



Guidelines for Academic Program Review  
Updated October 24, 2025

## Table of Contents

Purpose of Academic Program Review	3
Academic Program Review Cycle Timeline	4
Stage 1: Self-Study Overview	5
I. Self-Study Preparation	5
II. Resources	5
III. Drafting and Submitting the Self-Study Report	5
Stage 1-1: Self Study Report Template	6
I. Introduction and Context	6
II. Evaluation of Program Excellence	6
III. Evaluation of Program Sustainability and Support	8
IV. Self-Study Summary	9
Stage 2: External Review Overview	10
I. External Review Team	10
II. Choosing Reviewers	10
III. External Reviewer Documents	10
IV. Preparation for Site Visit Site Visit Itinerary	11
V. Site Visit Logistics	11
VI. External Review Report and Responses	11
Stage 2-1: Sample Site Visit Schedule	12
Stage 2-2: External Reviewer—Letter of Agreement	14
Stage 2-4: External Reviewer Report Guidelines	15
Stage 3: Overview of Action Plan and Memorandum of Understanding	20
Stage 3-1: Action Plan Template	21
Stage 3-2: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	23
Appendix A: Seven Year Program Review Cycle	24

Acknowledgement: In revising our program review guidelines, SCU gratefully acknowledges colleagues at the University of San Diego. USD's materials and forms were particularly helpful in guiding our own revisions.

## I. Purpose of Academic Program Review

Santa Clara University engages in the academic program review (APR) process as part of the ongoing process of program improvement and commitment to academic excellence. Program review provides an opportunity for the department or program to evaluate its effectiveness in achieving its educational goals, to identify ways it is functioning well and ways it can be improved, and to develop strategic, realistic plans and priorities for the future direction of the program. Although every program will address similar questions, it is helpful for the program to identify a small number of key issues or challenges upon which it will focus on from the outset of the program review. This might involve the curriculum, challenges in student learning, or working toward better meeting goals of diversity and inclusion.

Program reviews are integral to planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making within the university. Academic programs follow a schedule of program review determined by the Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness in conjunction with each School or College. Each academic program (department/major) must complete a program review, although schools or programs which are accredited by an agency other than WSCUC may follow a more abbreviated template since much of their accreditation self-study report overlaps with the program review template used at Santa Clara University. A separate document addresses the guidelines for programs accredited with agencies other than WSCUC.

Program review typically occurs every seven years on a schedule determined by the Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness in consultation with each school's dean. It consists of a three-stage process as shown in Figure 1, beginning with a reflective self-study, followed by an external review, and culminating with a long-term plan and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). All three stages of the program review should be completed within five quarters. The Dean provides ongoing guidance and feedback within each program. Both the Dean and Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness provide feedback at the conclusion of the process. The Academic Affairs Committee is responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the program review process and recommending changes to improve the process.

Programs must retain documentation relating to program review in a systematic and retrievable fashion for at least eight years. Such documentation includes at minimum the Self-Study Report, the External Reviewers' Report, the Long-term Action Plan, and any other pertinent reports.

Figure 1. Academic Program Review Three-Stage Process



### A. Academic Program Review Cycle Timeline

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Year prior to APR			Orientation to PR (Dean and Provost's Office) Department Plans for Self-Study
Year 1: Self-Study	Start Self-Study	Self-Study	Complete Self-Study/Identify External Reviewers
Year 2: External Review and Action Plan	External Review visit	Develop Action Plan and Conclude APR	Submit first assessment report summarizing any intended changes to Mission, Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Alignment
Year 3: Implement Action Plan and Begin New Cycle of Annual Assessments	Implement Action Plan/Identify Assessment Project	Begin New Cycle of Annual Assessments	Finish Annual Assessment Project
Year 4: Implement Action Plan (as applies) and Continue with Annual Assessments	Implement Action Plan/Identify Assessment Project	Begin New Cycle of Annual Assessments	Finish Annual Assessment Project
Year 5: Implement Action Plan (as applies) and Continue with Annual Assessments	Implement Action Plan/Identify Assessment Project	Begin New Cycle of Annual Assessments	Finish Annual Assessment Project
Year 6: Annual Assessments	Implement Action Plan/Identify Assessment Project	Begin New Cycle of Annual Assessments	Finish Annual Assessment Project
Year 7: Annual Assessment/Reflection on Impact of Action Plan	Implement Action Plan/Identify Assessment Project	Begin New Cycle of Annual Assessments	Finish Annual Assessment Project
Prepare for next Program Review			Orientation to PR (Dean and Provost's Office)

## **II. Stage 1: Self-Study Overview**

This section describes the preparation leading up to the program's self-study, the resources to guide the program's work, and the template for the self-study report.

### **I. Self-Study Preparation**

- A. Initiation of process
  - a. The Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and dean confirm with each other the date that the self-study is to commence.
  - b. The Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, dean or associate dean, and other members of the Provost's Office including, Educational Assessment and Institutional Research, offer a Program Review Workshop for departments or program review teams to receive training in the program review process the quarter prior to the beginning of the self-study. Teams should also schedule individual sessions with the dean's office.
  - c. Departments establish their process for undertaking and completing the self-study within the specified timeframe.

### **II. Resources**

- A. Orientation: The Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, associate dean, and other members of the Provost's Office (including, the Educational Assessment and Institutional Research), offer a Program Review Workshop for Self-Study teams to receive training in the program review process the quarter prior to the beginning of the self-study. Teams should also schedule individual sessions with the dean's office prior to and following the workshop.
- B. The IR website contains valuable data that should be used as evidence in responding to self-study items (e.g., enrollment, retention, graduation, faculty).
- C. With approval of the Provost's Office, Institutional Research can provide additional analyses to address issues the department has identified as relevant for their self-study.

### **III. Drafting and Submitting the Self-Study Report**

- A. The self-study report template assists programs by providing a template that lays out the self-study components, guiding questions, and examples of supporting data.
- B. Excluding appendices, the self-study report should not exceed 20 pages.
- C. Programs may request samples of other program review self-study reports and can consult with program self-study teams that have successfully completed the full program review cycle.
- D. The final self-study report should be submitted to the dean, associate dean, and the Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

### III. Stage 1-1: Self Study Report Template

#### I. Introduction and Context

This section describes central features of the program. Information in this section typically include answers to the following:

- A. *History and Development*: Provide a brief introduction and history of the program/department. Give an overview of the program and its degrees and concentrations. This section should especially focus on any major changes that have taken place within the program since the last review.
- B. *Mission and Goals*: Describe the program's mission, goals, and learning objectives/outcomes. How are the mission and goals aligned with the mission, strategic directions, and student learning goals for undergraduates of the university and the college/school in which it resides?
- C. *Program Contribution to University and Community*: How does the program contribute to its discipline and to the university? How does the program respond to the needs of the community/region/profession?
- D. *Program Contribution to a Diverse Learning Environment*: How does the program contribute to fostering a diverse learning environment with respect to the students, faculty/staff, the curriculum, and the university as a whole?
- E. *Overview of Special Issues*: Provide an overview of any special issues or concerns the program is facing and wishes to address in its self-study.

#### II. Evaluation of Program Excellence

This section provides profiles of the central elements (students, curriculum, and faculty) and evidence of student learning effectiveness, and other indicators of program excellence.

- A. *Student Profile*: What is the current profile of students in the program? Are there any concerns the student profile (ability to attract majors, diversity of majors, preparedness, or any persistence/time to degree issues?) What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its students' profile?

Data for this section should include # of majors, minors; characteristics of students (demographic, preparedness); retention and graduation rates (including any differences by gender, race/ethnicity, first-generation status). It may also address information about students related to the special issues identified by the program for the self-study.

- B. *Curriculum*: Describe curricular requirements of the program. Describe the efforts of the department to stay current with disciplinary-based trends. How well aligned is the curriculum with the program learning outcomes? Are there course sequences; are those reliably available? Do any external stakeholders (advisory board, practitioners) regularly review the program? What course enrollment trends, and other learning/development experiences (e.g., advising, internships, research experiences) are also relevant? In addition to an analysis of its own program, programs should provide comparative analyses with at least two other programs (one peer, one aspirational) in terms of the curriculum and any other issues of interest to the program. What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its curriculum?

Data for this section should include a comparative analysis of **curricula** from one benchmark and one aspirational program; curricular maps or flow charts to show how curriculum addresses outcomes; course enrollments for the last five years noting any trends; and a description of other relevant learning experiences (e.g., internships, research experiences, study abroad or other international experiences, community based learning, etc.), as well as how many students participate in those experiences. The data presented in this section should be consistent with the program website information and the curricular catalog listings.

**C. *Student Learning and Success:*** Briefly comment on the department's approach to assessing student learning and analyzing student success. Summarize what you've learned from your assessments of student learning. Are the students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program? Are they achieving those outcomes at the expected levels of learning, and how is the expected level determined? What steps does the department take to ensure that all students able to experience an inclusive and equitable learning environment? Are they prepared to apply their learning for advanced study or to the world of work? What evidence from the students themselves addresses these questions? Departments can also address program contributions to student learning through the Core Curriculum or other programs. What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its students' learning?

Data for this section should be available in the assessment reports of the program, including annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning (qualitative and/or quantitative); the degree to which students achieve the program's desired outcomes and standards; ongoing efforts by the program to respond to assessment results, indicators of student satisfaction, and assessment of the preparedness of majors for graduate study or chosen professional careers. Assessment may also include placement of graduates in graduate or professional schools and/or jobs, graduating senior surveys, employer critiques of student performance or employer satisfaction surveys, and alumni achievements. If applicable, include analysis of the way in which the senior thesis/capstone effectively engage students in integrating and synthesizing the central learning outcomes of the major.

**D. *Faculty:*** What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty in the program in relation to the program's mission and goals? How do faculty members' backgrounds, expertise, and professional work contribute to the academic excellence of the program? How engaged and successful are faculty in developing and using evidence-informed and inclusive teaching practices? How are faculty encouraged to engage in continuous improvement in their teaching and advising? Evaluate the research/creative productivity, and service of the faculty. What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its faculty?

Data should include a list of all faculty, specifying position type, terminal degrees, institutions from which faculty earned terminal degrees, faculty specialties within discipline (and how these align with the program curriculum); and faculty diversity. This section can also draw upon evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness as instructors and advisers or mentors, and professional development across faculty (e.g., peer observations and evaluations, faculty self-evaluations, students' course evaluations, faculty scholarship on teaching and learning, and participation in faculty development related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment). Also relevant is record of scholarship; external funding awards;

professional practice and service; and general awards and recognition (departments should emphasize the period since the past program review). Faculty CVs should be appended.

E. **Governance:** How well is the department/program functioning? Is there shared governance, or do a minority of faculty make most decisions? Are there written guidelines for department/program governance? How are new faculty welcomed into the department mentored (tenure-track, lecturers, academic year part-time)? Are there sufficient opportunities for faculty to interact with each other formally and informally? What are the administrative and technical staff needs within the department (e.g., professional development) and how well are they being met? What are the particular strengths and weaknesses revealed by the program's analysis of its governance?

Data can include guidelines created by departments, summaries of anonymous survey responses from faculty and staff, as well as descriptions of department protocols and processes.

### III. Evaluation of Program Sustainability and Support

This section identifies student demand for the program and the degree to which various resources are allocated appropriately and are sufficient in amount to maintain program quality.

A. **Program Demand:** In terms of similarity and distinctiveness, evaluate how well this program compares with other programs in the field. What are the trends in numbers of student major declarations and enrollments? What is happening within the profession, local community, or society generally that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future?

Data in this section might emphasize how the unique elements identified in previous sections are expected to attract students to this program.

B. **Evaluation of Resources** (*Human, Facilities, Technological, Financial*):

1. **Faculty:** Are there sufficient numbers of faculty to maintain program quality? Do program faculty have the support they need to do their work?

Data in this section might include the number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time-to-part-time faculty), faculty workload, faculty review and evaluation processes, mentoring processes/programs, professional development opportunities/resources (including travel funds), release time for course development, research, etc.

2. **Student Support:** Are there sufficient mechanisms in place to assist students with achieving their academic goals?

Data in this section might include academic and career advising programs and resources, tutoring and supplemental instruction, support for connecting general learning requirements to discipline requirements, orientation and transition programs, financial support, support for engagement across the community, and support for non-cognitive variables of success (including emotional, psychological, and physical interventions if necessary).

3. **Technology, Library, Facility, Staff and Financial Resources:** What technology or other resources does the program currently use or leverage from other units? Are there adequate Library and IT resources for sustaining the program? What facilities and unique space or equipment (e.g., labs) does the program use? Are the facilities adequate for sustaining the quality of the program? What clerical and technical staff support program operations? Are these adequate for sustaining the quality of the program? Are the financial resources of the program sufficient to meet the needs of faculty, staff, and students?

Data in this section might include library print and electronic holdings in the teaching and research areas of the program, technology resources available to support pedagogy and research in the program, and technology resources available to support students' program needs. In addition, data may include classroom space, instructional laboratories, research laboratories, office space, and student study spaces. Evidence for this section might refer to faculty/student load; FTE; other particular aspects of the program.

#### **IV. Self-Study Summary**

In a page or so, provide a summary evaluation of the program's strengths and weaknesses in the area of students, curriculum, student learning, faculty, governance, and evaluation of resources, as well as any particular issues that the program has decided to highlight. Identify the most pressing issues that the program wishes to deal with over the next five years, and what changes it would hope to implement. Briefly explain if these issues can be addressed with existing resources or if they will require some new resources. This summary will become the draft foundation for the long-term action plan which will be completed by the department after the self-study and the full external review process have concluded.

#### IV. Stage 2: External Review Overview

##### I. External Review Team

- A. **The external review process allows for objective feedback about the program:** degree and concentration offerings, curriculum and learning experiences, assessment of student learning, resources, program strengths, program areas in need of strengthening, opportunities, and plans for program sustainability.
- B. The two external reviewers are faculty members from a peer and aspirational institution (similar to SCU or program of higher quality).

##### II. Choosing Reviewers

- A. The external reviewers are selected jointly by the program and the Dean. The program submits a list of approximately six potential faculty reviewers to the dean, along with a CV or biographical sketch and rationale for each. Reviewers may be faculty at other institutions or practitioners in the field. Preferably, at least one of the external reviewers should have prior program review experience and knowledge of student learning outcomes assessment. According to standards established by the *WSCUC Resource Guide for Outcomes-Based Program Review*, external reviewers should be chosen from a university similar to SCU and be familiar with SCU's mission.
- B. External reviewers are ineligible if they graduated from SCU, worked at SCU within the past five years, were a prospective candidate at SCU, are related to a SCU employee, or have other conflicts of interest. External reviewers are not normally selected from among those who have participated in previous program reviews at SCU. External reviewers must disclose their relationships with SCU employees; any current ties with program faculty should not interfere with reviewers' ability to serve with complete candor.
- C. External review candidates are selected by the end of the quarter prior to the quarter during which the site visit is to take place.

##### III. External Reviewer Documents

- A. Once external reviewers are selected, they must provide the following to the individual designated by the Dean
  - Signed a Letter of Agreement
  - Legal Name, email address, mailing address, and phone number in order to initiate the process to be set up as a supplier in our system. When the individual designated by the Dean submits the request, the external reviewer will receive an email to complete the self-registration process.
- B. External reviewers will be given access to a Google folder containing the completed self-study and other pertinent documents prior to the site visit
  - The SCU Academic Program Review Guidelines
  - Site Visit Schedule and Contact Information
  - The Letter of Agreement
  - The External Reviewer Report Guidelines (available in "Word" in the Google folder)
  - Other relevant documentation requested by reviewers or supplied by the program

#### **IV. Preparation for Site Visit Site Visit Itinerary**

- A. The program, in cooperation with the dean, arranges lodging accommodations and travel arrangements.
- B. The program constructs the itinerary for the site visit in consultation with the dean's office. This should be completed at least three weeks prior to the reviewers' visit to campus. A typical site visit lasts 2 days and 1-2 nights.
- C. The program arranges for transportation, lodging, and meals.
- D. The program provides a meeting space for the visiting team, including access to computers, and if needed, a printer.
- E. The program makes samples of student work available to the reviewers.

#### **V. Site Visit Logistics**

- A. The external review team meets with the Dean/Associate Dean at the beginning for the first day of their visit to orient the team, discuss the APR process in general, and respond to any questions or needs the team has.
- B. Reviewers should plan to meet with representatives of all stakeholders in the program. Generally, it is recommended that the review team meet with
  - a. All faculty members (in groups or individually)
  - b. Groups of students (both undergraduate and graduate, if applicable) at a time most convenient to students
  - c. Staff members (in pairs or groups)
- C. The visiting team should be provided with sufficient private time to discuss its observations and begin drafting its report
- D. The penultimate meeting on Day Two should be with the Chair and tenured/full-time faculty of the program. The purpose of this meeting is for the external review team to discuss its findings and recommendations. At their discretion, the tenured faculty may invite others to participate in this meeting.
- E. The review team meets for an exit interview with the Dean/Associate Dean and the Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness in the late afternoon on the second day. The purpose of this meeting is for the visiting team to share its findings and recommendations. Only in very rare circumstances should the team raise issues that it has not already shared with the chair and tenured faculty of the program in the meeting held just prior to this.

#### **VI. External Review Report and Responses**

- A. The external review report should follow the format of the External Review Report Guidelines provided in Stage 2-5 and in the Google Folder as a template. A single report should be submitted by the review team.
- B. The external review report should be sent to the Dean/Associate Dean and chair within four weeks of the visit. After receiving and discussing the external reviewers report, the department chair meets with the Dean/Associate Dean to discuss it, typically within one month.

## V. Stage 2-1: Sample Site Visit Schedule

**Department/Program Name:**

**APR Reviewers:**

Reviewer Name, Title, University or College Affiliation

Reviewer Name, Title, University or College Affiliation

**Lodging:**

**A.**

**Travel Information:**

Indicate each reviewer's airline/flight #/arrival time/departure time OR indicate reviewer is driving OR taking train (Amtrak train #/arrival time/departure time).

**Evening before Site Visit Officially Begins – Day, Date, Year**

Start Time	End Time	Activity	Location
3:00pm		Hotel check-in	
6:00pm		Two reviewers meet for dinner to discuss site schedule and self-study report	

**Sample Schedule: Day One of Site Visit**

Start Time	End Time	Activity	Location
9:00		Meet with Dean/Associate Dean	
9:50	10:20	Meet with Department Chair	
10:30	12:00	30-minute individual meetings with faculty	
12:15	1:15	On-campus lunch with students	
1:20	2:05	Facility tour	
2:15	3:15	30-minute individual meetings with faculty	
3:30	4:30	Meetings with pairs or groups of faculty members	
6:00 pm		External review team meets for dinner on its own	

### Sample Schedule: Day Two of Site Visit

Start Time	End Time	Activity	Location
9:00	9:50	Coffee with program staff	
10:00	10:50	Meetings with faculty	
11:00	11:45	Meetings with other program administrators or faculty from other programs (as applicable)	
12:00	2:00	Lunch and time for team to work on external reviewers' report	
2:15	3:15	Meet with Chair and faculty of the department	
3:30	4:30	Exit meeting with Dean/Associate Dean & Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness	
4:45		Depart campus	

### Important Notes:

- Start and end times of meetings are flexible, except for meeting with dean and exit meeting.
- Programs/Departments may decide to have longer meetings with faculty depending on the number of faculty present.
- A meeting with department staff can be a coffee/tea meeting for 30-45 minutes.
- If a full department meeting is desired, allow at least an hour.
- Extra time between meetings for walking should be factored into the schedule if meetings are in different buildings; indicate this in schedule (allot 10 minutes walking between different buildings)
- A tour of facilities or affiliated spaces should be no longer than 60 minutes to ensure sufficient time for meetings



**LETTER OF AGREEMENT PERTAINING TO EXTERNAL REVIEW PARTICIPATION**

Thank you for serving as an external reviewer for Santa Clara University (SCU). For your participation, you receive an honorarium of **\$1,250** and reimbursement for travel to and from SCU. This payment is considered taxable income, reported on a form 1099-NEC per IRS regulations; therefore, you will be asked to provide an IRS form W-9 when you register in our supplier system.

As an external reviewer, your responsibilities include reviewing the self-study and any additional relevant materials delivered to you 4-6 weeks prior to the 2-day site visit.

During the site visit you will meet with faculty, students, staff, and senior administrators. Before you depart campus, you will have an exit meeting with administrators from the provost's office and dean's office. You will have four (4) weeks from the last day of the site visit to write and submit the external review report using the External Review Report Guidelines in the SCU Academic Program Review Guidelines.

Every program review requires the utmost care in preserving confidentiality. All documents and information reviewed must be kept confidential. Student and personnel information in particular must be handled with care. To the extent you have access to any student education records, you will be considered a "school official" only for the purpose of compliance with the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), and you agree to protect the privacy of all such student records and will only handle them in a manner consistent with FERPA. Please refrain from discussing issues with anyone other than the other external reviewer or SCU faculty and staff. If any personal and/or professional ties you may have with the program faculty might affect your ability to serve with complete candor, please let us know immediately.

If you agree with these terms, please sign and date this form and e-mail to the Dean's Office.

---

Name

---

Signature

---

Date



**External Review Report Guidelines  
SCU Academic Program Review**

The external review process provides a means for gathering objective feedback about the aspects of a program covered in the program's self-study. In addition to reviewing the program's self-study, the external reviewers participate in an on-site campus visit to observe firsthand how the program operates. The reviewers will produce a report that discusses the program's strengths, areas that could benefit from attention, and opportunities for long-term improvement and sustainability. This report follows the structure of the self-study, but may include additional topics as well.

Please provide the following information:

**Program Name**

**Name of Reviewers**

**Date**

## I. Introduction and Context

Use Section I of the self-study and your site visit observations to provide feedback about the following aspects of the program:

### **A. History and Development:** *Program offerings and changes since last review.*

How does the program's status and plans connect to or follow from its history and past development?

### **B. Mission and Goals:** *Program's alignment of mission and goals with the university's mission, goals, and strategic priorities, as well as with the college and Core Curriculum.*

To what extent has the program aligned its mission and goals with the university's mission and strategic priorities? How does program mission align with the college and Core Curriculum goals and priorities?

### **C. Program's Contribution to University and Community:**

To what extent is the program contributing to the University and the needs of the community?

### **D. Program's Contribution to a Diverse Learning Environment:**

To what extent is the program working to foster a diverse learning environment?

### **E. Program's Overview of Special Issues:**

Comment on the special issues or concerns presented in the self-study.

**Reviewers' Summary Comments:** *Introduction and Context of Program (A-E)*

**Reviewers' Summary Recommendations:** *Introduction and Context of Program (A-E)*

## II. Evaluation of Program Excellence

Use Section II of the self-study and your site visit observations to provide feedback about the following aspects of the program:

A. **Profile of Students:** *Evidence of student profiles related to program and university mission.*

To what extent are student profiles related to program and university mission? Are there any concerns about the program's ability to attract, persist, or retain student majors?

B. **Curricular Requirements:** *Evidence of a current curriculum and related learning experiences.*

How current are curricular requirements? How does the program's curriculum compare with peer/aspirational programs? Do they reflect disciplinary-based trends? Does the curriculum offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for the program's degree? How well is the curriculum aligned with the program learning outcomes? What student learning/development experiences are influencing the curriculum?

C. **Quality of Student Learning and Success:** *Evidence of student learning and use of results to improve student success.*

Are assessment processes appropriate (meaningful)? To what extent are assessment results being used to guide planning and improvement? How have changes led to improvement?

How well are the student learning outcomes interwoven throughout the curriculum to provide opportunities for students to develop increasing sophistication? To what extent are all students able to experience an inclusive and equitable learning environment? Are students being well-prepared for graduate studies or the world of work?

D. **Faculty:** *Evidence of faculty contribution to the academic excellence of the program.*

To what extent do the qualifications and achievements of program faculty align with the program's mission/goals? How do faculty members' backgrounds, expertise, and professional work contribute to the academic excellence of the program and service to the institution and community?

E. **Governance:** *Evidence of department processes for faculty/staff collaboration and decision-making.*

How well is the department/program functioning? Is there shared governance, or do a minority of faculty make most decisions? Are there written guidelines for department/program governance? How are department protocols and processes used to make decisions?

**Reviewers' Summary Comments:** *Evaluation of Program Excellence*

**Reviewers' Summary Recommendations:** *Evaluation of Program Excellence*

### III. Program Sustainability and Support

Use Section III of the self-study and your site visit observations to provide feedback about the following aspects of the program

A. **Program Demand:** *Evidence that program offerings are determined with consideration of and in response to program demand.*

In terms of similarity and distinctiveness, how does the program compare to other programs in the field? What is happening within the profession, local community, or society in general that identifies an anticipated need for the program in the future? To what extent does the program enrollment trend suggest a sustainable program?

B. **Resources: Evaluation of Resources: Faculty, Staff, Student**

i. **Human Resources:** *Evidence that there is a number of faculty members and a level of staff support identified to maintain program quality. Evidence that there are sufficient mechanisms (student support services) identified to help students achieve their academic goals.*

*Faculty:* To what extent can the program maintain a quality program with the current number and distribution of faculty and staff? How does the student/faculty ratio compare to similar programs? How does the tenure-line faculty/adjunct faculty ratio compare to similar programs? To what extent do program faculty have the support they need to do their work (e.g., mentoring program, professional development opportunities, release time opportunities for course development or research, travel funds, and a well-defined review and evaluation process)?

*Staff:* To what extent does program staff support program operations?

*Students:* To what extent are there mechanisms in place to assist students with achieving their academic goals (e.g., academic and career advising; tutoring or remediation; orientation; financial support; and overall academic success)?

C. **Resources: Evaluation of Resources: Technological, Library, Facilities, Financial**

To what extent does the program have sufficient resources in these areas to sustain program quality?

**Reviewers' Comments:** *Program Sustainability and Support*

**Reviewers' Recommendations:** *Program Sustainability and Support*

#### **IV. Reviewers' Summative Comments about Program**

This section allows for reviewers' comments about the overall strengths of the program; areas that could benefit from attention; comments about particular areas of concern for the program; and program opportunities for long-term improvement and sustainability.

**Reviewers' Comments:** *Program Strengths*

**Reviewers' Comments:** *Program Areas that can Benefit from Attention*

**Reviewers' Comments:** *Program Areas of Particular Concern Identified by Faculty*

**Reviewers' Comments:** *Program Opportunities for Long-Term Improvement and Sustainability*

**Reviewers' Comments:** *Additional Reviewers' Comments*

## VIII. Stage 3: Overview of Action Plan and Memorandum of Understanding

The value of academic program review rests on its process, its outcomes, and its usefulness. Academic program review links evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and, as needed, budgeting. The final stage of program review is the blueprint for evidence-based decision-making that can affect academic planning at all levels of the institution. It culminates in a long-term plan and a memorandum of understanding (MOU).

### Long-Term Action Plan:

- A. Within four weeks after receiving the external review report, the department should submit a long-term action plan to the Dean/Associate Dean identifying goals for improving and sustaining the program; identification and outline of suggested strategies for responding to recommendations; prioritization of the recommendations; identification and brief description of needed resources, with a clear differentiation between existing and additional resources; and an appropriate timeline for obtaining new resources and implementing and completing each item. Within four weeks of receiving this, the Dean/Associate Dean will meet with the department chair to provide feedback on the long-term plan. The department finalizes any changes needed to the long-term plan. Following this, the long-term action plan is shared by the Dean with the Associate Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. To ensure that the insights in the self-study are integrated into future planning and that the insights are not forgotten, Deans will engage in discussions with new chairs to discuss the long-term action plans and progress made.
- B. The program review process culminates with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed by the Chair, Dean, and Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. This MOU is an acknowledgment of the completion of the program review cycle, and the final action plan proposed by the program. The MOU allows the Dean's office and the Provost's Office to document programmatic needs to inform future budgets. Although the MOU does not guarantee that all requests requiring new resources will be met, it does enable the tracking of needs and requests to assist in efforts to procure needed funds for demonstrated departmental need. Requests for new faculty positions, facilities, equipment, or resources should draw upon the data, recommendations, and evidence presented in the self-study report.

## IX. Stage 3-1: Action Plan Template

As part of the Academic Program Review process, departments are required to create and submit an Action Plan that includes specific changes the program will implement (see below for details). Based on the vision for the department, the action plan identifies the steps will the department take to turn this vision into reality.

### **Action Plan**

The action plan describes the department's overarching plans for continuous improvement over the next five years. One important component of the action plan is the identification of 3 to 5 high-priority, actionable items that the department believes will lead to improvement in academic program quality. These areas for change should be informed by the data presented in this report and any internal or external challenges facing the department. Proposed changes may include new initiatives, modification of current initiatives, or elimination of current initiatives. The Action Plan can encompass a five-year period following program review, but can extend beyond five years if necessary. The first year of this long-term plan may include the year in which the academic program review concludes.

As the program identifies the most important priorities, it should consider:

1. What does the data analyzed during the program review process suggest in terms of departmental strengths, needs, and opportunities for improvement?
2. Does the department wish to revise mission, learning goals, or program learning outcomes?
3. What can the department accomplish using existing resources?
4. What additional resources (if any) are required?

### **Action items:**

Action items should be detailed enough to allow departmental faculty and staff to enact the them in the years following program review. Items should stem from the academic program review findings and the responses and recommendations received from the external reviewers and program faculty. These items may focus on areas identified directly from the self-study (e.g., students, curriculum, student learning outcomes, student success, faculty, program demand, student support, information literacy, technology, facilities, staff, financial resources, other).

### **For each of your action items identified, you will describe the following:**

1. the specific area where change or improvement is needed,
2. evidence supporting the recommended change(s),
3. the specific person(s) responsible for implementing the change(s),
4. the proposed timeline for implementing the change(s),
5. the resources you will need to successfully implement the change(s) (e.g., personnel, financial, facilities, etc.), and
6. your plan to assess change(s) after implementation.

Use Table 1 below to complete your action plan (you may include a narrative introduction to this table as well if needed). To ensure broad participation and support, all full-time faculty on continuing appointments should review and discuss this document.



## Academic Review Action Plan

**Department name:**

**Date:**

**Completed by:**

**Contact information:**

1. Specific area where change or improvement is needed	2. Evidence supporting the recommended change(s)	3. Person(s) responsible for implementing the change(s)	4. Timeline for implementing the change(s) (Academic year)	5. Resources needed to implement the change(s)	6. Plan to assess efficacy of change(s) after implementation (How will you know the impact of change?)
<b>Item 1: SAMPLE</b> Revise program learning outcomes (PLO) #1 and #2	Assessment results PLO #1 and 2 from 2019	Assessment Committee (insert faculty names here)	2021 (Year 1 = final year of program review)	Time during the fall faculty retreat	Updated assessment plan will reflect assessment of these PLOs within the next 3 years
Item 1:					
Item 2:					
Item 3:					
Item 4:					

## X. Stage 3-2: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)



### Academic Program Review Memorandum of Understanding

**Purpose:** Santa Clara University's Academic Program Review provides a continuous means of assuring excellence in student learning at the program level. It is designed to encourage reflection and dialogue among faculty members within the broader institutional and discipline-based contexts. The process is designed to assist programs in understanding their distinctive and collaborative roles within the university community and with external constituents. It provides the foundation for assessing student learning and for making evidence-based plans and decisions to foster improvement at all levels of the institution. Program reviews are integral for planning and other decision-making at the university.

This form serves as acknowledgement that the program/department has completed the Academic Program Review Process, including its Action Plan.

#### Feedback on Action Plan:

#### Comments on alignment with strategic priorities:

The following parties acknowledge completion of the Academic Program Review Process and defer action items in need of additional resources to be carried out at the discretion of the Dean through existing university processes.

---

Associate Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Date

---

Department Chair Date

---

Dean Date

## XI. Appendix A: Seven Year Program Review Cycle

Year	Review Begins	Participating Programs
1	Fall 2022	<p>College of Arts and Sciences, Humanities: Classics, English, and History; Music and Theatre/Dance</p> <p>School of Engineering: Undergraduate Engineering, aligned with ABET reports</p>
2	Fall 2023	<p>College of Arts and Sciences, Humanities: Modern Languages, Philosophy, Religious Studies</p> <p>College of Arts and Sciences, Mathematics and Natural Sciences: Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Studies and Environmental Sciences, Physics, Public Health</p>
3	Fall 2024	<p>College of Arts and Sciences, Mathematics and Natural Sciences: Mathematics and Computer Science, Neuroscience</p> <p>College of Arts and Sciences, Social Sciences: Anthropology, Child Studies, Communication, Ethnic Studies, Political Science, Sociology, Psychology</p> <p>Law School: Aligned with School-wide ABA accreditation</p>
4	Fall 2025	<p>College of Arts and Sciences: Art and Art History, Women's and Gender Studies</p>
5	Fall 2026	<p>College of Arts and Sciences: Graduate Program in Pastoral Ministries</p> <p>School of Education and Counseling Psychology: Counseling Psychology and Education</p> <p>Jesuit School of Theology: Master of Divinity and Master of Theological Studies</p> <p>Leavey School of Business: Aligned with AACSB reports</p>

6	Fall 2027	School of Engineering: Graduate Programs in Aerospace Engineering, Applied Mathematics, Bioengineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Engineering Management and Leadership, Mechanical Engineering, Power Systems and Sustainable Energy, Robotics and Automation
7	Fall 2028	Reflections on program review process