

# Program Review Training

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

**LIBERTY**  
UNIVERSITY.  
INSTITUTIONAL  
EFFECTIVENESS

# Program Review Rationale

- ✓ Program integrity
- ✓ Curricular continuity
- ✓ Ensure student learning
- ✓ SACSCOC reporting

# Part A: Curricular Review

## 1. Enrollment Demographics

## 2. Analysis of Enrollment

- Are any courses within the last three years under enrolled?
  - Undergraduate < 10
  - Graduate < 10
- Provide rationale for courses that should be continued, but fall below the numbers listed above.
- Carefully review major/programs which have fewer than twenty students, and which have graduated fewer than five students on average for each of the past five years. A compelling demonstration should be provided for continuing the program (UG and GR)

## 3. Curriculum Map

## Enrollment Demographics & Analysis

### Course Enrollments for the Major/Program and General Education Courses, if applicable.

Use this data as resources and justification for the questions below.

Courses in the Major/Program & General Education, if applicable	Current Year Total Enrollment	Current Year Average Enrollment per section.	Last Five Years Average Enrollment Per Year	Last Five Years Average Enrollment per Section	Last Five Years Average Number of Sections Taught per Year
FAKE 123 - D	1110	23	368	23	16
FAKE 123 - R	271	55	334	70	5
.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

## Student Enrollment in the Major/Program

Year	Total Enrollment in Major/Program Courses	Number of Courses Taught	Average Enrollment in Major/Program Course	Number Enrolled in Major/Program	Number of Graduates
Year 1	7117	232	28.4	MAJR-BA-12 MAJR-BS-236	MAJR-BA-2 MAJR-BS-26
.....	9645	335	27.2	MAJR-BA-25 MAJR-BS-300	MAJR-BA-7 MAJR-BS-36
Year 5	11838	440	26.5	MAJR-BA-120 MAJR-BS-415	MAJR-BA-45 MAJR-BS-57

# Part A: Curricular Review

## 1. Enrollment Demographics

## 2. Analysis of Enrollment

- Are any courses within the last three years under enrolled?
  - Undergraduate < 10
  - Graduate < 10
- Provide rationale for courses that should be continued, but fall below the numbers listed above.
- Carefully review major/programs which have fewer than twenty students, and which have graduated fewer than five students on average for each of the past five years. A compelling demonstration should be provided for continuing the program (UG and GR)

## 3. Curriculum Map

Courses	The student will be able to compose a discipleship ministry strategy for Christian ministries.	The student will be able to defend the theological and historical foundations of the Christian faith.	The student will be able to devise a plan for personal growth, development, and service.
FAKE 123-D		I, E	
FAKE 123-R		I, E	
FAKE 456-D			R
.....	I, E		

- Using the curriculum map provided, for every course designate which PLO it introduces, emphasizes, or reinforces.
- If there are one or more courses that do not align, determine how they can be aligned or eliminated.
- Based on the curriculum map, should the sequencing of any of the courses be adjusted?
- how is your course sequencing, including prerequisites where applicable, used to build and reinforce student learning?

# Part A: Curricular Review (con't)

## 4. Analysis of Curricular Design

- Show how Liberty's Biblical/Christian worldview is integrated into your major/program. b. How does the block of general education courses enhance or develop the overall learning of students in your major? If the LUO general education requirements differ, how do you compensate for those differences?
- If courses are identified as potentially duplicating other offerings in the major/program, identify basic differences between the courses or eliminate offerings which are, in fact, duplicative.
- What previous assessments (if any) of the curricular design in the major/program have been conducted in the last five years?
- Are there requirements of your licensure/certification board or programmatic accreditor that will necessitate changes in your curricular design in the next five years? If so, what changes?

## 5. Analysis of Syllabi

- Analyze the syllabi reviews from the past five years. Do the syllabi in the major/program follow the prescribed format?
- Are all of the course learning outcomes as stated in the syllabi measureable? If not, what action will be taken to revise the outcome(s)?
- What improvements have been made as a result of your syllabi review process over the last five years?

# Part B: Benchmark Curricular Review

## 1. Data for benchmark institutions

- UG and GR - 5 in Virginia, 10 Regional/National
- Free-Standing Minor – 5 total

## 2. Analysis of benchmarking

- Demographic Comparability
- Benchmark PLO's
- Relevant courses benchmarking
- Christian worldview





# Part B: Benchmark Curricular Review

## 1. Data for benchmark institutions

- UG and GR - 5 in Virginia, 10 Regional/National
- Free-Standing Minor – 5 total

## 2. Analysis of benchmarking

- Demographic Comparability
- Benchmark PLO's
- Relevant courses benchmarking
- Christian worldview

# Part C: Faculty Review

## Faculty Credential Audit Summary and Review

- Provide justification for any department chair, program director or coordinator, and/or faculty member who was not properly credentialed to meet accreditation criteria.
- Over the past five years, what faculty improvements and professional development activities have resulted from the faculty evaluation process?
- (GR Only) Provide justification for any chairs and/or readers of a thesis/dissertation committee who were not properly qualified.
- (GR Only) Highlight aspects of your graduate faculty that set them apart from the undergraduate faculty

Faculty Name	Highest Degree Earned; Institution / Address	Specialization/ Certification/ Licensure	Courses   Semester   Average Enrollment
Faculty A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University of Virginia   Charlottesville, VA - US, Doctor of Education, 2002</li> <li>Lynchburg College   Lynchburg, VA - US, Master of Education, 1997</li> <li>Liberty University   Lynchburg, VA - US, Bachelor of Gen Studies, 1995</li> </ul>		FAKE123-D   201240   18 FAKE123-D   201320   17 FAKE456-D   201240   25 FAKE456-R   201320   50 FAKE499-R   201240   10
Faculty B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University of North Texas   Denton, TX - US, Doctor of Philosophy, 2007</li> <li>University of North Texas   Denton, TX - US, Master of Education, 2002</li> </ul>		FAKE123-D   201240   18 FAKE123-D   201320   17



## Part D: Academic Resources

- Do you have an adequate number of student workers/GSAs to efficiently run your program?
- Do you have the resources (facilities (labs), equipment, classroom design, technology resources) that you need to effectively run your free-standing minor program? If not, please explain the deficiencies and identify the specific needs in order to correct the problem

# Part E: Program Learning Outcomes

## Program Learning Outcomes

\*\*Please attach your Program Learning Outcomes report from the Planning module.

- a. What has been learned about the effectiveness of the program in meeting each outcome and achieving the overall educational objectives – strengths and areas for improvement?
- b. Review the objectives and action plans that have been implemented since the last program review.
  - What action plans have been met?
  - What action plans are in the process of being met?
  - Are there action plans that need to be revised or deleted?

# Part F: Other Curricular Assessment Review

- \*\*Please attach your information from the Planning module in the Planning Sources area in regard to other curricular assessment reviews (other than PLOs). Examples include: MFT, Comprehensive Exams, Portfolio Analysis, etc.

# Part G: Other Analyses and Review (G.1)

## Opportunities for Career and Further Study

- What evidence (internships, practica, etc.) has been collected indicating that the program's requirements adequately prepare students for job/career placement in their field? Provide the documentation.
- What evidence (internships, practica, etc.) has been collected indicating that the program's requirements adequately prepare students for licensure/certification or further graduate work requirements? Provide the documentation.
- What has been learned about how the graduates of the program apply the knowledge and skills they have acquired?
- What recommendations have alumni provided to improve the program?



# Part G: Other Analyses and Review (G.2)

## Analysis of Compatibility and Suitability

- Discuss how the program supports and is compatible with the University's mission. Specifically, discuss how the program supports the eight statements in the mission, as appropriate.
- If your program is also accredited by a program specific accrediting body, discuss how that additional accreditation increases the suitability of the program for higher education.
- (GR Only) Discuss how the graduate program is progressively more complex and rigorous than undergraduate programs.
- (GR Only) Discuss how the graduate program is structured such that:
  - It includes knowledge of the literature of the discipline
  - It ensures student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences

## Part H: Comprehensive Analysis of the Review

- Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of program.
- What cost effective measures have been instituted in this major/program since the last program review?  
What new cost effective measures can be initiated?
- What budgetary allocations need to be made over the next five years for this major/program? Prioritize these allocations.

# Program Review Summary Chart

Instructions: Referring to the completed Program Review template, reflect on what has been learned in the review and provide recommendations and action plans that will be implemented within the next five years.

Section	Recommendation: Area for Improvement	Action Plan: Method of Improvement	Timeline	Budget Needs	Priority Code to be assigned by Chair	Priority Code to be assigned by Dean
Part A-Analysis of Enrollment						
Part A-Analysis of Curricular Design						
Part A-Analysis of Syllabi						
Part B-Analysis of Benchmarking						
Part C-Analysis of Faculty						
Part D-Analysis of Academic Resources						
Part E & F-Analysis of Program Learning Outcomes & Program Objectives						

# Summary and Review

Comments and recommendations from  
school/college dean



**LIBERTY**  
UNIVERSITY.  
INSTITUTIONAL  
EFFECTIVENESS



# Contact Information:

Assessment Facilitators

- Skip Kastroll ([hckastroll@liberty.edu](mailto:hckastroll@liberty.edu))
- Tim Fowler ([tjfowler2@liberty.edu](mailto:tjfowler2@liberty.edu))
- Robert Talley ([rtalley@liberty.edu](mailto:rtalley@liberty.edu))
- Dawn Brown ([cbrown241@liberty.edu](mailto:cbrown241@liberty.edu))

# THANK YOU!

**LIBERTY**  
UNIVERSITY.  
INSTITUTIONAL  
EFFECTIVENESS