and students, etc.)

   Examples of guiding questions include: Are students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program? Are they achieving those outcomes at the expected level of learning, and how is the expected level determined? Are they being retained and graduating in a timely fashion)?

   Evidence in this category might include:
   a. Annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning in the program (could be a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures), including the degree to which students achieve the program's desired standards
   b. Ongoing efforts by the department to "close the loop" by responding to assessment results
   c. Student retention and time-to-degree trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories)

5. **Are program objectives still appropriate functions of the division and University?** (Relationship to University mission and development plans, evidence of continuing need for the program, projections of employment opportunities for graduates, etc.)

   Further, page 9 of EP 5.201, Appendix B, Item 2 emphasizes attention to Board criteria requiring relevance of the program:
   a. To the professional, economic, social, occupational and general educational needs of Hawaiʻi.
   b. To national and international needs where Hawaiʻi and the University have unique or outstanding resources to respond with quality.
   c. To basic education needs for which there is a demand by Hawaiʻi's population
   d. As a necessary supporting discipline for quality programs.

6. **What is the program's relationship to the UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan and campus strategic plan?** Memo from VP Straney, dated February 21, 2018, notes that "Reviews should address the program's relationship with the UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan (April 20, 2017) and campus strategic plans."

    a. Collaboration across all programs and activities, "academically nimble"
    b. Shared use of facilities
    c. Recruit and support non-traditional students
    d. Focus on transfer students and Early College
    e. Improving retention and persistence
    f. Monitoring and anticipating workforce needs

4. **Data Gathering, Summary, and Analysis**

The specific requirements for Baseline Quantitative Indicators for Program Review are detailed in:

[UH System Executive Policy 5.202, Appendix B: Quantitative Indicators for Program Reviews (May 15, 2017):](#)

The following data (at least 5 years) are recommended for use in the program review process. Campuses will decide on the definitions of the quantitative indicators best suited for their campus. The data are provided by the campus administration to the program. Wherever possible, data are broken down by the level of instruction (e.g., lower division, upper division, certificates, minors, graduate or C.O., C.A., A.S.) and disaggregated in meaningful ways. Campus may add additional data points to this list.

1. Number of undergraduate students who have declared a concentration in the division
2. Student semester hours (SSH) taught
3. FTE course enrollment (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduate-level and by 12 for graduate-level courses)
4. Percent SSH/FTE disaggregated by own majors, majors within college and all others
5. Number of classes (sections) offered
6. Average class size (total student registrations divided by number of classes offered) and average fill rates (student registrations divided by course max) for all courses, including face-to-face courses and distance delivered courses
7. FTE faculty by tenure/tenure track and other faculty (temporary, I2s and lecturers)
8. Student-faculty ratio (FTE course enrollment divided by FTE faculty) for tenure/tenure track and other faculty
9. Completion measures, i.e.
    a. Number of degrees earned by majors
    b. Time to degree
10. Retention rates
11. Average credits earned at graduation by concentration
12. Budget allocation
13. Budget allocation per SSH

5. **Summary Reflections**

Source: UH System Executive Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs, May 2017; Board of Regents Policy 5.201 III.E. Review of Established Programs, January 2016; UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan, April 20, 2017.

This portion of the self-study report typically interprets the significance of the findings in the above analysis of evidence. Its purpose is to determine a division's strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. It is helpful to have questions that guide the interpretation of the findings, such as:

a. Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with the goals of the division?
b. Are concentration goals aligned with the goals of the constituents that the concentrations serve?
c. Is the level of program quality aligned with the university's acceptable level of program quality? Aligned with the constituents' acceptable level of quality?
d. Are division goals being achieved?
e. Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the expected level?
f. Any specific questions for the external review evaluator based on the evidence?

It is also helpful to have evaluation criteria in mind; that is, what guidelines will be used to determine what the evidence suggests about the division's strengths and weaknesses? In some cases, an absolute standard may be used. In other cases, a norm-referenced criterion may be more appropriate. For example, if a national student survey was used to assess student satisfaction, the evaluation criterion might be that your students' satisfaction is at least as high as students at other similar institutions.

6. **Future Goals and Planning for Improvement**

Self-study reports conclude with a section devoted to future planning and improvement. Findings from all prior sections of the report serve as a foundation for building an evidence-based plan for strengthening the division and each concentration. This section might address such questions as:

a. What are the division's goals for the next few years? In order to achieve these goals:
b. How will the division specifically address any weaknesses identified in the self-study?
c. How will the division build on existing strengths?
d. What internal improvements are possible with existing resources (through reallocation)?
e. What improvements can only be addressed through additional resources?
f. Where can the formation of collaborations improve program quality?
g. What curricular changes need to be made?

D. **The External Review**

The external review occurs after a division submits its self-study report.

1. **Choosing an External Reviewer**

At the time a division is notified that it will be conducting a program review, the chair is asked to submit to administration and the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee a list of names of possible reviewers. The reviewer should be external to the university. External reviewers should be distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners/scholars in the field and be chosen from campuses that are similar to UHWO. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration as well as related external workforce requirements including graduate school. With the inclusion of student learning results in program review, it is important for the reviewer to understand and be experienced with student learning outcomes assessment and have the ability to review and analyze the division and concentration assessment processes and results. The Faculty Senate Program Review Committee and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA) decides on the final list of possible reviewers. The OVCAA contacts the external reviewer candidate to determine their availability.

Procurement of the External Review services and travel must adhere to State and University laws and policies. Please contact the Academic Affairs fiscal staff for guidance/advice.

2. **Instructions and Materials for the External Review**

Prior to the scheduled visit, the information from the program self-study and any additional materials are sent to the external reviewer, along with the guidelines for External Review (Appendix B in this document) by the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee.

3. **External Reviewer Visit and Report**

The external reviewer visit typically lasts for two days (sometimes one day for small programs), during which time the reviewer meets with division faculty, academic advisors, students, the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee, and select administrators. The reviewer takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding the visit and is expected to submit his/her written evaluation to the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee within two weeks of the campus visit but no later than a month after the visit. Upon submission of the report, the reviewer will receive an agreed-upon fee and payment for travel related costs.

E. **Post External Review Process**

As soon as the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee receives the report from the external reviewer, it is distributed to the division and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The division reviews the report (within two weeks) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. The summary of factual corrections and misperceptions becomes part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee.

1. **Commendations and Recommendations Report**

The Faculty Senate Program Review Committee reviews all relevant documentation (self-study report, external review report, departmental response, if relevant) and, based on the evidence reviewed, writes a report detailing the major commendations and

recommendations resulting from the evaluation process. The commendations and recommendations report presents a cohesive plan of action for improvement within the division based on the program review documents. These commendations and recommendations are conveyed to the division by the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee. The chair of the division undergoing review distributes the commendations and recommendations report to the division faculty, staff and, in some cases, students. The division collects input from all constituents and prepares a detailed response, either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so. This response is submitted to the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee within a month for consideration in drawing up the final Commendations and Recommendations. The Faculty Senate Program Review Committee distributes its approved final report to the division for action and to the VCAA.

2. **Responding to Commendations and Recommendations Report: Action Plan**

The Faculty Senate Program Review Committee and the VCAA meet with the division chair and other division representatives to discuss the action steps to be taken as a result of the review. A timeline is set and resources needed to accomplish the plan's goals are identified. Those responsible for the implementation of the action steps are identified by position. An Action Plan is written and signed by the division chair and VCAA. The Action Plan contains recommendations that the division is expected to fulfill by the next review, including a timeline with progress milestones.

The Action Plan may also contain recommendations for resource allocation. Regarding the contents of the Action Plan recommendations, planning that emanates from the program review should not be confused with solely a demand for additional resources, but rather should enable institutions and programs to focus on effective ways to achieve their program goals. In fact, many recommendations do not require resource allocation or redistribution. A reorganization of curriculum, the addition of new courses, or partnerships with other divisions are examples of changes which might require no (or few) resources. On the other hand, an Action Plan might also suggest changes that do require substantial resource allocation, such as additional faculty or staff hires or the purchase of lab equipment. In those cases, the recommendation usually occurs in a section of the Action Plan directed to the VCAA. If there are serious issues that require immediate attention, the division will be required to write a plan for improvement. In this case, it will be given a timeline for reporting on the specific issues of concern before the next program review cycle.

3. **Sharing Results and Tracking Improvement Plan**

To maximize the effectiveness of program review, it is important to share the findings and resulting decisions with stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the division's and/or institution's goals and creates an opportunity for all stakeholders to review the program review results. To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, every two years, the division chair along with the Faculty Senate

Program Review Committee reviews the progress of programs based on annual updates submitted by the given division. If the division was not successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee or administrator may recommend follow-up actions to the division/concentration and appropriate campus administrators.

a. Memo from VP Straney, dated February 21, 2018 notes:

"An executive summary of each existing program review conducted during an academic year will be due to the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy by September 1 of the following academic year. The executive summary should identify the salient conclusions and recommendations in the review and administrative actions proposed in response. This summary will be shared with the Board in the annual Academic Action Report and we would expect that the summary (and the review itself) would be posted on a campus web page."

4. Distribution and Archiving of Program Review Documents

Copies of the unedited program review documents (self-study report, external review report, responses, commendations and recommendations report, improvement plan, Action Plan) are sent to relevant parties, such as the Chancellor, VCAA, Division Chair, and Faculty Senate. File copies (paper and digital) are archived in an appropriate location for future reference. Division Chairs and other administrators need to retain copies of program reviews and the decisions that resulted from them (including Action Plans) and refer to them in their planning and budgeting.

III. **Using Program Review Results in Planning and Budgeting**

Program review provides one way for institutions to link evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and budgeting. That is, the findings in the self-study, recommendations in the external review, Commendations and Recommendations Report, and MOU can be used as evidence to inform decision-making processes at various levels in the institution.

A. **Division Level**

At the division level, results from program review may include:

- Inform curriculum planning, such as:
  o Changing the sequence of courses in the concentration curriculum
  o Adding or deleting courses
  o Refinement or articulation of pre-requisite or disciplinary requirements
  o Re-design of the content or pedagogy of specific courses The primary questions driving such changes would be:
- Are our students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program?
- If not, what elements of the curriculum could be changed to improve learning?
- Inform changes in how resources are used within the division and concentrations, such as assignment of faculty to teach specific courses or sections

Source: UH System Executive Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs, May 2017; Board of Regents Policy 5.201 III.E. Review of Established Programs, January 2016; UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan, April 20, 2017.

- Changing the scheduling of certain courses or the frequency with which they are offered
- Changing the number of students required in course sections so that student learning and effectiveness of teaching are maximized
- Implementing improved advising and support services to increase learning, retention, and/or graduation rates
- Adjusting the allocation of faculty resources across General Education as well as the concentrations
- Providing additional professional development or research resources for faculty
- Adjusting faculty teaching loads and assigned/release time

- Some guiding questions here are:
- How can resources within the division be allocated in such a way as to better achieve the mission and goals of the division?
- At what point in the prioritization of division goals do these recommendations fall?
- What are the costs of each recommendation (both the direct monetary cost and the opportunity cost in the form of lost resources for other initiatives in addition to the cost to faculty time)?
- What is the extent of division funds available and where might the division turn for external funding?
- Make recommendations for how resources outside the division and concentrations should be used. For example, the division may suggest:
  o Specific enhancements to the Library collection
  o Additional tutors be added to the No'eau Center
  o Specified improvements to technology support
  o Further strengthening of writing/speaking across the curriculum initiatives
  o Definitive improvements to career placement services
  o Make a case to the division chair for specific additional resources. For example, a concentration may ask for an additional faculty line or support staff
  o Additional funds to support faculty professional travel or research
  o Release time for curriculum development or research-related activities
  o A reduction or increase in program enrollment, with recommendations on how to achieve these changes

B. **Concentration Level**

At the concentration level, program reviews can be used to decide how to allocate resources across concentrations. For example, by looking across the results of several divisions' program reviews, the Division Chair may decide to:

- Add resources, such as faculty lines, travel money, equipment, space, to certain concentrations, based on needs identified in the reviews
- Enhance support to concentrations with the potential to grow or to establish research distinction in the field
- Combine or phase out certain concentrations

Source: UH System Executive Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs, May 2017; Board of Regents Policy 5.201 III.E. Review of Established Programs, January 2016; UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan, April 20, 2017.

- Re-tool and reassign faculty or academic support staff

In making such decisions, a division chair may consider:

- How do these recommendations fit into the overall divisions' mission and goals?
- How do these recommendations fit into the University's mission and goals?
- At what point in the prioritization of both sets of goals do these recommendations fall?
- What are the costs of each recommendation (both the direct monetary cost and the opportunity cost in the form of lost resources for other programs)?
- What is the extent of resources available and where might the division chair turn for external funding?

In addition, Division Chairs may use resource allocation decisions to ensure that concentrations include outcomes-based assessment and evidence-based decision making in the program review process to ensure that the process is a meaningful tool for quality enhancement. This can be encouraged by withholding resources if these two elements are absent from the self-study or granting additional resources for those programs engaged in meaningful assessment of student learning and which demonstrate evidence-based decision-making within program review.

Program review will be viewed as more meaningful and divisions will take the process more seriously if there are a) consequences for divisions not meeting new program review and assessment standards and b) strategic funding by Division Chairs and the VCAA of evidence-based proposals for improving student learning and other dimensions of program quality.

C. **Institutional Level**

At the institution level, program reviews can be used in a variety of ways in planning and budgeting, among them:

- By Division Chairs bringing forward requests during the budgeting process that are informed by the results of program reviews
- In this case, many of the guiding questions listed under the division level may also be questions that are discussed at the institutional level
- By aggregating program review results across divisions, the institution can get
- a sense of whether university goals (or strategic planning goals) are being met or being modified.
- If the overall pattern of results suggests that there is an area for improvement then university leadership may decide to allocate additional resources, typically to divisions, to address that area
- By institutional leadership articulating its primary strategic initiatives and allocating funds or resources to Divisions or programs in order to strengthen efforts in those areas.
- If this approach is adapted, many of the guiding questions listed under the division level may also be questions that are discussed at this level, depending on institutional culture and the institution's business model

Source: UH System Executive Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs, May 2017; Board of Regents Policy 5.201 III.E. Review of Established Programs, January 2016; UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan, April 20, 2017.

- The institution controls all allocation of resources and can influence directly the decisions to improve specific aspects of desired strategic initiatives

UNIVERSITY of HAWAI'I®
WEST O'AHU

References

Allen, M. J. (2004). *Assessing academic programs in higher education.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Angelo, T. & Cross, P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bresciani, MJ. (2006). *Outcomes-based academic and co-curricular program review: A compilation of institutional good practices.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bresciani, M.J., Zelna, C.L., & Anderson, J.A. (2004). *Techniques for assessing student learning and development: A handbook for practitioners.* Washington, DC: NASPA.

Huba, M.E. & Freed, J.E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Maki, Peggy L. (2004). *Assessing for learning: Building a sustainable commitment across the institution.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Palomba, C. & Banta, T. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walvoord, B. & Anderson, V. J. (1998). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walvoord, B. A. (2004). *Assessment clear and simple: A practical guide for institutions, divisions and general education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

IV. Appendices

Source: UH System Executive Policy 5.202: Review of Established Programs, May 2017; Board of Regents Policy 5.201 III.E. Review of Established Programs, January 2016; UH System Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan, April 20, 2017.