

School of Continuing Studies (SCS) Program Review Guidelines¹

I. Introduction

The Constitution of the School of Continuing Studies (SCS), Georgetown University, Middle States (the University's primary accrediting body), and best practices require all degree-offering academic units to be assessed on a regular basis. The last major review cycle at the University was completed in anticipation of the 2002 Middle States evaluation team visit, and the current cycle began in 2009 in preparation for the upcoming Middle States visit and the pending capital campaign.

Academic program reviews allow for *quantitative* and *qualitative* assessments while encouraging genuine reflection to provide a clearer understanding of each program with regard to:

1. Teaching, scholarly profile, and service;
2. Value to students' education, preparation for society, and professional development;
3. Role within the School and University and effectiveness in fulfilling that role;
4. Resource sufficiency and effectiveness in using resources;
5. Future objectives and changes necessary to achieve them.

This review process affords deans, administrators, faculty, and students an opportunity to reflect on their goals and accomplishments in the context of their academic units and to receive feedback on their work from their peers. Academic program reviews are the joint responsibility of the (Senior) Associate Deans overseeing those programs and the SCS Office of Academic Affairs & Compliance which oversees and facilitates the academic program review process.

The SCS degree programs have all reached maturity and are ready for comprehensive self-study and peer (external) evaluation:

1. Public Relations & Corporate Communications; Journalism
2. Real Estate; Sports Industry Management
3. Human Resources; Technology Management
4. Undergraduate Liberal Studies (BALS); Graduate Liberal Studies (MALS and DLS)

¹ These guidelines were developed to assess the Liberal and Professional Studies academic programs within the School of Continuing Studies (SCS). They were devised incorporating criteria and strategies established by the Georgetown Provost's Office, The University of Washington, Northeastern University, and Grinnell College.

II. The Academic Program Review Process and Timeline

The program review process consists of two important parts: The Charge Committee, which develops the Core Questions and completes the Self-Study, and the Peer Review Committee, which conducts a Site Visit and provides a final report and recommendations.

A. The Charge Committee: Formation and Duties

The department head, (Senior) Associate Dean, will form an internal review committee, the Charge Committee, comprised of at least five members, including possible representatives from the following:

- Faculty (at least one faculty member is required; two are recommended)
- SCS Administrators
- Student Leaders
- University Representatives (Registrar's Office, Student Financial Services, Library)
- CNDLS or OADS Representatives
- Department Board Representatives

The department head will name a Chair for this Committee to develop and coordinate a reasonable meeting schedule. The department head can serve as Chair if s/he so chooses. The Chair will send (1) a list of the Charge Committee members and (2) meeting schedule by **April 17, 2012** to Dr. Walter Rankin (rankinw@georgetown.edu) to be listed on the SCS Assessment website (<http://scs.georgetown.edu/academic-affairs/reports>) in order to promote transparency and ownership of this activity.

The Charge Committee will (1) develop a series of Core Questions and Responses and (2) complete a comprehensive Self-Study (both described below). These items will be due to Dr. Walter Rankin (rankinw@georgetown.edu) by **August 31, 2012**. They will also be shared with the Peer Review Committee (defined below) in preparation for their visit.

B. The Peer Review Committee: Formation and Duties

In addition to the Charge Committee, the department head will form an external Peer Review Committee, comprised of at least five members, to conduct a formal site visit at the conclusion of the Self-Study. The members of the Peer Review Committee can include industry professionals but must also include representation from similar academic programs outside of Georgetown. A Chair for the Peer Review Committee should also be named. In considering members for this committee, please make known any personal connections or affiliation with Georgetown or SCS. Send the names, titles, and contact information for your proposed Peer Review Committee by **June 29, 2012** to Dr. Walter Rankin (rankinw@georgetown.edu). The names of your Peer Review Committee members will be kept on file but will not be published on the SCS Assessment website.

Travel, lodging, and meals for visiting members of the Peer Review Committee will be covered by the SCS Deans' Office. *All travel arrangements will be coordinated by the academic program under review.* The department head will provide a preliminary budget for the Peer Review Committee expenses and site visit by **June 29, 2012** to Dr. Walter Rankin

(rankinw@georgetown.edu). Please note: Peer Review Committee members with cost-prohibitive travel expenses may have to be replaced.

The purpose of the site visit will be to allow the Peer Review Committee members to visit with all constituents and key stakeholders who can provide information about, and advice to, the unit. Additionally, if there are any other individuals the committee wishes to meet, these meetings should be arranged in advance by the unit being reviewed. The site visit should be schedule through the program during **October 2012**.

The site visit concludes with a joint meeting of the Charge Committee and the Peer Review Committee, and possibly others from or suggested by the SCS Dean's Office. The first half of this meeting will allow both Committees to share their initial findings and recommendations. The second half of this meeting will be an executive session during which the chair/lead of the unit will not be present to permit a more open discussion.

The Chair of the Peer Review Committee will send a report by **December 4, 2012** to Dr. Walter Rankin (rankinw@georgetown.edu). The SCS Academic Affairs & Compliance Office will send a copy to the unit and Dr. Robert Manuel. The SCS Executive Committee and other relevant Georgetown units may also review the document as appropriate. These units will review all documents generated during the review process and, if necessary, ask clarifying questions of the program under review.

A final summary will be generated within two months of receiving the Peer Review Committee's report, outlining any recommendations or suggestions for the program.

III. Summary of Due Dates

April 17, 2012: Chair of Charge Committee sends list of Charge Committee members and schedule of meetings for publication on SCS Assessment website to rankinw@georgetown.edu.

June 29, 2012: Head of Academic Program sends list of Peer Review Committee Members to rankinw@georgetown.edu.

June 29, 2012: Head of Academic Program sends travel and lodging budget proposal for Peer Review Committee Members to rankinw@georgetown.edu.

August 31, 2012: Chair of Charge Committee sends completed Self-Study to rankinw@georgetown.edu. Self-Study is shared with Peer Review Committee Members.

September 18, 2012: Head of Academic Program determines date for site visit by Peer Review Committee in October 2012.

October XX, 2012: Peer Review Committee conducts site visit.

December 4, 2012: Chair of Peer Review Committee sends final report and recommendations to rankinw@georgetown.edu.

IV. The Self-Study Structure and Format

There is no page limit for this Self-Study. We do ask that the Self-Study follow the format outlined below and be saved as a single PDF file. For readability, we also ask that the Self-Study be double-spaced using a standard 12-point font with 1-inch margins.

A. Cover Page

Name of Program, Chair of Charge Committee, Charge Committee Members, Date

B. Table of Contents

C. Executive Summary

D. Core Questions and Responses

Core Questions should be developed to suit the unique nature of your program. These might include questions along the following lines:

- What collaborative or interdisciplinary opportunities do you envision for your program (at Georgetown, outside of the University, internationally)?
- What particular academic or financial challenges do you think your department will face within the next five years and how are you planning to meet those challenges? How can SCS and the University help with these challenges?
- What is the impact of your program regionally, nationally, and internationally? How can your program ensure a positive impact in these areas?

E. Curriculum and Program Profile

1. Working with SCS Academic Affairs & Compliance and Enrollment Services, provide 3-year enrollment, retention, and graduation information.
2. Working with SCS Marketing & Strategy, provide a competitive analysis (strengths and weaknesses) of your peers and aspirants. What specific metrics would you use to evaluate their overall quality?
3. What is your department's mission statement? How does your mission complement the mission of SCS and the mission of the University?
4. What are the published learning goals for your program? How were these established? How are they evaluated? Describe any metrics, rubrics, or assessment strategies you use to help ensure these goals are met. Please use the Middle States publication "Examples of Evidence of Student Learning" for guidelines (<http://www.msche.org/publications/examples-of-evidence-of-student-learning.pdf>).
5. Provide a Curriculum Map showing how each course offered is attached to the specific learning goals on your program.
6. Describe specific processes for periodic review of your curriculum, concentrations, degree requirements, and course content.
7. For graduate programs, how does your unit evaluate final capstone projects or theses to ensure overall quality?

8. Describe your advising system and processes to guide students from admission through graduation.

F. Faculty Profile

1. List all current faculty, highest degree earned, relevant professional experience, and courses taught by semester. Include any notable academic or professional achievements, presentations, or publications by your faculty.
2. Describe your training process for new faculty. How do they learn about developing syllabi, structuring and articulating measurable learning goals, academic policies and procedures?
3. Describe faculty recruitment and retention processes, including any professional and academic development provided to your faculty.
4. How do you ensure faculty are up-to-date with advances and changes in your field?
5. In addition to teaching evaluations, describe any criteria or evaluative measures used to assess teaching effectiveness (mid-semester course evaluations, peer reviews, class visits).
6. What specific strategies has the program employed to recruit and support the career success of faculty members from under-represented groups?

G. Appendix

- Current CVs for all teaching faculty (required)
- Syllabi for all courses (required)
- Student Surveys
- Grading Rubrics
- Operational Plans