

**KNOX COLLEGE**

**PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDE**

Galesburg, Illinois  
2011 (revised edition)

Also available as a pdf under "Faculty Resources" at:  
<http://www.knox.edu/Faculty-and-Staff.html>

# KNOX COLLEGE

# PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Review Process	2
Introduction	2
Overview of the Process	3
Selection of Reviewers	3
Timing of Visit of External Reviewers	3
Other Early Steps (in spring before the review year)	3
The Self-Study Report	4
Areas to Consider in the Self-Study Report	4
Supporting Documents (Basic Data Set, Curriculum, Faculty)	8
Formatting of the Report and Supporting Documents	9
Calendar for the Review Process	10
Visit of External Reviewers	11
Appendices	
1) List of Programs with Dates of Next Review	13
2) Retreat Planning	14
3) External Reviewers' Report	15
4) Budget for Program Review	16
5) Arranging Lunch and Open Meeting with Students (sample letters)	17
6) Checklist of Tasks for Self-Study Leaders	18

This *Program Review Guide* is intended for use in tandem with the *Knox College Guide to Academic Program Assessment*, developed by the Office for Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA).

## THE REVIEW PROCESS

### Introduction

The purpose of a cycle of program reviews is to have in place a process that encourages us to think on a regular basis about ways in which our programs might be improved. At the heart of the process is the self-study undertaken by the program and written up in a report that will go to external peer reviewers. The self-study analyzes the strengths, weaknesses and needs of the program (including understanding gained through program assessment); looks ahead to the challenges that the program may face; and considers ways in which the program might enhance its strengths and meet ongoing or new challenges. This process is independent of the ten-year cycle of reaccreditation review by the Higher Learning Commission. Programs will not need to do additional self-studies at times of decennial HLC reviews, given that they will all now be on a seven-year cycle of program review.

For the first cycle of review, programs will want to look back to their self-study reports written for the College's reaccreditation review in 2009. If the review comes soon after 2009, much of that report may be relevant to include in the self-study for program review. As more years pass, the 2009 report can be used as a reference point for developments that have occurred since.

The self-study should involve the collective and collaborative work of all faculty in the program, with tasks divided up in order to share the load, even while the final report should be a coherent whole, reflecting the thinking of the entire program (including discussion of differences within the program where they occur).

The ultimate goal of the process is to help programs fulfill the educational mission and to improve the quality of educational programs through peer review—review from within the programs themselves and from outside the program by disciplinary colleagues from peer institutions.

Each program at Knox has distinctive structures, composition, and considerations. ***This document is intended as a guide, not a prescription. Various details of process, timing, and content of the review will need to be adapted to the particular circumstances of each program.*** The Dean of the College and/or the Program Review Coordinator can help you figure out how to tailor the process to your program.

N.B. Throughout this document, the term "program" is used in a generic sense to refer to any academic program, whether that of a department or of an interdisciplinary program.

### Overview of the Process

The review process will take about a year and a half from start to finish. The main components of the process are:

**Setting up for the program review** (notification of programs, selection of external reviewers, gathering of data)

**Conducting the self-study and writing the self-study report**

**Visit of external reviewers**

**Follow-up to the visit**

For a detailed timetable, see the "Calendar for the Review Process" (pp. 10-11) and the "Checklist of Tasks for Self-Study Leaders" (Appendix 6). Certain elements of the process are explained further here:

**Selection of reviewers:** The program chair, in consultation with program faculty, develops a list of at least four possible reviewers. The list is submitted to the Dean, who, in consultation with the Chair of the program, will choose the reviewers (usually two). If you think more than two reviewers would be helpful, make that case when you submit your list of names. Programs are encouraged to submit names of at least two faculty from colleges similar to Knox and at least two faculty from graduate programs or professional schools to which we would like our students to aspire. In developing your list, you might want to consider other factors, such as multiple areas in your program (e.g., Studio Art and Art History) or particular issues facing your program. When you submit your list to the Dean, note any particular strengths of the individuals named, their familiarity with liberal arts programs (if at a research university), and any affiliations or prior work with Knox College program members. (It is preferable to avoid reviewers who have a close association with any members of the Knox program.) Include the suggested reviewer's name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address. For help generating names, you might consult your national professional organization; some organizations maintain lists of faculty who have experience doing external reviews. The Director of Academic Assessment at Knox can also help you develop a list of colleges that are similar to Knox.

**Timing of visit of external reviewers:** Visits will normally be scheduled for sometime between late February and early May. Let the Dean know your preferences for review dates at the same time that reviewer names are submitted. More than one option, or a range of suitable dates, should be given, in order to leave room for coordinating with reviewers' schedules.

### **Other early steps (in spring before the review year):**

- Decide who is responsible for coordinating the review (all the steps, from selecting names of possible reviewers through to the writing of the self-study and the visit itself). This will usually be the chair, but it could be another member of the program.
- Have a preliminary conversation about the issues the program thinks are most pertinent to be addressed in the review, issues that you might especially want to keep in mind as you launch the self-study process. This discussion will also help the program decide on whether or not to include a survey to supplement the data that

will be provided to all programs under review (see section below on "Basic Data Set"). Surveys could be of alumni, current students, and/or some targeted subset of those groups.

- Work with the Director of Academic Assessment on a plan for the analysis of data provided by the College, and for any further data you would like to have.
- If one or more members of the program will be on leave during the self-study process, develop a method of including them in the process in an appropriate way.
- If the program would like to have a retreat to facilitate the self-study process, decide on timing and let the Program Review Coordinator know of your plans. (See Appendix on "Retreat Planning.")
- Plan for a regular meeting time during fall term for the program to work on the self-study.

## THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

The program self-study should reflect on those years since the last program review was conducted, or for the last seven years if a review has not recently been undertaken. The self-study is not just a review of the past seven years, but also a consideration of any unresolved or anticipated issues. The body of the self-study should be organized according to the following outline, adapted to program needs as appropriate. Use tables or bullets where they will help your presentation. The document's emphasis should be on analysis and evaluation rather than description. What length should the document be? This is difficult to say, and it will certainly vary from program to program. Perhaps something like 15-20 single-spaced pages would be appropriate (plus supporting documents). Use your own good judgment to balance complexity with conciseness.

A program may want to divide up the writing of the self-study among more than one person, but the document should be edited into one cohesive whole by the person coordinating the review.

### Areas to consider in the self-study report

While all self-study reports will generally include the elements below, the guide is meant to be suggestive rather than prescriptive. Each program should shape its review to focus on matters that will help it consider the fundamental goals of teaching and learning.

1. **History:** For the sake of reviewers who know little of Knox and of your program, briefly describe the history of your program, including critical events or turning points. Focus on elements that will help explain the current shape of the program (personnel, curriculum, focus, physical facilities, equipment and technology, etc.), or current circumstances/culture. (Include any changes made as a result of a previous external review or self-study.)
2. **Learning goals/outcomes:** What knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics does the program expect of students who graduate with a major (or

minor, for those programs with no major)? The program should take this opportunity to review goals set previously, and to make changes if needed. (N.B. In the fall term following the review cycle, the Curriculum Committee will review the material on learning goals/outcomes and on the curriculum from the self-studies done in the previous year. If the review process has generated ideas for changing the curriculum, we would encourage you to develop proposals for submission early in the fall. Similarly, the Assessment Advisory Group will review the material on assessment.)

### 3. **Curriculum:**

- a. *In general:* (Some of these questions may be answered in later sections.)
  - How have the course offerings in the program evolved over time? What areas of the discipline does the program emphasize and why? How have these decisions been made? How does the resulting array of courses compare to that at peer institutions?
  - Is catalog copy up to date? Are there any course descriptions that need to be changed? Are there any courses that have not been offered in the past five years?
- b. *General Education:* What contributions does the program make to the General Education of Knox students? Explain the nature and structuring of course offerings aimed at and/or regularly populated by non-majors. What contributions does the program make towards the graduation requirements of Foundations, Understanding Diversity, Quantitative Literacy and/or Writing (courses appropriate to non-majors)? Discuss any co-curricular activities that have a wide impact on non-majors as well as majors (e.g., theatre/dance productions, music ensembles). Use enrollment data (including counts of non-majors) to reflect on trends, successes, and possible trouble spots.
- c. *Majors:* Present the rationale for the content, structure and sequence of the program for majors and analyze its success. Use data on majors and course enrollments as well as data from program assessment to reflect on trends, successes, and possible trouble spots. Some specific elements to consider:
  - Is the current curriculum new, well-established, or in transition? How is the structure/content of the requirements for the major consistent with the learning goals identified by the program?
  - Is the purpose of each element of the requirements for the major readily evident from the catalog description? Is there a balance between introductory, intermediate, and advanced courses? Does the usual sequencing of courses through the major (as indicated by prerequisites that are in place) make sense? Are there any "hidden" requirements (required courses that have as prerequisites courses that do not themselves count in the major)? If so, what is the rationale for not including the pre-required course(s) as part of the major?

- If there is a capstone experience for the major, analyze its success. If there is not a capstone experience for the major, explain why not.
  - In what ways does the curriculum for majors address the College's Key Competencies that are fulfilled within the major (Writing, Oral Presentation, Information Literacy and Informed Use of Technology)?
  - Are there any patterns in the second fields chosen by majors?
- d. *Minors*: Explain the structure and sequence of the program for minors and analyze its success. Use data on minors to reflect on trends, successes, and possible trouble spots. Some specific elements to consider:
- How is the structure/content of the requirements for the minor consistent with the learning goals identified by the program?
  - Is the purpose of each element of the requirements for the minor readily evident from the catalog description? Is there a balance between introductory, intermediate, and advanced courses? Does the usual sequencing of courses through the minor (as indicated by prerequisites that are in place) make sense? Are there any "hidden" requirements (required courses that have as prerequisites courses that do not themselves count in the major)? If so, what is the rationale for not including the pre-required course(s) as part of the major?
  - Are there any patterns in the major fields chosen by minors?
4. **Enrollment**: Looking at the data provided by the Registrar, and working with the Director of Academic Assessment for help with analysis of the data, identify any possible issues. Are there any "bottlenecks" in the program—either required-for-the-major or general education courses that are routinely oversubscribed or understaffed? Are there any consistently under-enrolled classes? If so, explain what has been done (or could be done) to alleviate the problems.
5. **Students**: How would you characterize students who major in the program? Other students who take courses in the program? What is the culture of the program for students? Is there a sense of community among the majors? If so, how is that created and sustained? If not, why not?
6. **Faculty**:
- a. What is the current *shape/character* of the faculty? You might consider such characteristics as tenured/untentured/non-tenure line; areas of expertise; range of methodologies/perspectives/teaching approaches, etc.
  - b. How would you characterize the *culture* of the program for faculty? Does it have a collegial environment? What efforts are made to mentor junior faculty? Are there particular pedagogical approaches that faculty are expected to adopt? Specific content areas that faculty are expected to teach?

7. **Advising:** What are issues that come up in the advising of majors (as distinct from the advising of undeclared first- and second-year students)? Is the advising of majors more or less challenging than other advising? for what reasons? Do majors understand the nature of the discipline, and how major requirements reflect that, or do they tend to see major requirements as boxes to check off? To what extent does advising in the major contribute to students' understanding of and achievement of the general goals of liberal education? Does the department provide career information to students, either through advising or some other means?
8. **Alumni:** Working from data provided by Advancement/CCPPD (enhanced, when possible, by information from faculty in the program), analyze graduate school and career outcomes for program alumni over the last seven years.
9. **Assessment:** Include an overall assessment plan for the program: learning goals, assessment tools and criteria for success, a timetable for assessing each learning goal. (See the *Knox Guide to Program Assessment* for guidance on the assessment process.)
  - a. *Map the curriculum:* In which courses is each of the learning goals set by the program introduced, reinforced, or demonstrated? (See p. 12 of the *Knox Guide to Academic Program Assessment*.) Looking at the resulting map, are there goals in need of strengthening? Are there unnecessary redundancies?
  - b. *Report on assessment undertaken since the last review:* This assessment must include some direct means of assessing of student learning. What learning outcome(s) have you addressed? What specific assessment questions have you posed? What information did you collect to answer those questions? What did you find out? What changes have you made in response to those findings?
  - c. *Report on planned assessment activities during the current academic year.*
10. **Governance/Decision-making:** How would you characterize governance and decision-making within the program? How are program chores distributed/carried out? Is governance/decision-making itself ever discussed?
11. **Connections to other programs:** What are the relationships to other programs at the College (e.g., FP, interdisciplinary programs, other College departments/programs, off-campus programs)? Is the program making appropriate contributions to other programs?
12. **Connections to communities beyond Knox:** If your program regularly involves connections with communities beyond the College, describe those connections.
13. **Resources:** Analyze the major resources currently available to your program. Are these resources sufficient for carrying out your program goals and desired curriculum? If not, what else would be of critical help? Some resources to consider:

- personnel
- program budget; restricted funds available to support the program
- library holdings and any special collections
- lab, studio, stage, other study or performance space and/or equipment
- information technology resources
- any resources off campus

14. **Overview and plans for the future:** As you look over the last seven years, what are you pleased about and what are your principal concerns? What is needed to improve the program? What impediments are there to making these improvements? Assuming the same resources, what changes, if any, do you anticipate in the next five or so years? If any retirements are likely in the next five years, what direction might the program go in its request for a continuation in that tenure line?
15. **Issues for the reviewers:** What issues or questions would you like the reviewers to keep in mind as they read your self-study and when they come to campus? On what issues would you like advice? What are current issues/questions currently under discussion in the program?

Supporting Documents: The following information/documents should be included in the materials sent to the external reviewers.

**Basic Data Set** (provided to programs)

<b>TYPE OF DATA</b>	<b>over what period</b>	<b>provided by</b>
enrollment data by course and section	last 7 years	Registrar
average class size, compared to all-college average	previous year	Registrar
number of graduates--majors	last 7 years	Registrar
number of graduates--minors	last 7 years	Registrar
patterns in 2nd field choice of majors	last 7 years	Registrar
patterns in 1st field choice of minors	last 7 years	Registrar
list of EL projects completed by majors	last 7 years	Registrar
list of faculty with number of advisees	last 7 years	Registrar
internships by major	last 7 years	CCPPD
alumni outcomes (grad school; careers)	last 40 years (program can select years of interest)	Advancement

**Curriculum**

Course syllabi from all courses taught in the previous academic year

List of honors projects completed in last seven years

List of independent studies taught in the previous academic year (faculty, topic, # of students)

Record of student collaborative research w/ faculty, if any, in the previous 7 years

List of relevant student internships undertaken by majors in the previous 7 years (working with information available from the CCPPD).

List of relevant Experiential Learning projects by majors (working with information available from the Registrar)

## **Faculty**

From each faculty member:

- full curriculum vitae
- a short list of key accomplishments in the last 7 years in teaching, research/creative work, and service
- paragraph on current initiatives/foci in teaching and research

Record of FP teaching in the program

Record of teaching in and leadership of interdisciplinary programs

Anticipated transitions in program faculty (within 5 years, within 10 years)

### Formatting of the report and supporting documents

All materials should be submitted in electronic format on a CD, which should be sent to the Program Review Coordinator; she will distribute copies to the external reviewers, the Dean, and the Director of Academic Assessment. Each document should be titled in such a way that its content is evident, and related documents should be put together in a folder. Make the self-study itself a document separate from the supporting documents. Any supporting material that cannot be submitted electronically (even by conversion to a pdf file) may be submitted in hard copy (three copies).

**Note:** Other College documents that will be supplied by the Program Review Coordinator:

College catalog

Links/pdfs

College Fact Book

College web page for program under review

directions to Knox, including a map of Galesburg and of the campus

information on motel where room reservation has been made

list of local restaurants (for one dinner out on their own)

## CALENDAR FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

### OVERVIEW

Summer of year previous to review	Collection and preliminary analysis of data relevant to the self-study. Develop and administer alumni/student surveys if needed.
Fall term (some may wish to work on this in the summer also)	Program does its self-study and writes the self-study report; writing may continue into winter term
Winter term	Report sent to external reviewers
Late winter or early spring term	Visit of external reviewers
One month after reviewers' report received	Program submits a written response
Year after the review	Follow-up to the review

### DETAILED CALENDAR

*Dates given are guidelines. Specific needs/circumstances of individual programs may lead to moving dates in one direction or another. See Appendix 6 for a checklist of tasks for the self-study leader, and see the body of the Guide for further detail on specific elements.*

<b>WINTER/SPRING OF YEAR PREVIOUS TO REVIEW</b>	
by January 15	Dean and Program Review Coordinator (PRC) <b>review the schedule</b> of program reviews to see if adjustments need to be made in which programs are next up for review.
by January 22	Dean <b>notifies</b> programs up for review in the next academic year.
by March 1	Program supplies list of <b>names of possible reviewers</b> to the Dean. Preferred reviewers decided on in consultation with program chair; chair should make an appointment with the Dean at the time that names are sent in. This is also the time to decide if someone besides the Chair of the program will be leading the self-study process. PRC begins correspondence with reviewers.
by April 15	Program identifies <b>data other than the standard list</b> that they would like to have for the review process (e.g., survey data from current and/or former students.) Program works with the Director of Academic Assessment on mechanisms for the gathering of such data; sample surveys are available.
by April 15	By this date, <b>reviewers should be secured and dates of review decided.</b>
by May 1	PRC tells Registrar, Advancement, and CCPPD of the <b>data to be collected</b> for programs up for review.
<b>SUMMER PRECEDING REVIEW</b>	
by June 15	<b>Alumni survey and invitation to participate</b> are written (self-study leader in conjunction with Director of Academic Assessment).
by July 1	<b>Alumni survey</b> is sent out (by Director of Academic Assessment).
by July 15	<b>Data supplied</b> by Registrar, Advancement, & CCPPD to program and to the Director of Academic Assessment. (See section on "Basic Data Set" for detail.)
summer or early fall	Program works with Director of Academic Assessment on <b>analysis of data.</b>
summer or early fall	<b>Program retreat</b> , if desired. PRC can help with retreat arrangements (reserving room, catering, etc.).

<b>THE REVIEW YEAR</b> (with visits of external reviewers usually scheduled between late February and early May)	
during fall term	<b>Program carries out its self-study.</b> Self-study leader consults as needed with PRC (for process issues), DAA (for assessment issues), and with the Dean (for other program-related issues).
two months before the review	PRC & Dean's office will make <b>arrangements for travel, lodging, and honoraria</b> payment for external reviewers.
two months before date of review	<b>Draft of self-study report</b> is circulated to all faculty in the program for comment; the draft is also sent to the Dean.
at least one month before date of review	The program will provide the Program Review Coordinator with an electronic copy of the <b>final version of self-study</b> , including all supplementary materials. The PRC will send copies out to the reviewers, the Dean, and the Director of Academic Assessment.
one month before the review	Program Chair, in consultation with the PRC and with the external reviewers, will <b>develop a detailed schedule</b> for the campus visit. (See "Visit of External Reviewers" for elements to be included in the schedule.)
two weeks before review	Program makes arrangements for students to have lunch with reviewers and for the open meeting with students. (See Appendix 5 for sample letters.)
within one month of visit	<b>Reviewers submit written report</b> to the PRC, who will forward it to the Dean, the program chair, and the DAA. (Reviewers have the option of sending a draft of their report to the program chair for correction of errors, before final submission to the PRC.)
within one month of receipt of reviewers' report	Program faculty meet to discuss the reviewers' report, and then write up a response, which is submitted to the PRC, who will forward it to the Dean and the DAA. This <b>written response</b> should include, where appropriate, plans for following up on the review. The response should take note of issues on which there are is disagreement within the program. Program chair (and self-study leader, if other than the chair) meets with the Dean to discuss the review and the program's response; if appropriate, all program faculty may be asked to attend the meeting.
<b>IN THE YEAR AFTER THE REVIEW</b>	
Fall term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director of Academic Assessment <b>shares the assessment section of the self-study</b> with the Assessment Advisory Group. Dean <b>shares the curriculum section of the self-study</b> with the Curriculum Committee (material prepared by the Director of Academic Assessment). The Committee will schedule a conversation with each program.</li> <li>• The Director of Academic Assessment will pull from the material any <b>elements that will be useful for sharing with other programs</b>, such as: learning goals, assessment plans, assessment tools, assessment reports.</li> <li>• Programs develop plans and timelines for changes, based on what has been learned in the review process.</li> </ul>
Spring term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Program reports to Dean on developments one year out.</b> Have any changes been made as a result of the review? Have there been impediments to changes the program would like to make? What ongoing developments are being considered? (Report will be sent to PRC, who will forward to the Dean and the Director of Academic Assessment.)</li> <li>• Director of Academic Assessment will write up a <b>summary report on reviews done in the previous year</b>: the main findings of the reviewers and the responses made or underway in the program. This report will be shared with the faculty as a whole.</li> </ul>

## VISIT OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

The table below can be used as a template for constructing a schedule for the reviewers, filling in specific appointment times and locations. The "escort" column is for identifying the person who will meeting the reviewers and taking them to the next event, where such is needed.

time	event	escort	location
day 1 (evening)	Reviewers arrive.		
	Dinner with program faculty (Chair meets reviewers at the motel and drives them to the restaurant.)	Chair	
day 2	Breakfast at motel (time for reviewers to consult with each other)		
	First appointment: a half-hour with the Dean of the College		Old Main 105
	Individual one-hour meetings with each member of the program: both reviewers meet with Chair; can split other appointments between the two reviewers		
	Lunch with majors		
	Individual half-hour appointments with a couple of faculty from other programs with which there is regular interaction with the program under review		
	As appropriate/desired, visits to facilities, individual classes, rehearsals		
	Open meeting for students		
	At this point, if the reviewers would like an addition to the schedule for day 3, they can contact the PRC or program chair to make arrangements.		
	Reviewers have dinner on their own, giving them time to consult with each other.		
day 3	Breakfast at motel (time for reviewers to consult with each other)		
	Individual meetings with faculty, if not completed in one day		
	Concluding meeting with program chair to recap visit		
	Concluding one-hour meeting with the Dean of the College		Old Main 105
	Time for reviewers to discuss/draft their report		

### Handling expenses for the visit

**Travel & lodging:** The secretary to the Dean of the College or the PRC will arrange for purchase of plane tickets, and will also arrange for lodging, with direct billing to the College. For travel by car, reviewers will be reimbursed by the Dean at the going rate.

**Food:** For dinner with the program faculty, make a reservation in advance, and request a purchase order number from Purchasing. You can then arrange with the restaurant for direct billing to the College. Common choices are Chez Willy (closed on Sundays) or the Landmark. If you choose a different restaurant, check ahead with the restaurant about direct billing. Reviewers will have dinner on their own at the end of day 2 and lunch on their own on day 3. They will have a list of restaurants provided by the PRC; it would be helpful for the Chair to make suggestions of specific choices from that list.

**Appendix 1: LIST OF PROGRAMS WITH DATES OF NEXT REVIEW**  
 (Reviewers will visit in the winter/spring of the year listed)

*If you think that it would make sense to move your review forward or back, contact the Dean of the College to settle on a revised time. There will also be an opportunity to make changes as the time designated for your review gets closer.*

<b>Alphabetical by Program</b>		<b>Chronological by Year of Review</b>	
American Studies	2014	Classics	2012
Anthropology and Sociology	2014	Environmental Studies	2012
Art & Art History	2013	Biology	2012
Asian Studies	2017	Business and Management	2012
Biochemistry	2014	Journalism	2012
Biology	2012	Music	2012
Black Studies	2015	Art & Art History	2013
Business and Management	2012	Mathematics	2013
Chemistry	2014	Modern Languages	2013
Classics	2012	Religious Studies	2013
Computer Science	2015	American Studies	2014
Economics	2014	Anthropology and Sociology	2014
Educational Studies	2016	Biochemistry	2014
English	2018	Chemistry	2014
Environmental Studies	2012	Economics	2014
Film Studies	2017	Black Studies	2015
Gender & Women's Studies	2016	Computer Science	2015
History	2016	Latin American Studies	2015
Integrated International Studies	2017	Philosophy	2015
Journalism	2012	Social Service	2015
Latin American Studies	2015	Educational Studies	2016
Mathematics	2013	Gender & Women's Studies	2016
Modern Languages	2013	History	2016
Music	2012	Neuroscience	2016
Neuroscience	2016	Political Science & IR	2016
Philosophy	2015	Asian Studies	2017
Physics	2018	Film Studies	2017
Political Science & IR	2016	Integrated International Studies	2017
Psychology	2018	Theatre and Dance	2017
Religious Studies	2013	English	2018
Social Service	2015	Psychology	2018
Theatre and Dance	2017	Physics	2018

## Appendix 2: RETREAT PLANNING

N.B. Once the program decides on a retreat and date, the Program Review Coordinator can take care of much of the logistical planning (location, food). All costs of the retreat are covered by the College, and each participant will receive a stipend of \$150.

Schedule: A retreat will typically run from 9:00 or 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. You might want to have dinner together the previous evening to get discussion going.

Location: Holding the retreat off campus is recommended. The novel and pleasant location and the absence of distractions helps concentrate attention and makes the occasion special. If you stay on campus, meet in a building different from the one where your offices are.

suggested locations off campus

The Great House, 501 E. Losey, 342-8683

The Carr House, 560 N. Prairie, 343-3444

suggested locations on campus

Wilson House

Seymour Union: McClelland Room or Ferris Lounge

Borzello 116

OM 306

Common Room, Old Main

Food :

Have coffee and snacks (baked goods/fruit) available in the morning.

Have lunch catered in (or, for a small group, go out together).

Have some kind of snack food/beverage available in mid-afternoon.

Catering sources include: Cornucopia, Q's, and Knox Dining Services.

### **Appendix 3: EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' REPORT**

The external reviewers' final report should address the following:

- overall quality of the program's self-study report
- effectiveness of assessment activities in the program
- suitability of the program's assessment plan
- findings from meetings with the Dean, students, and faculty
- strengths of the program
- weaknesses/challenges of the program
- responses to any specific issues raised by the program
- suggestions for strategies the program/College might take to address weaknesses/challenges.

The report should aim for a consensus view, while also making clear where reviewers disagree.

The report is due within one month after the visit. Reviewers submit the report to the Program Review Coordinator, who will forward it to the Dean and to the program chair. (Reviewers have the option of sending a draft of their report to the program chair for correction of errors, before final submission to the PRC.)

## Appendix 4: BUDGET FOR PROGRAM REVIEWS

(estimated costs, assuming two reviewers for each program review)

### PROGRAM RETREAT

space rental	\$150
snacks @ \$6 x 5	\$30
lunch @ \$12 x 5	\$60
stipend for participants @\$150 (estimating 5 faculty)	<u>\$750</u>
<b>total cost for a program retreat</b>	<b>\$990</b>

### STIPEND FOR COORDINATOR OF SELF-STUDY PROCESS

**\$1,000**

### VISIT BY TWO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Stipend for each reviewer @ \$1,000 x 2	\$2,000
Transportation @ \$400 x 2	800
1 dinners with program members @ \$50 x 7	350
1 dinner just reviewers @ \$50 x 2	100
two breakfasts x 2 (free at motel)	NA
five Oak Room lunches @ \$10 x 2 (at Knox—2 reviewers & 3 students off-board)	50
two lunches for reviewers, day 3 @ \$15	\$30
2 nights at motel @\$90 x 2	<u>180</u>
<b>total cost for visit by two reviewers</b>	<b>\$3,510</b>

### TOTAL COST for EACH PROGRAM REVIEW

**ca. \$5,500**

**Appendix 5:**  
**ARRANGING LUNCH AND OPEN MEETING WITH STUDENTS (sample letters)**

Program Chair will set up the lunch tab and reserve a room for the open meeting:

- Call Dining Services (x7785) to set up a tab for lunch in the Oak Room. Students on board will be free, but the tab will be there for the reviewers and students off board. Use the Title III account number: 11-2659.
- Contact Cindy Wickliffe (x7849) to reserve a room for the open meeting with students.

Suggested language for notices to students:

**1) LUNCH with about five selected students**

Subject line: Invitation to lunch to discuss your experience in the \_\_\_\_\_  
Department/Program

Dear John, Mary, X, X, and X,

This year the \_\_\_\_ Department/Program is undergoing a thorough review of its programs, something that all Knox departments are asked to do on a rotating basis. As part of the process, two external reviewers (professors from \_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_ ) will be on campus, talking with faculty and students about their experience in the \_\_\_\_ Department/Program . We are inviting a small group of students to have lunch with the reviewers on <date>, in the Oak Room, 12:00-1:00 p.m. Could you let me know whether or not you will be able to attend? I hope you'll say yes!

There will also be an open meeting with students from <time> in the <room> on that same day, if you are unable to attend lunch.

Look forward to hearing from you--

**2) OPEN MEETING with majors [or minors, if program does not offer a major]**

Subject line: Open meeting for \_\_\_\_\_ majors [minors] with external reviewers

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ majors [minors],

This year the \_\_\_\_\_ Department is undergoing a thorough review of its programs, something that all Knox departments are being asked to do on a rotating basis. As part of the process, two external reviewers (professors from \_\_\_\_\_ and ) will be on campus, talking with faculty and students about their experience in the \_\_\_\_\_ Department. We have set up a time for an open meeting between majors and the reviewers on <date, time, place>. This is an important opportunity for the reviewers to hear about the experience of students in our programs, and I hope you will be able to attend. Thanks in advance!

## Appendix 6: CHECKLIST OF TASKS FOR SELF-STUDY LEADERS

This calendar assumes the visit of the external reviewers will take place early in spring term. If your visit is scheduled for a different time, adjust accordingly. All elements in this list are described in more detail in the *Program Review Guide*.

**PRC** = Program Review Coordinator (Penny Gold)

**DAA** = Director of Academic Assessment (Leah Adams-Curtis)

DONE	Timing	Task
	<b>WINTER</b> (year previous to review)	
	by Mar. 1	List of at least 4 <b>reviewer names</b> sent to Dean; appointment made with Dean to settle on choices. See section on "Selection of reviewers" in <i>Program Review Guide</i> . Decide <b>who will lead the self-study</b> process for the program. Tell the PRC any preference on the <b>timing of the review</b> .
	by end of winter term	Read through the <i>Program Review Guide</i> .
	<b>SPRING</b>	
	early in spring term	Have an <b>initial discussion</b> of the review process with program faculty. Consider timing for a faculty retreat, if desired.
	late spring or beginning of summer	<b>Meet with DAA</b> to discuss the possibility of an alumni survey and/or other data you would like beyond the "basic data set."
	<b>SUMMER</b>	
	during summer (or early fall)	<b>Retreat</b> for program faculty.
	during summer	<b>Keep in touch with DAA</b> about alumni survey and/or other data requested.
	after "basic data set" received	<b>Review data and begin analysis</b> ; consult with DAA for help with analysis.
	during summer or early fall	<b>Ask program faculty</b> to send you electronic versions of <b>supporting documents</b> (syllabi from courses taught in previous academic year, full cv, short list of key accomplishments, paragraph on current initiatives/foci.
	by end of summer	<b>Plan out the work to be done</b> on the self-study, deciding on parts that can be delegated to others in the program.
	<b>FALL &amp; December</b> (of the review year)	
	early fall	<b>Meet with DAA</b> to discuss survey outcomes.
	during the term	<b>Work on the self-study</b> , consulting as needed with PRC (for process issues), DAA (for assessment issues) and with the Dean (for other program-related issues).
	by end of December	<b>Complete a draft</b> of the self-study.

	<b>WINTER</b>	
	2 months before date of review	<b>Circulate a draft of self-study report</b> to all faculty in the program for comment; also send the draft to the Dean.
	2 months before date of review	<b>Compile the supporting documents</b> to be submitted with the self-study.
	at least 1 month before date of review	Submit the <b>final version of the self-study, including supporting documents</b> to the PRC, who will forward it to the reviewers, the Dean, and the DAA.
	immediately after submission of self-study	Develop a <b>detailed schedule</b> for the campus visit.
	2 weeks before the review	Make <b>arrangements for students</b> to have lunch with reviewers and for the open meeting with students (see Appendix 5 for sample letters).
	2 weeks before the review	Make <b>arrangements for first night's dinner</b> with the reviewers: choose restaurant, get PO number, make reservations.
	late February to early May (usually)	<b>Visit of external reviewers.</b>
	<b>SPRING</b>	
	within one month of receipt of reviewers' report	<b>Program faculty meet to discuss the reviewers' report</b> , and then <b>write up a response</b> , which is submitted to the PRC, who will forward it to the Dean. This written response should include, where appropriate, plans for following up on the review. The response should take note of issues on which there are disagreement within the program. Program chair (or, if appropriate, the program as a whole) meets with the Dean to discuss the review and the program's response.
	<b>FALL</b> (after the review)	<b>Program develops plans and timelines for changes</b> , based on what has been learned in the review process.
	<b>ONE YEAR AFTER THE REVIEW</b>	<b>Program reports to Dean on developments one year out.</b> Have any changes been made as a result of the review? Have there been impediments to changes the program would like to make? What ongoing developments are being considered? Send report to PRC, who will forward to the Dean and the Director of Academic Assessment.