

**THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW  
March 28, 2017**

**Introduction, Background, and Purpose**

Most academic institutions include a program review process in their operational practices. In some cases, especially in professional programs, the expectations for program review are primarily

the program goals and objectives, the assessment of student learning outcomes, and the use of assessment results and other information to improve the program. In addition, the Academic Program Review process includes a proposed vision for the program's future, taking into account developments in the relevant academic discipline(s), the program's financial health and sustainability, and the resources needed for proposed improvements.

### **The Current Academic Program Review Process**

The process of Academic Program Review starts with the ga-2.6 ( h)2 (e)9 (r)-1 . (i)-2.6 (n)12.8 (e()-2 (s) E2 (s) E

each program and examples of the use of assessment results to improve student learning and educational quality.

### **Program Review and Assessment**

While all academic programs in the College of Arts and Sciences regularly assess and improve their effectiveness, particularly with regard to student learning outcomes, and submit assessment results for all of their Program Learning Outcomes to the Office of Educational Assessment in a three-year cycle, Academic Program Review provides a deliberate opportunity for a more focused and consultative reflection on assessment results. In addition, Academic Program Review provides an opportunity for departments to review and revise their assessment plans to improve the relevance, quality, and usefulness of their assessment results.

Most programs in the College of Arts and Sciences—especially those without external accreditation—developed and implemented assessment plans through the College’s first Academic Program Review cycle, which began in the 2007-08 academic year (see “Academic Program Review Cycle” below). Academic Program Review continues to provide a structure for programs to review and revise their assessment plans in light of the following: 1) the missions of the program, the College, and the University; 2) developments in the relevant academic discipline(s); 3) assessment results, including results from the direct assessment of student learning outcomes; and 4) relevant planning documents, including the Strategic Plans of the College and the University. In other words, program faculty develop and revise assessment plans—in Middle States terms, they “conduct assessment of the effectiveness of assessment processes”—in ways that are meaningful to them in the context of both their academic expertise and the University’s mission and identity.

In addition, Academic Program Review is one of several processes to assure that academic programs meet the expectations for Middle States accreditation, particularly with regard to standards III and V:

#### Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

[P]eriodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs providing student learning opportunities.

#### Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

[P]eriodic assessment of the

The intended audience for the Academic Program Review includes the program faculty, department chairpersons and program directors, relevant deans, members of the College of Arts and Sciences Deans' Conference, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost. The Deans'

In addition to these overall responsibilities, the Dean

when possible, offering low-enrol





7+( &2//(\* (

\*URS

+LVWRU\

+LVWRU\ %\$  
,QWHUQDWLRQDO 6WXGLHV %\$

3K\VLV DQG (QJLQHHLQJ

3K\VLV 6 V  
%LRSK\%6F V  
&RPSXWHUJ  
(OHFWULHQH  
(QJLQHHLQJ DQJHULQJ (OHFWULHQH %6  
OHFKDQJHHLQJ

6RFLRORJ\ &ULPLQDO -XVWLFH DQG &ULPLQRORJ\

&ULPLQDO -XVWLFH %6  
6RFLRORJ\ %6

:RUOG /DQJXDJHV DQG &XOWXUHV

&ODVVLQDO /DQJXDJHV %\$  
,QWHUQDWLRQDO /DQJXDJHV<sup>2</sup>%XVLQHVV %\$  
ORGHUQ /DQJXDJHV %\$

\*URXS

1HXURVFLHQFH LQWHUGLVFLSOLQDU\ SURJUDP

1HXURVFLHQFH %6

&RPSXWLQJ 6FLHQFHV

& R P S X W H U  
& R P S X W H U  
6 R I W Z D U H

7KHRORJ\ 5HOLJLRXV 6WXGLHV

7KHRORJ\ 5HOLJLRXV 6WXGLHV %\$  
7KHRORJ\ 0\$

\*URXS

&KHPLVWU\ GDWVHKG D FFRHUG DCGMWR \$XPHGLDQH&KRIPLF  
6 R F L H W \

%LRFKHPLVWU\ %6 06 0\$  
&KHPLVWU\ %6 06 0\$  
&KHPLVWU\ %XVLQHVV %6  
&KHPLVWU\ &RPSXWHUV %6  
&OLQLFDO &KHPLVWU\ 06  
)RUHQVLF &KHPLVWU\ %6  
0HGLFDO 7HFKQRORJ\ %6

\*URXS

%LRORJ\

%LORJ\ %6  
3K\VLORORJ\ %6

\*URXS

&RPPXQLFDWLRQ

& R P P X Q L F D V  
- R X U Q D O L V F  
6W U D W H J L F

(QJOLVK DQG 7KHDWUH

(QJOLVK %\$  
7KHDWUH %\$

0DWKHPDWLFV %\$ %6

\$SSOLHG 0DWKHPDWLFV %6 QHZ SURJUDP  
0DWKHPDWLFV %6  
0DWKHPDWLFV %\$ QHZ SURJUDP

3KLORVRSK\

3KLORVRSK\ %\$

3ROLWLFDO 6FLHQFH

3ROLWLFDO 6FLHQFH %6

3V\FKRORJ\

3V\FKRORJ\ %6

\*URXS

3URJUDP 5HYLHZ

%LRPDWKHPDWLFV %6  
6HVXISW /LEHUD\$ \$UWLV 3URJUDP

,PSDFW 5HSRUWV

\$UWV DQGU DPLF  
\$VL DVLHV  
%LRFKHPLVWU\ DDO%LRGRORHFX  
%6D DWRGLH V  
(QYLURQPHQD 6  
+RQRUV 3URJUDP  
/DQLPHUWDLG \$  
3HDFH DQGLWLFH  
:RPHGLH \$

\*URXS

,PSDFW 5HSRUW

0\$,6 SURJUDP

## Resources

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation*. 13<sup>th</sup> Edition. 2015.

<https://www.msche.org/publications/RevisedStandardsFINAL.pdf>

University of Scranton. Office of Institutional Effectiveness. *Assessment Documents & Resources*.

<http://www.scranton.edu/academics/provost/institutional-effectiveness/assessment-documents.shtml>

University of Scranton. Comprehensive Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning

[file:///C:/Users/R93979208/Downloads/ComprehensiveAssessmentPlan\\_with%20appendices2016%20\(3\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/R93979208/Downloads/ComprehensiveAssessmentPlan_with%20appendices2016%20(3).pdf)

University of Scranton, Office of Educational Assessment.

<http://www.scranton.edu/academics/provost/institutional-effectiveness/oea.shtml>