

## **Claremont Colleges Intercollegiate Programs Academic Program Review Guidelines**

The following guidelines describe the purposes, characteristics, and procedures for an intercollegiate academic program review. These guidelines are to help the program plan for, undertake, and interpret the results of an academic program review.

### **The Purposes of Academic Program Review**

Student learning and program planning are at the heart of the review process. Reviews will typically include an internal program self-study and a multi-day visit by external reviewers. The insights gained through this process should provide feedback to help the faculty assess the quality of the program, use its resources more efficiently, attract new resources to its curriculum and programs, and enter into a beneficial conversation about good educational practices.

### **Overview of the Academic Program Review Process**

The academic program review process includes four phases:

1. Planning for a Program Review – The Lead Dean and Program Chair appoint an ad hoc Program Review Committee with faculty representation from the relevant colleges involved with the program. The Program Chair and Program Review Committee will establish a timeline to complete the program review process and identify the resources required to support the process.
2. Self-Study: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning – The Program Chair with the support of the ad hoc Program Review Committee will engage in a reflective process that evaluates the intercollegiate program's strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement to produce a written self-study.
3. External Review: Selecting and Hosting External Reviewers – A team of at least three external reviewers that are not affiliated with the Claremont Colleges will conduct a two-day review of the program and write a report summarizing observations about the program.
4. Deriving and Implementing Program Improvements – The Lead Dean, Program Chair, and ad hoc Program Review Committee will engage other faculty in the program to consider the review team's recommendations for program enhancement, and to derive a viable plan for implementing the recommendations deemed most feasible and impactful.

### **Planning for a Program Review**

The Lead Dean initiates the review process by informing the Program Chair that a review will take place by a certain date. The Academic Deans Committee (ADC) provides the financial resources to support the program review process. With direction from the Lead Dean, the Program Chair is responsible for: preparing the academic program review plan that includes a complete timeline; convening and leading an ad hoc Program Review Committee comprised of faculty from the respective intercollegiate program under review; managing the review process, which includes writing the self-study; and preparing a response to the external reviewers' report.

In planning for and undertaking a program review, several resources are available to the Program Chair, the Program Review Committee, and faculty at large within the program. ADC and the

Lead Dean will provide support and guidance, including access to other intercollegiate programs that have undergone a program review. Administrative support and resources are made available through departments across the consortium such as offices of Assessment, Institutional Research and Registrar.

#### *Timeline for the Academic Program Review Process*

Ideally, academic program reviews will span a period of three to four semesters, a period that should allow a program ample time to prepare, collect and analyze data; write the self-study; host an external visit; review the external reviewers' report, and; discuss their findings and recommendations for program enhancement.

Approximately one month after the external review visit, the reviewers will be expected to submit their report to the Lead Dean, who then forwards the report to the Program Chair. The Lead Dean and Program Chair will discuss the content of the report and provide any necessary responses to the review team related to corrections of factual inaccuracies. The finalized report will be shared with the Program Review Committee and other program faculty. The Lead Dean is responsible for sharing the self-studies and resulting external team report with the ADC. No more than one semester after the review visit, the Program Chair in consultation with the Program Review Committee will provide a written report to the Lead Dean, outlining how the program intends to address and/or act upon the external reviewers' recommendations. The ADC will review the self-study, the external reviewers' report, and the Program Chair's response to the reviewers' report (if any). ADC will provide direct feedback to the Program Chair to share with the Program Review Committee and program faculty in order to consider and discuss next steps.

Approximately one year after the review, the Program Chair will submit a follow-up progress report to the Lead Dean who will make additional recommendations for any further action deemed appropriate to support the program's improvement. A sample timeline and checklist for academic program review can be found in Appendix A.

#### **Self-Study: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning**

In an effort to prepare a comprehensive self-study to inform the external review, the Program Chair will meet with the Lead Dean early in the process to discuss the elements of the self-study and obtain guidance and feedback that are important from the perspective of the ADC. The Program Chair will work closely with members of the Program Review Committee and the Assessment and/or Institutional Research Offices of the lead college to gather necessary information to write the self-study. While there is no single, prescriptive model for a self-study report, the report should include a comprehensive narrative about the program and substantive discussion of teaching and learning in order to provide the external review team a holistic perspective of the program within the unique consortial context. "*The Basic Elements of a Self-Study Report*" outlines fundamental areas that are typically included in a self-study report.

Appendix B provides an example of possible questions and topics for reflection and discussion in drafting the narrative of the self-study report.

#### *The Basic Elements of a Self-Study Report*

- I. The Claremont Colleges (<http://www.cuc.claremont.edu/aboutcuc/history.asp>).
  - A. Boilerplate description of the consortium (see Appendix C).
  - B. Brief descriptions of the colleges involved in the specific intercollegiate program:

- i. Mission of each college (see Appendix D).

- ii. Basic institutional data for each college will be provided by the Lead college's Director of Institutional Research who will work with the respective campuses to gather and provide 3-5 years' worth of data that will include the following:
  1. Degree-seeking Headcount/FTE enrollment;
  2. Demographic breakdown (e.g. race/ethnicity and gender);
  3. First-year Retention Rates and Six-year Graduation Rates;
  4. Degree Completions.

## II. The Intercollegiate Program

Describe how the program contributes to the intellectual life of the Claremont Colleges.

### A. Program History

- i. Describe the history of the program and ways it may have changed that include faculty, curriculum, and/or facilities.

### B. Current Program

- i. Describe curriculum; major/minor components.
- ii. Describe how the program cooperates with the relevant departments across the consortium.

### C. Faculty Information

- i. What are the general expectations for faculty?
- ii. How do faculty members' backgrounds and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?
  1. Scholarship and research.
  2. Service.
  3. External funding.
  4. Awards and recognition.
  5. Faculty rank and status by college affiliation.
  6. Diversity of faculty.

### D. Student Learning and Success

Describe how the program is meeting its curricular objectives. Are students achieving the desired learning outcomes and at the expected level of the program?

- i. Describe the student learning outcomes (SLO) of the program.
- ii. Annual results of SLOs assessed.
  1. Provide both direct and indirect assessment data when available (could be a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures).
    - a. Direct assessment of the program's student learning outcomes is required and might include, but is not limited to, embedded exam questions, portfolio evaluation, or capstone project/senior thesis evaluation.
    - b. Indirect assessment of the program's student learning outcomes is encouraged to supplement direct assessment measures. Indirect assessment might include, but is not limited to, institutionally created surveys that directly ask students about their gained skills and knowledge, national surveys such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Higher Education Research

Institute (HERI) CIRP Freshman Survey and Senior Surveys, or information gathered from interviews or focus groups.

- iii. Summarize assessment results and the actions taken to address assessment findings.
  1. Resources available to support assessment include:
    - a. Assistance articulating and/or revising program goals and student learning outcomes.
    - b. Support with data collection and analysis of direct and indirect assessment, including other relevant institutional data needed to inform the review.
    - c. Technical and administrative support for web-based surveys for stakeholder feedback (e.g. alumni, students, faculty, and staff).
      - i. Lead college's Director of Institutional Research will work with the IC Program Chair and faculty, as well as the registrars and alumni officers of the represented colleges to design, administer, and aggregate survey results. Surveys should be completed no less than six weeks prior to the self-study's deadline for completion.

#### E. Program Review Data

- i. Refer to "IC Program Review Standard Data Elements" workbook. Lead college's Director of Institutional Research (IR) will work with IR colleagues at the other colleges to define, collect, and analyze the data. Data should be disaggregated (when possible) by demographics (e.g. race/ethnicity) and must include the following:
  1. Student Body Demographics;
  2. Graduation rates;
  3. Faculty Demographics;
  4. Program Enrollments;
  5. Program Completions (Majors);
  6. Program faculty.

#### III. Program Resources

Description of the resources available to the program:

- A. Describe the financial and staffing resources available to the program (e.g. budget allocations and dedicated support staff).
- B. What library and/or information technology resources are available to the program?

#### IV. Summary Reflections

- A. Determine the program's strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. Below are some questions to help guide the interpretation of the evidence:
  - i. Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program?
  - ii. Are program goals being achieved? Explain.

- iii. Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the expected level? Explain.
- iv. What actions have the program faculty taken to improve curriculum and student learning?

### **The External Review: Selecting and Hosting Peer Reviewers**

The Program Review Committee will submit a list of 6-8 potential external reviewers, including names, titles, institutions and contact information, with brief statements explaining the appropriateness of each suggestion and disclosing any personal or professional relationships that may exist between program faculty and these individuals. The list and statements should be forwarded to the Lead Dean who will choose three external reviewers from this list or others identified by the Lead Dean in consultation with the Program Chair and Program Review Committee. The Lead Dean will formally invite potential reviewers. It may be beneficial to include one external reviewer from a comparable liberal arts college and one external reviewer from a research university that offers doctoral degrees in relevant disciplines. This may help to ensure that the program receives feedback on how well students are prepared for further study as well as on the approach(es) of the Claremont Colleges as liberal arts colleges. The external reviewers will be given the program's self-study report at least one month before the on-site review.

#### *External Review Team Visit*

The program faculty will indicate preferred dates for the external reviewers to visit campus. The office of the Lead Dean will determine availability and once reviewers have confirmed, will arrange travel and housing for the reviewers. The Program Chair, with support from the Lead Dean of Faculty's Office, is responsible for arranging the on-campus schedule for the visit.

External reviewers typically spend two days on campus. The external review team will meet with the Lead Dean on the beginning of the first day of their visit and again for an exit interview in the late afternoon on the second day. If available, the Lead President will be included in the exit meeting on the second day. After this exit interview, the reviewers will be afforded time to discuss their written report (and have no further contact with program faculty or personnel). The program will set the schedule for the visit, ensuring that external reviewers meet with: program faculty (including tenured/tenure-track and contingent) and support staff as well as individuals in joint or related programs; a subset of available Deans at the other Claremont Colleges, and; students, especially undergraduate majors and minors. This will allow reviewers to gain a full picture of the program from the perspectives of the relevant stakeholder groups. Many programs find it valuable to have reviewers visit one or more classes and review any significant resources (e.g. laboratories, workspaces). It may be advisable to provide reviewers time to read or review student work such as theses or class projects.

#### *External Review Team Report*

The external reviewers will produce a written report that addresses program strengths, opportunities for improvement/innovation, and recommendations for program enhancement. The final report will be sent directly to the Lead Dean who then will forward it on to the Program Chair. After receiving and discussing the external reviewers' report, the program will meet with the Lead Dean to discuss it. The Program Chair should contact the Dean's office to arrange this

meeting, typically within one month of receiving the report. Should further communication and/or clarification between the program and the external reviewers be necessary, the Lead Dean will facilitate this process and retain any documentation that results from this. The Lead Dean will take the self-study, the external reviewers' report and any clarification from the Program Review Committee to the Academic Deans Committee.

### **Deriving and Implementing Program Improvements**

No more than two semesters after the external review, the program will submit a brief follow-up report to the Lead Dean. The report will outline which recommendations have been addressed and which were not pursued along with the impact the changes have had on the program. The report should include the future direction the program intends to pursue and how this will impact teaching and learning. The report also can provide the program with an opportunity to remind the administration of additional steps that need to be taken. The Program Chair will meet with the Lead Dean to discuss the follow-up report. The Lead Dean is responsible for sharing the follow-up report with the Academic Deans Committee.

## Appendix A

### Sample Timeline and Checklist

#### Three/Four Semesters before Review

- I Initial meeting between Lead Dean and Program Chair to begin program review process planning.
- I Confirm semester and year for external reviewers' visit.
- I Program Chair and ad hoc Program Review Committee develop a list of 6-8 potential candidates to serve as an external reviewer. A call to the program faculty may be useful to identify potential candidates.
- I Program Chair forwards the top three candidates and a few alternates who could serve as external reviewers to the Lead Dean.
- I Lead Dean will reach out to external review candidates inviting them to participate in the program review team.

#### Two Semesters before Review

- I Program meets to frame focus of program review.
- I Program gathers relevant materials for review document:
  - o History of program
  - o Program student learning outcomes
  - o Assessment of student learning in light of aforementioned outcomes
  - o Data on enrollments/majors (disaggregated by relevant demographics)
  - o Data from student/alumni surveys
  - o Comparative data from similar colleges or programs
  - o Faculty profiles (CVs, teaching, research, service)
  - o History of finances/support for faculty and students (e.g., grants received for research, travel, senior projects)
- I Program Chair meets with Lead Dean to provide status of self-study and get feedback from Lead Dean

#### One Semester before Review

- I Complete the writing of the self-study report
- I Lead Dean's office confirms external reviewers and dates of visit with Program Chair; Invites reviewers.

#### Semester of Review:

- I Lead Dean's office arranges transportation/lodging for reviewers as necessary; Obtains CVs of external reviewers.



- I Program Chair sends complete version of program review document to Lead Dean. Lead Dean will send program self-study report to external reviewers no later than one month before the visit is to take place.
- I Program Chair and faculty will put together the schedule for the external reviewer's on-campus visit.
- I External reviewers submit their report to Lead Dean approximately one month after on-campus visit.
- I Lead Dean's office forwards external review team's report to the Program Chair for review and discussion with the Program Review Committee. The Program Chair will provide any clarifications of factual inaccuracies contained in the external reviewers' report in writing to the Lead Dean who will correspond with the external review team. The Lead Dean will retain evidence of the correspondence and any resulting changes to the external reviewers' report.
- I Within one month of receiving the final report, the Lead Dean will meet with the Program Chair to discuss the report recommendations.
- I The Academic Deans Committee will review the self-study, the external reviewers' reports, and any responses from the Program Review Committee.

### **One Year after Review**

- I One year after the program review has been completed, the Program Chair will submit a follow-up progress report to the Lead Dean. The Lead Dean will make further recommendations for action as appropriate.

## Appendix B

### Suggested Questions and Topics for Intercollegiate Program Reviews

(Adapted from the Pomona College Guidelines for Self-Studies and Reviews)

The following questions may spark further discussion among colleagues in your program. They are only suggestions, not requirements.

#### Teaching and Learning

- How does the program determine the learning goals are being met with its current curriculum? What kinds of evidence are used?
- How does the program use this evidence to evaluate and improve its curriculum?
- What sorts of faculty/student collaboration does the program support? How effective is this collaboration?
- Given the program's learning goals, how appropriate is the senior capstone experience? How does it help students integrate the information, concepts, and skills that they have learned?
- Are there striking ethnic, racial, and/or gender disparities among majors and non-majors taking courses in the program? What can be done to address them?
- How coherent are the major and minor requirements?
- How well-prepared are majors for graduate study? How successful are majors in getting into graduate school? What other post-graduate alternatives do the majors pursue?
- How do program offerings help all students lead satisfying, productive lives? Does the curriculum offer courses that provide useful skills and knowledge for students who will take only one or two courses in the concentration?
- What courses outside of the program do faculty advisors encourage students to take?

#### Faculty Development

- To what extent do professors in this program find their teaching satisfying? How can the program help faculty members continue to improve their pedagogy or develop new areas of teaching expertise?
- How appropriate is the faculty staffing, given the curricular goals and enrollments?
- What proportion of courses is taught by regular (tenured/tenure-track) and contingent (e.g., adjunct, visiting, term contract) members of the faculty?
- How do the physical facilities facilitate or hamper the program goals?

- In what ways does the program facilitate research productivity among faculty members?

### **Program Governance**

- How well is the program functioning? Is there shared governance, or do a minority of faculty or even just the chair make most decisions? Are there written guidelines for program governance?
- How does the program distribute or delegate responsibilities among individual faculty members? How is leadership encouraged and developed across the program?
- How does the program distribute resources among individual faculty members?
- How are junior faculty members mentored with respect to their teaching, scholarship, and service? Are information and expectations communicated effectively?
- Are there sufficient opportunities for the program faculty to interact with one another and share experiences (through both formal meetings and informal interactions)? Is there potential for better inter-program and intercollegiate cooperation and complementarity?
- What are administrative or technical staff needs within the program and how well are they being met?

## APPENDIX C

### **Boilerplate for inclusion in intercollegiate program review self-study documents** **Modified from <http://www.cuc.claremont.edu/aboutcuc/history.asp>**

#### The Claremont Colleges

“The Claremont Colleges” is a highly regarded consortium of seven independent colleges located in southern California. The institutions include Pomona College, founded in 1887; Claremont Graduate University, 1925; Scripps College, 1926; Claremont McKenna College, 1946; Harvey Mudd College, 1955; Pitzer College, 1963; and the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences, 1997.

The Claremont Colleges benefit from cooperation in terms of support services not limited to the library, student health and counseling services, an interfaith office of chaplains, and a central bookstore. Institutional support is also cooperatively provided in areas such as campus security, financial and human resource services, telecommunications, risk management, real estate, and physical plant maintenance.

To work out specific issues of intercollegiate cooperation, the consortium maintains an extensive network of intercollegiate committees. These range from a broad policy council to highly focused staff and faculty committees. There are more than a dozen such bodies contributing to the effective management and oversight of the consortium.

More than 6,300 full-time students enroll at The Claremont Colleges. The combined faculty consists of nearly 700 professors, with approximately 1,600 staff and support personnel. More than 2,000 courses are offered annually to students attending the colleges, and students are encouraged to cross-register for courses at colleges other than their home campus. This cross-registration is one of the consortium's most valued qualities. Undergraduate students, in particular, benefit from this arrangement and are able to retain the benefits of an intimate college experience, while taking advantage of a broad array of course offerings that are more typical of a large university.

In some cases, cooperative arrangements have resulted in intercollegiate academic programs, in which pooled resources and contributions from faculty across the undergraduate colleges contribute to a specified major and program of study that can be completed by students at any of the colleges. [Insert program name] is an example of an intercollegiate program.

## APPENDIX D

### Mission Statements for inclusion in intercollegiate program review self-study documents

Claremont McKenna College: <https://www.cmc.edu/about/mission-and-motto>

Harvey Mudd College: <https://www.hmc.edu/about-hmc/mission-vision/>

Pitzer College: <http://pitweb.pitzer.edu/>

Pomona College: <https://www.pomona.edu/about/mission-statement>

Scripps College: <http://www.scrippscollege.edu/about/>