PROGRAM REVIEW

ONE: Program Description, Learning Objectives, and Goals, Relevant to HPU's Mission Statement

Program Description:

Learning Objectives:

Goals:

Relevance to HPU's Mission:

PROGRAM REVIEW

TWO: SWOT ANALYSIS
Appraisal of Program Strengths, Weaknesses,
Opportunities & Threats

PROGRAM REVIEW

THREE: Analysis of Program Enrollment and Majors

Program Enrollment
- past year increase / decrease
- past three years increase / decrease
- origin of students (Hawaii, US Mainland, International)
- note: please include data for each program pathway if applicable

Interpretation of Current Enrollment / Trends by Faculty

Initiatives to Address Challenges in Enrollment

Enrollment Goals for Coming Three Years

PROGRAM REVIEW

FOUR: PROGRAM CAPACITY
Curriculum, Faculty & Resources

FOUR A: FACULTY DATA AND ANALYSES

Question: Is there a sufficient number, mix, and quality of faculty to meet the needs of student learning in the program?
1. Faculty Number and Composition
2. Faculty Specialties and Alignment with Program Purpose

Note: this section should include:
- faculty Bios
- course count reports
- course enrollment numbers
- overload data
- student/faculty ratio
- adjunct / full-time faculty ratio
- student access to faculty
- faculty qualifications and expertise
- involvement of faculty in governance and University Service
- extent of faculty consensus on program goals and direction

PROGRAM REVIEW

FOUR: PROGRAM CAPACITY
Curriculum, Faculty & Resources

FOUR B: STUDENT DATA AND ANALYSES

Question: Who are the students?

1. Enrollment numbers in each Major / Pathway
2. Student retention / graduation rates
3. Student demographics (age, sex, international etc…)
4. Full time vs Part time students

PROGRAM REVIEW

FOUR: PROGRAM CAPACITY
Curriculum, Faculty & Resources

FOUR C: ANALYSIS OF QUALITY OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING

Questions:
1. Is the program sustainable with the current curriculum?
2. Do the program learning outcomes align with the curriculum plan (include curriculum map)?
3. Is there clear course sequencing that is appropriate? Is it feasible to complete the program in 4 years?
4. Do the upper division / capstone courses prepare students for graduation, and do they align with the HPU catalogue?
5. Do all curriculum related claims (brochures / catalogue) match the reality of the curriculum?

Summarize:
1. Distance Education: Where is program going with distance education? What do faculty do to assure quality of courses and learning? Are DE course reviews and learning evaluated on the HPU schedule?
2. Capstone Courses: What are the program's capstone course/courses? What are the goals for the capstone course/courses? What student work is required – major paper? journal? other? How is learning or performance assessed in the capstone(s)?
3. Portfolios: Does the program use portfolios? How are portfolios used and what student work and performance areas are assessed?
4. Writing/Communication Requirements: Is there an upper-division writing requirement? Or is it accepted for instructors use quizzes, exams, and journals in upper division level courses?
5. Information Literacy: *note: WASC expects information literacy to be explicitly evident in syllabi, as a learning outcome or in assignments*. Is Information Literacy assured in each course? If not, where is the program with this expectation?
6. Syllabus Reviews: Does faculty review syllabi in a structured / systematic way on a regular basis? For what purpose(s)? On what schedule?
7. Student Engagement: What does this mean in this program and how do faculty foster student engagement? Include analysis of NSSE results and plans for utilizing these data.
8. Academic Rigor: Does the program have any specific initiatives to address academic rigor? Are there minimum reading / writing requirements?

PROGRAM REVIEW

FOUR: PROGRAM CAPACITY
Curriculum, Faculty & Resources

FOUR D: ANALYSIS OF LEARNING RESOURCES

Questions:
1. Is the program sustainable relative to the learning resources available?
2. Are the resources adequate to meet the needs of the curriculum and the students?
3. What learning resources need to be improved upon or added?

Note: Learning Resources include laboratory facilities, classrooms, computer classrooms, library support and tutoring services.

FOUR: PROGRAM CAPACITY
Curriculum, Faculty & Resources

FOUR E: OVERALL ANALYSIS

Questions:
1. What do the separate analyses (A-D) reveal about the success and needs of the program?
2. What are the areas that require the greatest improvement / work?
3. How will the program grow and flourish in the future?
4. How have faculty reflected collectively on the program and information relating to the program, both internally and externally.

Summarize:
1. Internal Strengths and Weaknesses
2. External Opportunities and Threats

PROGRAM REVIEW

FIVE: Analysis of Student Learning

Questions:
1. What learning assessments have been completed for this review?
2. What was the assessment method?
3. How do the results compare to national standards (if applicable) or to past assessments?

Note: comparison to MCP programs and between on-line and classroom learning should be included where possible

PROGRAM REVIEW

SIX: The Student Experience

Questions:
1. What systems are in place to assess student satisfaction with the current program?
2. How are course evaluations utilized to generate meaningful assessments of the student experience?
3. What does the latest collection of student experiences say about the program?
4. If these systems are not in place, how can they be created and incorporated in the future?

PROGRAM REVIEW

SEVEN: Program Status Regarding Global Citizenship at HPU

Hawaii Pacific University has adopted Global Citizenship as a University-wide strategic priority.

Questions:
1. How is Global Citizenship addressed in this program?
2. What initiatives / actions are in place or planned to incorporate Global Citizenship into the course / curriculum?
3. What are the outcomes desired in this specific program regarding Global Citizenship?

PROGRAM REVIEW

EIGHT: Major Educational Improvements Made Since Last Review

Questions:
1. What suggestions were made in the last Program Review?
2. How have these suggestions been addressed?
3. Show evidence of improvement in specific areas or address the lack of improvement.
4. Were these improvements linked to HPU's strategic goals?

PROGRAM REVIEW

**NINE: Overall Analysis of Program and Recommendations /
Plans for the Future**

Questions:
1. What were the major strengths / improvements in the program since the last review?
2. What are the major weaknesses / areas that need to be addressed in the program?
3. How can these areas be addressed?
    a. By whom?
    b. On what timeline?
    c. Who will be responsible for ensuring that improvements are made?

PROGRAM REVIEW

TEN: EXTERNAL REVIEW

Some general **guidelines** for the External Review can be found below.

1. Professional Context: The professional terms of the external review include the absence of any conflict of interest. The individual selected to be the external reviewer should not teach or have any other financial agreements with HPU, such as recent or future teaching, consultation, presentations, etc. However, a reviewer is urged to present ideas to the faculty that relate to the profession and have implications for program quality, such as changing standards or new technology or theories that would be of interest. The reviewer should also not have any connections with faculty that involve advantages or other benefits that might result from being the reviewer. If there is any risk of an appearance of conflict of interest, the request for approval should simply explain the potential appearance and why it is not an issue.

2. Required Steps: The required steps in setting up the external review are as follows:
    a. The faculty consider alternative candidates and reach agreement with the dean on a best candidate or several best candidates, and possible dates.
    b. A faculty member discusses the possibility with the candidate – see the requirements below for this discussion. This is not the contract in any legal sense, it is only a discussion of terms.
    c. Upon agreement with a candidate on the general idea of conducting the review, a memo/email with the proposed reviewer's CV is sent to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and to the Dean and the Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment for their confirmation. The proposal confirms faculty agreement and absence of any conflict of interest. After the Dean and Associate VP indicate their endorsement, the Vice President confirms the final decision.
    d. When approvals are complete, the letter offering the contract is issued by the Vice President of Academic Affairs, with copies to faculty Program Review Chair, Dean, Department Chair, and Associate VP of Planning and Assessment.

3. Before proceeding, check with college and/or OAA administrators to determine what forms and paperwork are required for the external review, from start to finish – from request to purchase of tickets to completion and reimbursements.

4. Create a Professional Agreement: The context for HPU external reviews is that the visit is service to one's profession not high-paid consultation. HPU has a record of positive experiences that confirm there are professionals in every discipline who have been willing to review on these terms. The monetary terms of the external review are outlined in item #5 below.
    a. The faculty program chair talks with possible reviewers to discuss terms and possible interest. This conversation explicitly notes that the discussion is **not a formal contract**, which can only be made by the Academic Vice President.
    b. The faculty member follows up with the reviewer after approvals/forms are complete, to advise to go ahead and purchase the economy-fare airline ticket. A general upper limit to suggest verbally is $1200 from East Coast and $600 from West Coast. Once purchased, the eticket is forwarded to Talia Malufau to begin processing the reimbursement. The reviewer is provided contact information for Talia Malufau and Joe Schmiedl for any questions relating to costs and reimbursements.

5. Monetary Terms of the Agreement: The terms generally include:

a. $1200 honorarium for 5 days – 3 days on campus, 1 day for preparation and 1 day for report writing. The report is a modest summary report with observations, comment on the review and faculty recommendations, and the reviewer's recommendations. This fee is paid after the report is submitted.
b. The reviewer purchases the airline ticket at economy fare at a reasonable price. HPU can start processing the payment as soon as the reviewer submits a receipt.
c. HPU pays for lodging, meals and ground transportation. The hotel should be booked by HPU, either the college or OAA. In most cases, HPU can pay the Executive Centre directly.
d. HPU anticipates up to $2500 to $3000 will be the maximum total cost of the external review. Allowable costs include HPU faculty participation in transporting the reviewer to locations, meals for the reviewers, and modest refreshments that might be served in a meeting. However, group dinners for faculty to meet with the reviewer are not generally reimbursed and should not be assumed; these need to be requested/approved in advance and should be modest arrangements. Costs for wine/alcohol are not reimbursed.
e. Reviewers are welcome to add days to their visit to see Hawai'i at their personal expense; we will assist with hotel arrangements and related as is feasible.

PROGRAM REVIEW

ELEVEN: FACULTY AND DEAN REVIEW OF RESULTS

The Dean and Faculty will meet to discuss the findings of the review. At this meeting, the following should be addressed:

1. The Summary of the Program Review

2. A Critique of the Program Review, which should include:
    a. The extent to which evidence is the basis for the conclusions and recommendations in the review.
    b. The adequacy of assurance of quality and focus on student learning using best practices criteria:
        i. Use of a curriculum map to align course learning with program learning outcomes (PLOs).
        ii. Completion of four learning assessments per year on student work or student performance, based on an Assessment Plan. Use of rubrics to assess student work – rubrics with multiple criteria and multiple points on each rating scale (such as 4-point scales). Use of multiple raters for at least some of the reviews of student work (inter-rater consensus).
        iii. Comparisons of online and classroom learning where possible and comparisons of Downtown and MPC learning where possible.
    c. Quality of educational improvements and use of learning assessments to define improvements.
    d. Overall validity of the analysis and identification of weaknesses that might (a) limit the validity of the recommendations, or (b) be worth correcting in the next year for the next annual report.

3. The Recommendations and the External Reviewer's Recommendations.
    a. Are the recommendations in alignment with the program's goals and objectives?
    b. Are the recommendations useful in providing direction towards program improvement?
    c. Are the comments / recommendations from the External Reviewer appropriate and in-line with the program's realities?
4. Improvement Plan – Resources Requirements and Timeline Goals
    a. What are the short-term and long-term improvements most relevant to the HPU mission?
    b. Are there important resource requirements? If so, how do these figure into the feasibility of implementing the improvements?
    c. Who will oversee the improvements?

PROGRAM REVIEW

TWELVE: Appendices, Notes and Review Portfolio

All supporting data should be collected in both electronic and paper form. The Program Review Chair will ensure that all reports and additional data are organized into an appendix.

Upon completion of the Program Review, an electronic and hard copy will be presented for storage in the College's Program Review Portfolio.

The review should be revisited on an annual basis and a short annual report, detailing the improvements made in the previous year documented.

Form 2 Report of Learning Assessment on Student Work/Artifacts

1. Program: Graduate Program	**2. Program Review Chair**: **Course Coordinator:**

Categories of Report
3. Degree objective addressed by assessment: Grad Program Outcome and the correlating course outcome:
4. Brief description of student work:
5. Course:
6. How was the student work reviewed & what criterion or rubric was used:
7. Summary of results - include % meeting criterion/standard
8. Conclusion(s) – what concern found (or no concern)
9. Actions to be taken (if any):
10. Implications for capacity and/or resources: