Santa Clara University

Academic Program Review Guidelines for All Graduate Programs and Undergraduate Programs with Specialized Accreditors[1]
Revised: December 15, 2021

Purpose and Overview

Santa Clara University engages in the academic program review (APR) process as part of the ongoing process of program improvement and commitment to academic excellence. Program review provides an opportunity for the department or program to evaluate its effectiveness in achieving its educational goals, to identify ways it is functioning well and ways it can be improved, and to develop strategic, realistic plans and priorities for the future direction of the program. Program reviews are integral to planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making within the university, and is part of our responsibility as an accredited institution of WASC Senior College and University Commission.

SCU recognizes that many programs with specialized accreditors are doing some, or even much, of the essential work of APR as they complete self-studies for their accreditors. These programs should draw upon descriptions, analysis, and evidence provided in their accreditation reports to address the critical elements of APR as defined by Santa Clara University. Additionally, some programs may need to provide supplementary information.

Most likely, programs will submit their completed APRs to the Provost Office in concert with the timelines of their accrediting agencies. Regardless, the SCU-specific APR process should be completed within a one-year timeframe, and may be completed in the same year as the accreditation visit.

What programs are subject to review?

At both the undergraduate and graduate level, each department should provide a program review that meets the SCU criteria for APR, regardless of whether there is specialized accreditor.

---

[1] These guidelines are intended to apply to programs in the Jesuit School of Theology; Law School; Leavey School of Business; School of Education and Counseling Psychology; School of Engineering; and the Pastoral Ministries Program in the College of Arts and Sciences. They were last revised on March 30, 2021.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX I: Accredited Programs – Cover Sheet

Program Review for Undergraduate Programs with Specialized Accreditors and/or Graduate Programs

Name of Accrediting Body (if applicable)	
Department/Program	
List of Undergraduate and Graduate Programs Included in this Report	

For any school with distinct programs, the following information should be provided about each program. For example, if a department has several Master's degree programs, address the following for each program. The total report should not exceed 10 to 15 pages.

Introduction and Context
This section describes central features of the program. Information in this section typically include answers to the following:

1. **History and Development:** Provide a brief introduction and history of the program/department. Give an overview of the program and its degrees and concentrations. This section should especially focus on any major changes that have taken place within the program since the last review. It should also provide a brief overview of the last program review and highlight efforts to implement the action plan.

2. **Mission, Goals, and Learning Objectives/Outcomes:** Describe the program's mission, goals, and learning objectives/outcomes. How are the mission and goals aligned with the mission, strategic directions, and student learning goals for undergraduates and graduates of the university and the college/school in which it resides?

3. **Program Contribution to University and Community:** How does the program contribute to its discipline and to the university? How does the program respond to the needs of the community/region/profession?

4. **Program Contribution to a Diverse, Inclusive, and Equitable Learning Environment:** How does the program contribute to fostering a diverse, inclusive, and equitable learning environment with respect to the students, faculty/staff, the curriculum, and the university as a whole?

5. **Overview of Special Issues:** Provide an overview of any special issues or concerns the program will is facing and wishes to address in its self-study.

Evaluation of Program Excellence
This section provides profiles of the central elements (students, curriculum, and faculty) and evidence of student learning effectiveness, and other indicators of program excellence. The following prompts may be helpful in getting started, but the department or program is not required to respond to each one.

1. **Student Profile:** What is the current profile of students in the program? For undergraduate programs: Are there any concerns about the student profile? Are there any concerns with the ability to attract majors, diversity of majors, preparedness, or any persistence/time to degree issues? For graduate programs: Are there any concerns with ability to attract students, and the type of students desired in terms of diversity, preparedness, and persistence. What is the average time to degree for students in the program? What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its students' profile?

Data for this section should include # of majors, minors (if applicable) or, at the graduate level, number of enrolled students; characteristics of students (demographic, preparedness); retention and graduation rates (including any differences by gender, race/ethnicity, first-generation status, or other program-defined characteristics).

2. Curriculum*:* Describe curricular requirements of the program. Describe the efforts of the department to stay current with disciplinary-based trends. How well aligned is the curriculum with the program learning outcomes? Are required courses or course sequences reliably available? Do any external stakeholders (advisory board, practitioners regularly review the program)? In addition to an analysis of its own program, programs should provide comparative analyses with at least two other programs (one peer, one aspirational) in terms of the curriculum and any other issue of interest to the program.

   What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its curriculum?

Data for this section may include a comparative analysis of **curricula** from one benchmark and one aspirational program; curricular maps or flow charts to show how curriculum addresses outcomes; course enrollments for the last five years noting any trends; and a description of other relevant learning experiences (e.g., internships, research experiences, professional development experiences) as well as how many students participate in those experiences. The data presented in this section should be consistent with the program website information and the curricular catalog listings.

3. Student Learning and Success: Briefly comment on the program's approach to assessing student learning and analyzing student success. Summarize what you have learned from your assessments of student learning. Are the students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program, and has the program disaggregated assessment data for subpopulations of students to ensure equitable outcomes? What evidence can the program provide for students' ability to meet the university-wide undergraduate or graduate learning goals? Are they achieving program outcomes at the expected levels of learning, and how is the expected level determined? What steps does the program take to ensure that all students able to experience an inclusive and equitable learning environment?

Data for this section should be available in the assessment reports of the program, including annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning (qualitative and/or quantitative); the degree to which students achieve the program's desired outcomes and standards; ongoing efforts by the program to respond to assessment results, indicators of student satisfaction, and assessment of the preparedness of majors for graduate study or chosen professional careers. Assessment may also include placement of graduates in graduate or professional schools and/or jobs, exit surveys, employer critiques of student performance or employer satisfaction surveys, and alumni achievements. If applicable, include analysis of the way in which any capstone, milestone requirement (e.g., qualifying exam, thesis, or dissertation) effectively engage students in integrating and synthesizing the central learning outcomes of the program?

4. **Faculty:** What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty in the program in relation to the program's mission and goals? How do faculty members' backgrounds, expertise, and professional work contribute to the academic excellence of the program? How engaged and successful are faculty in developing and using evidence-informed and inclusive teaching practices? How are faculty encouraged to engage in continuous improvement in their teaching and advising? Evaluate the research/creative productivity, and service of the faculty. What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its faculty?

> Data should include a list of all faculty, specifying position type, terminal degrees, institutions from which faculty earned terminal degrees, faculty specialties within discipline (and how these align with the program curriculum); and faculty diversity. This section can also draw upon evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness as instructors and advisers or mentors, and professional development across faculty (e.g., peer observations and evaluations, faculty self-evaluations, students' course evaluations, faculty scholarship on teaching and learning, and participation in faculty development related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment). Also relevant is record of scholarship; external funding awards; professional practice and service; and general awards and recognition (departments should emphasize the period since the past program review). Faculty CVs should be appended.

5. Program Governance: How well is the department/program functioning? How does the department achieved shared governance and ensure transparency? Are there written guidelines for department/program governance? How are new faculty welcomed into the department mentored (tenure-track, lecturers, academic year part-time)? Are there sufficient opportunities for faculty to interact with each other formally and informally? What are the administrative and technical staff needs within the department (e.g., professional development) and how well are they being met? What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its governance?

> Data can include guidelines created by departments, summaries of anonymous survey responses from faculty and staff, as well as descriptions of department protocols and processes.

Evaluation of Program Resources and Support
This section identifies student demand for the program and the degree to which various resources are allocated appropriately and are sufficient in amount to maintain program quality. The following prompts may be helpful in getting started, but the department or program is not required to respond to each one.

1. Program Demand: In terms of similarity and distinctiveness, evaluate how well this program compares with other programs in the field. What are the trends in numbers of student major declarations and enrollments? What is happening within the profession, local community, or society generally that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future?

> Data in this section might emphasize how the unique elements identified in previous sections are expected to attract students to this program.

2. Evaluation of Resources *(Human, Facilities, Technological, Financial):*

   a. Faculty: Are there sufficient numbers of faculty to maintain program quality? Does the program have adequate full-time faculty with appropriate professional qualifications to the degree offered? Do program faculty have the support they need to do their work?

   b. Student Support: Are there sufficient mechanisms in place to assist students with achieving their academic goals?

   c. Technology, Library, Facility, Staff and Financial Resources: What technology or other resources do the program currently use or leverage from other units? Are there adequate Library and IT resources for sustaining the program? What facilities and unique space or equipment (e.g., labs) does the program use? Are the facilities adequate for sustaining the quality of the program? What clerical and technical staff support program operations? Are these adequate for sustaining the quality of the program? Are the financial resources of the program sufficient to meet the needs of faculty, staff, and students?

Self-Study Summary
In two paragraphs or so, provide a summary evaluation of the program's strengths and weaknesses in the area of students, curriculum, student learning, faculty, governance, and evaluation of resources, as well as any particular issues that the program has decided to highlight. Identify the most pressing issues that the program wishes to deal with over the next five years, and what changes it would hope to implement. Briefly explain if these issues can be addressed with existing resources or if they will require some new resources. This summary will become the draft foundation for the long-term action plan which will be completed by the department after the self-study and the full external review process have concluded.

As part of the Academic Program Review process, programs are required to create and submit an Action Plan that includes specific changes the program will implement (see below for details). Based on the vision for the department, the action plan identifies the steps will the department take to turn this vision into reality.

Action Plan

The action plan describes the program's overarching plans for continuous improvement over the next five years. One important component of the action plan is the identification of 3 to 5 high-priority, actionable items that the program believes will lead to improvement in academic program quality. These areas for change should be informed by the data presented in this report and any internal or external challenges facing the department. Proposed changes may include new initiatives, modification of current initiatives, or elimination of current initiatives. The Action Plan can encompass a five-year period following program review, but can extend beyond five years if necessary. The first year of this long-term plan may include the year in which the academic program review concludes.

As the program identifies the most important priorities, it should consider:
1. What does the data analyzed during the program review process suggest in terms of program strengths, needs, and opportunities for improvement?
2. Does the program wish to revise mission, learning goals, or program learning outcomes?
3. What can the program accomplish using existing resources?
4. What additional resources (if any) are required?

Action items:

Action items should be detailed enough to allow program faculty and staff to enact the them in the years following program review. Items should stem from the academic program review findings and the responses and recommendations received from the external reviewers and program faculty. These items may focus on areas identified directly from the self-study (e.g., students, curriculum, student learning outcomes, student success, faculty, program demand, student support, information literacy, technology, facilities, staff, financial resources, other).

For each of your action items identified, you will describe the following:
1. the specific area where change or improvement is needed,
2. evidence supporting the recommended change(s),
3. the specific person(s) responsible for implementing the change(s),
4. the proposed timeline for implementing the change(s),
5. the resources you will need to successfully implement the change(s) (e.g., personnel, financial, facilities, etc.), and
6. your plan to assess change(s) after implementation.

Use Table 1 below to complete your action plan (you may include a narrative introduction to this table as well if needed). To ensure broad participation and support, all full-time faculty on continuing appointments should review and discuss this document.

Academic Program Review Action Plan

Department/Program name:
Date:
Completed by:
Contact information:

1. Specific area where change or improvement is needed	2. Evidence supporting the recommended change(s)	3. Person(s) responsible for implementing the change(s)	4. Timeline for implementing the change(s) (Academic year)	5. Resources needed to implement the change(s)	6. Plan to assess efficacy of change(s) after implementation (How will you know the impact of change?)
Item 1: SAMPLE Revise program learning outcomes (PLO) #1 and #2	Assessment results PLO #1 and #2 from 2019	Assessment Committee (insert faculty names here)	2021 (Year 1 = final year of program review)	Time during the fall faculty retreat	Updated assessment plan will reflect assessment of these PLOs within the next 3 years
Item 1:					
Item 2:					
Item 3:					
Item 4:					

Santa Clara University

Academic Program Review Memorandum of Understanding

Purpose: Santa Clara University's Academic Program Review provides a means of assuring excellence in student learning at the program level. It is designed to encourage reflection and dialogue among faculty members within the broader institutional and discipline-based contexts. The process is designed to assist programs in understanding their distinctive and collaborative roles within the university community and with external constituents. It provides the foundation for assessing student learning and for making evidence-based plans and decisions to foster improvement at all levels of the institution. Program reviews are integral for planning and other decision-making at the university.

This form serves as acknowledgement that the program/department has completed the Academic Program Review Process, including its action plan.

Feedback on Action Plan:

Comments on alignment with strategic priorities:

The following parties acknowledge completion of the Academic Program Review Process and defer action items in need of additional resources to be carried out at the discretion of the Dean through existing university processes.

_____
Associate Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness   Date

_____
Department Chair   Date

_____
Dean   Date