

HAWAI'I PACIFIC UNIVERSITY

GUIDE TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW



6TH Edition – 2011
(Updated 2011-13)

**Office of Academic Administration,
Planning and Assessment**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE: ALL DOCUMENTS ARE POSTED ON PIPELINE,
UNDER ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION TAB:
PROGRAM REVIEW, ASSESSMENT AND EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS CHANNEL

	<u>Page</u>
SECTION 1. OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM REVIEW & LEARNING ASSESSMENT	2
SECTION 2. PROGRAM REVIEW COMPONENTS & UNIVERSITY GOOD PRACTICES	3-6
SECTION 3. COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW	7-9
SECTION 4. THE REPORT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW	10-11
SECTION 5. THE EXTERNAL REVIEW	12-13
SECTION 6. FACULTY AND DEAN FOLLOW-UP MEETING TO REVIEW THE PROGRAM REVIEW & EXTERNAL REVIEW	14-15

APPENDICES & REFERENCES:

APPENDIX A. Lumina Foundation publication: “Redefining Degree Objectives to Differentiate Associate, Baccalaureate & Graduate Levels of Learning: The Degree Qualifications Profile”

Reference Posted on Pipeline as Separate PDF Document:

Also posted online: http://www.luminafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf

APPENDIX B. Association of American Colleges and Universities: “VALUE Project Rubrics”

Reference Also Posted in HPU GUIDE to Learning Assessment:

Also posted online: <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index.cfm> Page 16

APPENDIX C. HPU Distance Education Quality Assurance Policy and the QM Rubric.

References posted on Pipeline as separate HPU documents.

APPENDIX D. Easy Guide for 2011-12 Fast-Track Comprehensive Program Reviews. Source: HPU Guide to Program Review Pages 17-23

SECTION 1. OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW & LEARNING ASSESSMENT

Academic Program Review is a faculty-driven University-wide initiative that includes assessment of student learning and comprehensive analysis of program capacity, quality, student learning and success, and program improvements. Collaboration is a key component of all elements of program review to assure that main and military campus faculty are fully integrated in the processes of assessments, analysis and program improvement.

Programs submit annual reports/plans that address capacity and quality issues including student success. Comprehensive program reviews are completed approximately every 5-6 years, which include faculty recommendations for program changes and improvements. External reviews are conducted by discipline experts, usually from outside Hawai‘i. The comprehensive review and external review reports and recommendations are subsequently reviewed by the Dean, program faculty and Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment in a joint meeting to discuss outcomes of the review and implementation of long-term plans for program improvement.

The University’s program review model was implemented beginning in 1997 as an institution-level initiative, with support and technical assistance provided by a full-time coordinator. In recent years, academic program review has increasingly been considered to be a college-level activity with respect to directing the work and maintaining the Program Review Portfolios. At the same time, a balance between institutional-level and college-level coordination has been essential to assure there is documentation of institutional compliance with regional accreditation standards for program review and educational effectiveness. Support for academic program reviews has included institution-level coordination, course releases and payments to adjunct faculty who help with assessments and the review. From Fall 2011 to Summer 2013, there has been no institution-level coordinator role to support academic program review. As of July 2013, the new Director of Assessment has assumed the institutional lead for this work.



SECTION 2. PROGRAM REVIEW COMPONENTS & UNIVERSITY GOOD PRACTICES

1. The Program Review Portfolio. Current and past program review documents for each degree program are to be located in *Program Review Portfolios*, which are maintained by faculty and deans in the Colleges for each degree program. The portfolios are maintained electronically or as hard copies. Copies of reports and documentation are made available as requested at institutional levels. The format for reports is included in the **GUIDE to Learning Assessment**, a separate document that includes templates for assessment plans, timelines, reports and annual/ comprehensive program review reports. All GUIDES are posted on Pipeline. The **Program Review Portfolio** for each degree program includes:

- ① Posted student learning outcomes for the degree (as posted on HPU website)
- ② Curriculum Map (alignment of course learning outcomes with degree outcomes)
- ③ Learning Assessment Plan and Timeline on file for each program
- ④ Annual learning assessments (four or more) and reports including improvements
- ⑤ Annual Peer reviews of online courses using QM Rubric and in accordance with HPU's Distance Education Quality Assurance Policy
- ⑥ Annual Program Review/Planning Report
- ⑦ Most recent comprehensive Program Review Report
- ⑧ Most recent External Reviewer's Report
- ⑨ Documentation of follow-up meetings with dean and faculty

2. Program-Level Learning Objectives (Student Learning Outcomes). Degree-level learning outcomes for academic programs are published on the University website. Two areas of improvement in the University's degree-level learning objectives need to be on the agenda leading up to the 2015 WASC review for reaffirmation of accreditation:

First: The University has yet to define and commit to learning outcomes for students that address the "core competencies" outlined in the current WASC standards. In these standards, degree programs are expected to assure and document student learning with respect to writing, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and information literacy.

Second: Many degree programs have defined learning objectives that lack specificity as to level of learning, that do not comprehensively define the intellectual, behavioral and values that make up the scope of the degree, and fail to define the career path or outcomes that may apply to the degree.

The goal is to assure that degree outcomes are in alignment with expectations that are appropriate to associate, baccalaureate and graduate degrees.

3. Program Goals. Academic programs are expected to define program goals that reference plans for growth in program quality and enrollment (such as student success; global citizenship) and plans for longer-term vision and change that are in alignment with the strategic planning goals of the University.

4. Curriculum Map. This map shows the alignment of program learning outcomes with required courses in the major. Curriculum maps also help organize and align program outcomes with all the learning outcomes within all the required courses.

Program Curriculum Map

	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Obj 6
Course #						
Course #						
Course #						
Etc.						

5. Assessment – Defined as evaluation or appraisal. In universities, assessment includes multiple levels (see GUIDE to Learning Assessment, separate document):

- Course learning outcomes (learning assessment)
- Program/university learning outcomes (learning assessment)
- Program assessment (program review)
- Institutional outcomes assessments (using institutional outcome indicators)
- Course evaluations (perception of course quality)
- Teaching quality assessments and peer reviews

6. Learning Assessment Plan. Ongoing learning assessment in the majors is assured by completion of at least 4 learning assessments per year relating to degree learning outcomes (see **GUIDE to Learning Assessment**).

Program Learning Assessment Plan

Program Learning Objectives	Key Courses Relevant to Program Objectives (Sources of Student Work for Learning Assessments)	Student Work to be used for Learning Assessments & Method (Papers, exams, portfolios, etc.)
Objective 1.	JADMxxx JADM xyz	Term Paper Case study
Objective 2.	JADM abc JADM frc	Final exam Term Paper
Objective 3.	JADM xxx etc	etc
Objective 4.	etc	etc
Objective 5.	etc	etc
Objective 6	etc	etc

a) **Program Learning Assessment Plans** align student work in courses in the major (to be collected as artifacts/evidence of learning) with program learning outcomes.

b) **Learning Assessment Timelines** show the schedule of assessments the faculty are conducting each year. To complete learning assessments, artifacts of student work are sampled from the courses aligned with degree outcomes to assess learning relevant to these degree outcomes.

Multi-section and online courses are given priority when selecting courses as sources of learning artifacts for assessments. Whenever relevant to the program, assessments are structured so as to document comparability of learning with respect to (a) learning in online and classroom modalities of courses; and (b) learning in courses offered Downtown and in Military Campus Program locations. Additional assessments are conducted for the general education program.

The University is currently implementing Blackboard (Bb) Learn and Blackboard Outcomes. Once all the University's courses are housed in Blackboard (transferred from current WebCT), the structure will be in place to enter student work online in all courses. This step will enable student learning artifacts to be stored in Blackboard Learn and retrieved in Blackboard Outcomes for learning assessments. Rubrics are recommended for learning assessments where appropriate to the student work. Upon implementation of Bb Outcomes, these rubrics will be posted in Bb for use in completing assessments of student work relative to the program learning outcomes.

Learning assessments are completed through peer review. A faculty member from each program leads each or all assessments and organizes the collection of student work to complete the assessment. Rubrics may already be in place or may need to be created for a given assessment. The University is currently undertaking work to increase the quality of rubrics and to utilize rubrics from the AAC&U VALUE project as is or as models for rubrics to be used in the discipline (for more information on this project, see <http://www.aacu.org/value/index.cfm>). Additional resources for assessment are posted on PIPELINE, including the HPU GUIDE to Learning Assessment.

7. Reviews of Distance Education Course Quality. Programs approved to offer degrees online or with significant online components in the upper division conduct peer reviews of 2-3 online courses annually, using the **QM Rubric**. These reviews and the assurance of quality in HPU distance education is covered in the separate document, the **Distance Education Quality Assurance Policy**.

8. Annual Academic Program Review/Planning Reports. Annual program review reporting is now replaced by HPU strategic planning reports. For Fall 2011, this was the “Academic Program Analysis” required of each program for the President’s strategic planning process. Details are available from the Vice President of Academic Affairs. As the University’s strategic planning process evolves, the integration of program review with planning will continue to be upgraded and improved.

9. Comprehensive Academic Program Review. A comprehensive program review is completed every 5-6 years to assess overall program capacity and educational effectiveness. The review is both an evaluation and a planning process. To support the reviews, Institutional Research (IR) posts a Program Review Data Portfolio on Pipeline every semester and IR staff are available to meet with faculty regarding additional analyses that may be needed. The comprehensive review builds on the evidence and analyses accumulated in annual reports to complete a full analysis of program educational effectiveness, using a series of questions and topics to frame the review and guide the development of recommendations (Section 3 in this document).

10. External Review. The external review follows the comprehensive review and is guided by the policy developed for this review (Section 5 in this document).

11. Follow-up Meeting on Program Review With Dean and Faculty. A collaborative review of the program review, report, and the external review and recommendations to discuss plan for program improvement. The review includes the Dean, program faculty and Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment in a joint meeting to discuss outcomes of the review and implementation of long-term plans for program improvement (meeting guideline is in Section 5 in this document).

12. Major HPU Institutional Learning Assessment Quality Assurance Challenges:

- Monitor comparability relating to location: MCP and DT/HL
- Monitor comparability relating to modality: classroom and online
- Show that University faculty and programs are reviewing data on student success, such as retention, course completion, graduation rates, and implementing improvements appropriately

13. Selected WASC Requirements Applying to Program Review and Learning Assessment

- ① Publish and publicly disseminate degree learning objectives.
- ② Review academic programs on a periodic basis
- ③ Complete ongoing learning assessments to document learning and use assessment results as basis for educational improvements
- ④ WASC standards, Criterion for Review (CFR 2.7 & others):
 “In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such reviews.”
- ⑤ WASC 2007 “Systems Approval” for HPU online programs:
 WASC Substantive Change Committee requested assessment plans and more frequent learning assessments in online courses and as comparisons to learning in classroom settings where possible. Learning relating to each degree objective must be documented and reported.

14. Compensation for Faculty Participation in Program Review and Learning Assessment.

Compensation in the form of course release/stipend support is provided for faculty coordination of the learning assessments, faculty analysis of program educational effectiveness, writing the report and coordination of the external review. Course release/ stipend may be given under special circumstances. Compensation is also available for adjunct faculty who participate in completing learning assessments and maybe provided to regular and adjunct faculty who complete peer reviews of online courses (using QM rubric).

SECTION 3. COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW

The **COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW** is completed every 5-6 years to assess overall program capacity and educational effectiveness. The review is both an evaluation and a planning process. The intent of the report is to address the following elements in a straightforward way, aiming for simplicity not excessively lengthy explanations where a more simple explanation would work. The comprehensive program review is conducted within the University's larger culture of evidence. The report should make connections whenever possible to show what evidence has been analyzed and how the evidence and analysis support the conclusions, improvements and/or recommendations.

Support for the annual and comprehensive program reviews can be found in the Program Review Data Portfolio prepared/posted every semester by Institutional Research (IR). In addition, IR staff are available to meet with faculty and conduct additional analyses to support special questions that faculty choose to pursue. (Format for this report is included in this document and posted on PIPELINE.)

Required elements of the **COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW**:

1. Program Description, Learning Objectives and Goals; Discussion of Relevance to HPU Mission.
2. SWOT Analysis: Appraisal of Program Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats
3. Analysis of Program Enrollments & Majors:
 - a. Define program increase/decrease in enrollment past year? past 3 years? Include numbers by origin (Hawai'i, US mainland, international);
 - b. How do faculty interpret current situation on enrollments and number of majors?
 - c. What initiatives/actions are planned or in progress to address this challenge? What are the program goals for enrollments and number of majors for the next year? next three years?
4. Analysis of Program Capacity: Curriculum, Faculty & Resources. Address each capacity area, followed by an overall analysis of the program's current adequacy relative to its objectives and the future potential of the program to flourish. Includes: Faculty Data and Analyses; Student Data and Analyses; Analysis of Quality of Curriculum and Teaching; Analysis of Learning Resources; Overall Analysis
 - a. Faculty Data and Analyses. Assessment of carrying capacity and program sustainability relative to faculty composition, numbers, and alignment with program purposes. Present data summaries/sources for the analysis; append sources as appropriate. See notes below for guidelines for analysis and discussion. The overall question is whether there are a sufficient number, mix and quality of faculty to meet the needs of student learning in the program. Trend data and analysis as well as comparative analysis across programs may be developed for such indicators.

Examples of available reports in the HPU Program Review Data Portfolio posted on Pipeline each term by the Office of institutional Research include course count reports, course enrollment averages, and overload data. Consider student/faculty ratio, faculty adjunct/full-time ratio, student access to faculty, faculty qualifications and expertise, involvement of faculty in governance and University service, and extent of faculty consensus on program changes and direction.

- b. Analysis of Quality of Curriculum and Teaching. Assessment of program sustainability relative to the curriculum and teaching the curriculum. Alignment of program learning outcomes with course objectives (curriculum map). Appropriateness of course sequencing and feasibility of completing program in 4 years. Appropriate upper division and capstone courses and alignment with HPU catalog. Alignment of curricular-related claims (in brochures about programs, for example) with the reality of the curriculum

Review of use of high-impact teaching-learning methods in the program – summarize from the program's annual reports:

- 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 is 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 acceptable if instructors just use quizzes, exams, and journals at upper division level?
 - 5) Information Literacy: WASC expects information literacy to be explicitly evident in syllabi, as a learning outcome or in assignments. Is this assured in each course? or where is the program with this expectation?
 - 6) Syllabus Reviews: Are syllabi reviewed by faculty in a regular way? For what purpose(s)? And 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 in progress that address academic rigor? Are there minimum writing or reading requirements?
- c. Analysis of Learning Resources. Assessment of carrying capacity and program sustainability relative to learning resources available. Analysis of adequacy of resources to meet the needs of the curriculum and the students. Examples of resources include laboratory facilities, classrooms, computer classrooms, library support, and tutoring services. Identify needs for improvement including technology needs. Present data sources; append sources as appropriate.
- d. Overall Analysis. Integrative analysis of the program's capacity to function/flourish in the present and in the future. Present to show how faculty have reflected collectively on information relating to the program, both internally and externally. Summarize as to what are internal strengths and weaknesses, what are external opportunities and threats?

5. Analysis of Student Learning: Summary & analysis of learning assessment results (attach learning assessment results in appendix), assessment methods, and improvements made. Include reference to comparisons with MCP and comparisons between online and classroom learning, if relevant.

6. Program Status Regarding HPU Goal: Global Citizenship: What initiatives/actions (if any) are in progress or planned to formally address this strategic priority? What outcomes achieved?
7. Analyses of Program Status Relating to Specific Areas of Quality of Teaching & Learning:
 - a. Distance Education: Where is program going with distance education? What do faculty do to assure quality of courses and learning? Are faculty reviewing/documenting evidence of quality in courses and learning on a systematic basis?
 - b. Capstone Courses: What is program's capstone course(s)? What are the goals for the capstone course(s)? What student work is required – major paper? journal? other? How is learning or performance assessed in the capstone(s)?
 - c. Portfolios: Does the program use portfolios? How are portfolios used and what is assessed?
 - d. Writing/Communication Requirements: Does the program have an upper-division writing requirement? Or is student learning assessed only by quizzes, exams, journals at upper division level?
 - e. Information Literacy: WASC now expects information literacy to be explicitly evident in syllabi, either as a learning outcome or in assignments. How is this expectation being assured?
 - f. Syllabus Reviews: Are syllabi reviewed by faculty on any regularity? For what purpose(s)?
 - g. 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.
 - h. Academic Rigor: Any specific initiatives in place to address academic rigor?
8. Major Educational Improvements Made Since Last Review: description of improvement, evidence basis or rationale, intended and actual outcomes, and if linked with program objective or HPU strategic goal.
9. Overall Analysis of Program and Recommendations/Plans for the Future
10. External Review (see GUIDE for procedure).
11. Faculty and Dean review of results of review and external review and plan for program improvements.

SECTION 4. THE REPORT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW

The report of the comprehensive program review summarizes and builds on the evidence accumulated in the annual Program Review/ Planning Reports to complete a full analysis of program educational effectiveness. Annual and comprehensive reviews address a series of questions/issues to frame the review and guide the development of recommendations. The report includes:

1. Summary of the Program Review. Brief description of how the program review was conducted: names of participants, lead person, activities completed over time, and culminating meetings held to prepare the report. Briefly explain how faculty participated in the learning assessments and analysis of other student and faculty data to complete the analyses needed for the report. The “Program Review Portfolio” should be referenced and should list each faculty member, background and degrees, what they teach. A summary of the portfolio is sufficient for the report.
2. Program Description and History. Official program description (from the catalogue) and if there is a mission or purpose statement for the program. List the program learning objectives (outcomes). Provide a brief overview of program’s history including last program review and how that review influenced the program, including curriculum directions and program improvements.
3. Student Data and Analyses. Assessment of carrying capacity and program sustainability relative to student enrollment, graduation rates and other indicators of student success including demand/ opportunities for graduates.
4. Program Carrying Capacity and Sustainability. This section should present each capacity area, followed by an overall analysis of the program’s current adequacy relative to its objectives and the future potential of the program to flourish. Includes the following sections: a) Faculty Data and Analyses; b) Student Data and Analyses; c) Analysis of Quality of Curriculum and Teaching; d) Analysis of Learning Resources; e) Overall Analysis
5. Analysis of Student Learning. Summarize results of learning assessments (methods, results) as these relate to degree outcomes. Are there themes or core learning issues? Have results been used to make improvements? Have these been effective? Have improvements in assessment methods been made? Reference comparisons of main campus/MCP and between online/ classroom learning, as relevant. to the program. Summarize program’s status regarding HPU’s goal/mission on global citizenship. What initiatives/actions (if any) are planned or have been conducted to formally address this strategic priority? What outcomes have been achieved?
6. Program Status Regarding HPU Goal: Global Citizenship: What initiatives/actions (if any) are in progress or planned to formally address this strategic priority?
7. Analyses of Program Status Relating to Specific Areas of Quality of Teaching & Learning: Distance Education, Capstone Courses, Portfolios, Writing/Communication Requirements, Information Literacy, Syllabus Reviews, Student Engagement, Academic Rigor.

8. Major Program Improvements Made Since Last Review. Describe improvements, evidence basis or rationale, intended and actual outcomes, and if linked with program objective or HPU strategic goal.

9. Overall Analysis of Program Including Alignment with Mission & Recommendations/ Plans. Brief summary of overall program strengths and weaknesses, including program relevance to HPU mission and strategic priorities (as appropriate). Include recommendations and long term plans for the program. Plan for the external review.

10. Appendices as Needed. Program Review Portfolio should be up to date.

Learning Assessment Reports

Other Supporting Data

SECTION 5. THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

[This procedure is for guidance and does not replace any HPU policy.]

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:
 - The faculty consider alternative candidates and reach agreement with the dean on a best candidate or several best candidates, and possible dates.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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 ticket 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:

- \$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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

The following sample letter can be used to establish the terms of the contract with the external reviewer, once there is verbal agreement on the terms of the work.

From: Dean or Appropriate Administrator
(The following information will also be sent by snail-mail.)

Dear _____

I am pleased to confirm the invitation extended to you by the _____ faculty at Hawai'i Pacific University (HPU) to serve as external reviewer of our _____ program. I understand that you will visit HPU and meet with the faculty in _____. We would like to schedule you to meet for three days. We assume that an additional day may be required for travel, one day is required to prepare for the visit, and one day is required to write a final written report. The honorarium for this review is \$1200, which is forwarded to you when we receive your report.

We will also reimburse you for transportation to Hawai'i, assuming you travel economy fare and try to find a reasonable price on the ticket. We will arrange your hotel stay at the Executive Center Hotel and will direct pay the hotel for your lodging. We will also reimburse reasonable expenses for ground transportation associated with travel to and from airports and for meals during your stay.

Once you have booked your airline ticket, you can submit a copy of the ticket to my office and we will start processing the request for reimbursement. Reimbursement of your additional expenses and payment of the honorarium, please send copies of your dated receipts directly to my office.

We are pleased that you have agreed to participate in our academic program review process. I look forward to learning of your acceptance of this offer to compensate you for serving as an external reviewer.

Sincerely,

SECTION 6. FOLLOW-UP MEETING FOR FACULTY-DEAN REVIEW OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW & EXTERNAL REVIEW

The follow-up meeting for faculty-dean review and discussion of the Program Review and External Review should be documented to preserve a written report of the meeting. The report should summarize the decisions and recommendations for improvements, noting the evidence used for each decision and recommendation. The record of this meeting is included in the **Program Review Portfolio**. The purposes of the meeting discussion include the following:

1. Brief Summary of the Program Review. How the program was reviewed and high points of what went into forming the recommendations.
2. Critique of the Program Review. Before discussing the merit of the recommendations, review the validity and quality of the review.
 - a. Extent to which evidence is the basis for the conclusions and recommendations in the review
 - b. Adequacy of assurance of quality and focus on student learning using best practices criteria:
 - 1) Use of a curriculum map to align course learning with program learning outcomes (PLOs)
 - 2) 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 (interrater consensus).
 - 3) 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. Consideration of Recommendations and External Reviewer's Recommendations. Are the recommendations basically in alignment and effective in providing direction to program improvement? Any external reviewer responses that are not appropriate or in alignment with program realities?
4. Discussion of Improvements Including Resource Requirements and General Timeline
 - a. Define the short-term and longer- improvements that are most relevant to the program and the HPU mission.
 - b. Are there important resource requirements and how do these figure into feasibility of implementing improvements?

4. Discussion of Improvements Including Resource Requirements and General Timeline – continued

d. Certain improvements are going to be defined for programs to make in 2011-12 that are necessary for HPU to be in alignment with WASC accreditation expectations and “best practices.”

- 1) Degree objectives (outcomes) will be reviewed and revised as needed to more clearly define the level of learning of the program. The HPU guidelines for this revision have not yet been formulated, but the work will be guided by the concepts and principles of the Lumina Foundation project in collaboration with the Association of American Colleges and Universities. This project is addressing levels of learning to differentiate graduate-level learning, baccalaureate-level learning and associate-degree-level learning.
- 2) Degree objectives will also be required for the two learning outcomes identified in the HPU strategic plan, soon to be finalized by the new HPU president, Dr. Geoff Bannister. The outcomes are for (1) critical thinking and (b) writing/presenting skills.
- 3) In addition, a degree objective will be required that references post graduate “student success” with respect to what a student is prepared to do upon graduation.
- 4) Curriculum maps will be required as part of curriculum quality and learning assessment.

5. Program Review materials are now to be maintained in the colleges in a Program Review Portfolio that can be electronic or hard copy. This portfolio should be updated regularly as assessment reports, course reviews and other quality assurance activities are completed. Annual reports will be filed in the portfolio so they can be collated at the time of the next comprehensive program review.

Resource needs should be identified and a general timeline of what can realistically be accomplished next year and what is considered to be longer-term improvement. At the end of this document, improvements are identified that all programs will be asked to address next year.

APPENDIX B: EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT METHODS:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS & COLLEGES RUBRICS

Rubrics are multidimensional scales used to rate student learning artifacts to assess the quality of learning demonstrated in that artifact. The general properties of rubrics include the following:

1. Rubrics must use multiple rating scales to assess multiple dimensions of learning, such as the quality of writing, comparisons/contrasts, adequacy of references, use of examples/applications, etc. The dimensions are defined to address the various types of learning that are being evaluated.
2. The results of faculty ratings of student work are aggregated separately for each dimension of learning so that each dimension can be considered separately as to whether the student learning is adequate or improvements may be needed.
3. It is not acceptable practice to rely on one rating scale for a learning objective. It is also not good practice to create a “total score” for a rubric by adding up the dimension ratings to one total. In either case, the holistic rating eliminates the opportunity to evaluate student learning on the various dimensions.
4. The rating scales are essentially the same as Likert scales used in social science and typically the scales have 4 points. As such, the results of rubric ratings are shown as numbers and percentages at each level as well as for each dimension. It is not mathematically acceptable to compute mean scores for these scales.

There is an extensive literature available on the construction and use of rubrics. One excellent set of rubrics and supporting information about the use of rubrics has been published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU). These

<http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index.cfm>

Intellectual and Practical Skills

- [Inquiry and analysis](#)
- [Critical thinking](#)
- [Creative thinking](#)
- [Written communication](#)
- [Oral communication](#)
- [Reading](#)
- [Quantitative literacy](#)
- [Information literacy](#)
- [Teamwork](#)
- [Problem solving](#)

Personal and Social Responsibility

- [Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global](#)
- [Intercultural knowledge and competence](#)
- [Ethical reasoning](#)
- [Foundations and skills for lifelong learning](#)
- [Global learning](#)

Integrative and Applied Learning

- [Integrative and applied learning](#)

APPENDIX D. EASY GUIDE FOR 2011-12 FAST-TRACK COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEWS

SOURCE: HPU GUIDE TO PROGRAM REVIEW

SUBMITTED TO AND REVIEWED BY THE DEANS' COUNCIL, AUGUST 2011

A comprehensive program review should be completed every 5-6 years to assess overall program capacity and educational effectiveness. The review is both an evaluation and a planning process. The intent of these guidelines is to address program review requirements in a straightforward way, aiming for simplicity not excessively lengthy explanations where a more simple explanation would work. An approach to “fast tracking the comprehensive program review” is proposed to respond to HPU’s current compliance issues. This concept means that the Program Review is completed in a more compact way but the review is still conducted within the University’s larger culture of evidence.

As announced at last January’s Program Review meeting (before classes begin), HPU is seriously behind on meeting higher education expectations to complete periodic program reviews every 5-7 years. At that time, ten programs were named for accelerated or “fast-tracked” program reviews for the 2011-12 academic year. Combined with the six reviews completed last year, this would bring HPU performance close to “good standing,”

College leaders including deans, assistant/associate deans, department chairs and program and program review chairs will serve as a team to support this process. Deans are asked to lead and support department and program chairs on the work to be completed. Learning assessments will be facilitated by the CAIT center staff who will help finalize assessment plans and formats and enter reports into Blackboard.

The current record is shown in a chart below, as background for this initiative. Six program reviews were successfully completed this past year. Building on success, 10-11 more comprehensive program reviews in the next 10 months are necessary to position HPU to return to compliance with WASC standards/expectations by 2013. I will send a separate update to colleges regarding work already in progress with some programs. The goal is accreditation readiness including program review by 2013.

The program reviews anticipated to be involved in this process include:

Business Administration – Travel Industry Management (in progress, Hedlund working with J. Patoskie); MA Human Resource Management, Accounting, Finance

Natural & Comp Sciences – MS Marine Science. Environmental Science (2 degrees); Computer Science.

Humanities & Social Sciences – Communication, MA Comm, Justice Administration (Hedlund working with M. Masuda), MA Global Leadership Sustainable Development

Assessment is defined as evaluation or appraisal and in universities includes:

- Course learning outcomes (learning assessment)
- Program/university learning outcomes (learning assessment)
- Program assessment (program review)
- Institutional outcomes assessments (using institutional outcome indicators)
- Course evaluations (perception of course quality)
- Teaching quality assessments and peer reviews

A common response that comes up when faculty are asked to start program reviews is that the program objectives are just beginning to be revised and so the review will need to be postponed for two or more years to allow for the new curriculum to be developed, courses to be offered, and then learning to be assessed. This is not a good reason to delay the review. Instead, it is a good reason to fast-track the program review so there is more evidence available on which to base the program revision. This is consistent with WASC accreditation expectations that program revisions be based on evidence.

So for programs scheduled for fast tracking, the comprehensive review cannot be delayed in order to complete those revisions. The program review should go forward with the old objectives or with the revision work as a parallel. The fast track programs are behind and the reviews need to be completed.

Fall 2011 Timeline	
1. Start the Learning Assessments By 9/12 – Name the Team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name 1-2 faculty to lead assessment work and adjunct faculty who will help, if appropriate. • For assessments: work with Dr. Stephanie Schull & Eddie Merc to review program curriculum map and assessment plan. By 9/19 - Complete curriculum map – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link degree learning outcomes with upper-division course learning outcomes in major. By 9/26 - Complete program assessment plan & learning assessment plan – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show 2 assessments of student learning for each degree learning outcome. Include student work from downtown, MCP, online & classroom course sections. • Create work plan for completing <u>all 10-15 learning assessments & reports</u> by March 1. 10/17, 11/21, 12/12 & 1/16 – Submit progress reports to Dean/Assoc/Asst Dean & Hedlund	2. Start work on Remainder of Program Review Self Study & Report: By 9/12 – Name the team & begin. Name 1-2 faculty to organize the work & complete 1st draft. Suggestion: Consider requirements for program review and the “Academic Program Analysis” for HPU Planning, together to avoid duplication of work on overlapping areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWOT Analysis • Enrollment Analysis, • Analysis of Program Capacity: Curriculum, Faculty & Resources • Program Status Regarding Global Citizenship • Analyses of Program Status Relating to Specific Areas of Quality of Teaching & Learning • Identify possible external reviewers and initial contacts; confirm availability for Spring term. 10/17, 11/21, 12/12 & 1/16 – Submit progress reports to Dean/Assoc Dean & Hedlund

Spring 2011 Schedule
By 2/1 - Faculty meet with program faculty, dean and N. Hedlund to review progress and plan completion and external review. Meeting includes an initial review of the evidence on program capacity and related as well as progress with learning assessments.
By 3/15 - A second meeting to be scheduled as needed for planning improvements and drafting program review recommendations.
By 4/15 - Final draft of the program review is completed, disseminated, and revised as needed.
External reviews are scheduled during Spring term up through June 10 or 15, if possible, or by August 15 at the latest.

Definition of Program Review and Learning Assessment Terms:

1. **Assessment** – Defined as evaluation or appraisal and in universities includes:

- Course learning outcomes (learning assessment)
- Program/university learning outcomes (learning assessment)
- Program assessment (program review)
- Institutional outcomes assessments (using institutional outcome indicators)
- Course evaluations (perception of course quality)
- Teaching quality assessments and peer reviews

2. **Program Curriculum map** – Aligns degree objectives with upper division requirements in the major

Program Curriculum Map

	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Obj 6
Course #						
Course #						
Course #						
Etc.						

3. **Program Learning Assessment plan** –

- identifies 1-2 items of student work from degree requirements to match with each degree outcome (include designation of the courses/sources for that student work)
- resulting plan usually shows a timeline but for fast-track reviews, all to be done in 1 year

Program Learning Assessment Plan

Program Learning Objectives	Key Courses Relevant to Program Objectives (Sources of Student Work for Learning Assessments)	Student Work to be used for Learning Assessments & Method (Papers, exams, portfolios, etc.)
Objective 1.	JADMxxx JADM xyz	Term Paper Case study
Objective 2.	JADM abc JADM frc	Final exam Term Paper
Objective 3.	JADM xxx etc	etc
Objective 4.	etc	etc
Objective 5.	etc	etc
Objective 6	etc	etc

4. **Program Learning Outcomes** –

Same as program learning objectives.

5. **Program goals** usually refers to other planned program achievements, not **learning outcomes**.

Program goals might be retention goals, course evaluation improvement goals, etc.

6. **“2011 Academic Program Analysis”** – Program analysis required of each program for President’s strategic planning process. Has parallels with Program Review requirements. Program reviews should overlap the work with planning, where possible, to avoid duplication of effort.

HPU Program Review	2011 Strategic Planning Program Analysis
See HPU Program Review Guide for details <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning assessments: • SWOT Analysis • Enrollment Analysis, • Analysis of Program Capacity: Curriculum, Faculty & Resources • Program Status Regarding Global Citizenship • Analyses of Program Status Relating to Specific Areas of Quality of Teaching & Learning 	See HPU Planning Guidelines for details on the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Centrality to mission 2. Potential quality of current faculty 3. Demand by majors & service to non-majors 4. Capacity to increase number of majors 5. Facilities, equipment, library holdings 6. Demand for graduates 7. Locational/other advantages re competing programs 8. Community impact

Proposed Fall 2011 Fast-Track Schedule

<p>1. Start the Learning Assessments</p> <p>By 9/12 – Name the Team: Name at least 2 faculty to lead assessment work and adjunct faculty who will help, if appropriate. Make contact with Dr. Stephanie Schull; work with her and Eddie Merc to review/develop curriculum map and assessment plan.</p> <p>By 9/19 - Complete program curriculum map - Link degree learning outcomes with upper-division course learning outcomes in major.</p> <p>By 9/26 - Complete program assessment plan & learning assessments – Work with Dr. Schull & Eddie Merc. Show 2 assessments for each degree learning outcome. Find available student work from current/previous courses. Create work plan to complete assessments & reports by March 1.</p> <p>10/17, 11/21, 12/12 & 1/16 – Submit progress reports to Dean/Assoc/Asst Dean & Hedlund</p>	<p>2. Start work on Remainder of Program Review Self Study & Report:</p> <p>By 9/12 – Name the team & begin. Name 2 people to organize the work and complete the draft.</p> <p>Suggestion: Combine requirements for program review and the HPU Planning “Academic Program Analysis” to avoid duplication of work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWOT Analysis • Enrollment Analysis, • Analysis of Program Capacity: Curriculum, Faculty & Resources • Program Status Regarding Global Citizenship • Analyses of Program Status Relating to Specific Areas of Quality of Teaching & Learning • Identify possible external reviewers and initial contacts; confirm availability for Spring term. <p>10/17, 11/21, 12/12 & 1/16 – Submit progress reports to Dean/Assoc Dean & Hedlund</p>
--	---

Proposed Spring 2011 Fast-Track Schedule

<p>By 2/1 - Faculty meet with program faculty, dean and N. Hedlund to review progress and plan completion and external review. Meeting includes an initial review of the evidence on program capacity and related as well as progress with learning assessments.</p>
<p>By 3/15 - A second meeting to be scheduled as needed for planning improvements and drafting program review recommendations.</p>
<p>By 4/15 - Final draft of the program review is completed, disseminated, and revised as needed.</p>
<p>External reviews are scheduled during Spring term up through June 10 or 15, if possible, or by August 15 at the latest.</p>

Comprehensive Program Review Requirements

1. Program Description, program learning outcomes and goals, relevance to HPU mission.
2. SWOT Analysis: Appraisal of Program Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats
3. Analysis of Program Enrollments & Majors
4. Analysis of Program Capacity: Curriculum, Faculty & Resources
5. Analysis of Student Learning – Summary & analysis of learning assessment results (attach learning assessment results in appendix), assessment methods, and improvements made. Include reference to comparisons with MCP and comparisons between online and classroom learning, if relevant to program.
6. Program Status Regarding HPU Goal: Global Citizenship: What initiatives/actions (if any) are in progress or planned to formally address this strategic priority?
7. Analyses of Program Status Relating to Specific Areas of Quality of Teaching & Learning. Special attention is needed to review of use of high-impact teaching-learning methods in the program – summarize from the program's annual reports: Distance Education; Capstone Courses; Portfolios; Writing/Communication Requirements; Information Literacy; Syllabus Reviews; Student Engagement; Academic Rigor.
8. Major Educational Improvements Made Since Last Review: description of improvement, evidence basis or rationale, intended and actual outcomes, and if linked with program objective or HPU strategic goal.
9. Overall Analysis of Program and Recommendations/Plans for the Future

External Review. The external review follows the comprehensive review and is guided by the policy developed for this review, which is included in this document on pages 15-16.

Comprehensive Program Review Report Requirements. A comprehensive program review should be completed every 5-6 years to assess overall program capacity and educational effectiveness. The review is both an evaluation and a planning process. The intent of the report is to address the following elements in a straightforward way, aiming for simplicity not excessively lengthy explanations where a more simple explanation would work.

Fast tracking the comprehensive program review means that the process is completed in a more compact way. But the review is still conducted within the University's larger culture of evidence. The report should make connections whenever possible to show what evidence has been analyzed and how the evidence and analysis support the conclusions, improvements and/or recommendations.

Support for the annual and comprehensive program reviews can be found in the Program Review Data Portfolio prepared/posted every semester by Institutional Research (IR). In addition, IR staff are available to meet with faculty and conduct additional analyses to support special questions that faculty choose to pursue. (Format for this report is included in this document and posted on PIPELINE.)

The comprehensive review report summarizes and builds on the evidence accumulated in the annual Program Review/ Planning Reports to complete a full analysis of program educational effectiveness. Annual and comprehensive reviews address a series of questions/issues to frame the review and guide the development of recommendations. The report includes:

- 1. Summary of the Program Review.** Brief description of how the program review was conducted: names of participants, lead person, activities completed over time, and culminating meetings held to prepare the report. Briefly explain how faculty participated in the learning assessments and analysis of other student and faculty data to complete the analyses needed for the report. The “Program Review Portfolio” should be referenced and should list each faculty member, background and degrees, what they teach. A summary of the portfolio is sufficient for the report.
- 2. Program Description and History.** Official program description (from the catalogue) and if there is a mission or purpose statement for the program. List the program learning objectives (outcomes). Provide a brief overview of program’s history including last program review and how that review influenced the program, including curriculum directions and program improvements.
- 3. Student Data and Analyses.** Assessment of carrying capacity and program sustainability relative to student enrollment, graduation rates and other indicators of student success including demand/ opportunities for graduates.
- 4. Program Carrying Capacity and Sustainability.** This section should present each capacity area, followed by an overall analysis of the program’s current adequacy relative to its objectives and the future potential of the program to flourish. Includes: Faculty Data and Analyses, Student Data and Analyses, Analysis of Quality of Curriculum and Teaching, Analysis of Learning Resources, Overall Analysis.
- 5. Analysis of Student Learning.** Summarize results of learning assessments (methods, results) as these relate to degree outcomes. Are there themes or core learning issues? Have results been used to make improvements? Have these been effective? Have improvements in assessment methods been made? Reference comparisons of main campus/MCP and between online/ classroom learning, as relevant. to the program. Summarize program’s status regarding HPU’s goal/mission on global citizenship. What initiatives/actions (if any) are planned or have been conducted to formally address this strategic priority? What outcomes have been achieved?
- 6. Program Status Regarding HPU Goal: Global Citizenship:** What initiatives/actions (if any) are in progress or planned to formally address this strategic priority?
- 7. Analyses of Program Status Relating to Specific Areas of Quality of Teaching & Learning:** Distance Education; Capstone Courses; Portfolios: Writing/Communication Requirements; Information Literacy; Syllabus Reviews; Student Engagement; Academic Rigor.
- 8. Major Program Improvements Made Since Last Review.** Describe improvements, evidence basis or rationale, intended and actual outcomes, and if linked with program objective or HPU strategic goal.
- 9. Overall Analysis of Program Including Alignment with Mission & Recommendations/Plans.** Brief summary of overall program strengths and weaknesses, including program relevance to HPU mission and strategic priorities (as appropriate). Include recommendations and long term plans for the program. Plan for the external review.
- 10. Appendices as Needed.** Program Review Portfolio should be up to date.

Follow-up Meeting With Dean and Faculty. A collaborative review of the program review, report, and the external review and recommendations to discuss plan for program improvement. The review includes the Dean, program faculty and Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment in a joint meeting to discuss outcomes of the review and implementation of long-term plans for program improvement. The meeting guideline is included in this document on pages 17-18.

Program Review Council. To be formed in 2011-12. Council will review program reviews and portfolios on periodic basis.

NOTE: Two important upgrades to program review and quality assurance will be implemented starting Fall 2011 (more details to follow):

- a) Student Success initiative – based on WASC requirements for tracking student success.
- b) Lumina degree qualifications framework – starting with two new HPU institutional-level learning outcomes: (1) critical thinking, and (2) communication fluency.



Post Script: This initiative did not lead to the accelerated completion of program reviews that was the goal of the fast-track model. Factors included need for more administrative support, need for more resources to support faculty time, and faculty workload.