Guidelines for Academic Program Review

The University of Southern Indiana
Office of the Provost
Wright Administration Building 103

Summer 1998
Revised December 2001
Revised March 2003
Revised November 2004
Revised November, 2010
Revised August 2012
Revised June 2014
Revised March 2015
Revised January 2016

Guidelines for Academic Program Review
The University of Southern Indiana
Office of the Provost
Wright Administration Building 103
Summer 1998
Revised: December 2001, March 2003, November 2004, November 2010, August 2012, June 2014,
March 2015, January 2016

Introduction

What is Academic Program Review?

Academic Program Review is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of all academic and academic support programs on the campus of the University of Southern Indiana. Departmentally based programs are to be reviewed once every five (5) years. The standard academic program review consists of a small-scale self-study, followed by reviews by colleagues or administrators from within the institution but outside the department, including reviews if requested or warranted, by experts from outside the University. An academic program review is not a review of the department chair or program director.

Purpose

The primary purpose of Academic Program Review is to examine, assess, and strengthen programs. The areas in which program quality is evaluated include, but are not limited to: (a) the quality of educational programs, including an assessment of student learning outcomes; (b) quality of research, creative activity, or scholarly work; (c) the quality of outreach activities and service to the University, the academic profession, and the community; (d) the contribution or importance of the program to other campus programs; and (e) the potential and future expectations for the program. The review is intended to enhance the quality of a program and to assist in determining a program's ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities; to evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and thus, determine future priorities; and to aid in shaping a rational plan for the program's continued development.

Academic program review fulfills several purposes. The process is designed to assess program quality and facilitate program improvement where appropriate, to foster cooperation among academic units, and to assist in achieving the most effective and efficient use of institutional resources. The information gathered in the course of the review will assist in college and University planning efforts and guide University evaluation of new academic program proposals, budget requests, and capital project requests.

The five-year cycle of program review will ensure that the University has a regular process of internal review and evaluation of its academic programs in compliance with the criteria for accreditation with the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It is assumed that in the ten (10) ten years between NCA self-study activities, each academic program will, theoretically, undergo Academic Program Review twice.

Time Frame

The University of Southern Indiana *Schedule for Academic Program Review* (Appendix D) was developed in consultation with the deans of the various schools and conforms to the University's academic calendar. When possible, the schedule has been coordinated with other reviews and accreditation obligations of the academic programs. It is important to note that accreditation reviews are conducted for their own specific purposes and do not take the place of the Academic Program Review. However, elements of and preparation for these reviews may overlap.

This five-year program review cycle is flexible and may be revised by the Provost in consultation with the appropriate dean. A department chair or program director, with the approval of the dean, may request an Academic Program Review at any time. With the approval of the Provost, on rare occasion, and when circumstances warrant, a review may be extended or postponed.

The normal timetable required for the review of an academic program should be one full academic year. A model timetable for the entire review process can be found in Appendix B. Actual time for each stage of the program review will vary according to the department and the unique needs of each review. Some reviews may be completed in substantially less time. The one-year schedule, however, allows for occasional and often unavoidable interruptions in the process. It is anticipated that the review process can be accomplished within the proposed time frame.

The Process

The Academic Program Review consists of five major steps outlined below. These steps are (1) initial planning, (2) self-study, (3) internal/external review, (4) discussion of findings, and (5) a report to the Provost. The explanation of each step includes guidelines for the review process that have been proven effective. While the guidelines are not binding and may be adapted to the needs of the individual program under study, they should be followed as closely as possible.

I.   Initial Planning

The Academic Program Review process will be initiated each year by the Office of the Provost. The Provost, academic deans, the Council of Department Chairs and Program Directors or Graduate Council, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs will serve as facilitators of the process. At the beginning of the academic year, memoranda will be sent to the appropriate dean and department chair/program director notifying them of the program under their purview scheduled for review. At the March meetings of the Council of Department Chairs and Program Directors and the Graduate Council information will be shared to begin the review process. At this point, academic deans and department chairs/program directors should appoint a *Program Review Coordinator* (typically, but not always, the department chair/program director).

Department faculty and staff are also welcome to attend the informational meeting, which serves as an introduction to the academic program review process, its purposes, and guidelines.

Following this initial informational meeting, the dean, department chair/program director, and program review coordinator may meet to review the Academic Program Review criteria and to determine the particular procedures to be followed in the review. This meeting is also used to discuss unique needs in an individual department's review process and to establish a suitable timeframe for the review.

As with any review process, there is a need for support, ranging from secretarial assistance, to additional data collection, and even payment of expenses for external peer reviewers. It is expected that such support for the Academic Program Review process will be provided by the program being reviewed, its school, or a combination of the two. In extreme cases, funds may be made available through the Office of the Provost. Costs should be part of the discussion at the initial planning meeting.

II.   Self-Study

A. Guidelines

A thorough and thoughtful Self-Study will candidly assess a program's past and present efforts and will sketch out a realistic course for the program's future. The Self-Study provides a basis for the entire review process. Therefore, it is critical that the study cover all aspects of the academic program. *It is of particular importance that the Self-Study give focused attention to issues and measures of quality and student learning*. If a Self-Study has been undertaken within the previous year, or simultaneously for program-based accreditation purposes, it is possible, with appropriate modifications and updating, to adapt parts of that study for Academic Program Review purposes.

The areas and issues to be addressed within the Self-Study are reflected in the Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline (Appendix A). The Guidelines provide an overview of the features of the program to be examined.
Such features include:
- o Fit of the unit with the university mission,
- o goals and history of the program,
- o overview of program quality, faculty, undergraduate and graduate students,
- o undergraduate and graduate curriculum,
- o recruitment and retention of students,
- o distance education offerings,
- o research, creative works, and academic outreach,
- o fiscal and physical resources,
- o administrative organization,
- o and goals and needs anticipated in the next five years.

Because of the depth and breadth of many of the University's academic programs, it is assumed that the Self-Study will go beyond the issues and questions raised in the Outline. The Outline is intended to provide the skeleton of the reviews and should be augmented by whatever supplemental information is deemed necessary to create an effective self-assessment. This additional information may be presented as an extension of the information suggested in the outline.

B. Composition of the Self-Study Committee

Membership of the Self-Study committee generally is recommended by the department chairperson/program director; final decisions and appointments are to be made by the dean. The Self-Study committee should consist of at least three faculty from the department or program being reviewed. It is recommended that these committee members be faculty with a solid understanding of the department, as well as the discipline/profession. When possible, the committee should include both junior and senior faculty. If a Graduate Program is under review, the committee must include at least one member of graduate faculty. The committee may include students and adjunct faculty.

C. Procedures

The Self-Study process should be started immediately following the informational meeting and the initial departmental planning meeting so that it can be completed by the close of the summer semester. The Self-Study is the most time consuming aspect of the Academic Program Review procedure. The model timetable (Appendix B) allows sufficient time for the completion of a comprehensive report on

the important aspects of the Review. No specific procedures have been established for how the Self-Study is to be conducted. By following the guidelines and expanding upon those areas of special relevance to a particular review, the report will be responsive to the requirements and intent of the Academic Program Review process. It is important that every effort be made to ensure that the process and resulting report are comprehensive and thorough. It is also essential that the process and results be open and available to all members (faculty, students, staff) of the department or program.

It is recommended that the Self-Study committee make a special effort to consider all relevant data (and present them clearly in ways that serve as a basis of information for review); to interview all faculty and selected representative students and alumni; and to gain information and insight from other campus and non-campus resources, as appropriate.

Relevant data may include faculty vitae, annual reports, reports from prior reviews, and information pertaining to grant and contract research activities. Please be succinct and parsimonious, yet thorough. The Office of Planning, Research and Assessment will provide, upon request, various program data (see Appendix C for a list of available data elements). A draft of the program review should be made available to all departmental faculty for comment, prior to submission of the academic dean. Once completed and approved by the dean, a copy of the report should be forwarded electronically to the Provost's Office (USI.Provost@usi.edu) by the first Friday in September.

III.   University Program Review Committee

A.   Guidelines

The University Program Review committee consists of the following: three members of the Council of Chairs and Program Directors or Graduate Council and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. One of the Chairs/Directors will be designated as Convener and will chair the meetings. Additional reviewers will be permitted if conditions and circumstances warrant. This committee will make every effort to review the department or program within the context of the University's articulated mission statement. Among the features of the unit that will be examined are the undergraduate and graduate programs, assessment of student learning outcomes, distance education curriculum offerings, research and academic outreach efforts, fiscal and physical resources, recruitment and retention of students, and academic and administrative organization.

These suggestions are not exhaustive. The committee is encouraged to be responsive to other issues that come to the fore in the course of the review. It is expected that the review committee will make specific recommendations for the improvement of the quality of the program, as well as identify those aspects of the program that are exemplary.

The University Program Review committee will be nominated by the Chair of the Council of Chairs and Program Directors, and appointed by the Provost. It is anticipated that the selected reviewers will reflect the various academic areas covered by or impacting the program. Every effort will be made to assure that appointed reviewers are free of conflicts of interest that would prevent them from conducting an objective review. If a graduate program is under review, the Director of Graduate Studies should be added to the University Program Review committee.

When necessary and warranted, external reviewers may be used in the evaluation of the departmental Self-Study. Permission to engage external reviewers must be obtained by the school dean and/or the Provost.

When possible, external reviewers should be contacted by the dean several months in advance of the on-site visit to ensure willingness and availability. External review may be limited to assistance and review at the departmental level. If external reviewers are used at the formal review level, all formal correspondence will be sent from and under the signature of the Provost.

The initial correspondence should include a copy of the procedures manual for Academic Program Review, a copy of the departmental or program Self-Study, and a clear statement of the nature and purpose of the review and of the reviewer's role.

No specific guidelines have been established for the remuneration of external reviewers. This matter is the responsibility and at the discretion of the unit head and dean in consultation with the Provost.

B.   Procedures

The Program Review should be completed no later than the first Friday in December following the completion and submission of the Self-Study. The review should allow sufficient time for the reviewers to critically evaluate the self-study, review the comments of external reviewers, meet with program faculty, program majors, and program administrators, and to prepare a draft of their review report. Efficiency may dictate that the committee divides responsibilities to cover individually assigned areas. The departmental Self-Study Coordinator and/or Department Chair will be invited to meet with the committee to discuss review procedures, scope, and issues relative to the department or program under review during the spring semester. The report of the University Program Review Committee will be completed by the first Friday in March. The department chairs and deans are invited, but not obligated, to respond to the report of the committee.

IV.   Final Report to the Provost

The final report will include the committee's findings, including recommendations for program improvement. The narrative summary of the report should be limited to five (5) pages and include (a) a description of the program; (b) an outline of the most recent review and summary comments; (c) summary statement relative to the assessment of student learning outcomes; (d) major findings and conclusions of the review; (e) future plans for the program; and (f) a follow-up monitoring and reporting plan.

The University Program Review Committee will submit the final report of its findings to the academic dean, department chair/program director, and the Provost. The results of this review, which will include identification of program strengths, weaknesses, and areas in need of attention, should be conveyed to the Dean of the College in which the program resides for follow-up. Academic programs will have until the last day of the spring semester to prepare and submit to the Office of the Provost a formal written response to the findings of the Review Committee, if they choose to respond.

In instances where serious program concerns are noted, the Provost, at his/her discretion, may request an interim program report, to be prepared prior to the next regularly scheduled Academic Program Review period to show progress made toward addressing the concerns surfaced by the University Program Review committee.

Appendix A
Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline

A.   Program Description

1.   Briefly describe each of the academic degree programs being reviewed, including the name of the degree and major and the purpose and scope of the program.

B.   Program History

1.   Describe the program's history since the last self-study review or within the past five years, emphasizing major changes that have occurred. Include the recommendations of the previous self-study and the unit's responses to those recommendations.

C.   Overview of the Program's Academic Quality

1.   Describe the program in terms of its educational goals (i.e. knowledge and skills it intends to convey to students, currency of content and pedagogy, and incorporation of technology). Explain how the curriculum leads to the accomplishment of the educational goals.

2.   Describe any contributions the program curriculum and faculty make to the University Core Curriculum or other academic degree programs in the University.

3.   Describe how the program supports the University's mission as it relates to preparation for a multicultural society and a diverse workforce.

4.   Indicate how the North Central Association's *Guidelines for Distance Education* (Appendix E) are implemented if the program is offered via distance education.

5.   Describe the program enrollment trends over the past five years and indicate whether any increases or decreases are anticipated during the next five years. As part of your response, indicate how student demand for the program relates to the program's capacity to enroll students; (i.e. can the program accept more majors, or is enrollment limited because student demand exceeds program capacity?) Discuss how students' progress through your program and discuss the retention of those students from each year. Enrollment data trends must be included in this discussion.

6.   Describe the methods used to recruit, retain, and academically advise program majors.

7.   Describe major changes made, if any, to the program or its faculty during the last five years. Explain fully why the changes were made.

8.   Describe major changes planned, if any, for the program or its faculty during the next five years. Explain fully why these changes are necessary.

9.   Describe any contributions made by the program and faculty to the University's general academic climate [events, special programs, and other activities beyond regular instruction.]

10.   Describe how the program assesses the quality of academic advising. Include any changes to improve advising that have been implemented since the last accreditation cycle or program review.

D.   Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

1.   Describe and analyze the assessment measures used to evaluate program effectiveness and student learning, and discuss the results obtained from these measures.

2.   Describe how the results of student learning outcomes assessment are used to improve program learning and instruction.

3.   Describe how results from assessment demonstrate that graduates have gained the skills and knowledge they need to function in diverse local, national, and global societies.

E.   Faculty

1.   Provide collective information and a statement of evaluation regarding noteworthy professional activities and accomplishments of program faculty during the last five years (NOTE: only *collective* information should be reported; e.g., include the total number of scholarly books and research papers published by program faculty during the period in question. Do likewise with other types of faculty professional activities and accomplishments).

2.   Describe the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty within the program. How are these faculty assigned to their teaching loads and particular courses? Does part-time faculty participate in the academic program's meetings and discussions, in curriculum planning and/or in course design? How are part-time faculty identified, and how and by whom are their credentials evaluated?

3.   Describe the faculty's participation, leadership, and influence in the academic profession through such avenues as professional associations, review panels, and advisory groups. Include the faculty's contributions to the University through committee work.

F.   Resources

1.   Indicate what new major resources, if any, the program received during the last five years and explain how those resources were utilized.

2.   Indicate what new major resources, if any, the program requires during the next five years to address concerns, implement plans, and/or achieve goals. Justify fully why the new resources are needed.

G.   Planning

1.   Goals and Needs anticipated for the program in the next five years.

Appendix B

Timeline for Academic Program Review
2015

January
- Departments scheduled to undergo program review are contacted by the Provost's Office.
- Departments select individual(s) to serve as departmental Program Review Coordinator.

February
- Informational meeting for program review coordinators and the Provost Program review coordinators receive *Guidelines for Academic Program Review.*
- Departmental self-study committ*ee is formed.*

March
- Informational meeting for program review coordinators at the Council of Chairs and Program Directors and/or the Graduate council March meetings.
- Program review coordinators receive *Guidelines for Academic Program Review.*
- *Departmental self-*study committee requests necessary program data from the Office of Planning, Research and Assessment.

April-May
- University Program Review Committees established and Committee Conveners selected.
- Continued development of the departmental program review.

Summer
- Program review draft distributed to departmental faculty for review and comment.
- Program review draft forwarded to academic dean for review and comment.
- Revisions to review draft made based upon input from faculty and academic dean.

September (First Friday in September)
- Electronic Submission (.pdf version) of final report to the Provost's Office.

November
- Internal/external review of departmental report.

December (First Friday in December)
- Draft report of the University Program Review Committee completed.

January-February
- University Program Review Committee shares findings of internal/external review with department program review coordinator and academic dean.

March (First Friday in March)
- Committee review process completed and meeting with department chair and academic dean must be completed by March 1.
- Final report of the University Program Review Committee completed.

May (Last Day of Spring Semester)
- Department may submit formal written response to the report of the Review Committee.

May
- Findings of the internal/external review presented to Provost Council and report of findings submitted to the Provost.

Suggested Data Items Compiled Centrally for All Programs

Information Found in the USI FACT Book
Trending Number of program majors
Trending Number of program minors
Trending Number of program graduates
Trending Student Progression data (How many students are progressing through the major on track?)
Trending Number of credit hours generated by department that houses program
Trending 5-year data with diversity
Trending Average SAT scores (verbal and math) of program majors or GRE or GMAT for graduate students
Trending University SAT scores (verbal and math) (all majors combined)
Trending Average discipline-based assessment exam scores of program majors when applicable
Number of full-time faculty assigned to program
Number of part-time faculty assigned to program
Ratio of full- to part-time faculty assigned to program
Ratio of full- to part-time faculty assigned to department that houses program
Ratio of FTE program students to FTE program faculty
Ratio of FTE students in University to FTE faculty in University
Ratio of male to female program faculty
Ratio of tenured to non-tenured program faculty

Information Found in the USI Trace Reports
Trending Percentage of program freshman cohort that graduates in 4, 5, and 6 years (or graduate level data for 2, 3, and 4 years)
Trending Percentage of freshman cohort in program department that graduates in 4, 5, and 6 years (or graduate level data for 2, 3, and 4 years)

Information Found in the USI FLP Reports
Percentage of program credit hours taught by part-time faculty
Percentage of credit hours taught by part-time faculty in department
Trending Number of faculty in overload assignments
Trending Number of faculty with administrative release
Trending Average number of hours of administrative release per faculty
Trending Total number of administrative hours per semester

Information Found in the USI Retention Report
Trending Percentage of freshman cohort of University that graduates in 4, 5, and 6 years (or graduate level data for 2, 3, or 4 years)
     (all majors combined)

Departmental Information
Ratio of service course credit hours taught to majors course credit hours taught
Information about individual program and departmental faculty
        name
        highest academic degree earned and year earned
        academic rank
        tenure status (i.e., tenured, tenure track, adjunct, etc.
        full- or part-time
        gender and ethnicity
        number of years of service at USI
Ratio of program faculty with terminal degrees to those without terminal degrees

Other Information available through OPRA
Trending Average GPA of program graduates
Trending Average GPA of University graduates (all majors combined)
Trending Average general assessment exam scores of program freshmen (no report if n < 10)
Trending Average general assessment exam scores of program seniors (no report if n < 10)
Trending Average University general assessment exam scores of freshmen
Trending Average University general assessment exam scores of seniors
Number of students participating in internships or co-ops (may need to work with Career Services & Internships)

Appendix D

Schedule for Academic Program Review

By Academic Year: 2014-2017

Academic Year	Academic Area	College	Review Office
2014			
	Accounting & Finance (all programs)	Business	Academic Affairs
	Business Administration	Business	Academic Affairs
	Economics & Marketing (all programs)	Business	Academic Affairs
	History (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Radiologic & Imaging Sciences (all programs)	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Philosophy	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Management	Business	Academic Affairs
	Chemistry (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Food & Nutrition (all programs)	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Master in Health Administration	Nursing and Health Professions	Graduate Studies
	Respiratory Therapy	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
2015			
	Biology (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Information Sciences (CIS and CS)	Business	Academic Affairs
	Political Science & Public Administration (all programs)	Liberal Arts	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	Master of Arts in Liberal Studies	Liberal Arts	Graduate Studies
	Engineering (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	Teacher Education (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	University Division	University Division	Academic Affairs
	General Studies	Outreach & Engagement	Academic Affairs
	World Languages and Culture (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs

2016			
	Health Services	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Performing Arts (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Psychology (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Social Work (all programs)	Liberal Arts	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	Geology & Physics (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Mathematics (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Kinesiology & Sport (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Nursing	Nursing and Health Professions	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies D – Graduate Studies
2017			
	Art (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	English (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminal Justice Studies (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Communications (all programs)	Liberal Arts	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	Dental Hygiene	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Dental Assisting	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	International Studies	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Occupational Therapy Assisting	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Master of Science in Occupational Therapy	Nursing and Health Professions	Graduate Studies
	Master of Business Administration	Business	Graduate Studies

By Academic Year: 2018-2022

Academic Year	Academic Area	College	Review Office
2018			
	Accounting & Finance (all programs)	Business	Academic Affairs
	Economics & Marketing (all programs)	Business	Academic Affairs
	Communications (all programs)	Liberal Arts	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	International Studies	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Gender Studies	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Biology (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Chemistry (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Health Services	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Master in Health Administration	Nursing and Health Professions	Graduate Studies
2019			
	Management & Information Sciences (all programs)	Business	Academic Affairs
	Teacher Education (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	History (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	World Languages and Culture (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Philosophy	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Respiratory Therapy	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Radiologic & Imaging Sciences (all programs)	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Food & Nutrition (all programs)	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
2020			
	Business Administration	Business	Academic Affairs
	Master of Business Administration	Business	Graduate Studies
	University Division	University Division	Academic Affairs
	General Studies	Outreach & Engagement	Academic Affairs
	Psychology (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Political Science & Public Administration (all programs)	Liberal Arts	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies

	Engineering (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies
	Kinesiology & Sport (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
2021			
	Art (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	English (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Master of Arts in Liberal Studies	Liberal Arts	Graduate Studies
	Business Education	Business	Academic Affairs
	Geology & Physics (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Mathematics (all programs)	Science, Engineering, and Education	Academic Affairs
	Nursing	Nursing and Health Professions	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies D – Graduate Studies
2022			
	Dental Hygiene	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Dental Assisting	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Occupational Therapy Assisting	Nursing and Health Professions	Academic Affairs
	Master of Science in Occupational Therapy	Nursing and Health Professions	Graduate Studies
	Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminal Justice Studies (all programs)	Liberal Arts	Academic Affairs
	Social Work (all programs)	Liberal Arts	U – Academic Affairs G – Graduate Studies

Appendix E

The Higher Learning Commission of the
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
Guidelines for Distance Education

In order to facilitate the evaluation of distance education throughout the United States, the regional accrediting associations have agreed upon the following definition and guidelines. This agreement is based on an extension of the Principles developed by the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE).

DEFINITION:

__Distance education__ is defined, for the purposes of accreditation review, as a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction occurs when the student and instructor are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Distance education may employ correspondence study, or audio, video, or computer technologies.

GUIDELINES:

Any institution offering distance education is expected to meet the requirements of its own regional accrediting body, and be guided by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) Principles. In addition, an institution is expected to address, in its self-studies and/or proposals for institutional change, the following expectations, which it can anticipate will be reviewed by its regional accrediting commission.

Curriculum and Instruction

- Programs provide for timely and appropriate interaction between students and faculty, and among students.

- The institution's faculty assumes responsibility for and exercises oversight over distance education, ensuring both the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction.

- The institution ensures that the technology used is appropriate to the nature and objectives of the programs.

- The institution ensures the currency of materials, programs, and courses.

- The institution's distance education policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products.

- The institution provides appropriate faculty support services specifically related to distance education.

- The institution provides appropriate training for faculty who teach in distance education programs.

Evaluation and Assessment

- The institution assesses student capability to succeed in distance education programs and applies this information to admission and recruiting policies and decisions.

- The institution evaluates the educational effectiveness of its distance education programs (including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction) to ensure comparability to campus-based programs.

- The institution ensures the integrity of student work and the credibility of the degrees and credits it rewards.

Library and Learning Resources

- The institution ensures that students have access to and can effectively use appropriate library resources.

- The institution monitors whether students make appropriate use of learning resources.

- The institution provides laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses and programs.

Student Services

- The institution provides adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support the programs, including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, delivery of course materials, and placement and counseling.

- The institution provides an adequate means for resolving student complaints.

- The institution provides to students advertising, recruiting, and admissions information that adequately and accurately represents the programs, requirements, and services available.

- The institution ensures that students admitted possess the knowledge and equipment necessary to use the technology employed in the program, and provides aid to students who are experiencing difficulty using the required technology.

Facilities and Finances

- The institution possesses the equipment and technical expertise required for distance education.

- The institution's long range planning, budgeting, and policy development processes reflect the facilities, staffing, and equipment and other resources essential to the viability and effectiveness of the distance education program.

Appendix F

University of Southern Indiana Mission Statement

USI is an engaged learning community advancing education and knowledge, enhancing civic and cultural awareness, and fostering partnerships through comprehensive outreach programs. We prepare individuals to live wisely in a diverse and global community.