

Academic Program Review Instructions

U of L's academic program review process examines the goals, structure, performance, and needs of the academic programs offered by the university.

Data presented in each program's review provides the basis for programmatic plans toward achieving U of L's mission statement goals in the following five areas: educational experience; research, creative, and scholarly activity; accessibility, diversity, equity, and communication; partnerships and collaborations; and institutional effectiveness of programs and services.

Your program review file will consist of the following three components:

1. The **Statistical Overview**, includes data provided by the Office for Institutional Research and Planning on faculty resources, teaching and credit hour production, degrees awarded and fiscal resources. If there are inaccuracies in the data provided for your program, do not make the changes yourself. Instead, report the inaccuracies to the director of accreditation and program management (ccshum01@gwise.louisville.edu) so that the issue can be resolved. Other supplemental information on university norms for degree production, national studies on faculty productivity, and time to degree completion (PhD) will be provided when available.
2. The **Program Narrative**, written by the department faculty is a document (of no more than 20 pages total) that should synthesize the statistical overview provided by the Office for Institutional Research and Planning with other discursive and evaluative elements to address your program's strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities in the areas addressed in the template. In addition to providing data for your individual program, the narrative also presents other quantitative and qualitative data relative to program quality (for example, it is appropriate to compare the program to similar programs within U of L and/or at other universities across the country). Follow the outline in the **Academic Program Review Template** for each level within your program (i.e., undergraduate, master's, and doctoral level).
3. The Program's **Plan for Improvement**, a document (of no more than 5 pages) also written by the department in collaboration with the dean and tied to the Program Narrative analysis, to answer, the following questions:
 - a) Based on the answers to the Program Narrative questions (and data used in developing those answers), what are the program's primary strengths and weaknesses?
 - b) What will be the primary program goals and how are these tied to the university's current strategic plan? You can find the strategic plan at: <http://institutionalresearch.louisville.edu/planning/>
 - c) Given the resources available within the academic unit, what strategies will the program use to achieve these goals?
 - d) What measurable outcomes will be used to determine if these strategies were successful? The program's success in meeting its improvement plans will be reviewed five years after the completion of the review and will be the initial step in the program's next review (every 10 years).

Two appendices should accompany each unit program narrative report

- 1) Include an appendix with abbreviated faculty vitae (name, education, academic job experience, as well as five-year summaries of classes taught, research dissemination, and grant activity) and 2) Include an appendix of student learning outcomes for the past 5 years and a copy of the current program curriculum.

Academic Program Review Timeline – Critical Dates

1. **Statistical Overview (generally between August 1 to August 30 each year)**, the vice president for finance and director of institutional research and planning provides the department, dean, and provost's office with the appropriate data for the programs under review.
2. **Program Narrative & Plan for Improvement** - The department, in collaboration with the unit dean, undertakes the self-study to write the narrative and plan for improvement. The department chair is the primary individual responsible for ensuring that the program review is successfully completed. However, all departmental faculty should be consulted in the development of the narrative and plan, ideally through a fully participatory process under the guidance of the department chair. The dean and the academic unit may stipulate other requirements for the composition and development of the review so as to insure congruence with the unit's mission and strategic goals. Units may choose to create an internal review committee and/or to seek external review(s) to advise the dean prior to the November 15 deadline.
3. **Dean's Sign-off of the Program Review (on November 15)**, the department provides copies of the program review document to the dean of the unit. The final version of the program review document should be signed by the chair and dean (see APR cover page). The signature by the dean indicates that they have had a chance to review the document, but does not constitute his or her formal endorsement of all elements of the report. Thirteen copies of the report and/or an electronic version (and two hard copies) should also be forwarded within 15 days to the associate provost for academic planning and accountability.
4. **Dean's Letter (on January 10)**, the dean submits her/his response and recommendations for the programs under review to the executive vice president and university provost (Dean's Review Letter). Units may choose to create an internal review committee and/or to seek external reviews to advise the dean.
5. **Program Review Committee Final Report (by April each year)**, the program review committee will submit comments and recommendations to the executive vice president and university provost.
6. **Provost Meeting to Finalize the Review (between June and August each year)**, the executive vice president and university provost will provide a written response to the dean, chair, and faculty of each of programs reviewed during the year.
7. **Plan for Improvement Follow-up Report (October 1 - five years after the review)**, the department will provide a detailed update on their progress in meeting the goals of their plan for improvement. The update should be accompanied by a submission letter signed by the department chair and the dean.

Two appendices should accompany each unit program narrative report

1) Include an appendix with abbreviated faculty vitae (name, education, academic job experience, as well as five-year summaries of classes taught, research dissemination, and grant activity) and 2) Include an appendix of student learning outcomes for the past 5 years and a copy of the current program curriculum.