Review Committee Report Guide

At Kent State University the academic program review process is used for long-term planning and in setting both university and program priorities. External reviewers play an essential role in the academic program review process through feedback based on their expertise in the discipline, objectivity and ability to place the program in a larger disciplinary context both nationally and internationally.

The feedback that external reviewers provide in the form of a final report should cover program strengths, challenges/weaknesses, opportunities and recommendations for change. It should be evaluative rather than descriptive, and should be forward-looking, not simply an assessment of the program's current status.

The external reviewers are responsible for writing the final report, although the internal KSU faculty representatives may be asked to provide information and/or clarification. Typically, reports are eight to ten pages in length, and are due within four weeks following the campus visit.

Below you will find some tips for writing the final report as well as specific questions to consider including in the final report, which mirror the sections of the unit's self-study report. These questions may be used to guide the review process and the final report.

Review Report Writing Tips

The following are some tips to aid in the development of the final report:

- Include a 1 to 1.5 page Executive Summary
- An 8 to 10 page written narrative, synthesizing views from all external reviewers.
- If you use bullets, please be sure to expound/fully describe each (bulleted) point.
- Highlight the major findings during your visit.
  - Did any recurring themes surface? Explain.
  - What program strengths were identified during the review?
  - What areas for further improvement were identified during the review?
  - What observations do you have (e.g., something you found unique, a hidden gem, low-hanging fruit or area that may soon be in need of further enhancement)?
- Provide detailed recommendations for further improvement.

Please also note:

- You do not have to answer every question in this guide. Focus on what stands out to you given your experiences, and knowledge of the field and respective programs, as well as what the team in aggregate found to be interesting or in need of modification. The college's dean along with provost may have also discussed additional areas for the external review team to examine.
- Aim to have an outline of the report completed before departure, if possible.

- Honorarium will be awarded upon receipt of final Reviewer's Report.
- The final draft of report should be submitted within four weeks after the review visit. Please send the final draft of the report to Dr. Susan Perry (sperry31@kent.edu) and CC Marcia Kibler (mkibler1@kent.edu)

Section 1: Context

1. Are the mission and scope of the unit suitable given the current number of faculty, students and the resources available to the program(s)?
(Ex: Are there too many or too few areas of specialty/emphasis within the program(s) given the size of the faculty and number of students?)

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding the identified concentrations/emphases within the undergraduate and graduate program(s).
(Ex: Are there too many or two few areas of emphasis? Are the areas consistent with current professional and/or disciplinary trends?)

3. Provide evaluative comments regarding how the undergraduate and graduate programs may have an impact locally, in the State of Ohio, nationally and internationally.

Section 2: Curriculum, Assessment of Student Learning and Program Improvement

1. Provide evaluative comments regarding the ability of the undergraduate and graduate programs to prepare students for a career path.

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding the program undergraduate and graduate requirements and course offerings.
(Ex: Is the curriculum up-to-date? Are course offerings meeting the needs of the students?)

3. Are student learning outcomes assessed and is this information used to improve the student learning experience?

4. Evaluate the program's use of distance education for undergraduate and graduate programs. Is the program taking advantage of current opportunities for distance education? Is there an appropriate balance between distance education and face-to-face offerings? Do distance education offerings have the same academic standards as face-to-face offerings?

5. Evaluate the program's efforts to assess their distance education offerings for undergraduate and graduate programs. Has adequate action been taken to improve the quality of their offerings?

Section 3: Current Students

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment efforts of the undergraduate and graduate program(s).

2. Evaluate the admissions criteria, including program selectivity and the effectiveness of the <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> criteria.

3. Provide evaluative comments about the quality and quantity of the <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> program(s) applicants, as well as those offered and accepting admission.

4. Evaluate the quantity and quality of <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> student publications, presentations, performances, exhibits, showings, honors and awards.

5. Evaluative trends in <u>undergraduate</u> enrollment, degrees awarded, student retention and the number of service courses offered.

6. Evaluative trends in <u>graduate</u> enrollment, time to degree, student retention, degrees awarded and tuition/stipend support.

7. A list of graduate student theses and dissertations should be provided in an appendix to the unit's self-study report. Please select several theses and/or dissertations from the list, and assess the quality of the students' work. The complete documents are available on-line through the <u>OhioLink Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Center</u>. The preceding link will direct you to Kent State University's Electronic Thesis and Dissertation page. From this page, select "Departments" from the navigation menu on the left-hand side of the screen. Each department or school is listed separately, with the college name appearing first in the list. Please note that departments/schools are listed twice—one link will take you to a list of theses and dissertations for that department, while the other will take you to undergraduate honors theses. There is no way to distinguish between the two links, so if one takes you to undergraduate honors theses, you will need to go back to the list and find the other link. Alternatively, you may use the search feature at the top of the page to search by department/school, thesis/dissertation title or author name.

Section 4: Academic Support and Career Development Opportunities
Undergraduate Program(s)

1. Provide evaluative comments regarding how prepared <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> students are for a career path.

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding faculty mentoring for <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> students.
   (Ex: Is faculty mentoring regularly assessed, and is the program making appropriate changes based on these assessments? Are faculty identifying and supporting students who are not making adequate progress to their degree? Is the program providing adequate support to students who have special challenges, such as those coming from an underrepresented group or different culture or those with disabilities?)

3. Provide evaluative comments regarding the <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> program-arranged internships/placements.
   (Ex: Does the internship/placement enhance the pedagogical experience for the student? Are internships/placements regularly assessed, and is the program making appropriate changes based on these assessments?)

4. Comment on the proportion of <u>graduate</u> students that receive full (20 hours/week) and half (10 hours/week) assistantships. Are the average stipend amounts above average, average or below average?

5. Are the duties of <u>graduate</u> teaching assistants, research assistants and administrative assistants consistent with what you would expect? Are the students adequately prepared for and mentored in their duties?

6. Evaluate the program's efforts to assess the quality of graduate assistantship positions and the performance of teaching, research and administrative assistants. Has adequate action been taken to improve the quality of assistantship positions?

Section 5: Alumni

1. Is the program using an adequate process to gauge <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> student satisfaction? Is feedback being used to improve program quality in an appropriate way?

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding the employment obtained by program graduates and the career paths that the program is designed to support.

Section 6: Faculty, Administration, and Staff

1. Evaluate the diversity of unit's faculty.

2. Evaluate the overall scholarship and creative activity of the faculty with respect to both the quantity and quality of their work since the last review. Is this level of productivity what you would expect for a unit of this size and scope? Evaluate the outlets in which faculty are publishing and presenting their work.

3. Provide evaluative comments on the overall faculty workload, including research, undergraduate and graduate teaching, advising and service. Is this what you would expect for a unit of this size and scope?

4. Provide evaluative comments on the use of non-tenure track faculty, adjuncts and graduate students in teaching. Is this what you would expect for a unit of this size and scope?

5. What is your evaluation of the level of graduate student support from external awards given the goals and scope of the program?

6. Provide general comments and impressions of the unit's funding history and prospects for future funding in light of the funding opportunities in the discipline.

7. Is the administrative structure adequate in meeting the needs of the <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> programs and the students?

8. Please evaluate the <u>undergraduate</u> (if applicable) and <u>graduate</u> student handbook(s), which should be provided in an Appendix to the unit's self-study report.
(Ex: Are there areas that should be covered but are missing? Are there inconsistencies between the material covered in the handbook(s) and other university policies or procedures?)

Section 7: Facilities and Resources

1. Are the unit's office and laboratory spaces, specialized facilities and equipment and any other resources (e.g., computers, computer software, journal subscriptions) adequate?

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding how the unit's funding and resources are used to support <u>undergraduate</u> and <u>graduate</u> education.

3. Is the unit's revenue generation, including revenue generated through tuition, external funding and endowments, suitable given the size and scope of the program? Comment on the opportunities for revenue generation that are available to the program.