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I. INTRODUCTION

Welcome to DePaul University’s academic program review process. This guidebook is designed to provide simple, easy-to-follow information regarding the background, purpose, and process of academic program review at DePaul. It represents the work of the many individuals who have been involved in program review since its inception at the University in the late 1980s. It also reflects the commitment of the University and the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) to view the implementation of program review as an evolving process—one that will continue to be refined over time and that will, by design, change as necessary to meet the needs of academic units. While Academic Program Review is a requirement for maintaining our accreditation with Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, the reasoned, purpose-driven process we have developed has proven beneficial for individual units and the university as a whole.

Discussion of academic program review at DePaul University began during the 1987 North Central Association (NCA) accreditation visit. During that visit, the NCA team recommended that DePaul develop and implement a system of internal, university-wide, academic program review. A Task Force was convened in 1992 and produced a report recommending processes, procedures, and administrative oversight, but no action was taken. During North Central’s 1997 accreditation visit, the NCA team reiterated the recommendation regarding academic program review. DePaul’s Faculty Council then created an Academic Program Review Committee with representatives from all schools/colleges of the University. The Committee held its initial meeting in January, 1997; the group simplified the original 1992 proposal, developed an implementation protocol, and launched the process—with the expectation that DePaul’s Academic Program Review process would continue to evolve and improve with the completion of each megacycle.

The first megacycle of a seven-year cycle of program reviews was initiated in February, 1998, and it was completed prior to the 2007 North Central Association visit with a 2005-2006 review of Academic Program Review itself. As part of that review, the APRC developed several recommendations for ways to create a more concrete, sophisticated, and useful process for improving academic quality. In particular, the second 8-year megacycle, which began in Spring 2007, saw the addition of external reviewers to the process. For each unit’s program review, two external reviewers, chosen by the AVP for Academic Affairs from a list provided by the unit, review all the materials and come to DePaul for a 2 ½ day visit. Their charge is to 1) assess the currency of the program and faculty scholarship, and 2) consult on any issues of interest to the unit. At this writing, seven years into the second cycle, it is no exaggeration to say that the addition of external reviewers has enabled this process to blossom into an opportunity for genuine reflection and forward movement for the units.

Based on their experiences and an annual survey established to gain feedback from faculty engaged in academic program review, the APRC recommended other changes to the process. This included the extension of the time period for units to complete their program review plans. In the past, all tasks had to be accomplished in five quarters. The revised time-line now allows two years for this process. This revised time-line provides each unit with more time for reflection, planning, data collection, collaborating with supporting units (e.g., IRMA) and benefiting from feedback of the APRC during the process. Under this revision, each unit now has more time to gather feedback from students and to engage in exchanges and analysis with external reviewers. In particular, the
expanded timeframe for preliminary planning during the first year better prepares the unit for the second year of research and analysis. The intent for this change is largely to strengthen the research and subsequent reports to better position the unit for gaining support from University resources.

Academic Program Review leads each academic unit through a process that challenges faculty to demonstrate to themselves and the university that they are delivering the best academic program(s) they can. APRC faculty act as internal consultants, pressing this challenge on behalf of the unit and the university. APRC ex-officio members provide insight within the context of the university. Together we invite your active participation, and we join you in your vision of academic excellence.

II. PURPOSE

DePaul University’s Academic Program Review process is designed to be a reflective and analytical process. Its purpose is:

- to promote the 1) continuous quality improvement of 2) academic programs and the larger University, through a process that is 3) responsive to the mission, 4) faculty-driven, 5) focused, 6) collegial, 7) data-based, 8) contextual, and 9) adaptive, and that results in 10) an accountable plan of action (MOU).

Each of these major components is discussed more fully below:

(1) Continuous quality improvement: The improvement of overall academic quality is an ongoing objective. The intent of Program Review is to support each unit in developing and maintaining its own continuous, naturally embedded system of academic program review. Within such a system, periodic academic program review serves as an opportunity for a global consideration of the unit.

(2) Individual academic programs and the larger University: Quality is systemic. While Program Review originates at the individual program level, the analysis expands to incorporate activities and support services at the school/college and University levels. In addition, multiple related units are scheduled for review per cycle with the intent of increasing interaction and reflection between and among them.

(3) Responsive to the mission: The review of a particular program seeks to situate it in the context of DePaul’s unique mission, learning goals, and strategic plan. In so doing, Program Review seeks to enhance learning within a particular unit and among units and to further the evolution of a university culture characterized by ongoing institutional self-analysis leading to continually improved practice.

(4) Faculty-driven: Faculty are responsible for the curriculum; therefore, Program Review is a faculty responsibility. The Academic Program Review Committee is comprised of faculty from all schools and colleges. It is formed by the Faculty Council and charged to oversee the process of academic program review across the university. The academic program review process also provides for the formation of a faculty-appointed self-study committee within each unit.

(5) Focused: To be efficient and cost-effective, Program Reviews are conducted within a clearly limited time frame. Thus each unit is asked to identify important issues during the Program Review planning stage, investigate them along with those required by the process, and report
accordingly. The aim is meaningful reflection in areas identified by the unit’s faculty as well as those deemed to be critical across units by the University Academic Program Review Committee. Complete re-justification of programs or the production of lengthy reports is not the goal.

(6) **Collegial:** The process of Program Review seeks to support and sustain conversations among various university constituents that lead to the identification and analysis of a particular unit’s strengths and areas for improvement. Initially, these conversations are unit and school-based; however, as the process moves forward, they also involve perspectives from faculty colleagues across the University (i.e., the Academic Program Review Committee [APRC], Office of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment [TLA], Institutional Research and Market Analytics [IRMA]), and beyond the university (external reviewers), as well as those of academic administrators. The Program Review Self-Study documents, developed by individual units, function in service to this broadening conversation, not as an end in itself. The inclusion of multiple perspectives is intended to help units share their strengths as well as facilitate an improved university-wide understanding of the varied disciplinary and professional languages and norms that comprise the University. In addition, the self-study stimulates a culture of continuous reflection, internal research, and collegial accountability that is both program-based and university-wide.

(7) **Data-based:** In a University dedicated to rational inquiry, Program Review seeks to facilitate the development of plans of action supported by analyzed data rather than by anecdote or politicized perceptions. In so doing, Program Review seeks to support internal research and, through its ongoing activity, continually refine the University’s academic information systems to support decision-making at the unit, school/college, and university levels. As much as possible, claims made at all levels of the process and by all voices are to be supported by data.

(8) **Contextual:** APRC’s review encourages a cross-discipline/cross-profession dialogue and accountability for the University’s curricular programs as a whole. The APR process combines the strengths of *internal* review, best understood within the context of DePaul’s mission and array of programs, with *external* discipline-specific review, ensuring that academic programs represent current practice within the discipline.

(9) **Adaptive:** To best serve the University, Program Review must be dynamic, reflective, and evolving. To this end, the overall purpose of continuous improvement is paramount while the specific features of the process may be modified as needed for any individual unit to ensure the purpose is met.

(10) **Accountable plan of action:** The purpose of Program Review is the identification of sound initiatives for improving quality, i.e., initiatives supported by both data and broad-based understanding. To this end, Program Review results in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between and among the program, the school/college, and the University. This document outlines agreed-upon courses of action that the unit will take over the next several years to support improved academic quality. It also identifies resource support priorities for academic improvement.
The academic program review process will examine, during each megacycle, all graduate and undergraduate degree granting programs, general education, and all certificate programs within academic units.

APR will not review Centers and Institutes with the exception of those Centers or Institutes that have credit-generating academic missions and impacts. They will be reviewed with the linked academic unit. Otherwise, Centers and Institutes will be examined during a separate regular cycle designed to be appropriate to their issues. However, academic units whose academic issues have been supported by Centers/Institutes housed within the unit or closely connected with them will indicate in their self-studies how those Centers/Institutes support effective teaching and learning, along with faculty and student scholarship and creative activities.

Support units within academic affairs will not be reviewed within the APR megacycle. They will be reviewed as part of the annual performance reviews and through their annual reports. Faculty will have the opportunity to review the adequacy of the support provided by these units through their responses to key questions in the unit’s research report. Faculty will be solidly represented in this alternative review process.

The comprehensive schedule for Program Review includes a multi-year megacycle encompassing all colleges/schools, Liberal Studies, and centers/institutes. Currently, this ten-year cycle is scheduled as follows:

| Cycle 1 (2007-08) | SNL: Graduate and Undergraduate |
| Cycle 2 (2008-09) | LA&S: Humanities |
| Cycle 3 (2009-10) | CDM and LA&S: Natural Sciences and Math |
| Cycle 4 (2010-11) | Liberal Studies Program (including Honors) |
| Cycle 5 (2011-12) | Commerce: Undergraduate and KGSB |
| Cycle 6 (2011-13) | College of Education and Theatre School |
| Cycle 7 (2012-14) | LAS: Interdisciplinary Programs |
| Cycle 10 (2016-17) | HLC-NCA Preparation and Review and Revision of APR |

1 The College of Science and Health, formed in 2011, includes the natural sciences, math, nursing and psychology. The natural sciences and math underwent program review in Cycle 3. Cycle 7 will include interdisciplinary programs in the new College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, except for Catholic Studies and American Studies, which will be part of Cycle 8.
KEY PARTICIPANTS: DePaul’s Program Review Process includes the following constituencies:

**Academic Program Review Committee (APRC):** Committee members are appointed for three years by DePaul’s Faculty Council. Faculty from each of the University’s colleges and schools are represented. The APRC meets quarterly during the academic year to lead the university’s academic program review process and may from time to time call an executive session of its faculty members.

**APRC Director/Chair:** The Academic Program Review process is directed by the APRC Director who also serves as Chair of the APRC. This person is appointed by the Provost in consultation with the members of the APRC and Faculty Council. This position is responsible to both the Faculty Council and to the Office of Academic Affairs. The APRC chair is a faculty member and is also a former APRC member.

**APRC Ex-Officio members:** In addition to these faculty representatives from each college and school, the APRC also includes non-voting ex-officio members as representatives from the following offices: Academic Affairs, Teaching & Learning Resources, the Office for Teaching, Learning, & Assessment (TLA), and the Office of Institutional Research & Market Analytics (IRMA). Ex-officio members serve as advisors to the committee as a whole and therefore do not serve on subcommittees that work directly with units participating in review. Ex-officio members are chosen at the initiative of the APRC Chair in consultation with the Academic Program Review Committee and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs on an ad-hoc basis to advise the APRC and to share information from their offices as it supports the review process.

**APRC Subcommittee:** The APRC regularly forms itself into subcommittees—each of which is assigned to a particular unit or units scheduled for review during each cycle. The APRC Subcommittee is responsible for facilitating the process in accordance with the APR Guidebook, assisting units with the processes and procedures of program review, examining the documents submitted by the unit to the APRC, and preparing careful reviews of the document submitted by the unit under review to share with the full APRC.

**Office of Academic Affairs:** Academic Affairs provides guidance and support for the APR process. Several members of Academic Affairs participate in the APR process. The Provost, as chief academic officer, has final authority over all academic programs and is responsible for any university-level commitments in the MOU. The Associate Vice President (AVP) for Academic Affairs is an ex-officio member of the APRC and, along with the APRC Director/Chair, serves throughout the review process as a liaison to the Provost. The AVP also selects external reviewers from a list provided from the unit and arranges the visits. Both the Provost and the AVP for Academic Affairs sign the MOU, and in so doing recognize the unit’s priorities. The research associate in the Office of the AVP for Academic Affairs provides research support and assists the APRC Director/Chair in facilitating the Academic Program Review process.

**Unit Self-Study Team:** Each unit embarking on the program review process forms a self-study team of generally 3-5 full-time faculty members (tenured or tenure-track) who shall select a chair. The unit team may include APRC members but not as its chair. At its discretion, the self-study team may also include part-time faculty, staff, students, and alumni. In the interest of enhancing the faculty-driven nature of review, the team is not to be chaired by individuals holding administrative appointment within or over the unit participating in review unless the unit has reason to request otherwise. The team plans and implements the unit’s research plan, prepares the unit’s program
review documents, and, and engages in deliberations leading to an eventual Memorandum of Understanding pertaining to subsequent initiatives. (See Key Steps #1 below.)

**Unit Department Chair/Program Director:** The unit department chair/program director supports the program review process for the unit under review, but the process itself should be conducted by the self-study team to ensure that the process is faculty–driven. The self-study team should inform the unit chair/director of its activities and obtain input from the unit chair/director during the process, especially regarding the content of the self-study plan, list of potential external reviewers, and report prior to their submission to the APRC. The unit chair/director will also sign the MOU, and oversee the implementation of the initiatives in the MOU pertaining to that particular unit.

**Unit Dean:** The dean of the unit will review the unit’s research plan and provide input regarding its content prior to its review by the APRC. The dean will also provide input regarding the unit’s research report prior to the MOU meetings. Finally, the dean signs the MOU and in doing so recognizes the unit’s priorities within the college and is responsible for carrying out any college commitments identified as such in the document.

**External Reviewer(s):** When units undergoing review do not already undergo outside professional or other external review, the self-study team, in consultation with its unit, will make several recommendations to the APRC of appropriate external reviewers. The role of the external reviewers is to 1) evaluate the intellectual currency of the academic program, both undergraduate and graduate, and the overall quality of faculty scholarship, and 2) provide consultation on areas of interest and concern that emerge through the process of program review. Ultimately the AVP for Academic Affairs will select the external reviewers and will also pay all fees, stipends, etc., for the review. External review will be optional for units that regularly undergo outside professional or other external review.

**KEY DOCUMENTS** (SEE GREATER DETAIL IN SECTION V):

1. **The Program Profile** provides an opportunity for the unit to summarize the current status of its academic program and highlight opportunities to further examine questions of concern or opportunity, many of which may already be in discussion within the units. It also includes a review and reflection of the program’s learning outcomes and prior assessment projects. The program profile is submitted December 20, Year 1.

2. **The Response to Data** guides the unit through an analysis of data provided by the university with the aim of identifying fruitful questions for follow-up. It also provides an opportunity for the unit to revise its learning outcomes and curriculum map, as needed. This document is due at the end of February, Year 1.

3. **The Unit’s Research Plan (URP)** outlines the particular areas that the unit will focus upon during the unit’s research, and indicates additional data that will be needed. An assessment of student work for one or more learning objectives should be built in to the URP. The plan will be submitted at the end of April, Year 1.

4. **The Unit’s Research Report (URR)** provides analyses and findings that result from the unit’s research itself. Unlike the program profile, its purpose is not to describe the unit and its activities but to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the unit and the opportunities and challenges that it faces as it prepares for the future. The unit’s research report should provide answers to the questions in the research plan based on an analysis of the data and geared
towards informing decisions for ongoing program improvement. This document will be submitted no later than December 15, Year 2.

5. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): This document, based on the findings of program review, indicates the actions that will be taken by the unit to improve the academic quality of the unit’s programs. Signed by the unit’s Self-Study Chair, Department Chair or Program Director, College Dean, APRC Director/Chair, AVP for Academic Affairs and University Provost, the Memorandum of Understanding acknowledges by all the unit’s strategic plans and resource support priorities for academic improvement. The MOU signing takes place by the end of spring quarter, Year 2. Along with its MOU, each unit will submit an Assessment Planning document that will identify future assessment goals.

6. Progress Report: One year and five years after the signing of the MOU, the unit reports on the steps that have been taken to implement the MOU and the status of those steps have yet to be taken.

**TIMELINE FOR KEY STEPS IN THE APR PROCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I: preliminary documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient to APR; assemble Self-study team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Program Profile, including an assessment reflection (Assessment Planning, Part 1)</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Univ. Data (early Jan.); write Response to Data; revise learning outcomes and curriculum map, as needed</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Unit Research (UR) plan, building in an assessment of student work for one or more learning objectives</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Feedback on UR plan</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for UR</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III: implementing the UR plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Research, including assessment of one or more learning objectives</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV: external review and feedback</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive feedback in prep for MOU</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write MOU, including a plan for assessment (Assessment Planning, Part 2)</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year III +</td>
<td>Phase VI: Implementation of MOU</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td>IRMA data prep meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREPARATION (SPRING PRIOR TO YEAR I)**
- The APRC Director/Chair notifies unit chairs of the upcoming program review; unit chairs meet with the APRC research associate and representatives from the Office of Marketing and Institutional Analytics (IRMA) to discuss tailoring the institutional data package to the unit.

---

2 In addition, if appropriate, work on Assessment Plan for Office for Teaching, Learning and Assessment
**PHASE I: PRELIMINARY DOCUMENTS**³ (YEAR 1)

**Fall**

- Units identify their self-study team. The APRC Director/Chair orients the unit chair and unit self-study team to the purpose, products and time-line of program review.

- An APRC Subcommittee is identified for each unit being reviewed and contacts the unit self-study team to review the work ahead and offer their support.

- The Program Profile is written, reviewed by the APRC subcommittee and submitted to the APRC Director/Chair by December 20.

**January**

- The Unit APR team attends an orientation to program-level university data customized for the unit and organized by the APRC research associate in conjunction with IRMA.

**Winter**

- Using data received in January, the Response to Data document is written, reviewed by the APRC subcommittee and submitted to the APRC Director/Chair by the end of February.

**PHASE II: PLANNING THE UNIT’S RESEARCH (YEAR 1)**

**Spring**

- The Unit’s Research Plan is written, reviewed by the APRC subcommittee and submitted to the APRC Director/Chair by April 20. For ease of distribution and feedback, the Unit’s Research Plans are to be in electronic format (MSWord).

- Units undergoing external review also
  - Provide faculty CVs in electronic format (MSWord or PDF).
  - Provide a list of 4-5 names of external reviewers to the APRC Chair. The list will include all contact information and be annotated to indicate why the unit considers these individuals to be especially well suited to act as external reviewers. The unit may prioritize its requests. The APRC Director/Chair discusses the selection with AVP who acts as a liaison to the Provost for Academic Affairs.

- The APRC Director/Chair solicits feedback on the research plans from the appropriate dean and Academic Affairs, including requesting the identification of any issues beyond those identified by the APR Guidebook they wish to have explored in the review process. This early feedback is designed to ensure that all parties identify issues or concerns early in the process so that they may be given full consideration during review and so that major new issues are not introduced for the first time late in the process.

- The APRC Subcommittee reviews the Program Profile, Response to Data, and the Unit’s Research Plan, and represents the unit in discussion of the research plan at APRC meetings. After receiving feedback from the dean and Academic Affairs, the APRC Subcommittee prepares a short written response to the plan. The APRC Director/Chair uses these written responses to prepare a memo to the units which is submitted to the full APRC for approval before being disseminated back to the unit.

³ All documents are described in greater detail in section VI of this Guidebook.
The Director/Chair of the APRC writes a response from the APRC to the unit self-study team incorporating all feedback into suggested amendments to the proposed research plan. After this document is approved by the APRC, it is sent to the Self-Study Team.

PHASE III: IMPLEMENTING THE UNIT’S RESEARCH (YEAR II)
September-December
- The Self-Study Team conducts the Unit’s Research according to its plan as approved/amended.

Throughout the implementation and writing phase, regular communication between the Self-Study Team and the APRC Subcommittee is strongly encouraged to keep all aware of the direction being taken and of the progress being made. In particular the APRC subcommittees should act as internal consultants and help their unit by identifying areas of the study and/or report (if any) that: (a) are in need of clarification; (b) seem to be at variance with the unit’s approved Research Plan, including the Self-Study Guidelines; (c) make claims without sufficient supporting data; and/or (d) have been addressed but with no suggestion of possible initiatives, if needed.

- The AVP for Academic Affairs contacts potential external reviewers, orients them to the review process, schedules their visits in consultation with the unit under review and sends the external reviewers the unit’s Program Profile, Response to Data, and faculty CVs.

December
- The Unit’s Research Plan is written, reviewed by the APRC subcommittee and submitted to the APRC Director/Chair by December 15 who distributes copies to the APRC, the dean of the unit, and to Academic Affairs. For ease of distribution and feedback, the Unit’s Research Report (including all appendices) is to be submitted in electronic format (MSWord). If the unit undergoes a regular professional/discipline specific accreditation visit, it will submit a copy of the latest report from the accreditation team. In cases where elements of the accreditation report should be kept confidential, the dean will discuss the portions of the document that should be excised.

- The AVP for Academic Affairs distributes the unit’s research report to the external reviewers for those units undergoing external review.

PHASE IV: EXTERNAL REVIEW AND FEEDBACK (YEAR II)
January
- For those units undergoing external review, the review will take place in January. The report from the external reviewers should be received by the AVP for Academic Affairs by March 1st, who distributes it to the Provost, the APRC Director/Chair, the unit dean, the unit’s APRC chair, and the unit’s chair/director. The APRC Director/Chair will distribute to the APRC.

March
- In early March, the APRC Director/Chair solicits feedback on the unit’s research report and external reviewer’s report from the Provost and the dean of the unit’s college in advance of the APRC’s Spring meeting (see next item).

- The APRC meets for a review of all program review and external reviewer reports. Prior to this meeting the APRC subcommittees develop drafts of responses and suggestions for MOU items for the unit(s) assigned to them and submits the drafts to the Chair of APRC. The full APRC is
expected to read all of the executive summaries of the reports that have been submitted; the subcommittees are responsible for reading the full reports of the units assigned to them.

• Following the APRC meeting, the APRC Director/Chair writes a response to the unit research report providing feedback regarding the research report, offering comments/suggestions regarding the major issues raised through program review and serving as a starting point for conversations leading to the Memorandum of Understanding. Once approved by the APRC, the response is shared with the unit self-study chair and the unit chair/director, the dean, and the Provost. The unit’s Self-Study Team is to provide copies of this response to the unit’s full-time faculty.

PHASE V. PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE: DEVELOPING THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (YEAR II)

Spring

• The APRC response to the unit’s research report is to be the starting point for conversations within the full faculty of the unit aimed at identifying strategies to remedy weaknesses or gaps in current programs, to improve current programs, to take advantage of new opportunities facing the unit, and, in general, to sustain and improve the quality of the academic program based on what was learned through program review.

• The unit self-study team drafts the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which is circulated among the program faculty and approved. The MOU identifies short-term priorities and longer terms plans that the unit will take to build on what they have learned through program review. It includes a discussion of any additional resources that are considered a priority by the unit to help support these initiatives, as well as plan for assessment (Assessment Planning, Part 2). The approved draft of the MOU should be received by the APRC Director/Chair by May 20, who distributes it to the unit dean and AVP for Academic Affairs for feedback.

• Working with the unit self-study chair, the dean, and the AVP for Academic Affairs, the APRC Director/Chair helps negotiate the final MOU and arranges the signing of the MOU to take place before the end of the academic year. Once signed, the MOU is posted on the APRC website.

PHASE VI: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

• The unit carries forward plans identified in its MOU. To celebrate accomplishments and to ensure accountability of the unit, college and university, the unit provides a one-year and five-year report on the progress of the initiatives identified in their MOU. This is shared with the unit faculty, dean, APRC Director/Chair, and AVP for Academic Affairs. The APRC Director/Chair helps negotiate any items of concern expressed by any of the parties.

SUMMARY OF DOCUMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## V. PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENT GUIDELINES

The goal of program review is to enlarge the unit’s understanding of and imagination about its activities, as well as what it can and/or should be doing to engage in continuous improvement of its programs. The APRC supports the unit in its investigation of questions of interest as well as helps the unit to consider the issues it faces within the context of the University and across the universe of programs within the discipline.

The following document guidelines provide a template for systematically reviewing and questioning the components of a unit’s academic program. Use the prompts to organize each phase of program review and the writing of each document. All documents are to be submitted electronically (MSWord) to the APRC Director/Chair.

### SELF-STUDY PART I: PROGRAM PROFILE (~20 pp single-spaced not counting appendices; due December 20)

The Program Profile provides an opportunity for the unit to summarize the current status of its academic program and highlight opportunities to examine further questions of concern or opportunity, many of which may already be in discussion within the unit.

1. **Mission and Prior Review**
   a. Provide the unit’s mission statement
   b. Discuss the relationship of the unit’s mission to the college mission and university mission
   c. Provide a brief summary of the findings, recommendations, and actions resulting from the last Academic Program Review. Identify any unresolved areas of concern from the previous
Academic Program Review.

2) Curricular Offerings
   a) Provide a short narrative describing all degree programs, majors, certificates, and other formal programs currently offered. Explain the reasons for the structure of each program and its central requirements. Provide in selective appendices representative syllabi, curricular descriptions, brochures, bulletins, or other descriptive material, if you wish.
   b) Describe any new curricular initiatives.
   c) Are there centers or institutes housed within the unit or closely connected with the unit? If so, how does the center or institute support effective teaching and learning, faculty and student scholarship, and research and creative activities.
   d) Discuss the steps that the unit has taken to consider academic quality and raise the level of academic challenge as called for in Vision 2018.4
   e) Identify possible issues/questions, if any, related to this section that the unit feels may be important for the self-study5

3) Student Learning6
   a) What are the student learning outcomes for each of the unit’s degree-granting programs? Have any learning outcomes changed since your last APR? Are there any learning outcomes that are no longer current? Are the student learning outcomes clear, concrete, and measurable?7 Do they get at the most essential and deepest levels of learning the program is designed to achieve?
   b) How do the student learning outcomes map onto the curriculum? Include in an appendix a curriculum map.8 Are there learning outcomes that are not covered or are covered in multiple locations? Is the quantity and quality of emphasis appropriate?
   c) Since your last APR, which learning outcomes have you assessed? Are there any learning outcomes that you have not assessed? To help answer these questions, please complete the Assessment Planning, Part 1, document for each of your unit’s degree-granting programs (see footnote #9 for link to Assessment Planning template).9 You should review your unit’s annual assessments (including those completed for TLA and, if applicable, assessment or assurance of learning materials provided for accreditation/external review) to identify what your unit has learned of the strengths and challenges for student learning in your program.
   d) Based on where your program is now, and your priorities for the future, which learning outcomes do you see as a priority for future assessment projects? What could your unit do to improve student learning? How will you know if you are successful?
   e) Identify possible questions for further study, including, for example, whether any of the current learning outcomes need updating; or possible future assessment studies or actions that the unit may wish to consider in response to assessment of student learning.

4) Student Support

5 Each time this prompt appears there is an opportunity to capture, in this and other program review documents, questions of interest to the unit. Some of these questions may contribute to the unit’s self-study; others may resurface in the MOU.
6 This section is informed by the Higher Learning Commission’s Statement on Assessment of Student Learning, available at https://content.springcm.com/content/DownloadDocuments.aspx?Selection=Document%2C20177502%3B&accountId=5968.
7 See TLA checklist at: http://condor.depaul.edu/tla/Learning/LO_Checklist.pdf
8 Available at the TLA website: http://condor.depaul.edu/tla/Learning/mapping.html#Mapping
9 Available at the TLA website: http://condor.depaul.edu/tla/Learning/mapping.html#Mapping
a) Discuss how students are advised in the unit, including how your unit supports students who are academically under-prepared and/or historically underserved, as well as advanced students or students in Honors Programs.
b) Describe the co-curricular and extracurricular activities that the unit provides to support and engage its students.
c) Discuss the kinds of support your unit offers in helping your students think about their career plans.
d) Identify possible issues/questions, if any, related to this section that the unit feels may be important for the self-study.

5) Faculty and Staff Support
   a) Indicate scholarly/creative activities, specializations, etc., of the unit’s faculty and staff (where appropriate) and discuss collective strengths and limitations in relation to the unit’s purpose and academic goals.
b) Indicate the methods used to evaluate and provide continuous improvement to instruction for both tenure-stream and contingent/part-time faculty.
c) What staff positions support the work of the unit?
d) Identify possible issues/questions, if any, related to this section that the unit feels may be important for the self-study.

6) University and Community Engagement
   a) How does the unit serve students in the Liberal Studies Program and in other programs/majors within the university?
b) How does the unit interact with other units within the university? How do these interactions benefit students who major within the unit?
c) How does the unit engage with the community and contribute to community enrichment? How do these activities support student learning?
d) Identify possible issues/questions, if any related to this section that the unit feels may be important for the self-study.

7) Unit Specific Issues and/or Initiatives. Describe and discuss any unit-specific issues and/or initiatives not addressed in the preceding sections.

SELF-STUDY PART II: RESPONSE TO DATA (~ 10 pp single-spaced; due end of February) The Response to Data document guides the unit through an analysis of data provided by the university with the aim of 1) better understanding patterns of interest and 2) identifying fruitful questions for follow-up. All of the following should be based on university-provided data and the data should be included to support the text, either within the document or as appendices.

1) Faculty and Staff Information
   a) Using data provided by the University, assess and discuss:
      i. The demographic profile of your faculty.
      ii. Patterns of workload by full- and part-time faculty in the context of your college.
b) Identify possible questions for further study.

2) Student Information
   a) Using data provided by the University, assess and discuss:
      i. Patterns of enrollment in degrees/concentrations.
      ii. The diversity of the undergraduate student profile.
      iii. Degrees conferred, graduation rates (at College level only) and time to graduation patterns for your program(s)
iv. Course hours taught for majors and non-majors students in majors courses, service courses, and general education courses provided by the department
v. Market share, where data are available (patterns of interest by enrolling students)
b) Identify possible questions for further study.

3) **Student Perceptions of the Quality of their Academic Program**
a) Using data provided from the University surveys—the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Alumni Survey, the ACT Advising Survey, and the Graduating Senior Survey—assess and discuss:
   i. Student satisfaction with the quality and rigor of their academic program and its preparation for life after DePaul.
   ii. Student satisfaction with advising.
   iii. Student perceptions of acquired work-related knowledge and skills: communication (verbal and written), quantitative and analytical skills, etc.
   iv. Student engagement in community service, internships, extra-curricular and co-curricular opportunities, research with faculty, etc.
   v. Student perceptions about their exposure to diversity.
   vi. Student perceptions about the challenges they face to succeed in their academic programs and competing priorities.
   vii. Alumni perceptions of their knowledge and abilities gained in their program at DePaul.
b) Identify possible questions for further study.

4) Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map (as needed)
a) Using information gained while writing the Program Profile and from the analysis of university data, revise the program’s learning outcomes and curriculum map, as needed.

SELF-STUDY PART III: UNIT'S RESEARCH PLAN (2-3 pages, due April 20) *The descriptive Program Profile and the analytical Response to Data provide the foundation for the Research Plan, which focuses on a few specific questions of interest to the unit within an institutional framework and indicates what additional data will be needed.*

1) List the names of the members of the Self-Study Team.

2) Identify the major questions from the Program Profile and the Response to Data that will be addressed in the Unit’s Research Plan in order to help the unit improve the quality of its academic program. These questions can include investigating areas of concern remaining from the previous program review. Provide a short recap of why these are questions of interest/concern and how an answer to these questions will help you improve the quality of your academic program. Then, for each question, identify data collection and analysis techniques that will be used to address it. Be as specific as possible (if a focus group will be used, who will be the audience, what will be the goal of the session, what are some questions that may be used, etc). Include a time-line for the proposed work, and possible survey questions as appropriate. At least one question should involve an assessment of student work for one or more learning outcomes.

3) For units undergoing external review:
a. In a separate appendix, provide an annotated list of 4-6 external reviewers, including contact information. Use the annotation to explain how each external reviewer would be able to 1) assess the intellectual currency of the academic program and the overall quality of faculty scholarship, as well as to 2) help the unit reflect on issues of importance to them. Consider
external reviewers who come from institutions with attributes similar to DePaul.

b. Faculty Curriculum Vitae. Please provide an electronic copy of a recent curriculum vita for each full-time faculty member in a separate appendix.

SELF-STUDY PART III (CONTINUED): UNIT’S RESEARCH REPORT  
(15-20 pp. single spaced plus appendices; due December 15)  
The Research Report provides answers to the Self-Study: Unit Research Plan questions based on an analysis of the data and geared towards informing decisions for ongoing program improvement.

1) **Executive Summary** (2-3 pp.) Provide an abstract to include the highlights of each of the sections below.

2) What did you find out? Describe methodology, present and analyze data, and draw conclusions as you investigate each of the major questions of the research plan. Provide enough data in the body of the report to support the inferences you draw. Include additional data as necessary in an appendix. Be selective and include as appendices only those items that expand on what has been said in the research report in truly helpful ways (this will also help keep your appendices to a manageable length for the APRC, which is dealing with multiple self-studies in each cycle).

3) How will you use what you learned to help you improve the quality of your academic program?

4) Discuss what you see as your most important challenges and opportunities as the unit looks toward the next five or ten years, as well as how your unit will contribute to realizing the college’s and the University’s Strategic Plan.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND ASSESSMENT PLANNING (MOU 2-4 pp and completed Assessment Planning template; due May 20, signed by end of spring quarter)  
The MOU identifies goals, actions, and priorities based on the findings and feedback of program review. Upon completion, the MOU becomes the unit’s plan for the next year and beyond, and is a public document. Specifically, the MOU includes the following:

1) An introduction including a brief review/acknowledgements pertaining to the unit’s program review and self-study efforts;

2) Common issues that affect several units under review in the current cycle and that, therefore, call for College and/or University-level commitments;

3) Identification of areas to be addressed, areas requiring further investigation and actions to be taken by the unit a) over the next year and b) over the next 2-5 years to sustain and improve the quality of the academic programs of the unit under review;

4) Identification of resource priorities needed from the College and/or University to support the unit’s proposed initiatives.

5) Endorsing signatures: Chair of the Unit’s Self-Study Team, Unit Department Chair/Program Director, APRC Director/Chair on behalf of the APRC, Dean of Unit’s College/School, Associate Vice President and Provost.
Include with your MOU, your responses to the Assessment Planning, Part 2, document (see footnote #11 for link to document). These prompts are designed to help you plan future assessment activities, including identifying resources and support you may need. The document will be provided to TLA so that it can support future assessment efforts. This document is for planning and guidance only and can be revised as necessary in the future.

ONE YEAR AND FIVE-YEAR FOLLOW-UPS
One year and five years after the MOU signing, the unit will be asked to reflect on the status of its MOU items. The one year follow-up gives the unit an opportunity to reevaluate their goals and reset their agenda for the future. The five-year follow-up gives the unit an opportunity to take stock of its successes, identify what remains as a challenge or concern, and consider how unmet goals will be addressed.

---

10 Available at the TLA website: http://condor.depaul.edu/tla/Learning/mapping.html#Mapping