Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
Program Review

1. **Review of the Program Review Timeline**(detailed timeline at http://weber.edu/oie/program\_review\_checklist.html)
   1. Semester (-1) – departments notified of the pending program review
   2. Semester 1 – self-study document developed, on-site visitors nominated
   3. Semester 2 – site-visit occurs, site-team report written and delivered to department faculty, faculty response written, Dean’s response written. All documents posted online.
   4. Semester 3 – Faculty Senate Executive Committee reviews each program review and after presentation with question & answer period, makes a recommendation.
   5. Final, summary reports are written and forwarded to WSU Board of Trustees and Utah State Board of Regents.
2. **Faculty Senate Executive Committee review**  
   The program review standing committee is comprised of the Provost, two Associate Provosts, representatives of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and the members of the current Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Specifically, the role of the committee is to:
   1. **Prior to the Committee meeting**, read the following documents which are provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness:
      * + executive summary of the self-study
        + report of the Program Review Evaluation Team
        + response of the Program Faculty to the Team report
        + response of the Dean to all program review documents
   2. **During the Committee meeting**, listen to a brief ten to fifteen-minute summary by a Program Faculty member on the program review findings. As needed, ask questions for clarification. NOTE: The Committee's role is NOT to second-guess the findings made by the evaluation teams, but to create a division-wide perspective on the results of the reviews and to assist in improving our academic programs.
   3. **At the conclusion of each program report or at the end of the meeting**, the FEC will recommend one of a continuum of actions to the Provost. The Provost will consider the recommendation and make a final decision to be sent to the Board of Trustees and Board of Regents.
      * Letter of commendation to the department. (This would only be given to programs which are markedly exceeding expectations and functioning at an atypical level in all regards.)
      * Letter detailing strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions for the department to improve their program. (This is given to strong programs.)
      * Letter detailing suggestions for the department to improve their program with a required written response from the department by a specific date.
      * Letter detailing significant concerns sent to the department; the department has the option of having those concerns included in the final report to the Boards of Trustees and Regents or to defer reporting for one cycle with the understanding that changes will be implemented and a new program review cycle will be initiated the following fall semester.

Letters or discussions will be initiated by the committee. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness officially notifies the department chair (with a copy to the school/college) within 4 weeks after the action has been determined by the FEC.

1. **Program Review documentation**  
   All program review documents can be found on the “Past Results” page of the Institutional Effectiveness website - <http://weber.edu/oie/PR_past_results.html>. From that site you have access to the complete self-study document including executive summary, the evaluation team report, the department response, as well as the Dean’s response. You can also see view previous program review documents from the same page.
2. **Preparation**Please come to each scheduled review having read the supporting documentation and with any questions you have to which you would like the program chair to respond.  
     
   As you are reviewing documents, please keep in mind the document used by the site visit team. Consider whether the responses provided for each of the standards were adequate.
3. **Sample Rubric for PR Evaluation:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| **Faculty Info** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Student Info** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Curriculum** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Learning Outcomes** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Assessment Plan** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Evidence of ‘closing the loop** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Academic Advising** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Program Support** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Relationships – external communities** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |
| **Site Visit Recommendations Addressed** | **Adequate/Not Adequate** |  |