****

 ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

 Procedures for Submitting

the

 Review Advisory Panel Report

The purpose of review of academic units is to assure quality academic programs through periodic assessment of their strengths and weaknesses. To this end, reviewers are asked to review the unit in terms of research, teaching, the quality of academic programs, the quality of students, faculty professional service, and resources.

The Review Advisory Panel report is used as a basis for future planning for the unit. A meeting is held between the Provost, line dean and unit administrator to discuss the issues raised in the internal and external reports. From this, a written plan of action is developed and implemented. An annual progress report is required from the unit as to the status of completing the *Action Plan*.

**Structure of the Report**

While each unit is unique and each report will capture different information, it would be helpful to construct the report in the following way:

1. Title page. Please refer to the sample attached.

2. Introduction. Information on the days of the site visit, the make-up of the evaluation team, a brief account of the site visit and an explanation of the organization of the report should be included in this section.

3. Discussion & Analysis. The Provost has provided a series of questions related to each of the topics above (attached). While questions do not have to be addressed individually--unless it is appropriate to do so--it is important that the general themes are covered comprehensively.

4. Summary. This section lists the strengths and weaknesses of the unit.

5. Recommendations. Recommendations for alleviating the weaknesses of the unit as well as any advice the evaluators wish to convey to the unit or administration should be made here.

6. Please avoid:

\* Lengthy quotes from the self-study documents.

\* Characterizations of individuals, positive or negative. Please note that all documents associated with Academic Program Review are subject to Freedom of Information Act requests. If a decision is made to include information of a personal nature in the report, individuals should be mentioned by position title only.

**Process for Submitting the Report:**

1. Please submit your evaluation report within three weeks of the site visit. Please send an electronic copy to the Academic Program Review Office at apr@wayne.edu. We do not require a signed, paper copy.

2. A joint report is preferred. Separate reports should only be considered if there is insufficient agreement on the findings. Please note the cause for the differing opinions.

Thank you again for your work on behalf of Wayne State University.

**SAMPLE**  **SAMPLE**

 Evaluation Report

 for the

 Program/Department of X

 WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

 Detroit Michigan

 DATE

 **Evaluation Team**

Name, Position

Name, Position

Name, Position

## Questions from the Provost for Academic Program Review

1. Mission and Strategic Plan. Summarize the progress, strengths, procedures, and opportunities for improvement in the areas of mission and strategic planning.
	1. Assess the department’s mission and strategic plan, including its progress toward achieving the plan’s goals and processes for refining and updating the plan.
	2. Identify how the department’s mission and plan aligns with the University’s mission and goals.
	3. Identify how academic program assessment informs the department’s mission and strategic planning.
2. Management Operations. Summarize the progress, strengths, procedures, and opportunities for improvement in the area of management operations.
	1. Determine whether the department has a defined organizational structure that includes processes for review, evaluation, and improvement.
	2. Determine whether the organizational structure is appropriate for the size, mission and strategic plan of the department.
3. Academic Programs. Summarize the progress, strengths, procedures and opportunities for improvement in the academic programs.
	1. Evaluate whether departmental academic programs meet disciplinary standards.
	2. Evaluate whether academic programs are adequately structured to meet student needs.
	3. Identify the department’s program assessment processes for reviewing, benchmarking, updating, and improving academic programs.
	4. Describe the quality and functionality of program assessment methods and results.
	5. Identify the ways and degree to which the program uses assessment results for program improvement.
4. Faculty. Summarize the strengths, and opportunities for improvement of the faculty.
	1. Assess the quality of the faculty.
	2. Determine the level and quality of research and research funding.
	3. Evaluate the publication records of the faculty.
	4. Evaluate the service profile of the faculty.
	5. Identify and evaluate efforts to support and mentor new and junior faculty.
	6. Summarize the department’s progress in faculty recruiting.
	7. Assess the on-going processes for evaluating faculty performance over time.
5. Students. Summarize the progress, strengths, and opportunities for improvement of graduate and undergraduate students.
	1. Identify and evaluate efforts to support students in the areas of advising, mentoring and academic success.
	2. Summarize the department’s progress in student recruiting and retention
	3. Determine whether the department has a defined and effective process for assisting students in job placement.
	4. Determine whether the department has a defined and effective process for training and monitoring Graduate Teaching Assistants.
	5. Determine whether the department has a defined and effective process for providing opportunities for research collaboration.
6. External Relations. Summarize the progress, strengths, and opportunities for improvement in the areas of external relations.
	1. Assess the department’s identification of key internal and external constituents and its progress in developing relationships between constituencies and the department to advance its mission.
	2. Evaluate the department’s development and fund raising efforts.

Conclusions:

1. What are the major strengths of the research/creative activities program in the department? In its academic programs?
2. What are the major weaknesses in the research/creative activities program in the department? In its academic programs?