

Guidelines for the Academic Program Review Process

**Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Bradley University**

Approved by the Council of Academic Deans

Introduction

The Academic Program Review (APR) process is an ongoing activity in which all academic programs that are not accredited by external bodies will be reviewed over a multiple-year span of time. These guidelines will be reviewed and updated as needed no later than every six years by the University-wide Assessment Team. The University-wide Assessment Team serves as the coordinating and consultative group for all APR endeavors. The University-wide Assessment Team is available to help with any part of this process.

The Purpose of the Academic Program Review Process

The academic program review process provides information that supports planning and decision-making regarding programmatic changes aimed at improving the quality and appropriateness of Bradley's programs. The review process will therefore focus both on the role of each program in the overall Bradley mission and on assessing the quality of each program being reviewed. The APR process is designed for program reflection, curricular enhancements, assessment review, and continuous improvement. Please note there is an annual follow-up component regarding assessment as a result of the Higher Learning Commission Reaccreditation of 2021 and the elimination of Program Prioritization.

Definition of "Program" for APR purposes

Programs within a single department or unit (e.g. Biology, Computer Science, or English) or a stand-alone program (e.g. Health Professions Advisory Center, Honors Program, or EHS 120). The APR process covers all organized academic activities conducted within academic units (e.g., departments, colleges) and other key academic activities (e.g., Student Affairs, Centers) or spanning multiple units. Such activities include all non-accredited academic programs, including majors, minors, and interdisciplinary educational programs. Programs, units, or centers that do not grant academic credit should modify their self-studies as needed, in collaboration with the University-wide Assessment Team.

Leadership of Academic Program Review

Throughout the document, the terms "Program Leader" and "Dean" have been used. If a program is

- d. Accreditation cycles
- e. Time since the last review of the program

Elements of the APR Process

Once a program is scheduled for review, an APR Coordinator will be identified from within. The program will prepare a self-study in accordance with the guidelines provided in this document. An APR Team will be constituted in consultation with leadership (typically, the department chair), the college dean, and the Provost. The APR Guidelines, including construction and responsibilities of the APR Team and guidelines for developing the review, will be provided to the APR Team. A site visit will be conducted and an APR Team report will be submitted to the program leadership and college dean. The program submits a response to the report to the dean. The dean shares the complete packet of documents with the Provost, including the self-study document, the team report, and the program response. Based on the outcome of the review, appropriate recommendations for follow-up actions may be made by the Provost. The program will develop an action plan.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) serves as the repository of all of the APR documents for historical recording-keeping purposes. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness receives a copy of the self-study document at the time it is submitted to the external review team. The University-wide document. Copies of the team report, response, and action plan are submitted to the Office as those documents are completed.

Composition of the APR Team

The composition of the APR Team will vary from program to program and will not duplicate the role of visiting accrediting teams where information from the accreditation visits can be incorporated into APR.

In such cases (where there is information from the accreditation visits that can be incorporated into APR)

Student Learning Assessment

20. How are student learning outcomes being assessed? (<500 words)

21. How are both direct and indirect measures being used? If both are not being used, why not? (<250 words)

