<u>Suggestions for Preparing Suggested Summaries of
Recommendations from the ARC to the President</u>

- Do <u>not</u> conduct independent investigations.

- Review the IRC report, EC report and materials on which the IRC members and the EC relied to formulate their reports.

- Compare, evaluate and judge the IRC's and EC's opinions and recommendations.

- On the template provided, propose recommendations that the ARC should make to the President.

    - Where the IRC and EC differ, determine which position the ARC should adopt and report as its recommendation to the President.

        - In doing this, you may want to include commentary in your footnote for that particular recommendation.

            1. For example, the footnote might read something to the effect that:

            "The IRC, at page ** of its report, stated that faculty quality is excellent for this program. The EC, at page ** of his/her report, however, noted that pre-eminent programs in this area have faculty with *** credentials and experience, which this faculty lacks. After considering these divergent views, the ARC makes the above recommendation to the President. "

Possibly the following thoughts might facilitate your preparation. I offer these solely for your reflection. By no means do I intend to tell you what to do.

1. One of the most difficult tasks in preparing the summary and proposal is to ensure we have considered all relevant

comments by both the IRC and EC. What has proven useful is to take each comment by the IRC and place them in the corresponding sections of the proposed summary. For instance, suppose for the first item under Faculty and Faculty Development,

-the IRC comments:

A.   Faculty and Faculty Development

1. The faculty coverage for this program is not sufficient to meet the program's needs. The program has 3 full-time faculty members within the program supported by an additional 44 full-time faculty and 4 full-time/faculty administrators. This entire faculty group covers a wide variety of disciplines. In addition to the full-time faculty, there are also 222 part-time faculty members with unreported disciplines.

   In reviewing the classes covered by the full-time faculty for the fall semester, only 3 of the 51 faculty are currently covering classes within the program under review. Any or all other sections are apparently being taught by part-time faculty. It seems as if students are repeatedly being exposed to the same three full-time faculty members for the majority of their classes. This is not an ideal situation.

   In addition, it appears as if all three of the full-time faculty members within the reviewed specialty teach at least twice the required number of classes, covering the additional sections as 'overload' to their contracts.

and the EC comments:

   "… there are three full-time faculty members supported by other full time faculty and many adjunct lecturers. This is clearly insufficient and may have a distorting effect.

The IRC recommendations are well thought out and valuable. The salient features need to be pursued - especially the following:

- Hiring additional full-time faculty,
- Limiting number of courses taught."

If we were to take each of the above reports' comments and put them in the Proposed Summary Template under Faculty and Faculty Development **AND** take the next step, i.e. —assign one color for the IRC and a different color to the EC—the proposed summary in this section would look something like this:

II. Faculty

*** are sufficient in number for teaching and supervision

*** possess appropriate credentials and expertise for teaching in the field

*** reflect cutting-edge knowledge in their field as evidenced by scholarly involvement and other similar activities

*** reflect evidence of familiarity with effective educational techniques and technology

Specific 'Faculty' Recommendations:

1. The faculty coverage for this program is not sufficient to meet the program's needs. The program has 3 full-time faculty members within the international business program supported by an additional 44 full-time faculty and 4 full-time/faculty administrators. This entire faculty group covers a wide variety of business disciplines. In addition to the full-time faculty, there are also 222 part-time faculty members with unreported disciplines.

   In reviewing the classes covered by the full-time faculty for the fall semester, only 3 of the 51 faculty are currently covering

classes within the program under review. Any or all other sections are apparently being taught by part-time faculty. It seems as if students are repeatedly being exposed to the same three full-time faculty members for the majority of their classes. This is not an ideal situation.

In addition, it appears as if all three of the full-time faculty members within the reviewed specialty teach at least twice the required number of classes, covering the additional sections as 'overload' to their contracts.

 "… there are three full-time faculty members supported by other full time faculty and many adjunct lecturers. This is clearly insufficient and may have a distorting effect.

The IRC recommendations are well thought out and valuable. The salient features need to be pursued - especially the following:

- Hiring additional full-time MIBA faculty,
- Limiting number of courses taught.

Perhaps this process makes it easier to compare what the two have said and to determine their agreements or disagreements? Then we could determine what piece(s) of the above we want to keep in the recommendation section and how much to put in the footnote, in addition to the usual cites to the reports and pages. Of course, we would turn all the print black, one we decided what pieces we were keeping in the recommendations and the footnotes.

2. The second focus reflects on what to do if the IRC and EC disagree. Essentially, we could just refer to the rationale used for the opinion that seems more persuasive and use that rationale to explain why we chose that evaluation. It might help, also, to note in the footnote what the other (disagreeing) reviewer(s) said and identify where that could be found in that respective report.

<u>**Academic Program Review Evaluation Standards**</u>
<u>**And Possible Considerations**</u>

NOTE: **The numbered [e.g., 1)] possible considerations following each bold printed main topic we address for academic program review are provided simply as suggested points to consider. Committee members are free to and encouraged to identify and utilize all other considerations they deem relevant, rather than feel bound by these.**

I. Curriculum

In determining whether Curriculum is managed by a group of identified faculty who are assigned the responsibility of regular curriculum review and development, some points to consider might be:

1) whether the collaborative efforts of identified faculty with expertise in the curriculum are involved in the curriculum development.
2) whether regular curriculum review and development occurs regularly.
3) whether a process for curriculum development involves stakeholders in the curriculum content.
4) whether a defined system is used to guide faculty and administrators in the application of the curriculum.
5) whether there is a program coordinator listed for each program with discipline specific credentials.
6) whether the curriculum committee meets formally and regularly.
7) whether the curriculum committee:
   a. publishes its deliberations, recommendations and minutes, to all of the center's faculty and administration.
   b. stores indexes of all curriculum committee meetings' minutes.
8) whether information gathered from current students, graduates and their employers regarding student learning outcomes is used in revision and design.

In determining whether Curriculum provides for adequate coverage of all applicable licensure, certification, etc. requirements, some points to consider might be:

9) whether the program is eligible for applicable licensure, certification, etc. requirements.
10) whether applicable licensure, certification, etc. requirements been attained or the curriculum meets/exceeds guidelines and standards of the discipline.
11) whether the curriculum addresses applicable interdisciplinary guidelines.
12) whether professional development, training, and materials for curriculum development are readily available to faculty members.

In determining whether Curriculum is well organized with clear objectives, requirements, assignments, and grading procedures, some points to consider might be:

13) whether the curriculum is based on clearly delineated learning outcomes and is well organized to enable students to achieve those outcomes.
14) whether requirements, assignments, and grading procedures are communicated to students and readily accessible.
15) whether course objectives relate clearly and directly to program's student learning outcomes.
16) whether there are direct measures regularly collected to assess student learning outcomes.

In determining whether Curriculum employs effective educational technology in its delivery, some points to consider might be:

17) whether effective educational technology has been identified in light of the stated learning outcomes and whether an identification of the instructional methodologies most likely to assist the students in achieving those outcomes.
18) whether identified educational technology is available for faculty use, the faculty are trained appropriately to use the technology effectively, and there is a system in place to evaluate each faculty member's use of the technology.
19) whether applicable technology is available for student use , the students are trained appropriately to use the technology

effectively, and there is a system in place to evaluate each student's use of the technology.

20) whether application of educational technology is based upon known and evaluated pedagogy appropriate to the program of study.

21) whether evaluation of the educational technology is based upon accurate and documented standards, if any.

II. Faculty

In determining whether Faculty are sufficient in number for teaching and supervision, some points to consider might be:

22) whether a valid and reliable system is in place that effectively identifies the number of faculty needed for teaching, supervision, mentoring.

23) whether there is a reliable and valid system to determine faculty equivalents.

24) whether full time faculty is sufficient for teaching, supervision, scholarship, and oversight of adjuncts.

25) whether there's documentation of an assessment of the sufficiency of faculty for teaching and supervision of the curriculum.

26) whether faculty with teaching assignments in other departments and/or disciplines are reflected in faculty ratios.

27) whether the number of faculty is based on prior determinations of student learning outcomes and empirically effective methods of instruction.

In determining whether Faculty possess appropriate credentials and expertise for teaching in the field, some points to consider might be:

28) whether the program has a credentialing process that reviews academic degrees, qualifications, and experiences that ensure quality teaching in the discipline.

29) whether the faculty possess degrees, qualifications, and experiences that ensure quality teaching in the discipline.

30) whether faculty members possess appropriate credentials and expertise for supervision.

In determining whether Faculty reflect cutting-edge knowledge in their field as evidenced by scholarly involvement and other similar activities, some points to consider might be:

31) whether faculty engage in scholarship publication.
32) whether the scholarship is of acceptable quality and contributes to the field.
33) whether scholarship relates to faculty members supervision.
34) whether scholarly involvement is in peer reviewed publications widely recognized by experts in the program's substantive areas as quality publications.

In determining whether Faculty reflect evidence of familiarity with effective educational techniques and technology, some points to consider might be:

35) whether educational techniques have been determined by faculty members trained and experienced in instructional methodology.
36) whether faculty have been trained in the effective use of educational technology.
37) whether faculty members' instructional procedures reflect regular and effective use of educational techniques and technology appropriate to curriculum and student learning outcomes.
38) whether there are processes in place to evaluate instruction and educational techniques and those processes are the result of faculty collaboration involving those trained in and having expertise in instructional methodology and educational technology.

III. Students

In determining whether Students are selected based on measureable standards that reflect aptitude to perform in the program, some points to consider might be:

39) whether faculty are involved in determining appropriate admission's criteria.
40) whether the admission's criteria are related to the likelihood of success in the program.
41) whether the criteria are selected based on empirically identified student learning outcomes and studies evidencing students most likely to achieve those outcomes.

In determining whether Students are effectively tracked and provided ongoing advisement/counseling through the program, some points to consider might be:

42) whether students are provided appropriate advisement/counseling by faculty.
43) whether students are provided appropriate advisement/counseling by program advisors.
44) whether students are advised/counseled based upon a documented process that is appropriate for the program's curriculum.
45) whether students are advised/counseled based upon a documented process that is appropriate to students' needs and the program's student learning outcomes.

In determining whether Students are tracked after graduation and are regularly 'placed' in settings (job, advanced education, etc.) that are consistent with program goals, some points to consider might be:

46) whether alumni data is utilized to ensure curriculum quality and improvement.

In determining whether Students routinely achieve the Student Outcomes that have been established by the program, some points to consider might be:

47) whether the process of evaluation exists to determine poor performance due to lower quality entrance criteria.
48) whether student learning outcomes are based upon empirical studies of learning outcomes driven by the program's field.

49) whether there are direct measures regularly collected regarding student achievement for each program learning outcome.
50) whether analysis and interpretation of student achievement data leads to actions for improvement.

In determining whether Students actively participate in faculty scholarship/research, some points to consider might be:

51) whether scholarship/research participation is appropriate for the program.
52) whether the curriculum is built to involve student participation.
53) whether opportunities are made effectively available to students.

IV. Educational Support Services

In determining whether Educational Support Services faculty development opportunities are provided to all levels of faculty, some points to consider might be:

54) whether the program has a functional system by which to determine what opportunities to provide appropriately and sufficiently for faculty development.
55) whether the faculty are included in the process to determine needed and/or appropriate faculty development.
56) whether sufficient time is allotted for faculty participation in development opportunities.

In determining whether educational support is provided through availability of technology, library resources, and other similar services, some points to consider might be:

57) whether the available technology, library resources and other similar services adequately support the effective instructional methodologies when considering the student learning outcomes and curriculum.

In determining whether administrative services such as course registration, financial aid, career counseling, etc. are routinely available, some points to consider might be:

58) whether the administrative services adequately support the effective instructional methodologies when considering the student learning outcomes and curriculum.

In determining whether faculty and administrators are routinely available to students as mentors and problem solvers, some points to consider might be:

59) whether faculty and administrators regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the availability based on student needs.

V. Program Missions and Operation

In determining whether Program Missions and Operation are consistent and compatible with University mission, goals, and objectives, some points to consider might be:

60) whether the program has mission, vision, goals, etc readily available, are published, are appropriate for the college and/or department and are consistent with NSU's.

In determining whether Program Missions and Operation avoid redundancy with other University programs and activities, some points to consider might be:

61) whether the program has mission, vision, goals, etc are based upon a comparative process that determines the uniqueness of the program.
62) whether the process is reevaluated on yearly basis to avoid redundancy.

In determining whether Program Missions and Operation reflect collaborative efforts with other University Centers, Schools, and Colleges, some points to consider might be:

63) whether a process exists that illustrates the program's current involvement with other University entities.

64) whether the process is reevaluated on yearly basis to extend relationships.

In determining whether Program Missions and Operation functions cooperatively with University Academic compliance offices (i.e., IE and Academic Review), some points to consider might be:

65) whether a process exists that illustrates this involvement and details the level of cooperation.
66) whether the process is reevaluated on a yearly basis.