



Academic Program Review Guidelines for Academic Support Units

Updated May 2023

Contents

Academic	5
Outcomes and Follow-	
Program Review Checklist and Timeline	7
Peer and Aspirant	9
Self-Study Template	16

Purpose of Academic Program Review

As a Jesuit Catholic university, Marquette is committed to the pursuit of excellence in service of its educational mission. To ensure that its academic programs maintain the highest standards of excellence, the University employs a program review process that is data-driven, forward-looking, and outcomes-based. The process is also designed to help academic units align themselves with the University strategic plan.

Program reviews are designed to support long-term planning efforts, focus on areas that offer the potential for innovation, distinctiveness and preeminence, and assure the most efficient and effective use of resources. The process is designed to be institutionally consistent and yet flexible enough to accommodate the culture and goals of individual units and allow the University to adapt its review process over time.

Administration of the Program Review Process

The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dr. John Su (john.su@marquette.edu) manages and supports the academic program review process. **All questions regarding the process should be directed to Dr. Su.**

During the program review process, units should involve faculty and students, particularly during the self-study and the visit stages. As appropriate, an academic unit may make use of the expertise of standing committees such as undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees, assessment committees, teaching and research committees as well as department chairs and program directors.

The Program Review Co12 0 612mn geg6naq0.00000912 0 61-7(ri(oc)4d he)5(y Da)4(612 7it)-3(tee)6e2sTm0r

Academic Programs Subject to Review

An academic program is defined as a unit or group of units dedicated to achieving research, education, and/or service goals that advance the university mission. The units of analysis for academic program review are typically departments, offices, or centers but could include clusters of programs across areas.

All academic programs are required to participate in program review. The Office of the Provost publishes a calendar of program reviews, which occur within a 7-year cycle.

Academic programs to be reviewed include all units reporting up to the Provost.

Program Review Checklist and Timeline

(Note: Director = Director or Unit Leader)

Strategic Issues/Provost's Summit (Semester One)

Description	Attendees	Responsible Party	Due Date
	Provost, Vice Provost/ Dean/		

Office of the Provost and Dean/Vice
Provost/Academic Vice President provide
feedback on self-study

Vice Provost

Peer and Aspirant Programs

Through the Strategic Planning process, the university has identified 22 peer and aspirant institutions. In identifying the 3-5 peer and aspirant programs which the unit wishes the external reviewers to consider while reviewing the unit, academic units are requested to consider the list below. However, most important is that the unit chooses peer and aspirant programs in the discipline.

Boston College (MA)

Case Western Reserve University (OH)

Creighton University (NE)

Emory University (GA)

Fordham University (NY)

Georgetown University (DC)

Gonzaga University (WA)

Lehigh University (PA)

Loyola Marymount University (CA)

Loyola University Chicago (IL)

Saint Louis University (MO)

Santa Clara University (CA)

Southern Methodist University (TX)

Texas Christian University (TX)

Tufts University (MA)

Tulane University of Louisiana (LA)

University of Dayton (OH)

University of Denver (CO)

University of Miami (FL)

University of Rochester (NY)

University of San Diego (CA)

Villanova University (PA)

Wake Forest University (NC)

Guiding Questions for Strategic Issues

These questions are designed to help units begin a productive internal discussion and to identify strategic issues. They should also be used by the Program Review Council and the external review team for their reviews.

1. How well does the program serve our students, faculty, or other constituencies?
 - a. Is utilization of services/offerings increasing or decreasing?
 - b. How well does the program prepare students to succeed after graduation?
 - c. Does the program meet a current or emerging need for Marquette, Milwaukee, the state, or the region?
2. Is this an area of distinctiveness, growth, or innovation for the university?
 - a. How does the program advance the university mission?
 - b. How does the program advance the university strategic plan?
 - c. How does the program rank nationally, particularly in regard to its peer and aspirant programs?
 - d. What is the impact of the program on the reputation of the university?
3. Is the program well-managed, properly marketed, and adequately resourced?
 - a. Is the program properly resourced with respect to students, faculty, staff, facilities, and technology?
 - b. Has the program implemented strategies for reallocating current resources to meet changes in the environment?
 - c. Does the program have a sufficient operating budget and other sources of support to meet the needs of students, or does it have excess capacity?
4. Is this program an effective and efficient use of resources?
 - a. Is this program cost effective?
 - b. Given this, and its quality, alignment with mission and strat

Strategic Issues Statement and Peer/Aspirant Programs

To ensure that the program review process is focused on areas of opportunity and challenges, a small set of strategic issues, typically 3 or fewer, for the review will be established by the unit and the Provost. An initial version of this statement should be completed and submitted before

Summit and the unit will incorporate the issues into its self-study. Academic unit leaders are encouraged to engage faculty, administrators, and students in determining the strategic issues for the unit.

It may be helpful for the unit to provide some brief context for the presentation of its strategic issues strengths, weaknesses, or opportunities or relevant trend data (e.g., changes in the field, external forces, resource challenges, etc.). Page 10 contains a set of guiding questions that might be used to identify these issues based on data and trends.

The strategic issues statement should be no longer than 2 pages, excluding appendices. Please include the following information as part of the Strategic Issues Statement:

Unit of Analysis

Dean/Vice Provost/Academic Vice President and Director/Unit Leader

Semester of Review

Date Submitted

Strategic Issue 1

Strategic Issue 2

Strategic Issue 3

Also, choice of 3-5 peer/aspirant programs (with a brief explanation of choices) which the reviewers will use to benchmark the MU unit (1 page).

Self-Study Template

Outcomes and Action Plan Template

The action plan will be created by the unit and approved by the Dean/Vice Provost/Academic Vice President and the Provost, and the recommendations will be integrated into the annual planning process, as appropriate. Please fill out one table for each strategic issue and the relevant recommendations.

Please include the following:

Cover Page:

Academic Unit or Academic Support Unit

Dean/Vice Provost/Academic Vice President and Director/Unit Leader

Semester and Year of Review

Date Submitted

- I. Strategic Issues Statement and list of peer/aspirant programs
- II. External Review Team Recommendations
- III. Program Review Council Recommendations
- IV. Outcomes and Action Plan (a narrative may also be included)

Strategic Issue:

Recommendation	Action	Responsible	Date Completed