Self-Study Requirements for Academic Program Review
(Updated AY 2021)

The UCC Program Review process serves two intertwined purposes: to satisfy Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) and Higher Learning Commission (HLC) requirements for the accreditation of programs and to assist academic units in their strategic planning. Program Reviews completed in a timely manner ensure that 1) the UCC may determine the viability of a program based on current information, and 2) that the Department, College and University have current and complete information when planning and making decisions.

Instructions: Please include all of the information requested below.

Although the main part of the self-study is a narrative, the use of tables, figures, or other representations is allowed, if deemed appropriate.

The narrative section is to be followed by an appendix. You may include appendices as needed, making sure to reference each one in the narrative section.

Note that responses should address all curricular components of the program (Teaching, Research, and Service), whether offered at the Athens campus, regional campuses, or through E-learning.

The smallest unit of review is a program but is more often a group of programs. At the Athens Campus, this could be a Department, School, or College but at a Regional Campus may be a degree program or group of programs. Regardless, all reviews will address all requirements, and frequently the word "program" will refer to the Department, School, or College. The review is intended to be holistic.

While much of the required data is to be collected from within the department and/or college, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Analytics may provide some data support. Please see the end of this documents for more information.

Accreditation data may be substituted where appropriate as determined by the UCC Program Review Committee (PRC). Data not available or not gathered for the accreditation process will need to be submitted. Accredited programs should meet with the PRC Chair early in the process to determine how accreditation materials will be used.

Once complete, the self-study and appendices should be submitted electronically to the PRC Chair. **The deadline for the self-study is September 15.**

Narrative Sections of the Self-Study

1. **General Summary**
   a. What are the history, development, and expectations of the program?
   b. What are the most significant overall trends for the program since the last review? This could include an increase or decrease in faculty; a change in type of student enrolled; a shift of emphasis on research areas; an increase in courses offered to non-Athens-based students or online, etc.
   c. How do these changes interact with the historical context of the program?

2. **Faculty Profile** (CVs are to be included in the Appendix.)
   a. How has the composition of the faculty changed since the last review? (For example, number, diversity, concentration in RSCA areas, tenure-track faculty to instructional faculty ratio, undergraduate/graduate faculty, if applicable.)
   b. Which criteria drive the hiring of new faculty? (For example, concentration in one specialty or broad coverage? Tenure-track faculty vs. instructional faculty? How does the program ensure and sustain a diverse faculty? How does the University support a diverse faculty in this discipline? Does the faculty diversity reflect that of the students?)
   c. How does the faculty profile compare to benchmark programs? Are faculty resources sufficient to fulfill the program mission?
   d. What is the typical percentage of time that tenure-track faculty are expected to devote to teaching, advising and supervision of research (undergraduate/masters/doctoral), RSCA, and service? How is this determined? If applicable, specify whether and how this differs for undergraduate and graduate faculty.

3. **Educational Quality (Undergraduate)**
   What is the quality of teaching and learning at the undergraduate level?
   Data to include: Faculty WSCH, ratio of tenure-track faculty to instructional faculty teaching courses, typical teaching loads, class sizes, student enrollment data including application rate and diversity, time to degree, and student assessment data appropriate to the discipline. Include data on your programs and courses taught at different locations and online.
   a. Whom do you serve?
      i. What is the current student population?
      ii. How has that population changed since the last review?
      iii. How has the program responded to any changes in student population?
      iv. What are the expectations for student advising, and how are those expectations communicated to faculty and students?
      v. How is advising being assessed?

    vi.   How have findings from advising assessment been used to make improvements in advising since the last review?

    vii.   What trends in student success (retention rates, course completion rates, graduation rates, etc.) have emerged since the last review?

    viii.   If the program uses graduate students to teach undergraduate courses, how are those graduate students trained, mentored, and supervised?

    ix.   If courses are offered to non-Athens-based students, how is quality assured?

b. What and how should students learn?

    i.   What are the learning outcomes of the program?

    ii.   How does the program support and reward professional development in pedagogy for the faculty?

    iii.   How does the program contribute to general education?

c. How do you know what students have learned?

    i.   How is student achievement of learning outcomes measured?

    ii.   What evidence (direct and indirect) does the program have to support that students are achieving learning outcomes?

    iii.   How are the findings from these assessments being used to make improvements in the program related to student learning?

    iv.   How does the curriculum support the learning outcomes?

    v.   What measures does the program use to assess the curriculum?

    vi.   How are the findings from curricular assessment used to make improvements in the curriculum since the last review? Which areas still need improvement?

    vii.   How are co-curricular activities (learning communities, student research/creative activity, internships, education abroad, etc.) integrated into the curriculum?

    viii.   What innovative teaching methods are being used to support students' achievement of the learning outcomes?

    ix.   What measures does the program use to assess its teaching methods? How are the findings from these assessments being used to make improvements in teaching methods since the last review?

    x.   What is the effectiveness of the program as indicated by student research awards, the placement of students (in careers, internships, graduate programs, etc.) or other measures appropriate to the discipline?

4. **Educational Quality (graduate)**
    What is the quality of the teaching and learning at the graduate level?
    Data to include: number of Faculty and total WSCH, typical teaching loads, advising loads, number of graduate research and teaching assistantships, tuition waivers, evidence of original student research (at doctoral level), student enrollment data including application rate and diversity, time to degree, predominant employment of graduates within three to five years of graduation, and student assessment data appropriate to the

discipline. Include data on your programs and courses taught at different locations and online.

a. Whom do you serve?
   i. What is the current graduate student population?
   ii. How has that population changed since the last review?
   iii. How has the program responded to any changes in student population?
   iv. What are the expectations for graduate student advising, including doctoral advising, and how are those expectations communicated to faculty and students?
   v. How is advising being assessed?
   vi. How have findings from advising assessment been used to make improvements in advising since the last review?
   vii. How does the program provide professional mentoring for graduate students (e.g., career opportunities inside and outside academia)?
   viii. What improvements have been made to the program that correlate with increased graduate student success?
   ix. What methods are used to assure quality and continuity of the curriculum, courses, faculty at main campus, online, at regional campuses, and all other places or modes of delivery?
   x. What percentage of graduate students is supported through teaching and research assistantships, and what is a typical research or teaching load?

b. What and how should students learn?
   i. What are the learning outcomes of the program?
   ii. How does the program support and reward professional development in pedagogy and curricular development for the faculty?

c. How do you know what students have learned?
   i. How is student achievement of learning outcomes measured?
   ii. What evidence (direct and indirect) does the program have to support that students are achieving learning outcomes?
   iii. How is the program using the findings from these assessments to make improvements to student learning?
   iv. How does the curriculum support the learning outcomes?
   v. How were the findings from curricular assessment used to make improvements in the curriculum since the last review? Which areas still need improvement?
   vi. How is student research/scholarship/creative activity supported and integrated into the curriculum?
   vii. What is the effectiveness of the program as indicated by student research awards, the placement of graduates in discipline-appropriate careers, or for Master's programs, placement into doctoral programs, or other measures appropriate to the discipline? How does the program meet the needs of the region, state, and nation? What have graduates of the program done to generate new knowledge or

new initiatives in industry, teaching, public service, and/or other practice? How satisfied are recent graduates with advising, teaching, and program support services?

5. **Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA)**
   What is the quality, visibility, and impact of the program's research, scholarship, and creative activity?
   Data to include: worksheet to tally RSCA activities for each faculty member over the study period; summarize student activities; external support (a summary of external support during the review period, e.g., number of grants and external awards, the total amount of external funding); significant professional service that increases the visibility of the program; other measures appropriate to the discipline.
   a. What is the program's research strategy?
      i. Describe the program's view of the importance of RSCA to the mission of the program.
      ii. What is the priority and value of different forms of RSCA, consistent with the program's mission?
      iii. Which activities are viewed as important (e.g., performances, portfolios, basic research, contributions to practice, external sponsored research and/or learning and pedagogical research teaching contributions)?
      iv. What are the RSCA expectations for individual faculty members to meet the standards of the program? Explain any variations in expectations (e.g., for undergraduate/graduate faculty).
      v. What are the RSCA opportunities and expectations for students in the program?
   b. How does the program support, develop, and reward faculty RSCA?
   c. How does the program support and reward interdisciplinary RSCA?

6. **Service**
   a. University Service
      i. What level of university service is expected of faculty?
      ii. How does the program contribute to the university community in ways not described above?
   b. Professional Service
      i. What level of professional service is expected of faculty?
      ii. How do faculty contribute to their professional communities in ways not described above?
   c. Community Engagement
      i. How does the program define its public mission? (Public service also includes technology transfer, culture, or anything that provides tangible benefits to broader local, regional, national, and international non-university communities.)

ii. How does the program track and improve community outreach and engagement?
    iii. How does the program's community engagement specifically benefit the State of Ohio?

7. **Areas for Improvement:** Formulate an action plan to address the main areas for improvement before the next review.
   a. Who will oversee this process?
   b. What are the benchmarks for reporting progress?

Data Support

Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA), formerly Institutional Research & Effectiveness, can provide some data support for programs completing a self-study through the Academic Review Process. There are five distinct sources of support that IEA provides to departments, schools or programs completing their self-studies:

1. Academic Program Review OBIEE Reports
2. IEA Website Sources
3. Analytics & Decision Support (ADS) (under development)
4. Assessment Clearinghouse
5. OHIO Outcomes

For detailed information about the data support that IEA provides specifically for the Academic Program Review Self-Study process, please see [IEA Support of the Academic Program Review Self-Study](#).

Staff Support
While our data sources are designed to be self-service, IEA also offers staff support for the Academic Program Review Self-Study process. Whether you have questions about any of our data sources or need assistance using one of the IEA OBIEE reports, please reach out to Joni Wadley, Senior Director for Institutional Effectiveness by email or Microsoft Teams at schallej@ohio.edu or by phone at (740) 593-1054.

IEA Data Orientation
In addition, IEA offers one-on-one data orientation sessions specific to the Academic Program Review Self-Study process to help one person from each program become familiar with our data sources, learn how and where to access them, and manipulate data within OBIEE. These sessions can be scheduled anytime from April to September prior to the self-study deadline, but to ensure enough time for all programs to have the opportunity to participate, we need the programs to identify one person to Joni Wadley by **April 1**. Once this person is identified, Joni will work with that person to schedule their session at their convenience.