

OVERVIEW OF THE
KSU PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL
IN YEAR 1, 2001-2002

An overview of the purpose, structure, and operation of the University's Program Review Council in Year 1, 2001-2002 is provided below. Greater detail about the operation of Comprehensive Program Review at Kennesaw State University can be found by clicking on the Program Review button on the Institutional Research Web page at <http://ir.kennesaw.edu>.

Year 1 of KSU's Five-Year Cycle of Comprehensive Program Review

KSU's program reviews in Year 1 of the five-year cycle focus on undergraduate programs. Self-studies for each program under review in Year 1 were completed in Fall 2001 and were submitted to the VPAA in January 2002. All program review documents in Year 1, self-studies, Council evaluations, and follow-up will be archived electronically for subsequent reference and review by members of the University community, the Regents' staff, and SACS. (In the future, these will be developed, transmitted, and stored electronically.)

The KSU Program Review Council as External Evaluator

In addition to relying on self-evaluation by faculty associated with a program under review, the Regents' guidelines for program review call for institutional consideration of the judgments of external evaluators. KSU satisfies that requirement by subjecting all program review self-studies to evaluation by a campus-wide panel of the deans and a tenured faculty member from each college who collectively constitute the KSU Program Review Council. Most of the members of this Council will function as external evaluators in that they are affiliated with colleges and departments outside the program's college and department home and will judge the program from a university-wide perspective.

KSU Program Review Council Membership

The University's Program Review Council for Year 1 Spring 2002 will consist of the following members:

Ed Rugg, Council Chair, VPAA, Regents & SACS Liaison

Debbie Head, Council's Information Manager & Recorder, Institutional Research Director

Joe Meeks, Dean - Arts

Mike Walters, Faculty Rep - Arts

Linda Noble, Dean, Humanities & Social Sciences

Yiping Wan, Dean - Education

Pam Cole, Faculty Rep - Education

Susan Rouse, Faculty Rep - HSS

Larry Peterson, Dean - Science & Math

Ron Matson, Faculty Rep - S&M

Richard Sowell, Dean - Health & Human Services

Jan Flynn, Faculty Rep - HHS

Tim Mescon, Dean - Business

Tom Roper, Faculty Rep - Business

Mary Lou Frank, Dean, University Studies

Thierry Leger, Faculty Rep - University Studies

Bill Hill, AVPAA

Ralph Rascati, Department Chair Representative

Nature of the Council's Evaluations & Observations

The Council will make evaluative judgments for all components of the program review on the same rating scales used in the program's self-study (e.g., very strong, strong, satisfactory, weak, very weak). The Council will also record highlights of its observations about each component which should aid in explaining any difference between the program's self-evaluation in its self-study and the Council's evaluation from the university-wide perspective of the external reviewers. A standard form for recording the Council's evaluations and observations is contained in a separate attachment.

For some components of the program review, the Council will not have sufficient "common" information to make an independent and informed judgment of the program's strength. In those instances, the evaluative rating given by the Council will reflect its judgment of the strength of the arguments and evidence presented in the program's self-study.

Structure of the Council's Review Process

All Council members will have copies of all of the program self-studies and common data summaries. Council meetings will be used primarily to reach majority agreement on the Council's evaluation ratings and observations for each program under review.

Prior to the program's consideration by the Council as a whole, each program's self-study will be previewed in depth by a subcommittee consisting of a dean from another college and a faculty member from another college or department. This two-person subcommittee, in consultation with the dean and the faculty member from the program's college/school, will prepare a "discussion draft" of evaluations and observations for the entire Council's consideration, adoption, and/or modification. The Council's subcommittee will lead the Council's discussions of each assigned program. Completion of in-depth previews and discussion drafts before Council meetings should facilitate the efficient and effective use of the time of the entire Council.

Distribution of the Council's Workload

The Council will make evaluations and observations on 45 undergraduate programs during Spring 2002.

Eight Council subcommittees, consisting of one dean and one faculty member, will be formed. Each subcommittee will be responsible for completing in-depth previews and discussion drafts of evaluations and observations for 5 to 7 program self-studies (several of these involve substantial curricular overlap such as English and English Education).

Four day-long rounds (possibly on Fridays from 8:30 AM - 3:30PM) of Council deliberations are anticipated to complete evaluations for all 45 undergraduate program reviews. The first round will focus on "triggered" programs and any closely related non-triggered programs. The second round will examine KSU's largest degree programs, followed by a review of all other degree programs in the third round. The fourth round is reserved for programs in University Studies and any unfinished business from the earlier rounds.

The subcommittee pairings, their assigned program self-studies, and round scheduling are provided in the next section.

Council Subcommittee Pairings, Self-Study Preview Assignments,
And Scheduled Round for Council Consideration

Subcommittee: Sowell & Matson in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	Spanish, Spanish Ed	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)
Round 2	Finance, Economics	(Consulting: Mescon & Roper)
Round 3	Political Science	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)
Round 4	General Education	(Consulting: Frank & Leger)

Subcommittee: Mescon & Rouse in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	Theater	(Consulting: Meeks & Walters)
Round 2	Early Childhood Education	(Consulting: Wan & Cole)
Round 3	Biology	(Consulting: Peterson & Matson)
Round 3	Human Services	(Consulting: Sowell & Flynn)
Round 4	Joint Enrollment Honors	(Consulting: Frank & Leger)

Subcommittee: Wan & Rascati in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	Music, Music Performance, Music Ed	(Consulting: Meeks & Walters)
Round 2	Marketing, Professional Sales	(Consulting: Mescon & Roper)
Round 3	Sociology	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)
Round 4	Senior-Year Experience	(Consulting: Frank & Leger)

Subcommittee: Noble & Flynn in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	Chemistry,	(Consulting: Peterson & Matson)
Round 1	Science Ed	(Consulting: Peterson & Matson)
Round 2	Accounting	(Consulting: Mescon & Roper)
Round 3	Art, Art Education	(Consulting: Meeks & Walters)
Round 4	First-Year Experience	(Consulting: Frank & Leger)

Subcommittee: Peterson Leger in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	Operations/Purchasing, Management	(Consulting: Mescon & Roper)
Round 2	Nursing	(Consulting: Sowell & Flynn)
Round 3	Social Studies Ed, History	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)
Round 4	University Honors	(Consulting: Frank & Leger)

Subcommittee: Meeks & Roper in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	Sport Mgt, Exercise Science, HPE	(Consulting: Sowell & Flynn)
Round 2	Psychology	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)
Round 3	Middle Grades Ed	(Consulting: Wan & Cole)
Round 4	Pre-College Learning Support	(Consulting: Frank & Leger)

Subcommittee: Frank & Cole in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	French, French Ed	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)
Round 2	Info Systems, Computer Sci	(Consulting: Peterson & Matson)
Round 3	International Affairs	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)

Subcommittee: Hill & Walters in Collaboration with (Dean, Faculty Rep)

Round 1	Math & Math Ed	(Consulting: Peterson & Matson)
Round 2	Communication	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)
Round 3	English & English Ed	(Consulting: Noble & Rouse)

February 13, 2002

MEMORANDUM

To: Program Review Council Subcommittee Members
From: Ed Rugg, Program Review Council Chair
Subject: Subcommittee Responsibilities

As members of one of the Program Review Council's eight subcommittees, the two of you have been assigned the enclosed self-studies for your in-depth preview and your preparation of a "discussion draft" of evaluations and observations before the Council meets to consider these programs as scheduled in round 1, 2, 3, or 4. An evaluation form for completing your subcommittee's "discussion draft" is attached to each self-study. (Luan will send you an electronic version for your use in finalizing your discussion draft in preparation for the full Council's deliberations and preparing the Council's final edits afterwards.)

Your homework assignment before each Council's meeting is as follows:

- 1) Using the common information available to you as well as the self-study's report, read and critique each section of the assigned program's self-study as outlined on the evaluation form.
- 2) Consult the dean and faculty member of the program's college/school for clarification and information. Complete a "discussion draft" of the form for the Council's consideration. If possible, share copies of that draft with the program's dean and faculty representative before the Council meeting.
- 3) As external reviewers, the subcommittee should provide its independent rating (e.g., very strong, strong, satisfactory, weak, very weak) for each section and record explanatory notes and/or assessment comments in the spaces labeled, "Council's Evaluations." Please make judgments from an objective and university-wide perspective. Please also give special attention in your critiques to the summary sections of the form, especially II. Summary of Program's Overall Quality, III. Summary of Program's Overall Productivity, IV. Program Viability, VI. Plans for Improving Quality & Productivity, Future Course of Action, and Council's Recommended Follow-up.
- 4) Bring 20 copies of the completed discussion draft to the meeting at which the program is scheduled to be reviewed by the entire Council.

During and after the Council meeting: 1) lead the review of the program using your discussion draft and take note of changes that the Council wishes to have made in its final draft of the evaluation. Ideally, a program's review by the full Council will be completed in 30 minutes or less. 2) After the meeting, make the changes to the evaluation form in its electronic format and email it back to the VPAA's office.

The program's dean and I will be responsible for informing the department of the Council's evaluation, initiating follow-up as necessary, and communicating with the Board of Regents at the end of the Year 1 process.

February 13, 2002

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans & Faculty Representatives of the Program's College/School

From: Ed Rugg, Program Review Council Chair

Subject: Your Unit's Self-Studies

Enclosed are the self-studies from your college/school which you may need to reference when working with one of the Council's subcommittees on the discussion drafts of the Council's evaluation for these programs.

Reference copies of these self-studies will also be available at the Council meeting for members who did not receive them earlier and who will want to reference them during the Council's deliberations on its subcommittees' discussion drafts of the program evaluations.

ER:ls

Enc.

To: Program Review Council Members
From: Ed Rugg
Subject: Spring Meeting Schedule

It has been a challenge to find four Fridays this spring which are free for all 18 members of the KSU Program Review Council to meet. However, a large majority of us are free on several dates or can change other appointments to be free on those dates. Thank you for sending us your availability and for being flexible so that we can complete this essential task in KSU's Year 1 agenda for comprehensive program review.

Please reserve the following dates on your calendar for meetings of the full Council from 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM:

Friday, March 15
Friday, March 29
Friday, April 12
Friday, April 26
Friday May 3 (if needed for overflow)

We will meet in one of the electronic classrooms at the KSU Center, Room 460.

If for some reason you cannot attend one of these scheduled meetings of the full Council, please be sure that your subcommittee colleague knows of your absence. Please also arrange to have a substitute attend in your place if at all possible. Substitutes will need to be briefed on your subcommittee's discussion draft of the Council's evaluation. Your subcommittee colleague will probably have to shoulder more of the burden for presenting the case at the Council meeting in your absence. Hopefully, your input will be reflected in the discussion draft document and can be conveyed by your substitute.

These are very important meetings for everyone who has been deeply involved in comprehensive program review this year, and your faithful attendance and pre-meeting preparations will be greatly appreciated.

Thanks!