

Mission Statement: *The purpose of Academic Program Review is to evaluate an academic program's strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities, to review its alignment with and contribution to SMU's Strategic goals and learning, and to support the program's efforts to practice responsible fiscal stewardship.*

Academic program reviews (APRs) are comprehensive reviews of an academic program that occur every seven to ten years. An academic program is defined as a credit-bearing credential, including certificates and degrees. The focus of the APR is the academic program, but for purposes of organization, the APR process works through the department or unit that delivers each academic program, and all academic programs delivered by a given department or unit will be reviewed at the same time. The APR involves both a self-study conducted by the faculty and staff of the department delivering the program, and an on-site review conducted by expert, external evaluators. The end result is a memo from the Provost to the Dean of the College or School in which the program is housed detailing the success and strengths of the program and outlining a discrete number of opportunities for improvement.

Both the self-study and the external review are supported by university - provided data about enrollments, time to graduation, employment outcomes for students, program learning outcomes, assessments of student learning, faculty productivity, and other measures relevant to the teaching and research activity of an academic program. A central component of the review process is the on-site review, during which external evaluators meet and speak with all faculty and staff in the academic program, as well as students in the program, and any other key stakeholders. The purpose of the APR is to present, to academic program, the Provost and the Dean, a clear picture of the mission, goals, and outcomes for a given academic program, as well as the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that exist for that program.

For departments, the APR process offers an opportunity to reflect on the academic composition, goals, successes, and challenges of the program while evaluating the goals and the future direction of that program. It also provides an opportunity for getting expert advice on opportunities for improvements and finding efficiencies. The APR process also offers the opportunity to convey to senior Academic Leadership at

For the university, the APR is an opportunity for a detailed look at each academic program, its contributions to the overall university mission and strategic goals, its strengths, its challenges, and the opportunities to help the program continue to advance. It also offers an opportunity to review the student learning outcomes and assessments of student learning in the program.

During the APR process, external reviewers will read the program self-study, will review institutional data for the program, and will interview faculty, staff, and students from the program. The review team will then write a summary APR report that includes recommendations for improvements. The APR evaluators report will be provided to the Deans, Vice Presidents, and the Provost to assist them in strategic decision making. Upon receipt of the APR Evaluator's report, the Provost will draft a summary memo to the Dean of the school in which the program resides summarizing finds and detailing actions toward improvement. The memo will request action and follow-up by the program within a specific timeframe (typically one year).

Report of the Internal/External Review Committee — Committee members are asked to read the program's Self Study and Appendices; interview faculty, students and staff; and tour program facilities to evaluate the applicable sections detailed below.

Submission Date:

Department/Program:

Department/Program Chair:

Reviewers:

SECTION ONE: PROGRAM INTRODUCTION**MISSION & OVERVIEW**

1. Is the program mission clearly stated and measurable? Is the mission reviewed periodically for alignment to the university mission and strategic plan?
2. Does the program show evidence of national and/or international recognition for excellence and and/or does it show that it has offerings that are distinct from or better than competitors?
This section may include a brief outline of strengths/distinctiveness in comparison to peer and aspirant departments/programs as well as a discussion of obstacles and opportunities for future direction of the program.
3. Does the program

GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (*applicable sections only*)

1. OUTCOMES: Are there a sufficient number of student learning outcomes for each program? Are these outcomes clear, meaningful, appropriate to the program, descriptive of the levels of learning expected, and measurable?
2. MAPPING: Are learning outcomes clearly mapped to the curriculum? Do these outcomes reflect scaled or scaffolded learning opportunities within the program?
3. ASSESSMENT: Is there evidence of annual or cyclical assessment of student learning at the end of the program? Is there evidence of the use of meaningful, relevant measures (direct and indirect) in assessing student learning?
4. ASSESSMENT-BASED IMPROVEMENT: Is there evidence that assessment of student learning is used to review and improve curriculum design, delivery of academic content, pedagogy,
 - 4.
 - 4.4.

4. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: Is there is a clear and strategic program for mentoring of junior faculty, continued growth for senior faculty. Are teaching and professional faculty, adjuncts and graduate students closely monitored and mentored for teaching excellence?
5. SCHOLARSHIP:

3. GOALS: Are long-term goals for the program clear and tied to SMU strategic goals? Is there a clearly outlined strategy and implementation plan for achieving these goals?
4. TIMELINE: Is there a clear, precise timeline for achieving strategic goals that is achievable?