

Emory College of Arts and Sciences Program Review Guidelines

Academic Year 2021-22

Purpose

Program review provides Emory College of Arts and Sciences (ECAS) departments and programs with an opportunity for self-evaluation; for assessment of their programs; and for articulation of their objectives, goals, and plans. Based upon a thorough consideration of the current state of the department, the process seeks to improve department and program quality by creating a solid plan for the future. The in-depth knowledge resulting from program review informs long-term administrative planning and decision-making. For those departments with graduate programs, ECAS and the Laney School of Graduate Studies (LGS) collaborate closely throughout the process and encourage a substantial dialogue among departments/programs and the ECAS and LGS administrations.

Overview of the Process

ECAS's departments and programs (subsequently referred to as departments) are scheduled for program review according to an approximately seven-year cycle. Overseen by a small committee of ECAS and LGS deans and administrators, this process comprises three major components, each of which spans at least one semester. A brief overview of the main phases of the review process follows, with each discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections of the guidelines.

1. Study and analysis—the self study

The program review process is a shared effort, and the department, ECAS, and LGS will work together to create a review that has benefits for both the department and the administration. The review begins with an orientation meeting, where department faculty, the deans of ECAS and LGS, and other members of the administration consider some of the key issues facing the department. These issues will be covered in the unit's self-study report, a document discussing the current state of the department and the critical opportunities and challenges the unit will face for the next seven to ten years. The self study should be the result of informed collective discussion among the faculty, with a small leadership team assuming responsibility for this semester-long project.

2. External review

A small team of external experts from peer institutions will conduct a two-and-a-half day site visit to review the department in the semester following the self study. The list of potential reviewers is assembled by the administration with input from the department faculty, and the reviewers visit campus under the auspices of ECAS and LGS. The reviewers submit their report to the administration, and it is shared with the department faculty.

3. Follow-up and continuation

The department, ECAS, and LGS leadership will work together to define the next steps for each unit based on the review. Following a focused discussion with departmental leadership, the ECAS and LGS deans will write a memorandum of understanding that summarizes the review findings and documents the follow-up plan discussed in the meeting. Resource allocation is not commonly an immediate or direct result of program review, which is focused on the department's scholarly mission, rather than its budget. The department will also present a written update to the administration about its program review progress at two separate points: first, one year after receiving the deans' memo and, again, four years after the external reviewers' visit, at the midpoint between review cycles.

Study and analysis—the self study

During the first semester of the review, the department will write a self study. The self study drives the review process, and it should express the unit's unique culture, reflect on its strengths and limitations, define goals and objectives, and develop plans to work toward its goals for the next seven-to-ten years. The self study should be comprehensive in scope (i.e. it should cover all of a department's programs, structures, and activities). Within this framework the faculty, in conjunction with the administration, will identify a small number of key issues (roughly 3–4) for more extensive discussion and analysis.

Program review provides an opportunity for self-reflection, and most departments have found this reflection to be one of the most valuable aspects of the process. The serious consideration of the department's intellectual self-definition and its sense of its place in the discipline are particularly significant aspects of the review process. The self study should be based on extensive discussions among faculty, with input from staff and undergraduate and graduate students, and consider the current state of the unit. Faculty discussions that provide the basis for the self study, and the self study itself, should address the data gathered for the self study (discussed in detail in Appendix A). These data are essential to a full consideration of the department and in many cases will provide points of reference as the department develops or refines its plans to work towards its objectives and goals.

Program review is also a means by which a department can rigorously consider its future directions. We encourage the department to be clear and specific about its objectives and plans to achieve them, as more specific proposals have yielded the most useful feedback. It is understandable that some of a department's plans for improvement may depend on new resources, but the department should take care to define plans that can be achieved through current resources as well. The self study should focus on strategic choices and directions, with the understanding that goals will be met primarily with existing resources. We encourage the department to consider whether existing resources can be reallocated to better support department priorities.

Orientation meeting

Soon after the department has been notified that it will undergo review, the faculty and staff will meet with the Dean of ECAS, the Dean of LGS, and other members of the ECAS and LGS leadership to discuss the program review process. The meeting will cover program review goals, possible outcomes, and particular issues to be thoroughly addressed in the review. The conversation will help the department and the administration develop a set of shared goals and priorities that are tailored to the individual department as it undertakes the review process.

Leadership team

Encouraging faculty discussion of major questions for the department, or the field, and assembling the resulting self study require significant work, as the self study spans all aspects of the unit and its programs. The chair should appoint a self-study leadership team and provide the names of the team members to the assistant director of program review early in the review process. The leadership team will guide the study and analysis of the unit. Often the leadership team will consist of the Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Graduate Studies, but other configurations that are better suited to an individual department will be supported. While the leadership team assumes responsibility for the completion of the self study, the report should be shared with all members of the department faculty before it is submitted to the program review office. In cases where there is no consensus about major questions, the self study should represent the differing points of view among faculty members.

The unit's report

The self-study report should be limited to 40 pages, excluding appendices. A brief executive summary (1-2 pages) highlighting the major issues addressed in the self study should accompany the document. A complete hard copy

and an electronic copy of the self study and all other supporting materials should be submitted to the office of program review at least eight (8) weeks before the review team's campus visit, with the specific deadline to be established by the chair and the assistant director of program review.

The self study should cover all the department's programs. The contents of the self study will be determined by the unit's individual needs, and most will include the following major areas:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and description of department
 - a. Explain the process of conducting the self study and assembling the resulting report.
 - b. Identify the department's mission, the fields covered by the department, and its major activities.
 - c. Provide a brief history of the department since its most recent program review. Summarize the major findings of the previous review. Are these findings still accurate and relevant?
3. Governance and operations
 - a. Explain the departmental governance and committee structure. Describe the department's culture and its decision-making processes.
 - i. What is the internal policy for making teaching assignments and deciding teaching loads?
 - ii. How are mentoring and advising responsibilities distributed across the faculty?
 - b. Composition of faculty.
 - i. Describe the current distribution of faculty across professional rank.
 - ii. Describe changes in the regular faculty during the past seven years (recruitment, losses, progression through ranks, tenure and promotion cases). Please note: unsuccessful tenure cases should not identify the candidate by name.
 - iii. What is the department's ethnic and gender diversity as a whole and broken down by professional rank?
 - c. Recruitment and professional development.
 - i. Discuss the department's efforts to recruit and retain excellent faculty. How do these efforts encourage faculty diversity?
 - ii. How does the department recruit, mentor, and retain junior faculty?
 - iii. How does the department foster continuing professional development for tenured and lecture-track faculty members?
 - d. Discuss staff positions and the staff members' departmental roles and responsibilities.
 - i. Describe any changes in staff or staff responsibilities since the previous review.
 - ii. How do staff and faculty interact, collaborate, and share responsibility for administration of the department?
 - e. Evaluate the department's infrastructure (space, computer support, library resources, teaching and research laboratories, etc.).
4. Departmental scholarship and research
 - a. State of the department: Assess the data collected for the self study as you consider the current state of the department.
 - i. Describe the unit's intellectual and scholarly areas of focus.
 - ii. What are the department's distinctive research strengths? Discuss the ways in which these strengths support the unit's scholarly mission and its undergraduate and graduate curricula.
 - iii. Describe the unit's grant activity, including faculty grants, graduate student grants,

- and training grants. What steps does the department take to promote grant activity?
 - iv. What is the scope of research coverage? Does the department have significant areas of research or teaching strength or weakness?
 - v. How does the department engage with traditions and trends in the discipline?
 - vi. Identify any new areas of research strength that need to be developed and what they will contribute to the department and the campus.
 - b. Consider the department's intellectual interests and position in the discipline as a whole.
 - c. Discuss the unit's role within ECAS, LGS, and the University. What are the department's connections to other campus units (and beyond)? How do they serve the unit's mission? Identify any collaborations you hope to develop in the future.
5. Faculty research
- a. Highlight faculty achievements, including publications, presentations, grants, and awards.
 - b. Characterize the activities of the faculty, covering the following:
 - i. Research: publications, presentations, grant activity
 - 1. What is the depth and quality of faculty research?
 - 2. Describe how you regard the visibility of faculty research.
 - ii. Teaching: teaching and advising or mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.
 - 1. How are undergraduate- and graduate-level teaching shared by tenure-track, lecture-track, temporary, and part-time faculty and graduate students?
 - 2. Discuss the distribution of advising or mentoring responsibilities across tenure-track and lecture-track faculty.
 - iii. Service: to the department, ECAS, University, and profession.
 - c. Discuss faculty members' scholarly contributions to the field. Describe the visibility and recognition of faculty members' contributions within the field (invited presentations, memberships in honorary societies, honors, awards, citations, and other markers of professional standing).
6. Undergraduate programs
- a. Consider the undergraduate majors(s) and minor(s) offered by the unit.
 - i. Review any recent changes to the major or minor as well as any changes planned for the near future.
 - ii. Describe the undergraduate student population and the intellectual atmosphere for majors.
 - iii. What are the programs' greatest strengths? Which areas need additional attention?
 - iv. Summarize trends in majors and enrollment.
 - b. Discuss the undergraduate curriculum.
 - i. What are the course requirements for majors and minors?
 - ii. Characterize the breadth and depth of undergraduate course offerings.
 - iii. How does your undergraduate major contribute to the overall liberal arts mission?
 - iv. How do you balance the needs of providing courses for majors with service courses for non-majors, including GER requirements?
 - c. Explain the system for advising undergraduate majors.
 - d. Address the opportunities for undergraduate research in your program. Is there a capstone experience or research requirement? What percent of majors participates in research? Describe research opportunities that are not course-based.
 - e. Describe the Honors Program. How many students participate in Honors?
 - f. If there are other significant components of the undergraduate program, such as study abroad or internship requirements, describe these aspects of the program as well.

- g. Are students achieving the goals of the major(s)? Describe your learning assessment plans; discuss recent results and how you have used those results to modify the curriculum.
 - h. How do alumni view their undergraduate experience? What sorts of careers or continued education do your majors pursue following graduation from Emory?
7. Graduate programs
- a. Identify and describe the graduate program(s) offered by the unit. Discuss any recent changes to the program(s) and any anticipated changes in the near future.
 - b. Describe the recruitment and admissions processes. Evaluate the quality of applicants and those who are admitted. What steps does the program take to attract, recruit, and retain excellent and diverse candidates?
 - c. Discuss the graduate curriculum.
 - i. Are there sufficient course offerings and balance among offerings? How are courses coordinated?
 - ii. Are courses cross-listed? Do students take courses offered by other graduate programs? If so, are there particular courses that meet students' needs? Do students from other graduate programs enroll in your courses?
 - d. Describe other aspects of graduate education and training: advising, teaching training, teaching requirements, professionalization efforts, etc.
 - e. Discuss the objectives of the graduate program, your ability to meet them, and how you measure your success in this regard. Discuss the program's strengths and limitations. How do faculty evaluate the program? How do alumni view their educational experience?
 - f. What are the hallmarks of quality graduate education in your field? How does the program meet these standards?
 - g. What sorts of careers do graduates pursue? How do you evaluate graduate placement?
 - h. Discuss the intersection of graduate training and the undergraduate curriculum.
8. Goals and Plans
- a. Identify the department's goals for the next five-to-ten years.
 - b. Describe the department's vision for the future and discuss the issues the unit must address in order to thrive. Identify priorities for addressing these issues and any improvements (both ongoing and specific initiatives) the department intends to make.
 - c. How will you measure your progress? Which data will be helpful as you evaluate your progress?
9. Data: The self study will contain data to support the department's narrative. The data requested should contribute to the understanding of the department's governance and operations, faculty and research, the undergraduate program, and the graduate program and are discussed in detail Appendix A.

External review

The review of the department is conducted by a team of external experts who are able to view the program within the larger context of the discipline and provide feedback based on their knowledge of the field and their experiences at peer institutions. We seek distinguished scholars who are recognized leaders in their fields to conduct a rigorous, independent, and informed review of the department. During the previous cycle of reviews, many departments received useful advice from the review committee and used the reviewers' insights to help implement meaningful changes. The members of the review committee are reimbursed for travel expenses and receive honoraria for their service.

Selection of reviewers

As soon as a department has been notified of its program review, the department is asked to provide the office of program review with a list of 15–20 individuals from whom to request nominations for external reviewers. Chairs of peer departments, editors of major journals, officers of professional organizations, and other leaders in the field are ideal recommenders; recommenders may also nominate themselves to serve as reviewers. The office of program review will solicit recommendations from the individuals named on the department's list and return to the department the resulting list of potential reviewers. We ask that department faculty carefully review the list of potential reviewers and eliminate anyone who might have close ties to or a conflict of interest with the department.

The assistant director of program review will seek the department's advice regarding the coverage of disciplinary subfields and possibly other qualifications of potential reviewers as well. The office of program review will invite reviewers, assemble the review committee, finalize the visit schedule, and coordinate travel plans for the review committee.

Materials to be sent to reviewers

The unit's self study will be forwarded to the reviewers at least four weeks prior to the review team's visit. The office of program review will supplement the self study with additional materials, including the program review guidelines and the University, ECAS, and LGS strategic plans. A week before the site visit, ECAS will send the reviewers a draft of the review schedule and a letter outlining the charge to the external review team.

External review visit

The external reviewers visit campus for two and a half days and will meet with the department's faculty, staff, undergraduate and graduate students, and any other members of the Emory community who could help provide a broader context for the program under review. On the first day of the visit, the committee will have an initial meeting with the ECAS and LGS leadership. During the second day and the morning of the third day, the reviewers will meet with the members of the department under review. The reviewers must meet with the following constituencies: all regular faculty (with separate meetings reserved for untenured, tenure-track faculty); staff members; undergraduate students; and graduate students, if the faculty participate in graduate education. The visit schedule also reserves a significant amount of work time for the review committee. Before leaving on the third day, the committee will have a final exit interview with members of the ECAS and LGS leadership. The assistant director of program review will work with the department chair and staff to design the review visit schedule.

The office of program review will be responsible for all of the reviewers' travel and lodging arrangements and expenses. During the campus visit the department will be responsible for transportation between campus and the hotel (usually the Emory Conference Center) and for arranging the reviewers' meals. At the beginning of the semester of the external review, ECAS will deposit \$1,000 to the department's primary operations account (E & G account) to cover meal expenses during the reviewers' visit.

Charge letter and external review report

A week before the campus visit the charge for the review will be sent to external committee members. The charge asks general questions about the department's programs, governance, research and scholarship, and teaching, similar to those asked of the program in the self-study guidelines (pages 3–6). The charge letter will also address the key issues that are emphasized in the self study and request that the committee not use the review as an opportunity to advocate for additional resources for the department.

The external review committee will submit its report to the assistant director of program review within 30 days of its campus visit. The report should address the questions specified in the charge letter and offer a general consideration of the department, including a clear statement about its strengths and limitations, its teaching programs, its research profile within the field, and the appropriateness of its goals and its plans to achieve them. The external reviewers' report is a crucial part of the program review process, but it is not the final statement of the department's merits or the final word in the review process. The reviewers' report is shared with the ECAS, LGS, and University leadership, as well as the faculty of the unit under review. The report is treated as a confidential document and should not be widely circulated.

Error-of-fact report

Once the report has been forwarded to the chair, the department has 14 days to review it for errors of fact. The chair should report all factual errors to the assistant director of program review, who will append the error-of-fact report to the reviewers' report. The error-of-fact report should focus upon factual mistakes, not questions of interpretation. Should faculty have serious concerns about the report, the post-review meeting will provide a forum for a fuller discussion (see below). Should the report contain no factual errors, the chair should notify the assistant director of program review that the report does not require corrections.

Follow-up and continuation

Post-review meeting and memorandum of understanding

Soon after the faculty has read the review report and sent its error-of-fact report, the unit's self-study leadership team will meet with the Dean of ECAS, the Dean of LGS, and other members of the administration to consider the review process, including the external reviewers' report. The meeting is an opportunity for an open conversation among department, ECAS, and LGS leadership, allowing all parties to reach a collective understanding of the department's strengths, limitations, goals, and priorities. The objectives of this meeting are several: as part of an ongoing conversation, it will help the administration find ways to better support the unit; it will provide a forum to discuss the unit's needs in the context of ECAS's and LGS's goals and priorities; and it will allow ECAS, LGS, and the department to agree upon next steps for the department. The chair will receive a memorandum of understanding from the ECAS and LGS deans commenting upon the unit's review and detailing the agreed upon steps toward achieving the department's goals and the projected timeline for achieving these goals. The deans' memo may discuss questions that involve resources, but the deans will not make substantial resource commitments in the memo, as such commitments are considered part of the overall budgeting process. From this point forward, management of program review follow-up will become the responsibility of the administration and the chair, rather than the self-study leadership team.

One-year follow-up

One year after the deans' memo is received, the department chair will submit a written report to the assistant director of program review describing the unit's program review follow-up, as agreed upon with the deans and discussed in the deans' memo to the unit. Following the receipt of the report, the chair will meet with the Dean of ECAS and the Dean of LGS and other members of the ECAS and LGS leadership to discuss the chair's report.

The meeting should continue the substantive discussion of the department's goals and ambitions. At this meeting, some goals may have been realized, others may be in process or require revision. The follow-up steps for a unit may be substantially revised if the unit has undergone significant unanticipated changes or if it has not made adequate progress toward achieving its goals. The deans of ECAS and LGS will send the chair a written response, outlining the conclusions from the discussion.

Mid-cycle review report

Approximately four years after the review visit the chair should submit copies of a brief program review progress update as part of the unit's annual report to ECAS and LGS. The update should cover all of the components of the review discussed in the memorandum of understanding. Several years after the review, it is expected that some of the recommendations may continue to guide the unit's decision-making while other goals may have been attained or revised extensively. In some cases, the chair may sketch some of the issues that the department plans to explore in its next review.

The guidelines for this second cycle of program review respond to comments made by faculty and staff as they evaluated the first cycle of program review. We hope that departments find that these changes enhance the process. Cheri Kersey, Assistant Director of Program Review, welcomes your questions and comments about the process. Please contact her at cnkerse@emory.edu or 727-0856.

Appendix A

Most self studies should include the following data, most of which can be found in faculty CVs and the department's annual reports to ECAS (OARS and OFARS) and LGS. Not all of the requested data will apply to every department. Conversely, some departments may wish to provide additional data as part of the self study. ECAS, within the limits of current systems, may be able to provide some data or other support for the compilation of data. Please contact the office of program review to discuss this possibility.

Some of the data requested below is referred to or requested in the self-study questions on pages 3–6 of the guidelines. Data that is presented in the self-study narrative need not be duplicated in the data section.

1. Governance and operations

- A. List department committees, current members, and frequency of meetings.
- B. Provide the number of tenure-track and lecture-track faculty by rank for 2016-17 to 2020-21.
- C. Provide numerical data on the gender and racial/ethnic composition of the faculty for 2016-17 to 2020-21.
- D. Summarize the changes in faculty rank (including new hires and losses) and progression within tenure- and lecture-track ranks for 2016-17 to 2020-21.

2. Faculty and research

- A. Submit current and complete curriculum vitae for all faculty associated with the program. Faculty CVs will be the primary source of data about individual faculty members and much of the standard information found in CVs will not be requested elsewhere.
- B. Faculty scholarship: Each member of the regular faculty should provide a brief description of his or her three most significant scholarly achievements, similar to the listings on individual faculty member's webpages. Present these data alphabetically by faculty member within faculty rank.
- C. Faculty awards and honorary societies: List by faculty name and date for 2016-17 to 2020-21.
- D. External Research Funds: 2016-17 to 2020-21
 - a. Provide data on total external research funds by faculty and graduate students for each year. Provide the name of the funding source; the type of source (federal, foundation, etc.); the dates of the grant; the grant amount; and the indirect cost rate.
 - b. Identify any training grants and the number of students they support.
 - c. Provide data on internal awards (i.e., University Research Committee (URC) grants) by faculty for each year.

3. Undergraduate program

- A. Students: Provide the numbers of majors and honors students, and list student awards from 2016-17 through 2020-21.
- B. Course offerings: Provide data on courses and enrollments in the form of a table. For each course list course number and title, instructor's name and rank, enrollment, and overall course evaluation mean for courses from 2016-17 through 2020-21 (see sample template below).
 - a. Indicate if courses are cross-listed.
 - b. Identify courses that fulfill GER requirements with the appropriate code (**FSEM**: First-Year Seminar; **FWRT**: First-Year Writing; **WRT**: Continuing Writing; **MQR**: Math & Quantitative Reasoning; **SNT**: Science, Nature, Technology; **HSC**: History, Society, Cultures; **HAP**: Humanities, Arts, and Performance; **HAL**: Humanities, Arts, and Language; **HTH**: Personal Health; **PED**: Physical Education and Dance).

Course data sample template

Semester	Course #	Course title	Instructor	Rank	Enrollment	Evaluation mean	Cross-listed	GER
Spring 18	XXX 141	Introduction to X	Smith	Sr. Lecturer	57	7.9	YYY150	
Spring 18	XXX 190	X through time	Jones	Assoc. Prof	12	8.4		FSEM

- C. Teaching distribution: Indicate the percentage of courses and of students taught by each of the following categories: tenure-track faculty, lecture-track faculty, part-time or temporary faculty, and graduate students, 2016-17 through 2020-21.
- D. Provide a summary of departmental assessment reports or plans from spring 2016–spring 2021.
- E. Handbook for majors.

4. Graduate Program

- A. Applications and admissions: number of completed applications, number of students offered admission, number of students accepting admission, selectivity and yield for the past 5 years (2016-17 to 2020-21); for each student who declined admission, indicate school attended (from LGS Annual Report).
- B. Composition of student body: What is the current gender and race/ethnicity composition of the unit’s graduate students? What is the percentage of international students?
- C. Attrition/Retention: number of students leaving the program before completion of Ph.D., by year in program, for cohorts of students beginning in 2011-12 through 2020-21 (from LGS Annual Report). Note: the years will change depending on the program. Natural Science and Social Science programs will present 5 cohorts who started at least 7 years ago (i.e., the most recent cohorts who have been in the program at least 7 years). Humanities programs will present 5 cohorts who started at least 9 years ago. Note: the number of students dropped from the program for each year.
- D. Completion and time to degree for the most recent five academic years.
- E. Current student mentoring and advising: list the advisors and committee members for currently enrolled students by faculty member.
- F. Completed Ph.D. and Masters’ Theses: list by faculty member, indicate if faculty member was an advisor or a committee member, and provide student’s name and title of thesis for years 2016-17 through 2020-21.
- G. Placement: List first job placement since Ph.D. degree and current placement, by employment sector, for students completing their degrees from 2016-17 to 2020-21 (from LGS Annual Report).
- H. Student publications: list with full citation for years 2016-17 through 2020-21.
- I. Student awards: external fellowships, honors, etc. for years 2016-17 through 2020-21.
- J. Courses: list courses by year, include instructor’s name and rank, course enrollment, and indicate if the course is cross-listed for years 2016-17 to 2020-21. Similar data is also requested for the department’s undergraduate courses, and the course offering charts may be combined, if the department prefers.
- K. Provide a summary of graduate program assessment reports or plans from spring 2017–spring 2021.
- L. Graduate Student Handbook.