

The Office of Curriculum, Academic Effectiveness and Policy Development is committed to supporting our faculty and staff in their efforts to improve student learning.



Academic Program Review Undergraduate and Graduate Programs 2022-23

With over 100 unique programs and 10 master's degrees available, all undergraduate and graduate programs are reviewed on a 7-year cycle with three 2-year program progress reports completed in the interim.

The purpose of an academic program review is to analyze and evaluate the degree or program under review, coming to consensus on a plan for improvement and acknowledgement of a program's strengths. The academic program review process includes several phases: review and analysis of program data and organization of the external reviewer (virtual) site visit, meeting with program faculty, preparation of the program review report, holding a review culmination meeting with the Chair and members of senior leadership, and preparing an executive summary for the board of trustees.

The program review report is prepared and written by the faculty-led Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), which is constituted at the beginning of the fall semester of the academic year in which the program review process begins.

The APRC consists of the Director of Academic Program Review, a Program Review Director, one Faculty Associate, and approximately 8 committee representatives from the Colleges of Business, Letters, Arts and Sciences, Health and Applied Sciences, and the Schools of Education and Hospitality.

In support of the research and analysis required of the program review report, the APRC receives a comprehensive data packet with information collected by the Office of Curriculum, Academic Effectiveness and Policy Development (CAEPD). This data packet is shared with the external reviewer and forms the basis for subsequent discussions about the direction and focus of the program review.

Following the preparation of the data packet, external visit the campus to meet with faculty members, administrators, and students; the reviewer then prepares a site visit report. In response to this report and all other information collected by the APRC, suggestions for program improvement are made. A 1-year follow-up is provided by the Dean. During the 6-year interim between reviews, three 2-year program progress reporting cycles are completed, which filter into the program's next 7th year review.

For more information about the 2-year reporting process, please contact Lou Moss: lmoss3@msudenver.edu, or visit the [Academic Program Review](#) website.

Table of Contents

I. Process Timeline.....	3
II. Responsibilities for Program Review Process	4
III. External Site Reviewer Selection	5
IV. Site Reviewer Campus Visit	5
V. Materials to be Supplied by the Program Chair	6
VI. Program Review Self-Study Narrative Template	6
VII. Program Review Information Packet.....	10
VIII. Faculty Forum with the APRC	10
IX. APRC Report	10
X. Review Culmination Meeting	10
XI. Executive Summary	10
XII. 1-Year Follow-up Report.....	11
XIII. Annual Updates	11
XIV. External Site Reviewer Checklist	12

I. Process Timeline

Academic Program Review is a three-semester process starting in the Fall. Below is a table with the phases and deadlines of the program review process.

Activity	Deadline or Occurrence
Data manager provides data for all programs.	August
APRC members assemble.	Late August
Chair to submit the program self-study narrative, including but not limited to 2-Year Academic Program Progress Reports, faculty CVs (formatted and submitted electronically), and advising materials as outlined in guidelines document.	August 31
Chair to submit the site reviewer approval request form. (Available on APRC website.)	August 31
Chair and Program Review Director finalize site reviewer campus visit dates.	Early September
APRC meets to discuss program data packets containing information collected by the Office of CAEPD.	September
APRC meets regularly, typically weekly, to discuss and analyze program data packets, the program's 2-year Program Progress Reports that were completed in the 6 year interim between program reviews, and any other relevant data such as the NSSE student satisfaction survey results.	September and October
External reviewer conducts (virtual) site visit.	September to December
APRC meets to discuss essential questions to be answered in the program review report; committee drafts program questions; committee strategizes on the division of work.	September and October
APRC meets regularly to discuss new drafts of the program review report as it develops, and draft questions for the faculty forum; data concerns or additional data requests can be raised with the Office of CAEPD's data manager.	September to November
The APRC meets with the program's Chair and full-time faculty members to discuss questions developed by the committee after reading the site reviewer's report and the program narrative.	October to December
APRC completes a final draft of the program review report. Distributes to all stakeholders to include program faculty members, Chairs, Deans, and Provost.	December to March
The APRC Faculty Associate drafts questions for the program Chair, which will be discussed at the review culmination meeting.	March to May
The APRC Faculty Associate, Provost, Dean, program Chair, and Associate Vice President meet to discuss concerns discovered during the program review.	May to July
APRC completes an executive summary for the board of trustees. The summary is made available to all stakeholders to include program faculty members, Chair, Dean, and Provost.	May to July
The program's Dean provides a 1-year update to the board.	Following December

II. Responsibilities for Program Review Process

Semester	Program Chair	Dean	CAEPD / The APRC Faculty Associate	APRC
Summer 2022	Select site reviewer.	Approve site reviewer.	Approve site reviewer.	
	Write narrative; supply information to AE (page 8).		Assemble data packet.	
Fall 2022	Prepare site reviewer itinerary. Work with CAEPD/Program Review Director to select visit dates that work for all (Provost, Dean, APRC, etc.).	Assist Chair with itinerary.	Assist Chair with itinerary.	Review data packet and program materials.
	Facilitate site visit. Program Chair serves as host for the site visit.	Meet with site reviewer during site visit.	AVP and Provost to meet with site reviewer individually during site visit. APRC Faculty Associate to write faculty forum questions.	Meet with site reviewer during site visit.
Fall 22 – Spring 23	Host faculty forum with APRC.			Program faculty forum with APRC.
	Respond to faculty forum questions.			
Spring 2023 - Summer 2023	Review culmination meeting (Provost, Dean, Chair and other stakeholders).	Respond to review culmination meeting questions.	Prepare review culmination memo.	Prepare program review final report.
	Assist Dean in response to review culmination questions.	Review culmination meeting.	Review culmination meeting.	
Fall 2023		Presentation to the BoT (along with CAE AVP).	Presentation to the BoT (along with the Dean).	

Fall 2024		1 Year Follow-Up presentation to the Board (along with AVP).	1 Year Follow-Up presentation to the Board (along with Dean).	
Subsequent 6 Years Until Next Program Review	2-Year Program Progress Reports. See APRC website for schedule, forms, and information.	2-Year Program Progress Reports. See APRC website for schedule, forms, and information.	Review 2-Year Program Progress Reports.	Review 2-Year Program Progress Reports.

III. External Site Reviewer Selection

The purpose of the program review site reviewer is to evaluate the quality of the program in the following areas: Curriculum, Faculty, Assessment, Student Experience, Resources, and Online/Media Presence. The ideal program review site reviewer is up to date on the curriculum discussions and debates within the discipline. They understand that the curriculum can be structured in a variety of ways, all of which can be effective, in addition to understanding a wide range of issues related to faculty roles and higher education resource allocation. The program should select an objective site reviewer who has no previous ties, either professional or personal, with the University or individual faculty members. Site reviewers may not conduct more than one review of a single program. The Dean should submit the site reviewer approval form by **August 31** of the review year.

The following are criteria to consider when selecting a potential site reviewer. The site reviewer:

- has been a program review site reviewer for other institutions' programs or has evaluated other programs.
- has served on an accreditation team that evaluated an institution's program.
- has been active in the educational/curricular organization or sub-organization of a professional organization aligned with the discipline.
- has worked at a number of different institutions and thus has had exposure to different types of programs.
- has written articles covering curricula of the discipline.
- is familiar with both undergraduate and graduate level distinctions (if applicable to this review).

IV. Site Reviewer Campus Visit

After the reviewer has been selected, and the Dean has submitted the site reviewer approval request form (by **August 31**), the Chair will contact the site reviewer to determine general availability for the campus visit; prior to confirmation, dates must be cleared with the Program Review Director to avoid site visit overlaps with other programs undergoing a review, and to verify Provost, Dean, APRC, and other stakeholder meeting availability.

The Chair will ensure that the site reviewer has a clear understanding of the conditions of payment, consistent with fiscal rules. The site reviewer will not be paid until MSU Denver has received the reviewer's report. The Chair should send the Program Review Director the site reviewer's contact information after the site reviewer checklist (page 14) and payment information has been confirmed with the site reviewer.

Site Reviewer Checklist

The site reviewer will receive a checklist from the Chair detailing what needs to be done prior, during and after the visit.

The site reviewer will receive a \$1,500 payment (from CAEPD) for conducting the review and preparing a report, which is due to the University within 30 calendar days following the visit. If the report is received between 31 and 45 days following the visit, the stipend is \$1,200. If the report is received between 46 and 60 days following the visit, the stipend is \$750. The purpose of this reduced stipend schedule is to facilitate the timely completion of the report so the APRC can proceed with its work.

The Office of CAEPD will process all necessary paperwork for payment and expense reimbursement, requesting from the site reviewer a W-9 form for tax purposes and a copy of their photo ID, such as a driver's license or passport, along with an invoice for the \$1500 stipend.

Example Site Reviewer Itinerary

The program Chair serves as host to the site reviewer. Working with the Program Review Director, the program Chair schedules the reviewer's visit so that the reviewer meets with or observes the following:

- a. Dean(s) at the end of day one, and end of day two.
- b. Associate Vice President for CAEPD.
- c. Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and graduate program directors, if applicable.
- d. Provost.
- e. students in the program.
- f. classroom visits, where possible.
- g. alumni, where available.
- h. program faculty members, staff, advisors, and other stakeholders.
- i. program faculty members and staff from related programs.
- j. advisory council, if applicable.
- k. members of the APRC.

A site reviewer's itinerary should include any meetings essential to a fully informed campus visit. Chairs should add any additional meetings necessary to create the most comprehensive visit possible.

Before finalizing and distributing an itinerary, please communicate with the Program Review Director to confirm available dates for site visits to take place. Two program reviews cannot be scheduled for the same week. Site visits should take place when all stakeholders are available (Provost, Dean, APRC, etc.).

V. Materials to be Supplied by the Program Chair

Program Chairs, with help from faculty members, supply the following materials to the Program Review Director by **August 31**. Materials should be sent in electronic form.

1. Up to date curriculum vitae for all full-time faculty.
2. program review narrative (template and details below).
3. program strategic plan, role, and mission.
4. program marketing materials.
5. advising checklists and/or plans.

VI. Program Review Self-Study Narrative Template

Program Chairs, with help from faculty members, prepare a narrative that explicitly addresses the following areas below. The narrative is organized in the same categories as the APRC report. Please use these categories and questions as a template for the program narrative. (Copy and paste into a Word document.) Some questions may not be directly applicable to your program.

Narrative Template

Mission

A. The strengths or distinguishing features of the program as compared with other programs. In particular the narrative should identify:

1. The mission statement and program goals of the department.
2. The differences between the program and other similar programs offered on the Auraria campus and in the metropolitan area, if such others exist.
3. The interconnections and cooperation, if any, which exist between the program and other similar programs offered on the Auraria campus and in the metropolitan area.
4. If the program has an advisory council, the narrative should contain a description of the composition and functions of the council and its activities during the review period. Changes to the program that have been suggested by the advisory council might be noted.

Curriculum

B. Describe any significant changes to the curriculum since last program review, together with the rationale for these modifications. The answer to this question should include a description of:

1. Curriculum philosophy, including the role accreditation plays in shaping course design and content.
2. Changes in the curriculum that have been proposed but are not yet through the curriculum process.
3. Changes in the curriculum being considered by the program and an explanation of potential benefits of these changes. Are any of these changes the result of a systematic review of exceptions requested and/or approved by faculty?
4. The program's use of and interest in online courses.
5. How the program has integrated technology into the curriculum and plans for integrating new technologies.
6. A list of the specific general studies courses required of program majors or minors, if any. What is the rationale for these specified general studies courses? Is there any conflict or confusion with Pathways transfers? If so, please explain.
7. Any identifiable trends in the employment/further education of graduates, and its impact on the curriculum.
8. The major changes occurring in similar programs at other institutions; that is, the changes in the curriculum of the discipline that are taking place nationwide.

Assessment

C. An analysis of assessment activities, including:

1. A clear description of the program's goals and student learning outcomes.
2. The results of a faculty review of the program's student learning

- outcomes. Are any revisions needed? If so, explain.
3. The usefulness of the student learning assessment data. Are any revisions needed? If so, explain.
 4. Changes made in the curriculum to address concerns about student learning, e.g., changed prerequisites because students lack the prerequisite knowledge. See D.
 5. How students' participation in internships, undergraduate research, field experiences, service-learning courses or co-curricular activities are connected to the program's student learning outcomes. Identify the outcomes and how the effectiveness of those experiences are evaluated?
 6. How faculty members have shared assessment results with students and others, including their advisory council members, if applicable.

Faculty

D. Information about faculty turnover, strengths, and challenges. The narrative should describe the:

1. Strengths or specialties of current faculty's professional development interests.
2. Changes in the faculty since the last program review, i.e. who retired or resigned and who was hired, along with any changes in specialties that resulted either from the change in personnel or from retraining of current faculty.
3. Special expertise possessed by part-time faculty teaching in the program.
4. Faculty's interest in research on teaching and learning.
5. Key scholarly and intellectual outputs by faculty. Incorporate Digital Measures as relevant.

Students

E. Methods by which the program strives to meet the needs of students, particularly nontraditional students, including a description of the:

1. Academic and career advising and tutoring services provided to students.
2. Success of program strategies designed to improve degree completion rates. What challenges does the program face in addressing degree completion rates?
3. Extracurricular activities and/or clubs sponsored by the program for its majors and minors, and their recent activities.
4. Special scheduling needs of the department's or program's students, if any, and the method of assessment of those needs.

F. Enrollment Management. The narrative should describe:

1. Admission requirements into the program, if any.
2. Strategies the program has developed to recruit and retain students, especially activities aimed at women, minorities and non-traditional students.
3. Any special academic and/or demographic characteristics of students the program is intended to serve.
4. Any memoranda of understanding (transfer agreements) and their effectiveness in recruiting students.
5. If prerequisites are not being enforced using Banner, why not?
6. Methods the program intentionally uses class size and other variables to manage enrollment.
7. Policies on assigning evening and weekend courses, overload courses, and summer teaching.

8. Policies and practices in relation to multi-section courses and affiliate faculty. In particular, methods used to assure reasonably uniform course expectations across different sections should be described.

G. Student achievements and collaborative activities with faculty outside the classroom. The narrative should describe:

1. The role of undergraduate research within the program.
2. Student involvement in undergraduate and graduate level research, together with details of any research outputs and presentations.
3. Significant student awards, performances, or presentations.
4. Other notable student engagement with stakeholders outside the classroom.

H. Knowledge about alumni. The narrative should describe the:

1. Actions taken or planned to ensure closer and continuing contact with alumni.
2. Achievements, awards, honors or recognition received by current students and alumni of the program. [MSU Denver awards should not be included.]

Resources

I. The program's relationship to the external community. The narrative should describe:

1. The service and engagement opportunities provided to the community that require significant personnel time or funds and the method by which the service/engagement opportunity is assessed.
2. Evidence that the services/engagement activities provided are valued by the internal and external constituencies.
3. Those community needs that the program cannot meet due to lack of resources.

J. Ways in which the program strives to effectively use its personnel and equipment resources, including strengths and areas of concern. The narrative should address the effectiveness and adequacy of:

1. Facilities, equipment, software, and databases. Needed items should be mentioned. Do you use resources at other institutions or locations (e.g., labs, libraries)? If so, please describe.
2. Alignment of faculty expertise with course scheduling/rotation to facilitate student success and completion of the degree
3. Staff support.
4. Support given to faculty in relation to instruction, e.g., supplies.
5. Administrative support.

K. Outside support and funding. The narrative should describe the:

1. Successful attempts the program has made to receive outside funding. Grants written for the program, as well as other sources from which funds were requested, should be briefly described.
2. Gifts received by the program including their approximate value. This would include gifts of equipment as well as funding for scholarships.

Stakeholder Engagement Using Online Media (Online Presence)

L. The narrative should include information about the program's website and its overall approach to establishing an online presence:

1. Is the program's website outward facing, targeting prospective students and the

student's family?

2. Is the site content current and regularly updated?
3. Is there someone within the program that is responsible for maintaining the website?
4. Does the department have enough resources (faculty or staff) to properly maintain the website?
5. What social media or other media platforms does the program use to reach out to prospective students?

The narrative should answer as many of these topic areas as possible. Do not hesitate to add any additional comments that give a better understanding of how the program views and supports the website and other social media in promoting the program to prospective students.

VII. Program Review Information Packet

The program review data packet will be delivered to the site reviewer approximately 2 weeks prior to the site reviewer's visit. It will contain program data collected from the data manager, the program's self-study narrative, faculty CVs, advising materials, and other departmental information. The packet will be sent electronically by the Program Review Director.

VIII. Faculty Forum with the APRC

Part of the program review process is an interview of the faculty and persons involved with the program by the APRC. The meeting is generally scheduled for about one hour. All tenured/tenure-track faculty members should attend, if possible. In addition, Category 2 faculty members usually participate. The program may want departmental staff or affiliate faculty to attend as well.

Approximately two weeks prior to the faculty forum, the committee will send written questions to the department Chair in electronic form. The Chair is encouraged to share these questions with all faculty. These questions and their responses will be discussed during the meeting.

IX. APRC Program Review Report (Spring)

Four to six weeks after the faculty forum, the committee issues a report summarizing program strengths, along with concerns and recommendations in the areas of:

- Mission
- Curriculum
- Student Experience
- Faculty
- Resources
- Online Presence

X. Review Culmination Meeting and Chair Responses (Summer)

After the APRC issues its report, the Chair, Provost, Dean, APRC Faculty Associate, meet to discuss the program review reports (from the external site reviewer and the APRC). Prior to that meeting, the APRC prepares a review culmination meeting memo identifying the important issues to be discussed.

XI. Executive Summary (Late Fall term of next academic year)

The executive summary presented to the board of trustees contains the most important information from the APRC and site reviewer's reports.

XII. 1-Year Follow-up Report

One year after the review culmination meeting, the APRC will request a 1-year follow-up response from the Dean and Chair summarizing actions taken since the program review process was completed. This statement should indicate how concerns have been addressed, whether recommendations have been followed and if any new issues have arisen. Responses will be forwarded to the Program Review Director and prepared for presentation to the board of trustees.

XIII. Annual Updates

In the six years that follow between program reviews, a program will complete three 2-year program progress reports to assess ongoing program goals and initiatives. The data and information contained in these reports will be useful to the next program review.

XIV. External Site Reviewer Checklist

Chairs are to provide the following checklist to all potential site reviewers prior to obtaining Dean approval and submitting the site reviewer approval form.



Academic Program Review
External Site Reviewer Checklist

Prior to Visit:

- ┌ The APRC Program Review Director will send you forms to be completed and submitted prior to your campus arrival. Forms include a W9, copy of your driver's license, invoice, and University accounting services forms.

This information is used to establish you as a vendor with Metropolitan State University of Denver; all items are required to process your payment.

- ┌ A data packet of program information will be sent to you approximately 2 weeks prior to your visit to MSU Denver. Please note that the University catalog is available electronically at: <http://catalog.msudenver.edu/>

After the Visit:

- ┌ The report (using the attached guidelines) is due within **30 calendar days** of your review. Please submit the report electronically to Lou Moss, lmoss3@msudenver.edu.
- ┌ The report is to be sent in Microsoft Word formatting (.doc or .docx) and not as a .pdf. This allows formatting changes to be made as necessary. No substantive changes will be made.
- ┌ The site reviewer will receive a \$1,500 payment for conducting the review and preparing the report, if received on time.

If the report is received between 31 and 45 days following the visit, the stipend is \$1,200. If the report is received between 46 and 60 days following the visit, the stipend is \$750. The purpose of this reduced stipend schedule is to facilitate the timely completion of the report so the APRC can proceed with its work.

Thank you; we look forward to your visit to MSU Denver.