WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY

Weber State University Five
Year Program Review

Dear Program Review Committee Member,

Thank you for your willingness to participate on the committee to review one of Weber State University's academic programs. Whether you have come from across the country, within the state, or from here on campus your support and expertise are appreciated and valued. This document contains guidelines, instructions, and worksheets for the program review visit. You may complete either an electronic or a hard copy version of this document.

If you have questions about the review process prior to your visit, feel free to contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at (801) 626-8586.

Name of program under review: <u>Master of Arts in English</u>

Names of reviewers: <u>Dr. Nancy Ciccone, Associate Professor and Chair of English at UC Denver; Dr. Richard L. Harp, Professor and Chair of English at UNLV; Dr. Susan Matt, Professor and Chair of History at WSU; Jim Jacobs, MFA, Professor of Visual Arts at WSU, Program Review Committee Chair.</u>

Contents

Purpose of Program Review

The primary purpose of program review at WSU is to improve academic programs. An academic program may consist of an entire department which houses several majors, or an academic program may be a component of a department.

Program reviews are not conducted to expressly identify individual programs for discontinuance. Reviews will result in an identification of program strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for change. The program faculty, responsible academic dean, and provost will respond in writing to these recommendations as part of a program-improvement plan.

Responsibilities of Program Review Committee

The program review committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Review of the content of the program to ensure that it is consistent with high standards and practices within the discipline.
2. Review resources (faculty, facilities and selected budgets, such as travel budgets) to ensure that they are consistent with supporting a quality program.
3. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the program.
4. Note any concerns or recommendations about the rates of recruitment of new students, placement of graduates and sensitivity to community and professional needs.
5. Review sufficiency of the evidence of student learning.

Program Review Process

Program reviews are generally conducted on a 5 year cycle. Exceptions to this schedule may occur as a result of previous review recommendations or outside accreditation schedules.

The faculty representing a department scheduled for 5 year program review develops an extensive self-study report during the fall semester. The final self-study report goes through a series of approvals culminating with sign off from the Dean of the appropriate college. The purpose of the self-study is twofold. First, it provides an opportunity for department faculty to collaborate at a program-level perspective to consider their programs and the status or 'health' of those programs. Second, the self-study document is sent to members of the program review committee to provide them with information and background about the program under study, to help those individuals become better acquainted with the program they are being asked to evaluate.

At the conclusion of the site visit, recommendations and commendations are compiled by the department chair and presented in a report to the program faculty. The program faculty is then given an opportunity to formally respond to that report. All reports and responses are then forwarded to the appropriate Dean who also develops a response.

At the beginning of the fall semester following the site visit, the Dean's response along with the self-study, review recommendations/commendations, and faculty response are forwarded to the Provost's Office. Program reviews are then distributed to the institutional reviewing committee (often the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) and a formal review is scheduled with this committee and the department chair(s). The department chair makes a presentation to the committee; the committee asks questions of the department chair; finally, the committee makes a recommendation to the Provost about the program under review.

The final step is development of program review reports by the Provost for distribution to and consideration by the university's Board of Trustees and the Utah State Board of Regents. These reports are developed and delivered during the spring semester.

Self-study Format and Standards

The most critical element of program review is the self-study that is prepared by the program faculty. The self-study document is both a description and an analysis of important aspects of an academic program. Once this document has been completed, it is reviewed and approved by the responsible Academic Dean prior to its dissemination. The self-study is approximately 25-30 pages in length, exclusive of appendices, and should follow the format described below. An executive summary of the self-study is also prepared by the Program Faculty. This summary document is 3-5 pages in length, exclusive of the appendices and includes brief information about the program under review.

Executive Summary

Mission Statement
Curriculum - types of degrees, number of courses, admissions process
Student learning outcomes and assessment
Academic Advising
Faculty
Program Support
Relationships with the External Community
Student, Faculty, Contract/Adjunct Faculty and Staff statistical summaries (Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research)
Information of review team members (name - current position - place of employment - contact information)

Self-study Format

    I.   Cover Sheet/Title Page
   II.   Program Review Elements and Standards
         A.   Mission Statement
         B.   Curriculum
               1.   Curriculum Map
         C.   Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
               1.   Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses
               2.   Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major
               3.   Evidence of Learning: High Impact Service Learning
         D.   Academic Advising
         E.   Faculty
         F.   Support (Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library)
         G.   Relationships with the External Communities
         H.   Results of Previous Program Reviews
  III.   Appendices
         A.   Student and Faculty Statistical Summary
         B.   Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile
         C.   Staff Profile
         D.   Financial Analysis Summary
         E.   Relationships with External Communities
         F.   Additional information as determined by Program

Program Evaluation Worksheet

FOR USE BY PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

This form is to be used by each team member to record program data and information during the team visit. The following quality ratings are suggested:

S   Strength; effective practice or condition

C   Concern; action could be needed in the future

W   Weakness; action needed

X   Did not evaluate – indicate why the area was not evaluated.

At the conclusion of the visit, leave the original of this form with the team chair, who will use it to prepare the draft statement for the institution.

STANDARD A - MISSION STATEMENT

Evaluate how effectively the mission statement articulates the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The expected outcomes of the program need to be clearly defined.	S	The outcomes are clearly defined.
b.	A process by which these accomplishments are determined and periodically assessed based upon the constituencies served by the program.	S	The assessment process is thorough. The steering committee is effective in its assessment and guidance activities. Depending on the growth of the program, additional personnel may be needed to assess the various options.
c.	A clearly defined educational program, including a curriculum that enables graduates to achieve the mission.	S	MENG currently has two main goals: continuing the development of teachers at the Masters level and preparing students to enter PhD programs. These programs are clearly defined. The success of MENG is demonstrated by the number of students that are placed in jobs and in graduate programs.
d.	The program mission statement must be appropriate to and support the mission statements of both the college housing the program and the university.	S	Overall the mission statement is good; however, we recommend reversing the first and second paragraphs to reflect the objectives of the program first and the environment in which those objectives are achieved second.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD B – CURRICULUM

Evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program should demonstrate that the curriculum for each degree and for any general education/service courses offered by the program is the result of thoughtful curriculum planning and review processes.	S/C	The program's Steering Committee under Dr. Crimmel's guidance, fosters thoughtfulness, consistency, and ensures a rigorous program to meet student and academic goals. This is particularly important for this degree program, as there are a number of different areas covered by the MENG such as, Licensure, Linguistics and Literature (both theoretical and historical approaches). MENG has done a good job in seeing that all voices are heard. There were some concerns voiced about the implementation of the TESOL program and the Creative Writing Option, but we believe MENG is well-positioned to take steps to implement each option in terms of curricula and faculty. The TESOL option may need additional coordination with the LEAP program. The increase in the program's enrollment may eventually offset initial economic investment needed to implement these options The Program Review Committee recommends that MENG reinstate GRE requirement for admission. We believe lack of the GRE requirement creates image problem, as does near 100% acceptance rate.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

| b. The curriculum should be consistent with the program's mission. | C | There is some concern about the dual-designation courses. From the interviews with the students it appears that some of the faculty teaching the dual designation courses take additional time to work with the MENG students outside of class. When this occurs the students see these courses as being on par with the courses for graduate students only. However, not all faculty teaching dual-designation courses do this. Consequently the students felt that some of the dual–designation courses did not match the rigor of the other graduate courses. The PRC recommends that MENG try to reduce the number of dual-designation courses and increase the number of graduate seminar courses. If this is not possible, MENG should insure that all dual-designation courses offer the same rigor as the other graduate courses.

Some faculty were also concerned that theory was not sufficiently covered in all courses. It's difficult for the PRC to assess this given the information we have. In addition, it is understood and valued that perspectives on and approaches to teaching theory will be varied. |

c.	The program should be able to demonstrate that there is an appropriate allocation of resources for curriculum delivery that is consistent with the mission of the program, the number of graduates, and the number of major/minor and general education SCHs produced.	C	The teaching load is a concern. Four courses per semester is a substantial load. Because of the additional preparation required for a graduate course, teaching three undergraduate and one graduate course per semester can be seen as an unreasonable load. One faculty member felt that teaching the graduate course was less demanding; however, this was a young colleague who may not yet be as fully engaged in the other demands of the university and, because of their recent completion of a PhD, may not need to spend as much time to stay up to date on current ideas. We applaud the awarding of stipends to faculty who teach a graduate course, participate in course development and work with students in a directed readings course. We recommend that TAs be paid more than adjuncts, perhaps through an additional stipend, to recognize their vital role. We are impressed that good quality students are being attracted to the program even though remuneration is not at the same level as other programs. The university needs to have greater resources in the library to match the needs of graduate programs. The current collection size is far too small for a masters level university. Faculty development probably is adequate but undoubtedly more travel money to attend conferences (or just to spend a day in Salt Lake City or Provo to work at the excellent libraries there) would be well spent.
d.	Courses to support the major/minor/general education/service programs are offered on a regular basis to ensure students are able to complete graduation requirements in a timely manner.	S	Courses are offered on a regular schedule that allows students to plan effectively and graduate within a reasonable period of time.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD C - STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

Evaluate the extent to which the program has clearly defined outcomes.

Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a. Learning outcomes should describe the expected knowledge, skills, and behaviors that students will have achieved at the time of graduation (overarching program goals).	S	With all options in mind, the learning outcomes in MENG thoroughly describe the knowledge, skills, and behaviors an ideal student will have at the time of graduation. It should be noted, though, that Learning Outcomes—not just at Weber—but at a great many schools are aspirational goals to be achieved. MENG's assessment shows movement toward fulfilling them but it should not be expected that all students will meet every outcome.
b. Learning outcomes must support the goals of the program and the constituencies served.	S	Student constituencies are divided between those who are pre-PhD and those who are terminal MA. We recommend an awareness of the goals of the separate constituencies, so as to tailor education with each in mind.
c. Learning outcomes should be directly linked to the program's curriculum. An explicit curriculum grid illustrating this alignment, as well as the depth to which each course addresses each outcome, is publicly available.	C	The curriculum grid clearly articulates in which courses outcomes will be achieved; however, the depth to which each course addresses the outcome is not covered. Depth can be seen when the syllabi from the courses are matched to the curriculum grid. We recommend the development of consistent criteria/requirements for the graduate level sections of these courses in order to achieve the graduate LOs and to obviate disadvantaging students in these courses as they matriculate in the graduate only courses.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

Evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment process based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program has a developed set of measures for assessment that are clearly defined and appropriately applied.	S	The measures are clearly defined. There are questions about how faculty members interpret the measures. The director has indicated that he will add norming sessions to ensure consistency among the various options and the faculty members doing the assessment. We believe this will be helpful.
b.	Each learning outcome is assessed with *at least one direct measure* of learning; thresholds for acceptable performance are defined (for each measure) and published.	S	The review of students' best papers is a good way to measure learning. MENG may want to consider a random sampling of assignments as way to augment the knowledge gained in portfolio reviews.
c.	Demonstrate that evidence of learning is being gathered on a regular basis across the program, that the evidence is aggregated, and reported at the aggregate.	S	MENG conducts regular qualitative sampling of papers. It aggregates the data and specific percentages are reported. For example, a 56% "Strong" grade in 2012 improved to a 93% "Strong" grade in 2014 for Learning Objective #1 for the "Introduction to Graduate Studies" course.
d.	Demonstrate that these measures are being used in a systematic manner on a regular basis and are reviewed against department-established thresholds, i.e., are the program faculty meeting regularly to discuss the evidence?	S	The MENG steering committee meets regularly and that ensures feedback is considered and appropriate adjustment measures are adopted. It provides a consistent forum for any programmatic concerns.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

e. Demonstrate that the assessment of the program mission and student outcomes is being used to improve and further develop the program. Is the evidence acted upon? Is it clear what drives program change?	S	The steering committee is devoted to fine tuning the program through assessment and extensive review. Their assessment results so far are comprehensive and indicate the high quality of the program. Two developments answering student needs include a Creative Writing option and a TESOL option. The MENG program is well-positioned to take steps to implement each option in terms of curricula and faculty. The TESOL option may need additional coordination with the LEAP program. The increase in the program's enrollment may eventually offset initial economic investment needed to implement these options.

STANDARD D - ACADEMIC ADVISING

Evaluate the following related to the advising process.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program has a clearly defined strategy for advising their major/minor, or BIS students that is continually assessed for its effectiveness.	S/C	MENGs approach to advising is thorough and effective. It involves personal attention and face-to-face contact. To a large part, the outstanding effectiveness of advising depends on assistant's skills and knowledge. To maintain this quality the PRC recommends that the assistant be compensated commensurately to her performance. The program may also benefit from an additional position, especially as the enrollments grow. In addition, students can self advise via Cat Tracks; however, the director and his assistant have requested that the administrators of Cat Tracks make some adjustments to make the format easier to understand. As of this date those changes have not been made.
b.	Students receive appropriate assistance in planning their individual programs of study.	S	Students seem very well pleased with the mentoring they get from faculty and staff. Dr. Crimmel's interviews with each applicant strengthen the community of graduate students and results in their successful matriculation. Our concern is for the sustainability of this laudable procedure; another faculty member may be needed if the enrollments increase in order to sustain the program's graduation success.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

c.	Students receive needed assistance in making career decisions and in seeking placement, whether in employment or graduate school.	S	All students are encouraged to meet with the director to discuss any career or graduate school plans that they might have. The dedicated faculty and Ms. Bates currently achieve outstanding success in directing and mentoring students. The sustainability of excellence, however, depends on additional and systemized resources targeting faculty re-assignments in terms of teaching and advising and on re-evaluating the position of the assistant to the program.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD E – FACULTY

Evaluate the extent to which the faculty demonstrates the following characteristics.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	Faculty size, composition, qualifications, and professional development activities must result from a planning process which is consistent with the program's mission.	S	The faculty members represent a wide range of areas within English. Faculty members from the Department of Foreign Languages also teach in the MENG program. This diversity of interests and approaches is valuable to the program and matches the needs of the program.
b.	The program maintains a core of full-time faculty sufficient to provide stability and ongoing quality improvement for the degree programs offered.	S	There is a sufficient number of faculty members to offer a variety of courses and maintain enrollment in those courses at low numbers. The English department is growing and its new hires seem extremely good and committed to the program.
c.	Contract/adjunct faculty who provide instruction to students (day/evening, off/on campus) are academically and professionally qualified.	S	There are only two adjuncts listed as MENG faculty. They both appear to be academically and professionally qualified.
d.	The program should demonstrate efforts to achieve demographic diversity in its faculty.	S	There are slightly more women than men teaching in the program, 16 vs. 14 the ethnicity is primarily Caucasian. There are two Hispanics, one Asian and one Pacific Islander. Like more institutions in Utah, and most departments at Weber, racial diversity has been hard to achieve; however, every indication given by MENG is that they are working to achieve diversity. Current faculty hires indicate these efforts.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
e. The program should have appropriate procedures for the orientation of new contract/adjunct faculty.	S	New faculty members are regularly mentored by the director, the chair of English and other faculty.
f. Processes are in place to determine appropriate teaching assignments and service workloads, to guide and mentor contract/adjunct faculty, and to provide adequate support for activities which implement the program's mission.	S/C	The workload stipulations for faculty teaching in MENG are well thought out and designed to avoid burn out or over-work, by preventing faculty from teaching overload and grad courses simultaneously. Nevertheless, the 4-4 load is substantial, especially considering that one of the courses is at the graduate level. To this point, MENG has conducted an excellent program but we do fear they are at the tipping point for 'burn out.' A couple of the faculty we spoke to did voice this concern.
g. Teaching is systematically monitored to assess its effectiveness, and revised periodically to reflect new objectives and to incorporate improvements based on appropriate assessment methods. For both contract and adjunct faculty, there is evidence of: Effective creation and delivery of instruction. Ongoing evaluation and improvement of instruction. Innovation in instructional processes.	S	The routine of faculty submitting syllabi to the Director is an excellent practice to assure that learning outcomes are being pursued—and that in mixed classes (undergraduates and graduates) graduate students are being required to do significantly more work than undergraduates. The University's review of faculty is strong. The processes are in place to evaluate and improve instruction. The faculty monitor their courses and combine efforts for improvement.
h. A formal, periodic review process exists for all faculty, and the results of the reviews are available.	S	All faculty are periodically reviewed. This includes, tenured, tenure-track and adjunct faculty. The results are available.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD F - PROGRAM SUPPORT
Evaluate the nature and adequacy of the program support based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The number and capabilities of the support staff are adequate to meet the mission and objectives of the program.	C	The assistant to Dr. Crimmel is outstanding—and does far more—in advising students, helping set their three-year program, compiling and writing up data for assessment and other purposes, routine office work, etc.-- than any other such person in my experience. It will very likely be impossible to replace her with someone else for the same salary who will have anywhere near the appropriate skills. We recommend that this position be upgraded so that the salary is commensurate with the work being done. This may help ensure that Ms. Bates remains with the program. If not, the upgrade should at least make this position attractive to someone with enough skills and energy to perform at the same level as Ms. Bates. MENG may also want to consider hiring a Research Assistant to help with the administration.
b.	Administrative support is present in assisting in the selection and development of support staff.	S	The department chair, the program director, and the staff assistant participate in selecting and overseeing support staff, but as mentioned elsewhere, a re-categorization of the staff position is necessary.
c.	The facilities, equipment, and library support needs are adequate to meet the mission and goals of the program.	C	Library holdings need to be increased to match the needs of a graduate program. The only reason that students can get by is that ILL exists. But to be a truly credible graduate program, the library needs to grow from its current very small size. However, raising TA stipends, increasing the salary of the administrative assistant are top priorities.

We understand that most libraries are downsizing in terms of books and increasing electronic access to books and other publications. While electronic delivery and the ILL are great resources, they still do not match a substantial library. |

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD G - RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES

Evaluate the relationships according to the following elements.

Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a. If there are formal relationships between the program and external communities of interest they should be clearly defined.	S	There are very good relationships with local educators, school districts, and increasingly with applicant pools which might be interested in the program. Additionally, connections to local activities such as Weber Reads, NULC, etc. have raised the profile of the program. Also international constituencies are brought in through LEAP/TESOL.
b. Such relationships should have a clearly defined role and evidence of their contribution to the program (curriculum, equipment, faculty, budget, etc.) should be demonstrated.	S	While the relationships exist, the budgetary connections aren't clear. The licensure program is clearly an important part of MENG since we surely want content specialists training our public school English teachers.
c. If the program has an external advisory committee, it should meet regularly and minutes	S	There is no external advisory committee.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD H - PROGRAM SUMMARY

Evaluate the effectiveness of the program to implement recommendations and make changes based on previous reviews.

Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a. The program must show how it has implemented any recommendations from the previous review and what effect these changes had on the program. If any recommendations were not implemented the program should explain why they were not put into place.	X	This was the first review.

Rating: S = Strength, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

Please include any other notes you feel are relevant to your review of the program:

The MENG program is healthy and thriving. It is poised to expand to serve additional students' needs and new trends, but it will need additional resources to sustain its excellence, perhaps beginning with a reallocation of current resources. We are concerned about the faculty load of 4-4. This is particularly high for faculty teaching in a graduate program. We admire Dr. Crimmel's for interviewing every applicant. This is an excellent way to understand the candidates' potential and to discourage those who are unqualified from proceeding. We do recommend requiring the GRE as part of the admission process, beginning with the Verbal Aptitude Test. However, this should be just one part of the selection process. A lower score in the GRE should be evaluated in its full context to ensure that it doesn't outweigh other assets that a candidate might bring to the program. As the program grows, MENG might benefit by increasing their selectivity.

Notes:

Suggested Questions for Program Review Evaluation Team Members

Questions for program department chair

1. What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the program?
2. How are program goals and objectives assessed?
3. Whom does the program serve?
4. What are the special/unique features of the program?
5. What relationships exist between the program and external communities?
6. Is there an advisory committee? Is it active? What is the meeting frequency?
7. Are any major curriculum changes planned? What? When to implement?
8. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?
9. How much time and what resources are available to the faculty for professional development?
10. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various support departments?
11. Who is responsible for certifying that students have completed requirements before graduating?
12. What are the hiring criteria for adjunct faculty?
13. What type of new faculty orientation is provided to full-time and adjunct faculty?
14. How is the effectiveness of faculty determined in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship?
15. What are the program's advising procedures?

Questions for individual faculty members

1. How much time and what resources are available for professional development?
2. How many faculty members teach in this program?
3. Is the administration supportive of the program?
4. Does the program provide appropriate procedures for orientation of new faculty?
5. What professional organizations are you a member of? Are you active? Hold any offices?
6. What are the student learning outcomes for this program? How are they assessed?
7. How are the results of the student learning outcomes assessment used?
8. How do you go about obtaining needed equipment?
9. Is there an effective process for faculty evaluation?
10. What unique or unusual teaching methods are used in your department?
11. Are there formal relationships between the program and external communities?
12. What is the role of the faculty in curriculum revision?
13. What changes should be made to improve the program? To improve the facilities?
14. What advising opportunities are available to the students?
15. What is the role of the faculty in student advising?
16. Is there adequate secretarial and computing service available to you for preparing examinations, handouts, demonstrations, etc.?
17. How large are the classes?
18. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?

Questions for students – groups or individual

1. Are the faculty members in the program competent in their fields?
2. Are faculty members available to you at times convenient to you?
3. Are adequate advisement opportunities made available to you?
4. If you have laboratories, are they well equipped? Do you get hands-on experience?
5. Do instructors provide effective delivery of instruction?
6. Do you plan to continue your education after graduation? When? Where?
7. Do you plan to accept a job after graduation? When? Where?
8. What is your overall view of the program? Would you recommend it to a friend?