

INSTRUCTIONS AND OUTLINE FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS FOLLOWING COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW

Reporting Expectation and Submission Due Date

All graduate programs and centers/institutes that underwent comprehensive program review in 2002-2003 are expected to complete a follow-up report. The reporting period for improvements achieved covers two academic years from the beginning of Fall Semester 2002 when the Year 2 self-study process was initiated to the end of Spring Semester, 2004. **The deadline for completing and submitting follow-up reports is June 4, 2004.**

Each report should be submitted as a Word document attachment and emailed to erugg@kennesaw.edu. It will be posted on the Web site for Comprehensive Program Review at www.kennesaw.edu/ie in the section entitled, "Follow-ups on Year 2 Program Reviews."

Overview

Comprehensive Program Review at KSU has been designed to address several major and essential SACS/COC accreditation requirements. Institutional compliance with Core Requirement #5 in Section II of the Principles for Accreditation requires evidence that "the institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide planning and evaluation processes that incorporate a systematic review of programs and services that (a) results in continuing improvement and demonstrate that the institution is accomplishing its mission" (underlining added for emphasis). Compliance with Comprehensive Standard #16 in Section III under Institutional Effectiveness requires evidence that "the institution identifies expected outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative services, assesses whether it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of those results" (underlining added for emphasis).

An electronic archive of evidence which documents KSU's compliance with these key and essential institutional accreditation requirements has been established at www.kennesaw.edu/ie under Comprehensive Program Review. KSU's five-year cycle of comprehensive program review is an on-going, integrated, and institution-wide planning and evaluation process that incorporates a systematic review of programs and services not only at the unit level (i.e., through a common and standardized self-study process), but also from a university-wide perspective (i.e., through the reviews and evaluations of the University Program Review Council and follow-up from KSU's administrative leadership). The expected outcomes for these programs and services have been established from an institutional perspective and are reinforced by the policy on program review of the Board of Regents. These outcomes focus on different measures and indicators of quality, productivity, and viability. Comprehensive Program Review assesses whether these outcome indicators of quality, productivity, and viability are being achieved, identifying strengths and weaknesses in that regard.

Rationale for the Program Improvement Follow-Up Report

The fundamental goal of comprehensive program review is to foster continuous improvement of all programs and services. Comprehensive program reviews help to highlight specific aspects of a unit's quality, productivity, or overall viability that can be and/or should be improved. Action plans and priorities for achieving such improvements are expected to emerge from these major assessments. Achieving planned improvements "closes the loop" and demonstrates that the results of these assessments were used to guide improvements in the quality, productivity, and viability of KSU's programs and services.

The follow-up reports as outlined here will be the principal vehicles for collecting and reporting the evidence that program review assessments have resulted in substantive and continuing improvement. These reports will also be added to the electronic archive to demonstrate KSU's compliance with institutional accreditation requirements. Therefore, it is imperative that each program or service that has been evaluated under comprehensive program review report substantive and persuasive evidence of improvements that have been achieved as a function of the program review assessment and any related assessment activity.

Content Outline for the Follow-Up Report

In preparation for writing this report, review the action plans and priorities for improvement as reported in the self-study, the guidance provided from the University Program Review Council's evaluation (both are available on the Web site), and any other related assessment results.

Ideally, most of your reported improvements will be traceable to the results of the program review assessment. However, you are also welcome to report other notable improvements that emerged from parallel or related assessments, especially if such evidence strengthens your case for demonstrating commitment to continuous evaluation and improvement activity.

Cover/Title Page (unnumbered)

Prepare a cover/title page for the follow-up report in the following format:

**2004 FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON THE
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF THE
(DEGREE ACRONYM) PROGRAM IN (PROGRAM NAME)
[OR CENTER/INSTITUTE NAME]
FOLLOWING COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW
IN 2002-2003**

Prepared by

(Name of Department)

(Name of College)

May, 2004

Text Sections

Each report should contain eight sections, labeled and organized as follows:

I. Specific Plans and Priorities Adopted for Improving the Program's/Center's Quality Since the Self-Study and UPRC Evaluation

Identify the specific plans and priorities adopted by the unit for improving the quality of the program/center over the past two years, linking those plans to the results of program review or other assessments.

Even if quality was rated as very strong with little room for improvement, comment on how these exceptional strengths will be maintained. (Avoid responses that suggest you have no plans for improving or maintaining high quality.)

II. Evidence of Improvements Achieved to Date for Quality Enhancement of the Program/Center

Of the plans and priorities cited in Section I, describe the improvements in program/center quality actually achieved to date and present supporting documentation of those achievements either here or in the Appendix (Section VIII).

If substantial progress has been made on completing a particular action plan for quality improvement and full achievement will occur soon, report those developments here also. Otherwise, comments about any action plans which are largely unfinished or are scheduled for implementation in the future should be reported in Section VI.

III. Specific Plans and Priorities Adopted for Improving the Program's/Center's Productivity Since the Self-Study and UPRC Evaluation

Follow the guidance given in Section I as it would pertain to adopted plans and priorities for enhancing the productivity of the program/center.

IV. Evidence of Improvements Achieved to Date for Productivity Enhancement of the Program

Follow the guidance given in Section II as it would pertain to improvements achieved in the productivity of the program/center.

V. Current Status of the Program's/Center's Viability

Report the current status of the program's/center's overall viability and comment on any improvements or changes in the program's viability since the self-study and UPRC evaluation.

VI. Specific Plans and Priorities for Continuing Program Improvement in the Future

Comment on the status of the unit's plans and priorities for continuing improvement of the program/center.

VII. Timetable for and Progress Made Toward Removing the Program from the Regents' Triggered List of Programs with Exceptionally Low Productivity (If Applicable)

Insert "Not Applicable" unless the program was "triggered" by the Board of Regents for special review because of low productivity in number of majors or degrees awarded.

Describe and document annual gains made over the past two years in degree productivity and/or enrollment of majors from the period of time when the program was triggered for low productivity. If the Regents' productivity minimums have not yet been surpassed, present a projected timetable for when the program will achieve that goal. Describe all efforts currently underway or planned to achieve gains toward that goal.

If it does not appear possible for the program to exceed the Regents' productivity minimums in the future, explain why that is the case. In this instance, comment on the offsetting measures taken and achieved to maximize program viability and program quality despite low program productivity.

VIII. Appendix of Supporting Documentation (If Needed)

Significant supporting evidence and documentation can be referenced in the text and included in this appendix. Please avoid the inclusion of material of minor significance in the appendix.

Dean's Review & Approval

Before submitting your final report, please secure your dean's review and approval of its content. Please keep in mind that the substance and quality of your report reflects not only on your program, but also on your college and the university. Your thorough and thoughtful attention to this report preparation will be greatly appreciated.