History of Academic Program Review at JMU

Academic Program Review (APR) was first undertaken at James Madison University (JMU) in the 1993-94 academic year. Three programs were reviewed on an experimental basis in that year and six additional programs in 1994-1995. In 1995-96 the University formalized the APR process and began to review programs on a six-year cycle. Since that time, almost all of the programs at JMU have completed academic review. The guidelines for conducting APR were first developed in the Office of the Provost. An Ad Hoc Committee chosen by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Office of Academic Enhancement revised the current guidelines in the summer of 1999. The Academic Council approved substantive changes to the guidelines in April 2005. Additional changes to this revision have been made to delineate between goals and objectives related to program activities in contrast to those focused on student learning objectives. An excellent monograph entitled, *Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major*, published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities was used extensively in the development of these guidelines. Copies of the monograph are available in the Office of Academic Enhancement. It describes the conceptual framework underlying APR and should prove helpful as faculty undertake discussions of various areas critical to the success of their program(s).

Introduction and Purpose of Academic Program Review

The national movement toward outcome assessment is becoming increasingly important in the determination of a program's quality and requires that attention be given to the effects of the program on students. Therefore, a clear specification of desired educational outcomes with accompanying evidence of achievement is required when conducting an APR. JMU has also recognized the need for APR to be responsive to outside constituents, to require data necessary for allocation of resources and to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs on students. APR is a common practice in most colleges and universities and has often been a part of an accreditation process or initiated by campus administrators to monitor program quality.

Accreditation often focuses on various data as indicators of program quality. As useful as these data may be, APR requires additional data to assess the actual educational quality of a program. The position stated in the monograph, *Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major*, suggests that to assess educational quality one must also examine the issues of curriculum and pedagogy. These issues are more directly related to objectives, instructional practices, and learning outcomes. In the endeavor to improve the quality of teaching and learning, APR should result in an increased awareness of faculty members about their educational goals and practices. Foremost, it should encourage the program and program faculty to identify specific areas of the program that have been successful as well as identifying areas of the program requiring change.
“In a very real sense, APR is (or should be) a continuous process.” This statement in the aforementioned monograph recognizes the importance of teachers reflecting on the effectiveness of what they are doing when they advise and teach their students. This kind of reflection should result in continual modifications being made to their courses and programs. However, periodic structured reviews are still necessary. APR should not be initiated or viewed solely as a response by administrators to external constituencies or a crisis situation but to the ultimate goal of improving the program.

APR continues to be a university-wide process that intends to demonstrate both unit and institutional commitment to excellence, rational decision-making, and accountability and that:

- Facilitates and stimulates continuous growth toward excellence (quality improvement) of academic programs.
- Provides a coherent planning process that systematically links unit and university-wide goals, interests, direction, and resources.
- Provides data and program direction to be used by the President and Provost in their interaction with external constituencies.
- Facilitates the program’s ability to accurately portray their character and outcomes.
- Creates a positive system of accountability on the part of both the institution and the individual unit that involves both internal and external examination.
- Is integrated with external accreditation and other reporting and planning processes. Most notably of these is the Six-Year Plan of the University, The Southern Association of Schools (SACS), the Annual Report, and various surveys administered by the Center for Assessment and Research Studies (CARS) and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
Types of Academic Program Reviews

Comprehensive

Comprehensive APR’s must follow the guidelines in the Internal Self-Study Report. APR Guidelines may be modified for units in the Division of Academic Affairs that support academic programs but do not offer degree programs. A comprehensive review seeks assessment and/or evaluative information about the entire program or unit. The Guidelines for Comprehensive APR’s recommend that they occur at least once every six to eight years. The APR schedule may be modified at the discretion of the Office of the Provost in consultation with the Deans and Heads of programs. Decisions to modify the APR schedule are made on the basis of considerations such as pending program changes, changes in program leadership, the influence of technology and budgetary constraints. The intent of a comprehensive review is the examination of programmatic issues as outlined in the Internal Self-Study Report.

Accreditation

Reviews by accrediting agencies may be substituted for comprehensive reviews if they are outcome-based, demonstrate substantial JMU faculty involvement, and include on-campus visits from the accrediting agency. Student learning outcomes and assessment must be part of the Accreditation Report along with Assessment Progress Templates. Substituting an accreditation review for a comprehensive review allows a program to invite additional external reviewers to examine areas not addressed by the accrediting review. A request for submitting a review from an accrediting agency is subject to approval by the Dean of the College in which the program resides and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
Roles and Responsibilities for Academic Program Review

The APR process requires collaboration among the various units and offices of the University and individuals from the community. The planning of successful reviews involves shared responsibilities and includes all major stakeholders. Further, the implementation of the findings of the process becomes a matter of mutual accountability.

THE DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

**Provost**
- Meets with the External Review Team (ERT) during the onsite review.
- May assist the Dean of a college in the preparation of a response to the recommendations of the report written by the ERT.

**Vice Provost for Academic Affair**
- Gives final approval to the lists of persons nominated to serve on the ERT.
- Oversees the APR process through the Academic Program Review Coordinator and with the cooperation of the colleges and academic programs.
- Attends the exit interview conducted by the External Review Team.
- Approves the APR schedule and any changes as requested by the Dean and Academic Unit Head of the program.
- Approves changes to the Academic Program Review Guidelines.

**Coordinator of Academic Program Review:**
- Provides orientation and consultation to the self-study teams involved in the APR.
- Monitors progress of the self-study.
- Contacts ERT to inform them of honorariums and procedures for travel and lodging.
- Assists in the development of the itinerary for the on-site visit.
- Meets with JMU external team members and the program coordinator to review questions and issues raised by External Review Team members before the onsite visit.
- Provides transportation and escorts the ERT to and from the campus.
- Attends meetings of the ERT.
Executive Secretary in the Office of Academic Affairs

- Develops a schedule for the visit of the ERT, in consultation with the Academic Unit Head and the JMU chairperson of the ERT.
- Makes copies of the self-study and distributes them to the ERT and other appropriate offices at least one month prior to the visit.
- Contacts members on the ERT to make arrangements related to travel and lodging.
- Schedules meeting rooms and meals onsite for the ERT and all persons who will meet with them during the interview process.
- Prepares copies of the final report of the ERT and distributes them to the appropriate offices and persons.
- Sends a copy of the program self-study, the External Report and the Action Plan to the Carrier Library to be archived.

THE COLLEGES

Deans

- Identifies the programs to be reviewed and sets the schedule for their review in consultation with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Academic Unit Heads.
- Participates in the planning and implementation of internal self-studies.
- Approves the selection of the Internal Review Committee and may recommend members for the ERT in conjunction with the Academic Unit Head.
- Identifies questions and focus areas to be addressed in the review in conjunction with the Academic Unit Head.
- Reviews and approves the Internal Self-Study that is forwarded to the External Review Team through the Office of the Provost.
- Reviews the final report and recommendations of the ERT.
- Is responsible, in conjunction with the Academic Unit Head, for integrating the ERT’s recommendations into the Action Plan describing the planning and budgeting process for the college.
The Academic Unit Head

- Approves/recommends the chairperson and members for the Internal Self-Study Committee.
- Approves/nominates, in consultation with the Dean and program faculty, the membership of the ERT using the Criteria for Selection of External Review Team.
- Submits, for approval, a list of ERT nominees to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs through the college Dean.
- Coordinates the preparation of the Internal Self-Study. Approves and forwards the self-study to the Office of Academic Enhancement through the Dean.
- Monitors implementation of recommendations resulting from the internal self-study and the report of the ERT. Communicates progress regarding these recommendations to the Dean as part of the Annual Report.
THE THREE STAGES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Academic Program Review is a three-stage process. The first stage of APR is the development of a written Internal Self-Study that occurs at the program level and should involve all program faculty as well as support personnel. The second stage of APR involves a review of the Internal Self-Study and an on-site visit by the external team who interview students, faculty, administrators and support staff associated with the program. A written External Team Report is submitted recognizing the strengths of the program and suggesting recommendations for improvement. The third stage of APR is the development of an Action Plan by the college Dean and program representatives identifying major objectives of the program, the plan for achieving those objectives and a timeline for their completion. The Internal Self-Study, the External Report and the Action Plan are sent to the appropriate offices and are archived in the Carrier Library.

Stage One: The Internal Self-Study

At the beginning of the Internal Self-Study, the self-study team identifies the major goals they want to achieve. These will vary from program to program depending on the nature of the program, previous reviews that have been conducted and current developments in the particular discipline. Examples of major goals that have been undertaken in previous APR’S include some of the following:

- Identifying potential linkages between the program and others within a college in order to develop new major concentrations.
- Examining the relationship of the curriculum to the General Education Program and undertaking appropriate modifications.
- Performing an environmental scan to determine rapidly changing characteristics of the employment market.
- Seeking consultation from experts in technology to improve the use of technology in instruction.
- Undertaking a significant reconceptualization of the curriculum in a discipline that no longer attracts a significant number of majors.
- Undertaking a significant restructuring of a department to improve the focus of the curriculum and to more efficiently utilize resources within the department.

The self-study team is expected to seek input from faculty and staff both within and external to the program that impact the program. Additionally, students currently enrolled in the program and those who have recently graduated provide information critical to the self-study process. For APR’S to be useful, evidence collected over time is preferred to that collected immediately prior to the review. Annual reports are and continue to be increasingly important in establishing both the accomplishments and needs
of programs over time. This kind of evidence is necessary to analyze trends and to serve as a reminder to the importance of staying alert to factors affecting the quality of the program. The Alumni Survey and the Employer Survey provide programmatic information that is extremely useful to the self-study process. The result of all these activities leads to the production of an Internal Self-Study of the program that is forwarded to the Academic Unit Head, College Dean, and the Office of the Provost. Early in the development of the Internal Self-Study, prospective members for the ERT are identified and contacted to serve as reviewers of the program.

**Chairperson of the Internal Self-Study Committee**

- Meets with the Coordinator of Academic Program Review (APR) to discuss questions and issues related to the development of the Internal Self-Study.
- May invite the Coordinator of APR to meet with the Internal Self-Study Committee to discuss the APR Guidelines.
- Assigns sub-committees as needed to address sections of APR Guidelines.
- Develops timelines and monitors progress of the Internal Self-Study.
- Submits the Internal Self-Study to the Academic Unit Head for approval.
- Develops a list of nominees for the ERT onsite visit.
- Ensures that Section II-E of the Internal Self-Study is sent to the Coordinator for Academic Program Review before any nominees for the ERT have been contacted.

**Internal Self-Study Committee**

Generally composed of six persons from the program or department and should include in addition the liaison librarian/ILR liaison, the program’s assessment liaison to the program (program faculty designee), student representatives and graduates of the program, if feasible.

- Completes the self-study using the guidelines provided within this document, after receiving notification from the Dean or Academic Unit Head.
- Completes the Internal Self-Study and submits it to the Coordinator of Academic Program Review **at least six weeks prior to the visit of the ERT**.
- Responsible for involving the entire program faculty who are not serving directly on the committee.
- Proposes a specific schedule for the onsite visit of the ERT in consultation with the Dean and Coordinator of APR.
- Selects, in counsel with the Academic Unit Head, the persons to serve on the ERT and submits the list for approval to the Dean and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- Meets and presents an overview of the program to the ERT during the Sunday night dinner at the beginning of the onsite visit.
Stage Two: The External Review

The External Review provides an opportunity for program faculty and administrators to gain a perspective on the strengths and weaknesses of the program from academicians and practitioners outside of the university. Serving as an ERT, the primary charge of these individuals is to review the Internal Self-Study and make substantive comments regarding each of the major areas. The External Review Team is normally composed of six individuals—two individuals from within the university and four external to the university. Upon completion of their work, they will produce an External Report that will identify strengths of the program and make recommendations for improvement.

Criteria for the Selection of the External Review Team

- Two of the External Team members will be JMU faculty from outside of the programs college. One of these members will serve as the chairperson for the External Review Team.

- Two members of the External Review Team should be academicians from peer institutions outside the Commonwealth of Virginia with significant regional and national visibility in the discipline being reviewed.

- One or two practitioner members should be chosen from persons employed in areas related to the program. They should be individuals who can provide valuable information relative to career demands and development.

- One graduate of the program within the past two to five years is selected who can provide a perspective on the contribution of the program to their career.

James Madison University shall not knowingly select an off-campus person as an evaluator on an external academic program review committee if that evaluator:

1. Has been – within the last ten years – a compensated consultant, an appointee or employee of the institution, or has been a candidate within the past five years for employment at the institution.

2. Has a close personal or familial relationship with persons at the institution or a strong bias regarding the institution.

3. Is a member of an association or professional activity that an impartial person might reasonably conclude would serve as an impediment to rendering an impartial, objective professional judgment regarding the accreditation of an institution.
Chairperson of the External Review Team

The role of the chairperson is to ensure that the external team members develop program recommendations based on several sources of information. This would include the internal self-study report, documentation from university sources and interviews with faculty, students, and administrators. The chairperson has the responsibility to:

- Gather any supplemental information requested by team members prior to the onsite visit.
- Notify the Coordinator of Program Review to contact additional persons that the team requests for interviewing during the onsite visit.
- Ensure that the APR Guidelines are followed.
- Chair the interview process and ensure that the timeline and schedule is followed as much as possible.
- Review the schedule developed for the onsite visit and makes any needed changes.
- Assign team members writing responsibilities for sections of the external report following the outline of the self-study.
- Inform team members of their role in the exit interview.
- Set the deadline for written responses and editorial comments from team members and compose the final written report.
- Submit the written report to the Coordinator of Academic Program Review within thirty to forty-five days of the onsite visit.

External Review Team Members

The role of the committee is to:

- Review the Internal Self-Study and make substantive comments and recommendations regarding each of the major areas covered.
- Assist the chairperson by reading the Internal Self-Study and identifying any issues or additional information needed before the onsite visit.
- Interview faculty, students, and administrators who have a direct impact on the program.
- Act as consultants to the program by providing information and expertise based on their experience and involvement with similar programs elsewhere.
- Provide the unique perspective of the “real world” activities of persons graduating from programs in the discipline being reviewed.
- Participate in the writing and editing of the external report.
- Provide recommendations for program improvement giving consideration to personnel, planning, and accommodations.
The External Report

The Chairperson of the ERT, after receiving written responses from all members of the team, writes the External Review Report. The report should follow the outline referenced at the end of these guidelines. The report should be approximately ten to twelve pages in length. It should summarize the findings of the External Review Team and provide specific recommendations relative to each section of the Internal Self-Study Report. The report should also include an Executive Summary of two to three pages. The complete report is sent to the Coordinator of Academic Program Review. It is photocopied and forwarded to the department/program and Dean. Both the Internal Self-Study Report and the External Review Report are archived in Carrier Library. At all levels, recommendations made by the External Review Team are incorporated into the planning process. The Academic Council reviews the recommendations of the internal and external reports and is responsible for incorporating the results of the APRs into the Master Plan for the Division of Academic Affairs. Central to this process is prioritizing the needs of various programs and allocating necessary resources to them.

Faculty Response to the External Report

The faculty of the program being reviewed has the opportunity to respond to the recommendations made by the ERT. A written response to the recommendations made in the External Team Report may be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs through the Dean of the college. The intent of the response is to address any factual errors made by the ERT.
Stage Three: The Action Plan

The program faculty and Dean are responsible for developing an action plan. This is done in consultation with the Office of the Provost. The action plan should include time lines for various activities and should be integrated into the department and college annual reports. The action plan will describe how the program intends to implement the recommendations of the external team and the extent to which educational goals and objectives are being achieved. Action Plans may be accessed through the department in which the program resides. Action Plans should be submitted with the Annual Report or within the semester following receipt of the external APR report. Action plans based on Accreditation reports must include student learning outcomes.

Specific responses to External Review Team recommendations are reviewed annually and incorporated into the Restructuring Report for the university that is provided to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV). Funding allocations to the university are based on evidence of vitality and currency in the programs of the University. In addition, SCHEV utilizes this information for long-range planning and resource allocation at the state level.

OUTLINE FOR THE INTERNAL SELF-STUDY REPORT

While the Internal Self-Study should basically conform to the following outline, it is understood that the relative emphasis given to each of the items will vary depending on the major goals and objectives of a particular APR. The following outline may be supplemented with additional sections to focus on issues that are most relevant to the program.

The self-study document should be subdivided by section using the heading in the outline below. Each major section should be tabbed in order to make it easier for external reviewers to reference the self-study. Supporting documentation, identified at the end of this outline, should be in the self-study so that the review team may see it before their onsite visit. Extensive documentation should be provided to the team on CD’s. The Internal Self-Study and CD’s should be sent to the Office of the Provost at least six weeks before the scheduled onsite visit. They will be copied and sent to the External Review Team at least one month prior to their arrival on campus.

I. Executive Summary for the Internal Self-Study
   An executive summary of the self-study including an overview of the major recommendations for future action should be provided. This summary should be two to three pages in length.
II. Narrative Section

A. History and Mission

1. Give a brief history of the program.
2. What is the current mission statement?
3. How was the current mission statement developed and who participated in it?
4. How does the current or proposed mission statement support the college and university mission statements?

B. Discuss program structure and reputation:

1. Evaluate the program in the following areas:
   a. Viability of the program in terms of state, regional and national needs.
   b. Coherence and integrity of the curriculum when compared to standards of best practice as determined by regional and national learned societies.
   c. Currency (timeliness) of the curriculum both now and for future students.
   d. Compare the program to other programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia and/or comparable programs offered elsewhere. What is unique about the JMU program?
   e. Discuss the national accreditation status of the program, if applicable.

2. Assess the size of the program regarding need for expansion or contraction. Use regional and national sources of data regarding demand for the program and placement of majors in the employment market.

3. Discuss the service that the program provides to non-majors, if applicable.

4. Discuss the reputation of the program among current students, graduates, employers and other faculty throughout the University.
C. **Evaluate the program’s role in the college and the university:**

1. Discuss the process whereby program faculty work collectively to develop curricula and do long-range planning for the program.

2. Identify the degree of participation and involvement of individual faculty in carrying out program objectives.

3. Discuss cooperative or joint efforts with other programs.

4. Discuss the relationship of the program to college-wide efforts (e.g., minor offerings and interdisciplinary programs).

5. Discuss the relationship of the program to general education, if applicable.

6. Discuss faculty involvement in governance and curricular activities in the department, college and the university.

7. Discuss the commitment of the program to diversity both among program faculty and students within the program.

D. **Evaluate the role of students in the program.**

1. Describe the academic and pre-career advising system and the student’s perception of it.

2. Describe the involvement of the students in program affairs.

3. Provide information on:
   a. The academic standard or passing level of various competencies contained within the program.
   b. Provide information regarding the percentage of students that have met or exceeded the academic standards set by the program.
   c. Provide an interpretation of assessment findings about the quality of the program, including strengths and weaknesses regarding various program components (e.g., courses, field experiences, internships, etc.)
E. Provide assessment data on student learning objectives using the Assessment Progress Template for Annual Academic Department Reporting (see below).

Introduction and Purpose:
The purpose of this template is to provide the most current assessment related information for each of JMU’s academic programs. A separate template will be completed for each academic major program offered at JMU. With this information, James Madison University will have information to share with both internal and external constituents about the quality of all academic programs.

How to Obtain Assistance with Template Completion:
PASS is a service that provides assessment-related assistance to members of the JMU community, including help with the writing of objectives, the creation of an assessment design, and the analysis of data. You may also directly contact your CARS faculty assessment liaison for assistance (please contact PASS if you do not know who serves as your CARS faculty assessment liaison). To contact PASS by phone, you may call 568-7962. You can also reach PASS via email at programassessment@jmu.edu.

I. Objectives - Please provide your academic program’s learning goals and objectives. Describe the process by which the objectives receive faculty review. Which, if any, of your objectives were modified, deleted, or added in the last year?

II. Course/Learning Experiences - Provide the linkage between your program’s goals and objectives and their instructional delivery via your curriculum. This can be demonstrated with a matrix that lists the goals and objectives by the courses that address each. See page 22.

III. Evaluation/Assessment Methods - Provide a listing of the systematic methods and procedures for gathering information about achievement of your goals and objectives. This can also be demonstrated with a matrix or similar form that lists the goals and objectives by assessment methods. See the form on page 22 of these guidelines. Please also describe the process for systematic data collection.

IV. Objective Accomplishments/Results - Provide a description of your program’s assessment results for the last two years. Provide an interpretation of the program’s assessment results. What do these results mean for you and your faculty?

V. Dissemination- Describe how your assessment results are shared with your faculty and others concerned with your program. Illustrate how your assessment results are incorporated in the planning and governance structure of your program.

VI. Uses of Evaluation/Assessment Results and Actions Taken. Demonstrate how the program’s assessment results have been used to contribute to program improvement and enhanced student learning and growth. Examples of program actions taken might include modification and or additions to learning objectives, curriculum revisions, instructional delivery changes, changes in course sequencing, or increased emphasis on specific skill development.
F. **Assess the faculty in the following areas:**

1. The commitment of the program faculty to teaching, advising, scholarship, and service activities.
2. The perception of students regarding the overall level of teaching in the program.
3. The level of research and service activity of the faculty.
4. The quality of faculty credentials as compared to comparable institutions throughout the country. *(Complete curriculum vitae may be included in the appendix of the review or, if extensive, on a CD.)*

G. **Evaluate the quality and quantity of academic support:**

1. The adequacy of the staffing level of the program, given its mission.
2. Assess the library resources, indicating the levels and quality of access to information. Also assess the level to which students are able to locate and use relevant materials.
3. Evaluate the adequacy of non-salary based support (e.g. operating budget, grants, foundation money).
4. Evaluate the level of technological support necessary to carry out the program mission.
5. Evaluate the adequacy of facilities utilized in the program including classrooms, labs, other instructional facilities, and office space.
6. Where appropriate, provide specific recommendations for future modifications in facilities for the program.

H. **Strategic Goals and Objectives (as found in Annual Reports, Action Plans and the University Planning Database)**

1. State the programs current major annual and strategic goals and objectives. Describe how they relate to the: university and college.
2. Describe the methods used to assess and evaluate the achievement of these goals and objectives.
3. Identify and briefly describe the major activities that have supported efforts in achieving these goals and objectives.
4. How were these goals and objectives developed and communicated to faculty and students?
5. How would you define the goals of the program for the next five years in light of your self-evaluation? What will be the major priorities for the program?
6. What specific recommendations do you have for improvement of the quality of the program? Have assessment results been utilized in framing these recommendations?

7. Plans for Implementation:

   a. Specific steps the program can initiate (e.g., substantive areas you plan to concentrate on; areas in which you could seek faculty replacements, changes in faculty workload, specific efforts to cooperate with cognate and other units of the university). That is, how might you re-marshal your existing resources to achieve the changes you advocate?

   b. If you had additional resources, to what priorities would you allocate them and why?
III. **Documentation:** The following documents are listed as possible resources of information for the Internal Self Study. Extensive data should be stored on CD’s and referenced within the self-study.

A. Program requirements and Curriculum Design – including course descriptions.

B. Alumni Surveys.

C. Number of declared majors and minors – a five-year retrospective summary. (provided by the Office of Academic Affairs or departmental records).

D. The service role of the department -- a five-year retrospective of overall enrollments including changes in student-faculty ratio as well as race/gender information provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and from department records.

E. Departmental Budget Information -- salary and non-salary as a five-year retrospective from departmental records or you can request from the Office of Academic Affairs.

F. External support and sponsored research -- a five-year retrospective (provided by Sponsored Programs).

G. Faculty Vitae. (Much of this information can be derived from Departmental Annual Reports.)

H. Equipment and facilities -- description and evaluation of facilities and equipment available as needed.

I. A summary of assessment data collected annually in collaboration with CARS.

J. The department’s current strategic plan and annual reports provide a history of program changes.

K. A collection of 20-30 representative course syllabi, including courses that are mandatory to the program.

L. All reports related to external accreditation.

M. University Planning Database provides information on program objectives

N. University undergraduate or graduate catalog.
Outline of the External Review Team Report

The following outline is to be followed but may be supplemented with additional sections that identified issues most relevant to the program.

I. Executive Summary (Two-three pages identifying major findings and recommendations).

II. Narrative

  a. Response to history and mission

  b. Response to program structure and reputation

  c. Response to evaluation of program role in the college and university

  d. Response to the role of students in the program

  e. Response to assessment of student learning objectives in the program

  f. Response to assessment of faculty

  g. Response to evaluation of the quality and quantity of academic support

  h. Response to strategic goals and objectives
SAMPLE MODEL FOR AN EXTERNAL REVIEW SCHEDULE:

Normally, team visits are planned so that the team members arrive on Sunday afternoon and depart sometime on Tuesday depending on the requirements of the review. The specific activities and meetings associated with each review will vary depending on the nature and needs of the program. However, the following represent some of the types of activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>External Program Review</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, (Date)</td>
<td>Met at hotel lobby by Program Review Coordinator for drive to JMU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>Orientation to APR &amp; review of program documents and issues Room TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-6:00</td>
<td>Tour of Campus Facilities (if needed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-8:30</td>
<td>Team dinner and overview of program Room TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>External Review Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Internal Review Team Representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Academic Unit Head</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dean of the College</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Program Review Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty, Staff, and Administration to be interviewed**

- **Mandatory:** Assessment, Faculty, and Students
- **As Needed:** Library, Advising, University Studies, and Graduate and Outreach Programs

**Note:** Schedule can be adjusted to fit your needs

**MONDAY, DATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>Met at hotel lobby--escorted by Program Review Coordinator to JMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00</td>
<td>External Review Team meets to review questions to be asked during interviews. Room TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:45</td>
<td>Meet with Room TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:30</td>
<td>Meet with Room TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10:30-10:45   Break

10:45-11:30   Meet with ____________________________

              Room TBA

11:30-1:00   Lunch

              Location TBA On/off campus

1:00-1:45   Meet with ____________________________

              Room TBA

1:45-2:30   Meet with ____________________________

              Room TBA

2:30-2:45   Break

2:45-3:30   Meet with ____________________________

              Room TBA

3:30-4:15   Meet with ____________________________

              Room TBA

4:15-5:00   Meet with Douglas Brown, Provost.

              Room TBA

5:00-5:45   Meet with ____________________________

              Room TBA

5:45-6:15   Team Meeting

6:15-8:00   External Team Dinner and Meeting,

              Location TBA On/off campus

**TUESDAY, DATE**

8:15    Meet Coordinator of Program Review at hotel lobby and drive to JMU

8:30-11:00   External Team compiles preliminary findings

              Room TBA

11:00-11:45   External Team presents Exit Interview to the Program Faculty,

              Academic Unit Head, Dean of the College, and Vice Provost for Academics

              Room TBA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Course/Learning Experiences</th>
<th>Evaluation/Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Objective Accomplishments/Results</th>
<th>Uses of Evaluation/Assessment Results and Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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</table>