

UMKC's 2006-07 Program Review Calendar

Last Revised: May 30, 2006

1. The program review cycle begins with an orientation session for the five units undergoing review (art and art history, communication studies, economics, foreign languages, history). This session outlines the purpose of program review and delineates the steps involved in the process. (June 1, 2006)
2. The units begin their self-studies, providing the requested information in each of the evaluation domains described in the Guidelines. (June 2006)
3. A review panel will be formed with the following composition by September 2006:
 - External reviewer (1) – a professional in the same discipline as the program under review
 - UMKC reviewers (2) – at least one of the reviewers must be a current member of the Program Evaluation Committee
 - UM System Auditors (2-3) – members from the other UM Campuses to be selected by the UM Academic Affairs Office.
4. Review panel participants receive training in continuous quality improvement from Academic Affairs (UM System & UMKC offices). (September 1- September 15)
5. A half-day retreat will be held to facilitate departments' program review processes. Departments undergoing review will meet with review panel participants, PEC members, and any needed resource/support persons to discuss progress on their self-studies and address any difficulties they are encountering. Plans for completing the self studies will be developed with each department. The plans will outline the remaining steps in the process and assign timelines and primary responsibilities for completing the tasks. (September 15- September 30)
- ⑥ The self-study document is completed by the unit. Copies are sent to each review panel member and to the Provost's office. (November 15-December 15, 2006) (1) 20 pages (2) Culture of evidence
7. The schedule for the site visits is coordinated by the Provost's Office in consultation with the review panel members. (January 15 – February 28, 2007) (3) set of steps/s
8. The final report of the review panel is due four (4) weeks after the site visit. The program then is given the opportunity to respond to the report. (March 1 – April 15, 2007) For memo. by object
9. PEC reviews self-studies, committee reports, and departments' responses. PEC meets with department chairs and their deans to discuss the materials and their proposed follow-up activities. PEC's executive summaries and the agreed upon timelines for follow-up activities are submitted to the Provost (March 15 – April 30, 2007) (4) See new guidelines for IPH. center

10. The Provost reviews the reports and responds to PEC with approval or amendments to the follow-up activities agreement. (April – May, 2007)
11. Department chairs and deans meet with PEC to discuss progress and/or completion of follow-up activities as specified in the agreed upon timelines.
12. PEC files an annual report with the Provost outlining the actions that have resulted from the 2006-07 Program Review Cycle.

University of Missouri-Kansas City

Program Evaluation Guidelines

Approved by Program Evaluation Committee: November 4, 2005

*Edit: JRW 2-23-06; RDA 3-20-06; JRW 3-21-06; RDA 4-5-06; RDA 5-5-06; RDA 5-10-06;
JRW 5-11-06; RDA 5-24-06; RDA 5-31-06*

Introduction

The University of Missouri's Executive Guideline 25 describes the policy for the review of existing academic units at five-year intervals. The policy requires an examination of the full array of activities of academic units: undergraduate, graduate, professional, and extension programs with special attention given to teaching, research, and creative activities. The policy specifically states that recommendations from the program reviews should be considered in developing operating and capital budget requests and in planning for reallocations when necessary and appropriate.

The *domains of review* outlined in this document provide a set of proposed topics to help structure the process. Departmental discussions and processes should be documented in the self-study report. Ultimately, however, the desired product from the program review process is the development and implementation of plans aimed at enhancing the quality of departmental programs and services.

Part I: Program Evaluation Process

A. Review Process

Self Study

In preparation for a site visit by an investigating committee, the academic unit prepares a self study that evaluates the accomplishments of the previous five-year period and establishes its priorities for the next five years. The purpose of the self-study process is to generate department-wide discussion and reflection about ways of improving academic programs and/or services. Through the self-study process, the faculty of the unit identifies the strengths and weaknesses of its programs and develops consensus about the program's direction within the strategic plans of UMKC and the University of Missouri.

During the self-study process, faculty and administration assess all programs and centers in the academic unit. From this study, the faculty makes recommendations additions to or changes in the existing program. The self-study should address the present quality of teaching, research, and service within the academic program, and should provide explicit plans for improving quality over the next five years.

B. Review Panel

1. The process of appointing the review panel is a collaboration between the Provost's office, the PEC, and the unit that is intended to best meet the needs of the academic unit being evaluated.
2. Review panels will be composed of six (6) members, one external reviewer and two UMKC members, and three UM System auditors. In special circumstances (e.g., a very large unit), additional members may be added. In some cases, more than one external reviewer will be necessary, for instance when there are multiple programs within a unit with significantly different content or foci.
- ③ The external reviewer, who will be charged with producing the first draft of the evaluation report, must be a professional in the same discipline as the program under review and working outside of the state of Missouri.
4. The final report should correspond to the domains of evaluation as specified in Part I of this document.
5. The coordinator of the review process (likely from the provost's office) initiates the review by requesting from the national professional organization with which the program/unit is most closely aligned a list of five (5) possible external reviewers. Peer
Instituti
6. The list of potential external reviewers is submitted to the unit/program for comment. The unit may argue against the inclusion of a given reviewer or may add candidates to the list.
7. Of the two (2) UMKC reviewers, at least one (1) must be a current member of the Program Evaluation Committee (PEC). The second UMKC reviewer may be a member of the PEC or other tenured faculty member appointed by the Provost.
8. In September of each academic year, the Chair of the PEC will provide a list of programs/units to be reviewed in the subsequent year. The Chair nominates committee members to review panels on the basis of their preferences and input from the unit/program. The Provost makes final appointments.
9. A UMKC member serves as chair of the review committee. This individual must have prior experience as a member of a review panel (e.g., COPE, APA, NCATE, NCA).
10. Ordinarily, PEC members serve on a maximum of two (2) review panels per year.

C. Schedule

February preceding the academic year of the review (In 2006-07, the cycle will start with an orientation session in June.)	Alert the academic unit and provide guidelines and consultation
Preceding year: July-September	Establish the review panel; engage and contract with external reviewers
Academic Year of Review	
November-December	Submit completed self study to Provost's Office and to the review panel members
January-February	Schedule site visits with review panel - report is due four weeks after the visit
March-April	PEC, department chairs and their dean discuss self studies, and the review panel reports, and reach agreement about follow-up activities. PEC's executive summaries and recommendations are submitted to the Provost
April- May	Provost reviews reports/recommendations and responds to PEC

Feb very busy
For Hist

1. Programs to be reviewed in a given academic year are notified by the PEC (or Provost's office) at the end of the academic year *preceding* the year of review.
2. The unit then prepares a self-study document, providing the requested information in each of the evaluation domains.
3. During the summer, the Institutional Research Office (IR) works with department to ensure that they have accurate data needed for their self-study.
- ④ The self-study document is submitted by the program two (2) months prior to the intended review date. Copies are sent to each review panel member and to the Provost's office.
5. The schedule for the site visit is coordinated by the designated administrator for the program in consultation with the review panel members.
6. The final report of the review committee is due four (4) weeks after the site visit. The program then is given the opportunity to respond to the report. -

Part II: Domains of Review

A. Unit Description

Describe the academic unit and complete the tables listed below. Include: organizational structure, degrees/programs, and budget data (general fund allocation, tuition and grant income).

Describe how the program serves its constituent groups. How do the unit and its programs support the overall mission of UMKC and the UM System (see: <http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/about/strategic/>)

Table 1: Faculty

Table 2a: Graduate Teaching Assistants

Table 2b: Graduate Research Assistants

Table 3: Staff

B. Programs or Support Functions

Describe the programs the unit offers: specify each program's general goals and its associated objectives or student competencies. How are the competencies/objectives taught/addressed, e.g., describe coursework and other required experiences and provide representative syllabi, internships, and supporting documents.

For some helpful guidelines and ways of stimulating thought on these issues see: www.geneva.edu/object/assess_program_guide.html

How are student learning outcomes assessed? What is the evidence of success?

For department-level examples of student learning outcomes and assessment methods, see the University of South Florida's web site: <http://www.ie.usf.edu/OA>

Please note any references from the above documents or other information from the assessment literature that you found helpful in developing your outcomes or assessment methods.

If the unit supports doctoral study, describe how the faculty establishes objectives and evaluates outcomes? What processes support continuous quality improvement?

If the unit participates in the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program:

- What are the goals for the doctoral discipline with the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program?
- What are the curricular areas of excellence that are you seeking to develop with this program?
- What features of the program make it interdisciplinary?
- What priority does the faculty give the doctoral program in relationship to other departmental priorities?

- Describe the interdisciplinary strengths the doctoral faculty brings to mentoring students in the program.
- What processes support continuous quality improvement?
- How does the unit's Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program integrate with the unit's overall goals and strategic plan?
- Provide a list of Interdisciplinary Ph.D. completions in the past five years showing coordinating and co-disciplines. If possible, provide information on graduates' present placements.

If the unit is home to academic centers/institutes and/or service/contract centers/institutes, explain the mission, goals, objectives, and activities of each and describe how each center/institute relates to the work of the unit. Describe the role of the faculty in each center/institute. Evaluate each center's/institute's effectiveness for the past five years. Provide a strategic plan for each center/institute. Identify the person who is responsible for filing an annual report with the Provost and provide a copy of the most recent report to the Provost and identify the person who prepared the report. .

If the unit provides support for other programs/units, describe how it does so and define the competencies and outcomes associated with coursework or other experiences.

What is the process for reviewing and updating the curriculum? How does the faculty consider the needs of the various student populations being served by the program (e.g., first-generation, students of color, non-traditional,) in the design and delivery of the curriculum? What strategies are used to enhance student success? How does the program integrate diverse/multi-cultural perspectives?

Who provides leadership for the unit's program or support functions? Describe the decision-making process in the unit. Describe how course assignments are made and advising duties distributed.

Table 4a/4b: Degree Program/Support Program Goals, Experiences and Student Learning Outcomes

C. Faculty

Describe the faculty in the unit and how it contributes to the degree programs. What are the general expectations of the faculty with respect to the program? Document teaching and advising loads for each faculty member. How is the quality of faculty's teaching and advising evaluated? Attach an abbreviated vita for each faculty member.

Describe your process for recruiting, mentoring and retaining faculty. How do you proactively seek out and recruit candidates from diverse backgrounds? Outline the process used to create development/mentoring plans for the faculty members in your department; what issues are addressed in the plans?

Briefly describe the processes in your department for:

- tenure and promotion
- post tenure review
- workload allocation

and attach copies of your policies/guidelines

For those programs that participate in the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program:

- Describe the interdisciplinary abilities that are sought when hiring new faculty members.
- How are faculty evaluated on their participation in the doctoral program and how is this reflected in annual evaluations and the promotion and tenure process?

How are the quality and quantity of the faculty's research evaluated? What evidence is used in measuring the effectiveness of faculty research? Does the unit have a coherent agenda for research, and does the agenda support the goals of individual faculty members, the unit, and the university?

How do the faculty and students collaborate to develop an effective research environment? How does the research environment support continuous quality improvement?

Does the unit have a plan for sponsored projects? If so, how are faculty achievements in the conduct of these projects evaluated

Describe how the faculty's research supports and enhances the educational program.

Table 5a: Abbreviated Faculty Vitae (Data could be pulled by Institutional Research (IR) from the Faculty Accomplishment System if desired by the department)

(Two pages for each faculty member including: faculty name and rank; earned degrees; teaching assignments over the past 5 years; research productivity; and service activities relevant to the program.)

Table 5b: Faculty Summary Data (Data to be supplied by IR)

Table 5c: Faculty Demographics (Data to be supplied by IR)

D. Students

Describe students currently in the program (e.g., the majors, minors). Identify significant support provided for other degrees/units, and describe typical patterns of use. If appropriate, add other information such as admission requirements, SAT or GRE scores, GPAs, graduate/undergraduate status, or other relevant information.

Table 6a: Student Information: Student Credit Hours (Data to be supplied by IR)

Table 6b: Demographics of Majors (Data to be supplied by IR)

Table 6c. Student Success (Data on Graduates, Retention, and Test Score Data (AP, GPA, MFAT – where applicable) to be supplied by IR)

E. Resources

Describe the resources in the unit that support the program (such as administrative assistants, work study students, or graduate assistants). Briefly describe your patterns of resource usage and how they compare with similar programs (e.g., cost of instruction from UM System Cost Study). Note any deficits or peculiarities encountered with your budget or cost data. Describe the physical location of the unit/programs and how this supports the unit. What other resources support the program? How does the program use library and information technology resources?

F. Evaluation Methods, Data and Future Planning

How does the program evaluate itself? What is the evidence that students are achieving the objectives/goals of the program? Present supporting data in tabular form. How are these data used? How is this information used for program improvement and planning?

What information does the faculty use to ascertain that the program is consistent with local/regional/national trends in programs of high quality? Explain if the quality of the program/unit differs significantly from that of similar programs.

Please note any models from other institutions and/or research literature that informed your approach on these issues.

What is the process through which the faculty conducts an on-going review of the program's functioning, experiences, and outcomes? How does this process inform strategic planning?

List the unit's strengths and areas in need of improvement, and present a five-year strategic plan for addressing them.

Table 7a: Teaching Evaluation Data

Table 7b: Outcome Indices and Data: Goals, Experiences and Student Learning Outcomes (this table should parallel Table 4a/4b)

Table 7c: Follow-up on majors who have graduated

Table 7d: Strategic Plans: Goals, Objectives, Responsible Persons, Timelines, Anticipated Outcomes, and Measures of Success