



2022 Assessment Institute in Indianapolis

Program Review: Purposes, Perspectives, and Processes

Caleb J. Keith and Stephen P. Hundley

Workshop Objectives

1. Identify the purposes and significance of program review
2. Describe various processes to program review
3. Recognize perspectives of various roles related to program review
4. Reflect on, plan for, and/or improve program review options in your own institutional context



Workshop Outline

1. Introductions and Context
2. Program Review: Purposes
3. Program Review: Processes
4. Preliminary Q&A
5. Break
6. Program Review: Perspectives
7. Action Planning and Conclusion
8. Discussion and Q&A



Introductions

Caleb J. Keith

Director of Institutional Improvement
Track Leader and Organizer of the Assessment Institute
Associate Editor, *Assessment Update*
Producer, *Leading Improvements in Higher Education* Podcast
IUPUI

Stephen P. Hundley

Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement,
Professor of Organizational Leadership
Chair of the Assessment Institute
Executive Editor of *Assessment Update*
Host of *Leading Improvements in Higher Education* Podcast
IUPUI



Quick Audience Introductions

How many colleagues are from 2-year institutions?
4-year institutions?

How many colleagues teach exclusively at the graduate or professional level?

How many colleagues are in programs that are accredited by a discipline-specific body?

How many colleagues have been working with program review for 5 or more years?
How many colleagues are new to program review?



Small Group Discussion and Report-Outs

In small groups, choose:

Timekeeper, Scribe, and Spokesperson

Answer the following questions:

What is your definition of program review?

Why is program review important?

What questions do you have concerning program review?



Program Review: Purposes

Program Review Purposes

- Improvement
- Accountability
- Though not mutually exclusive
- Overview of evaluation models: Input, Connoisseur, Goal-Based, and Hybrid (each explained on the following slides)



Input

- Reputational
- Rankings
- Resources

- Disadvantage: doesn't look at impact of the institution on student learning



Connoisseur

- Relies on an outside evaluator
- Possible disadvantage: could have missed opportunities to collaborate internally



Goal-Based

- Goals clarified
- Indicators are defined
- Achievement data collected
- Results compared to pre-set criteria
- Disadvantage: used alone, can omit important unintended outcomes; the *appropriateness* of goals are not assessed



Hybrid Approach

- Evaluates both goals and processes
- Leverages the benefits of prior models



We Know the WHAT But What About the ...

When

- Reoccurring?
- Screening?

Why

- Formative?
- Summative?

Who

- Internal?
- External?
- Combination?



When

- Reoccurring Model (Cycle)
 - All departments are put on a 5-, 7-, 9-year cycle
- Screening Model
 - Data is reviewed for all departments and based upon results departments are flagged for a comprehensive review
 - Indicators such as enrollment drops, lack of critical mass of faculty, loss of accreditation, and lack of evidence that goals are being accomplished trigger a review



Why

- Formative
 - Improving programs, generally internal
- Summative
 - Accreditation, generally external
- Why not Both?
 - Coordinate mandatory summative reviews for accreditation with formative internal reviews



Who

- External peer reviewer
- Internal reviewers
- Again, why not both?
 - Look to your mission and strategic plan for the answer
 - How does the mission and strategic plan inform program review?



Using Results from Program Review (some examples)

- Matching money from graduate school to fund public scholars
- Faculty encouraged to go up for promotion and/or tenure
- New deans review findings with department chairs to better understand the department and to clarify goals
- Program creation or expansion (or new tracks/specializations)



Using Results from Program Review (some examples—continued)

- Reorganization of departments
- Reallocation of resources
- Dean of IT on a team took action based upon meeting with students
- Faculty member from another department discovered avenues of collaboration



Using Results from Program Review (some examples—continued)

- Reorganization of departments
- Reallocation of resources
- Dean of IT on a team took action based upon meeting with students
- Faculty member from another department discovered avenues of collaboration



Important role of Peer Reviewers in Program Review

- Throughout 2022, the theme of our Editors' Notes in *Assessment Update* has been: "Peer Review in Assessment and Improvement: Five Principles to Promote Effective Practice."
- Peer review has long been used in the higher education sector to serve a variety of purposes and meet the needs of several audiences.
- Activities supportive of assessment and improvement—such as Program Review—rely on peers to enhance cultures of evidence and learning



Principle #1, Recognize the Purpose of the Peer Review Process in Higher Education Assessment and Improvement

- Defining peer review
- Identifying appropriate peers
- Understanding the strengths and challenges to peer review processes



Principle #2, Value the Multitude of Perspectives, Contexts, and Methods Related to Assessment and Improvement

- Understanding perspectives
- Acknowledging contexts
- Employing appropriate methods



Principle #3, Adopt a Consultative Approach to the Peer Review Process

- Determining how a consultant differs from other forms of peer review roles
- Engaging in the consultative process
- Recognizing considerations for consultants



Principle #4, Make Effective Judgements Using Inclusive Sources and Credible Evidence

- Seeking inclusive sources for the review process
- Using credible evidence
- Attending to the purpose, scope, and context of the review



Principle #5, Provide Relevant Feedback to Stakeholders

- Identifying how and by whom feedback will be used
- Determining the timing and nature of feedback
- Developing action-oriented recommendations, observations, and considerations



Program Review: Processes

Consider

- 1. What is your institutional context?**
- 2. What does Program Review look like at your institution?**
 - What is the purpose?**
 - What is the frequency?**
 - Who is involved?**
 - What steps are involved?**



IUPUI's Context

IUPUI is Indiana's **urban research** and **academic health sciences campus**.

IUPUI's mission is to advance the State of Indiana and the intellectual growth of its citizens to the highest levels nationally and internationally through **research and creative activity, teaching and learning, and civic engagement**.



Overview of Program Review

1. Centrally-sponsored evaluation activity that is improvement-oriented
2. Focus is on the program
3. Pledge to Higher Learning Commission of our commitment to ongoing review



Program Review Process at IUPUI



Phase 1: Planning

1. Cohort kickoff meeting
2. Program identifies a list of potential reviewers
3. Reviewers are invited to participate





Phase 1: Planning			
Ideal Timeframe	Item/Action	Submit to	Who is Responsible/Involved
12 months before visit	Schedule meeting to plan review for each Program Review “cohort” Share “Purpose and Process of Program Review” document at meeting	School Dean/Vice Chancellor (or designee) and Department Chair/Program Leader	Director of Institutional Improvement and Program Review Coordinator
12 months before visit	Send Program Review self-study elements and suggested reviewer list (including current roster of PRAC members) following kick-off/planning meeting Request dates to consider for the review and list of potential reviewers Offer to have Director of Institutional Improvement (co-)facilitate self-study brainstorming session with department/unit	Department Chair/Program Leader	Director of Institutional Improvement and Program Review Coordinator
12 months before visit	Schedule individual program-specific meeting to discuss timelines and expectations	Department Chair/Program Leader and Director of Institutional Improvement	Program Review Coordinator
12 months before visit	Review list of potential reviewers with Dean/Vice Chancellor (Dean/VC to appoint IUPUI internal reviewers); Dean/VC signs off on list of potential reviewers	Dean/Vice Chancellor (or designee)	Department Chair/Program Leader
12 months before visit	Send department description, list of potential reviewers, and potential dates for the review	Program Review Coordinator	Department Chair/Program Leader
12 months before visit	Invite reviewer participation by email	Potential Reviewers	Program Review Coordinator
12 months before visit	Send email confirmation to Review Team members	Review Team Members	Program Review Coordinator



Phase 2: Development

1. **Self-study development**
2. **Development of schedule, in concert with program director**



Self-Study Development

- Self-Study Elements Documents
- Strategic Consultation from PAII
- Cross-campus collaboration and data gathering



Program Reviews

Program Review at IUPUI is a collaborative process designed to bring to bear the judgment of respected colleagues in assessing and improving the quality of academic units, student affairs and co-curricular units, and research centers and institutes. The Program Review process involves multiple stakeholders, including students, faculty, community members, school and campus administrators, and external specialists in the field or discipline.

Examples of Department Self Study

- [Center for Enhancing Quality of Life in Chronic Illness \(CEQL\) - May 14, 2021](#)
- [Communication Studies - March 8-9, 2021](#)
- [Counseling & Psychological Services \(CAPS\) - April 19-20, 2021](#)
- [English - February 22-23, 2021](#)
- [Tourism, Event, and Sport Management \(TESM\) - April 22-23, 2021](#)

Resources

- [Academic Program Review Self-Study Elements](#)
- [Center and Institute Program Review Self-Study Elements](#)
- [Student Affairs and Cocurricular Programs and Services Program Review Self-Study Elements](#)
- [Program Review Self-Study Elements and Data Sources Quick Guide](#)
- [Departments Reviewed and Team Members](#)
- [IUPUI Program Review Considerations in Selecting a Review Team](#)
- [IUPUI Program Review Schedule Examples](#)
- [IUPUI Program Review Timeline](#)



Phase 3: Site Visit

1. Review team orientation
2. Review team conducts site visit
3. Review team sends final report



Phase 4: Reaction

1. **PAll has meeting with program to process report and engage in planning**
2. **Program creates an action plan**
3. **PAll provides assistance through the process**



Phase 5: Implementation

1. Program reports on implementation of improvements
2. Program connects with Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) representatives for inclusion of information in subsequent PRAC report
3. Program invited to participate in Program Review Panel at PRAC meetings



Consider

- 1. What is your institutional context? How does your institutional context inform your Program Review process?**
- 2. What does Program Review look like at your institution?**



Preliminary Questions and Break

- What questions do you have?
- What can we clarify?

~BREAK~



Program Review: Perspectives

Perspectives

- **Concerns, challenges, and expectations perceived by:**
 - Faculty
 - Chairs
 - Deans and academic leaders
 - Campus administrators



Panelists

Kristine Brunovska Karnick

Associate Professor and Chair of Communication Studies
Founding Director, Program in Applied Theatre, Film, and Television

A. Sonia Ninon

Director of Research Planning and DEI Evaluation

Stephen P. Hundley

Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement
Professor of Organizational Leadership



Action Planning and Conclusion

Small Group Discussions and Report-Outs

In small groups, choose:

- *Timekeeper, Scribe, and Spokesperson*

Think about Program Review in your own institutional context:

What are the present strengths? What are the present weaknesses?

What are the future opportunities? What are the future threats?

What actions emerge from SWOT Analysis?

What are the roadblocks to implementing program review at your institution?

What are possible next steps for implementing/adapting program review at your institution?



Discussion and Q&A

Discussion and Q&A

Questions or comments about Program Review?

What recommendations or suggestions do you have?



Contact Information

Caleb J. Keith

Director of Institutional Improvement
cakeith@iupui.edu

Stephen P. Hundley

Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement,
Professor of Organizational Leadership
shundley@iupui.edu





2022 Assessment Institute in Indianapolis

Program Review: Purposes, Perspectives, and Processes

Caleb J. Keith and Stephen P. Hundley

Workshop Facilitators
Caleb J. Keith, Ph.D. and Stephen P. Hundley, Ph.D.
Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement, IUPUI (planning.iupui.edu)

Caleb J. Keith, Ph.D. (cakeith@iupui.edu)

Caleb J. Keith, Ph.D., is Director of Institutional Improvement at IUPUI, an urban-serving institution with 30,000 students. He works in the Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement, directing the Program Review process, supporting IUPUI's Program Review and Assessment Committee, providing internal consulting services to support change management processes, analyzing trends and producing periodic reports, collaborating with the Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and other campus leaders on strategic projects, representing the Office to various campus and external constituencies, and making intellectual contributions through professional venues.

Caleb is associate editor of *Assessment Update*, an award-winning, bimonthly publication from Wiley with a national readership, and he serves as a producer of *Leading Improvements in Higher Education*, an award-winning podcast profiling people, initiatives, institutions, and organizations improving conditions in higher education. Caleb also serves the higher education community as a reviewer for the *Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry* and as a member of the Higher Learning Commission Peer Corps.

He has addressed a variety of audiences on three continents and throughout the United States. He writes, consults, and presents on topics related to student affairs and co-curricular learning, assessment and evaluation, educational research, strategic planning, and higher education administration.

Prior to IUPUI, Caleb served in positions at Millikin University, the Qatar Foundation (now Hamad bin Khalifa University), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech), the University of Georgia, and University of the Ozarks. He earned a Bachelor of Music in commercial music and music business and a Bachelor of Arts in communication from Millikin University in Decatur, IL. He received a Master of Education in college student affairs administration from the University of Georgia and his doctoral degree from the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia in Athens, GA.

Stephen P. Hundley, Ph.D. (shundley@iupui.edu)

Stephen Hundley, Ph.D., is the Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement at IUPUI, an urban-serving institution with 30,000 students. He is a Professor of Organizational Leadership within the Department of Technology Leadership and Communication in IUPUI's School of Engineering and Technology. Stephen provides strategic advice and consultation to the Chancellor, the Chancellor's Cabinet, and the Council of Deans on a range of matters pertaining to IUPUI's strategy, effectiveness, and future directions. He leads the Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement, including facilitating the administrative and program review processes; directs campus-level strategic planning activities; handles the

executive search and leadership onboarding function for the campus; promotes various improvement-oriented initiatives; and serves as executive sponsor of IUPUI's Program Review and Assessment Committee.

Stephen also chairs the annual Assessment Institute in Indianapolis, which is the oldest and largest higher education event in the U.S. focused on assessment and improvement. He is executive editor of *Assessment Update*, an award-winning, bimonthly publication from Wiley with a national readership, and he serves as host of *Leading Improvements in Higher Education*, a podcast series profiling people, initiatives, institutions, and organizations improving conditions in higher education.

Stephen has addressed a variety of audiences in more than 30 countries on six continents and throughout the United States. He writes, consults, and presents on topics related to organizational effectiveness, learning and development strategies, and higher education administration. Additionally, he has been recognized for his accomplishments through teaching, publication, and service awards and has received competitive funding from private foundations and state and federal agencies to support his work, including continuous funding from the National Science Foundation for more than a decade (awards #1618408, #1153850, and #0969500).

Since 2015, Stephen has been a member of the IUPUI Chancellor's Cabinet. During this time, he has periodically provided leadership to campus-level units in transition, including serving as interim chief enrollment officer in the Division of Enrollment Management and interim associate vice chancellor for undergraduate education and dean of University College in the Division of Undergraduate Education. His prior leadership roles include associate vice chancellor for strategic initiatives in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, and associate dean for academic affairs and undergraduate programs, department chair, and program director in the School of Engineering and Technology. Stephen earned his bachelor's and master's degrees from Virginia Commonwealth University and a doctorate from American University in Washington, D.C.

IUPUI Annual Assessment Reports and Program Review Processes

	Annual Assessment Report	Program Review Process	Program Review with Specialized Accreditation
Occurrence	Every year	Every 5–7 years	On specialized accreditation cycle
Purpose	Sustain and demonstrate historical commitment to using evidence to support students’ learning and success	Improvement-oriented process aimed at enhancing program effectiveness	Review of the quality of higher education programs by one of approximately 60 recognized programmatic accrediting organizations
Responsible Parties	Unit PRAC Representative(s)	Program leaders and stakeholders; Review Team of identified external and internal experts	Program leaders and stakeholders; Review team from one of the recognized programmatic accrediting organizations
Audience	PRAC and IUPUI administration	Primary: Program leaders and school dean; Secondary: IUPUI administration	Primary: Program leaders and school dean; Secondary: the public (e.g., students, families, government officials, the press); Tertiary: IUPUI administration
Focus	Student learning, through identified student learning outcomes (SLOs)	Program context and profile (e.g., characteristics of students, faculty, and staff), program quality (e.g., curricula, SLOs, graduate outcomes), program viability (e.g., enrollment management, fiscal health, facilities, human resources), and strategic priorities (e.g., connection to IUPUI strategic plan, future directions)	Criteria or standards set by accrediting organization, program profile, program quality, program viability, and strategic priorities

IUPUI Program Review Academic Program Review Self-Study Elements

Program leaders and colleagues will develop a self-study of approximately 7,000 words/20-25 pages to address the following program elements. Links to websites, documents, and other resources may be embedded in the self-study, and appendices may provide additional relevant supporting materials.

Executive Summary

The executive summary will allow the review team to become acquainted with the contents of the self-study report and will provide guidance on topics to which they should pay particular attention.

1. Brief summary of the **context** of the program
2. Description of the top **strengths** ((3–5) of the program
3. Description of the chief **challenges** (3–5) of the program
4. **Specific questions** (4-6) about which the program seeks guidance from the review team

A. Program Profile

1. Brief description of program **mission**, including goals, history, and context
2. **Characteristics of students**, including demographics, preparation/qualifications for program admittance, and recent enrollment trends
3. **Characteristics of faculty**, including demographics, qualifications, type of appointment, and principal research/creative activity emphases
4. **Description of program resources**, including classroom and laboratory spaces, library holdings, support services available, and partnerships (campus, community, inter-institutional, and international)
5. **Any additional information** needed to provide review team members with an understanding of the program

B. Program Quality and Viability

1. **Student learning outcomes** at the program level, including a discussion of how these outcomes were developed and what assessment and improvement processes are in place to support student achievement of the outcomes
2. **Curriculum structure/mapping**, including the conceptual framework(s) guiding the curriculum (e.g., specialized accreditation) and discussion of relationships among courses and learning experiences included in the curriculum
3. **Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success (for undergraduate programs)**, including how these are introduced, reinforced, and assessed in the program
4. **Other experiences** that support student learning, including co-curricular, community, and experiential learning opportunities for student engagement, **High-Impact Practices** (for undergraduate programs), and other **educationally purposeful activities** in the program, including the rationale for these experiences and actions taken to ensure effective development/implementation
5. Discussion of how **research/creative activities and engagement activities** contribute to and are influenced by the academic program(s)

6. **Graduate outcomes** from the program, including employment, graduate/professional education, and continued engagement with the program
7. **Feedback** from program stakeholders, including students, graduates, employers, advisory board members, etc.
8. **Enrollment management plan** for the program, including a forecast of future program demand, analysis of retention and graduation rates, student recruitment priorities/strategies, and student retention efforts
9. Analysis of the **Fiscal health** of the program, including how well the program manages its budget
10. Assessment of the adequacy of **facilities**, including technology/specialized equipment used in program delivery
11. Assessment of **human resources** contributing to the program, including faculty/staff recruitment, retention, diversity, and development/advancement priorities

C. Program Strategic Priorities

1. Program contributions to **IUPUI's strategic plan**
2. Program contributions to **unit-specific plans/priorities**
3. A summary of the overall program's **internal strengths and weaknesses** and **external opportunities and threats**
4. Discussion of the program's **future directions**

IUPUI Program Review Center and Institute Program Review Self-Study Elements

Center and Institute leaders and colleagues will develop a self-study of approximately 15–20 pages to address the following program elements. Links to websites, documents, and other resources may be embedded in the self-study, and appendices may provide additional relevant supporting materials.

Executive Summary

The executive summary will allow the review team to become acquainted with the contents of the self-study report and will provide guidance on topics to which they should pay particular attention.

1. Brief summary of the **context** of the program
2. Description of the top **strengths** ((3–5) of the program
3. Description of the chief **challenges** (3–5) of the program
4. **Specific questions** (4-6) about which the program seeks guidance from the review team

A. Center/Institute Profile

1. Brief description of Center/Institute, including **formal mission statement**, founding documents (included in appendices as applicable), goals, history, and context
2. Overview of **projects undertaken and services offered** by the Center/Institute
3. Overview of **faculty, staff, and other stakeholders involved in the Center/Institute**, including demographics, qualifications, type of appointment, duration with the Center/Institute, and principal contributions to Center/Institute mission, projects, and services
4. Overview of **student engagement** within the Center/Institute, including demographics and contributions
5. Overview of **Center/Institute resources**, including current external/institutional funding, work space, library holdings, support services available, and partnerships (campus, community, inter-institutional, and international)
6. Any **additional information** needed to provide review team members with a foundational understanding of the Center/Institute

B. Center/Institute Quality and Viability

1. **Principal activities and accomplishments of the Center/Institute** over the past 5 years, including a discussion of evidence of quality/effectiveness of the projects, services, activities, and accomplishments
2. Description of the **units/collaborators/partners involved in the Center/Institute**, including specific roles and contributions each makes to its functioning
3. Discussion of how the **Center/Institute contributes to the educational, research, and service/engagement missions** of the units/collaborators/partners involved in its functioning
4. Analysis and summary of **feedback from Center/Institute stakeholders**, including frequency of feedback and how it is used to improve the function of the Center/Institute
5. Discussion of the **forecast of future demand for the Center/Institute projects, services, and activities**, including how the Center/Institute is **distinctive or differentiated from other similar providers**

6. Analysis of the **fiscal health of the Center/Institute**, including source(s) of funding for the Center/Institute; cost(s) of running the Center/Institute; and how well leaders manage budget resources and attract diverse and sustainable revenue streams to support the Center/Institute
7. Assessment of the **adequacy of facilities**, including technology/specialized equipment used to support Center/Institute functioning
8. Assessment of **human resources contributing to the Center/Institute**, including talent recruitment, retention, diversity, and development/advancement priorities, incorporating transition/succession plans

C. Center/Institute Strategic Priorities

1. Discussion of Center/Institute **contributions to IUPUI's strategic plan**
2. A summary of the overall **internal strengths and weaknesses** of the Center/Institute **and external opportunities and threats**
3. Discussion of the Center/Institute **future directions**

IUPUI Program Review
Student Affairs and Cocurricular Programs and Services Program Review Self-Study
Elements

Program leaders and colleagues will develop a self-study of approximately 7,000 words/20-25 pages to address the following program elements. Links to websites, documents, and other resources may be embedded in the self-study, and appendices may provide additional relevant supporting materials.

Executive Summary

The executive summary will allow the review team to become acquainted with the contents of the self-study report and will provide guidance on topics to which they should pay particular attention.

1. Brief summary of the **context** of the program
2. Description of the top **strengths** ((3–5) of the program
3. Description of the chief **challenges** (3–5) of the program
4. **Specific questions** (4-6) about which the program seeks guidance from the review team

A. Program Profile

1. Brief description of program **mission**, including goals, history, and context
2. **Characteristics of students engaged in programs and services**, including demographics, programs of study, and trends in engagement across various programs and services
3. **Staff**, including demographics, qualifications, type of appointment, duration with the program, and principal contributions to mission, projects, and services
4. **Description of program resources**, including physical spaces, support services available, and partnerships (campus, community, inter-institutional, and international)
5. **Any additional information** needed to provide review team members with a foundational understanding of the program

B. Program Quality and Viability

1. **Principal activities and accomplishments of the program** over the past five years, including a discussion of evidence of quality/effectiveness of the projects, services, activities, and accomplishments
2. **Unit program and service structure/mapping**, including the conceptual framework(s) guiding the structure (e.g., specialized accreditation, model programs) and discussion of relationships among programs/services to facilitate student success
3. **Student impact/outcomes including student learning outcomes (connection to Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success and/or Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning)**, including a discussion of how outcomes were identified, how they are assessed, and how they contribute to overall student success. For learning outcomes, include how these are introduced and reinforced in the program. Discuss what programmatic assessment improvement process are in place to support student achievement of outcomes.
4. **Other experiences/activities** that support student success, including the rationale and actions taken to ensure effective development and implementation of the activity
5. **Measures of student academic/career success**, such as graduation/retention rates, GPA, employment, graduate/professional education, and continued engagement with the program

6. Discussion of how **research, grant support, sponsorships, community partnerships and/or creative activities** contribute to the program goals and objectives
7. **Feedback** from program stakeholders, including students, graduates, employers, community members, advisory board members, etc.
8. **Forecast of future program demand**, reflection on recent trends, student rates of return, student recruitment priorities/strategies
9. Analysis of **financial support**, including overview of budget, sources of funding, and projected trends
10. Assessment of adequacy of **facilities**, including technology/specialized equipment used in program delivery
11. Assessment of **human resources** contributing to the program, including staff recruitment, retention, diversity, and development/advancement priorities

C. Program Strategic Priorities

1. Program contributions to **IUPUI's strategic plan**
2. Program contributions to **unit-specific plans/priorities**, including DEI Strategic Plan
3. A summary of the overall program's **internal strengths and weaknesses** and **external opportunities and threats**
4. Discussion of the program's **future directions**

IUPUI Program Review Considerations in Selecting a Review Team

Program reviews at IUPUI are periodic, improvement-oriented processes aimed at enhancing the program's effectiveness. The process is intended to be both reflective and regenerative for the program; we do *not* take a "justify your existence" mentality with program reviews. As such, the composition of review teams is intended to provide important perspectives and insights for the program under review. Teams typically consist of two external experts in the discipline or functional area, two IUPUI faculty or staff members from other programs, and one community representative, all of whom have relevant perspectives to share on the issues that will provide the focus for the review.

The membership of our review teams reflects our goal to improve our programs along with two additional goals. First, we hope the reviews will increase collegiality and collaboration within the discipline—as well as among faculty and staff from our various schools—and thus encourage interdisciplinary collaboration. Second, given IUPUI's status as an urban campus, we also seek to strengthen ties with the various communities with which we interact. Each program has its own unique context, activities, outcomes, and stakeholders. As a result, we provide flexibility in the composition of the review. To aid in the identification of potential members of the review team, we provide the following considerations for selecting reviewers.

Consider Experience and Expertise

Helpful peer reviewers bring content knowledge and professional expertise to the review process. This may include perspectives on curriculum and sequencing, disciplinary standards and norms, interaction with and contribution to scholarship, industry engagement (as appropriate), etc. It is helpful to have reviewers with experience and expertise who can evaluate the program against accepted norms and provide helpful insights and recommendations. As such, you may consider individuals from your discipline, field, or functional area who are leaders at the national level, either through scholarship, leadership, or engagement with professional organizations and associations. You may also consider individuals in similar positions at peer institutions or situated within peer or aspirant programs or departments.

Consider Objectivity

Helpful peer reviewers make rational judgments and recommendations about a program, entity, activity being reviewed, often maintaining neutrality and objectivity during the process. Reviewers with too close of a connection to the program—or its personnel—run the risk of being unlikely to provide critical feedback or constructive recommendations to the program. As such, it is worth considering acquaintances—or even strangers—through recommendations from trusted peers or colleagues. A "critical acquaintance" is more likely to provide insights that are regenerative for the program.

Consider Diversity & Representation

Reviewers with a diverse range of professional and life experiences are more likely to provide a broad array of useful observations and recommendations during program review. A diverse team is also likely to provide critical insights and priorities to aid in the longevity and relevance of the program. Consider a range of identities (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity) when suggesting reviewers.

Consider “Critical Friends”

Internal reviewers—IUPUI faculty or staff members from other programs—serve an important role on the review team. Not only can they provide useful context for external reviewers, such as insights into IUPUI policies and practices, funding models, and campus jargon, but they also serve to provide useful feedback from the perspective as individuals within the institution. This “arm’s length” perspective can be helpful in commenting on the program’s reputation, recognition, cross-campus collaboration, etc.

Consider Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers with real or perceived conflicts of interest may have difficulty providing unbiased, objective feedback to the program undergoing review. As such, when recommending reviewers, it is important to consider potential conflicts of interest. Individuals who have recently applied for a position with the program likely have a conflict of interest. Individuals from a competing institution or program may have a conflict of interest; consider if information shared through the program review process is likely to provide any operational or competitive advantage.

Consider the Role of the Team Chair

The chair of the review team is an important role during the program review process. The chair is expected to lead and engage the review team in discussion and activities to ensure a successful visit resulting in a meaningful report for the program. Consider selecting a team chair who not only has meaningful professional experience and expertise within your discipline, field, or functional area, but who also has the leadership experience necessary to steer a team of reviewers. You might also consider the professional role of the candidate to be the team chair; often, programs find it helpful to have a chair situated in a peer—or somewhat comparable—program, department, or unit, as they are able to suitably filter and contextualize the review team’s feedback in a manner that is valuable to the program under review.

IUPUI Program Review Considerations in Developing Program Review Team Reports

Program reviews at IUPUI are periodic, improvement-oriented processes aimed at enhancing the program's effectiveness. We conduct such reviews of academic departments/programs, research centers/institutes, co-curricular/student affairs programs/services, and other campus support units. The process is both reflective and regenerative for the program; we do *not* take a "justify your existence" mentality with program reviews.

Each program has its own unique context, activities, outcomes, and stakeholders. As a result, we provide flexibility in developing the program reviewers' final report. Keep in mind the *primary audience* for the report is colleagues in the program, including program leadership. Please adopt a consultative, improvement-minded perspective and address the report to your peers. A *secondary audience* includes both leadership in the unit in which the program resides and IUPUI campus leadership. All audiences appreciate a succinct, well-written report to which all members of the review team contribute. Review team reports are due within one month of the site visit. The Program Review Coordinator will confirm the "due date" with the Review Team Chair following the conclusion of the site visit.

Executive Summary

Provide an executive summary to serve as cover material for the final report. In the executive summary, include the following:

- The top strengths (3–5) of the program, as evidenced by the program review process.
- The top challenges (3–5) of the program, as evidenced by the program review process.
- The top issues or opportunities (3–5) emerging from the program review.
- The review team's top recommendations for the program.

Review Team Final Report

Following are some general considerations that may be helpful in thinking about how to structure the report:

- Brief recap of the program review process, including highlights from the self-study, stakeholders consulted during the site visit, and supplemental materials reviewed.
- Responses to questions posed to the review team in the program's self-study.
- Priorities and recommendations for the program to consider adopting. These could be organized:
 - By *major themes*, including addressing either a situational analysis (internal strengths and weaknesses; external opportunities and threats) or as a summary of what is working well and areas for improvement;

- By *stakeholder groups consulted*, including students, faculty, campus partners, and community partners;
 - By *recommendation audience*, including program leadership, unit leadership, and IUPUI campus leadership;
 - By *time/cost horizon*, ranging from immediate/low-cost to longer-term/high-cost implementation; or
 - *Any combination of the above* that emerges based on how the review unfolds.
- Finally, we recognize all programs could likely benefit from an infusion of resources, including people, money, and space. Please be judicious in making any recommendation contingent on resource (re)allocations. Whenever possible, offer creative recommendations or opportunities for how programs can maximize existing resources or pursue alternative revenue streams in advancing their mission(s).

IUPUI Program Review Review Team Report Response Action Plan Worksheet

This document is designed to aid in identifying recommendations from the Review Team report to guide action planning. This action plan will identify department-level actions and goals to address the recommendations. Completing this worksheet will aid preparing for the IUPUI Program Review Response Report shared in advance of the Program Review follow-up meeting.

Complete the table below, adding additional rows as needed.

Program:

Date(s) of Review:

Review Team Recommendation	Action(s) to Address Recommendation	Timeline	Responsible Individual(s)	How Progress Will be Measured or Assessed
#1				
#2				
#3				
#4				

Data Needs: List any data needed to respond to recommendations made in the report. Indicate the recommendation number, along with potential sources of data.

Additional Information: List and discuss any additional context, considerations, or necessary resources related to the recommendations made in the report.

Connections to PRAC and Annual Strategic Plan Reports: Describe any potential connections between recommendations and activities described in the unit's Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) and Annual Strategic Plan Reports. *Note:* A conversation with the unit's PRAC representative(s) is recommended.

IUPUI Program Review Response Report Elements

Program leaders and colleagues will develop a follow-up report of approximately 3–6 pages (1,000–1,500 double-spaced words) to respond to the Program Review team report and provide updates on implementation of improvements. Links to websites, documents, and other resources may be embedded in the report, and appendices may provide additional relevant supporting materials as necessary.

A. Executive Summary*

1. 200–250-word description of the program review process, including an overview of findings and recommendations from the Review Team.

B. Report on Progress of Implementation of Improvements Toward Recommendations

1. Identify recommendations from the Review Team’s report.
2. Describe the program’s planned—and implemented—actions to address these recommendations, along with the associated timelines and responsible individuals.
3. Detail the measurement, evaluation, or assessment activities related to the implementation of these recommendations.
4. List and discuss any additional context, considerations, or necessary resources related to progress toward the recommendations made in the report.
5. Provide status updates on implementation activities.

C. Connections to Program IUPUI’s Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) and Annual Strategic Plan Reports

1. Briefly highlight connections between the implementation of improvement activities to address the Program Review team recommendations and activities described in the unit’s Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC), and Annual Strategic Plan Reports, DEI Strategic Plans, and/or other unit-specific planning documents.

**Note:* The Executive Summary should be written to be public-facing, as it will be used on the IUPUI Program Review website to summarize the Program Review.

Situational Analysis of Program Review

Present Strengths	Present Weaknesses
Future Opportunities	Future Threats

Planning

Actions from SWOT Analysis	Potential Roadblocks	Next Steps