DATE:       May 13, 2011

TO:         Board of Regents, State of Iowa

FROM:       University of Northern Iowa

Subject:    Review of Academic Programs

Attached as requested are reports summarizing academic program reviews conducted at the University of Northern Iowa. These reports are for programs reviewed during the 2009-10 academic year including programs in:

- Marketing
- Counseling
- Post-secondary Education
- Principalship
- Doctor of Education
- Communication Sciences and Disorders
- Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Sociology
- Anthropology
- Criminology
- Humanities
BOARD OF REGENTS SUMMARY REPORT

Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 4, 2010. They are due no later than December 14, 2010 to the Executive Vice President and Provost's office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: BA Chemistry, BA Chemistry-Marketing, BA Biochemistry, BA Chemistry Teaching, BS Chemistry, BS Biochemistry, MA Chemistry and Biochemistry, MS Chemistry and Biochemistry, and PSM Applied Chemistry and Biochemistry

2b. List date(s) of program review: September 6 – 8, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___x___ No ___

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ___2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ___x___ No ___

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

We have been successful in recruiting students to our undergraduate degree program. Undergraduate majors have increase from about 100 to 140 over the past three years.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No ___x___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ___x___ No ___

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

**Undergraduate Program.** Positive comments from the reviewers address our strength in working with undergraduates, the collegial atmosphere among the faculty and staff, the general good facilities and excellent instrumentation available, and the strength of the students as well as the faculty. In addition, the reviewers noted the Chemistry–Marketing major as a distinctive program. They also noted, with appreciation, our chemical hygiene plan and emphasis on safety.

Areas of concern regarding the undergraduate program include the growth in the number of majors with no growth in the number of faculty. The reviewers indicate concern that we may need to increase lower level course size. They suggest that we offer fewer varieties of some similar courses.

Reviewers note that we need to revitalize our relationships with Iowa high schools as a means to continue to attract strong students. In addition, they suggest we work on developing relationships with community colleges so that transfer students choose UNI to complete their degrees and also so that students transferring are successful when they come to UNI.

They note that the curriculum might be streamlined given changes to the ACS-CPT guidelines and suggest this could help attract and retain students to the major. They strongly encourage us to develop a lab safety course for all majors. The reviewers fault the department on the Student Outcomes Assessment plan indicating it is inadequate and out-of-date.

Communication within the department needs to be more constant and concerted in all directions: administration with faculty, faculty with faculty, faculty with staff, and faculty with students. The reviewers urge the department to have all labs the same for all students in multisection courses. This would benefit students, staff, and student assistants.

**Graduate Program.** The reviewers are very positive about the BA/MS and BA/PSM programs where students can get a graduate degree and their undergraduate degree within 5 years. They identify the PSM program in Applied Chemistry and Biochemistry as a very promising program that has the advantage of requiring very few new resources, is part of a set of PSM programs across campus, and positions students well for industry careers.

Areas of concern in the graduate program include that the PSM program needs attention to better market the program and to assist students in finding internships. The reviewers note that the latter should not be the responsibility of a single faculty member, but rather a shared responsibility of the faculty.
The reviewers felt the MA program was not a viable program.

The reviewers are concerned about the number of course offerings at the graduate level and feel there needs to be more depth in these academic offerings. In particular, they view the MS as a program that should narrowly focus students in smaller niches of the discipline. Our program provides greater depth but broadly.

**Other Issues.** The reviewers felt that the department needs to clarify and strongly articulate the role and importance of active research to the faculty and the strength of the program. The reviewers are also concerned about the number of failed searches the department has experienced over the past 7 years. They encourage us to look for a pattern and to address this issue. The expectations for P&T are not clear and needs to be addressed even though there is a general sense of expectations.

Finally, they strongly encourage the department to support staff in finding and taking advantage of professional development opportunities. Furthermore, the lab coordinators could be given the opportunity to develop, implement, and assess lab experiences.

**Response**

The goal in responding to the concerns of the external reviewers is to do so in a way that preserves the excellent opportunities also cited by the reviewers while continuing to improve these for students, staff and faculty.

In this past academic year, the following steps have been taken to address concerns raised by the reviewers. Many of these steps began prior to receiving the report and are a response to our self-examination.

1. **Add faculty members in Biochemistry and Chemistry Education.**
   We had two searches this past year. The search for a Biochemistry faculty member was successful, but the search for a Chemistry Education faculty member was not successful. Salary was one factor in the unsuccessful search, but a more critical factor was the unusually large number of positions available. We lost potential matches from the pool before we could get them to campus for an interview. The remaining candidates were, as a group, weak. In addition, salaries nationally for candidates in Chemistry Education are much higher than the salary we were able to offer.

2. **Revise and implement new SOA plan.**
   The SOA committee has a plan developed, but not implemented or fully communicated to the faculty. Questions remain about whether we should examine the DUCK from the ACS Exams Institute. Beginning in summer 2011 and continuing into the fall, Department Head needs will work more closely with the SOA committee to finalize and implement the SOA for the department.
3. **Review and revise P&T document.**
The P&T document has been revised and adopted by vote of the faculty, effective this past April 2011. The document greatly increases the clarity at both the Assistant to Associate level and the Associate to Full level. The significant role of research in the department is clearly articulated. In addition, a pathway to promotion for faculty with outstanding service work is now articulated.

4. **Increase flexibility in upper-level course offerings.**
In this year’s curriculum cycle we have proposed changes to the Biochemistry I and II sequence and proposed a course in laboratory safety that will be a requirement for our undergraduate majors. We are continuing to explore curricular options allowed by new ACS guidelines. We are increasing online course offerings, for example offering a section of Biochemistry I in fall that is in an online format. Additional online courses at the upper and graduate level are in the works by appropriate faculty. We also have an online version of Molecules in Life and a blended-version of Organic Chemistry I.

5. **Improve efficiency in entry-level course offerings by consolidation of similar classes.**
Applied General Chemistry and Principles of Chemistry have been combined into a single course under the “Principle of Chemistry” name and number. This reduces the need for adjunct instructors and provides a more efficient use of space and materials.

6. **Reconstitute recruiting pipelines to high schools and establish connections with community college programs.**
The past two years have seen summer workshops for high school teachers provided by our faculty. This spring was a first Update for chemistry teachers in many years.

7. **Identify professional development opportunities for staff.**
This has been discussed with the staff and will be implemented in the next academic year.
Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Graduate Program: MA Chemistry and Biochemistry, MS Chemistry and Biochemistry, and PSM Applied Chemistry and Biochemistry

2b. List date(s) of program review: September 6 – 8, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___x___ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ___x___ No _____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.
We have been successful in recruiting students to our undergraduate degree program. Undergraduate majors have increase from about 100 to 140 over the past three years.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No ___x____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ___x____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

**Graduate Program.** The reviewers are very positive about the BA/MS and BA/PSM programs where students can get a graduate degree and their undergraduate degree within 5 years. They identify the PSM program in Applied Chemistry and Biochemistry as a very promising program that has the advantage of requiring very few new resources is part of a set of PSM programs across campus, and positions students well for industry careers.

Areas of concern in the graduate program include that the PSM program needs attention to better market the program and to assist students in finding internships. The reviewers note that the latter should not be the responsibility of a single faculty member, but rather a shared responsibility of the faculty.

The reviewers felt the MA program was not a viable program.

The reviewers are concerned about the number of course offerings at the graduate level and feel there needs to be more depth in these academic offerings. In particular, they view the MS as a program that should narrowly focus students in smaller niches of the discipline. Our program provides greater depth but broadly.

**Other Issues.** The reviewers felt that the department needs to clarify and strongly articulate the role and importance of active research to the faculty and the strength of the program. The reviewers are also concerned about the number of failed searches the department has experiences over the past 7 years. They encourage us to look for a pattern and to address this issue. The expectations for P&T are not clear and needs to be addressed even though there is a general sense of expectations.

Finally, they strongly encourage the department to support staff in finding and taking advantage of professional development opportunities. Furthermore, the lab coordinators could be given the opportunity to develop, implement, and assess lab experiences.

**Response**

The goal in responding to the concerns of the external reviewers is to do so in a way that preserves the excellent opportunities also cited by the reviewers while continuing to improve these for students, staff and faculty.

In this past academic year, the following steps have been taken to address concerns raised by the reviewers. Many of these steps began prior to receiving the report and are a response to our self-examination.

1. **Remove MA program.**

   We put forward a request to remove our MA program.
2. **Review and revise P&T document.**
   The P&T document has been revised and adopted by vote of the faculty, effective this past April 2011. The document greatly increases the clarity at both the Assistant to Associate level and the Associate to Full level. The significant role of research in the department is clearly articulated. In addition, a pathway to promotion for faculty with outstanding service work is now articulated.

3. **Increase flexibility in upper-level course offerings.**
   This is an item affecting both our graduate and undergraduate program. In this year’s curriculum cycle we have proposed changes to the Biochemistry I and II sequence. We are increasing online course offerings that graduate students can take, for example offering a section of Biochemistry I in fall that is in an online format. Additional online courses at the upper and graduate level are in the works by appropriate faculty.

4. **Identify professional development opportunities for staff.**
   This has been discussed with the staff and will be implemented in the next academic year.
BOARD OF REGENTS SUMMARY REPORT

Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 4, 2010. They are due no later than December 14, 2010 to the Executive Vice President and Provost’s office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution_____ University of Northern Iowa ________________________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Undergraduate Program -- BA Chemistry, BA Chemistry-Marketing, BA Biochemistry, BA Chemistry Teaching, BS Chemistry, BS Biochemistry.

2b. List date(s) of program review:____________September 6 – 8, 2010__________________

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___x___ No ______

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ___2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  Yes ___x___ No ______

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

We have been successful in recruiting students to our undergraduate degree program. Undergraduate majors have increase from about 100 to 140 over the past three years.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  Yes ______ No ___x____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ___x____ No ______

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

**Undergraduate Program.** Positive comments from the reviewers address our strength in working with undergraduates, the collegial atmosphere among the faculty and staff, the general good facilities and excellent instrumentation available, and the strength of the students as well as the faculty. In addition, the reviewers noted the Chemistry–Marketing major as a distinctive program. They also noted, with appreciation, our chemical hygiene plan and emphasis on safety.

Areas of concern regarding the undergraduate program include the growth in the number of majors with no growth in the number of faculty. The reviewers indicate concern that we may need to increase lower level course size. They suggest that we offer fewer varieties of some similar courses.

Reviewers note that we need to revitalize our relationships with Iowa high schools as a means to continue to attract strong students. In addition, they suggest we work on developing relationships with community colleges so that transfer students choose UNI to complete their degrees and also so that students transferring are successful when they come to UNI.

They note that the curriculum might be streamlined given changes to the ACS-CPT guidelines and suggest this could help attract and retain students to the major. They strongly encourage us to develop a lab safety course for all majors. The reviewers fault the department on the Student Outcomes Assessment plan indicating it is inadequate and out-of-date.

Communication within the department needs to be more constant and concerted in all directions: administration with faculty, faculty with faculty, faculty with staff, and faculty with students. The reviewers urge the department to have all labs the same for all students in multisection courses. This would benefit students, staff, and student assistants.

**Other Issues.** The reviewers felt that the department needs to clarify and strongly articulate the role and importance of active research to the faculty and the strength of the program. The reviewers are also concerned about the number of failed searches the department has experiences over the past 7 years. They encourage us to look for a pattern and to address this issue. The expectations for P&T are not clear and needs to be addressed even though there is a general sense of expectations.

Finally, they strongly encourage the department to support staff in finding and taking advantage of professional development opportunities. Furthermore, the lab coordinators could be given the opportunity to develop, implement, and assess lab experiences.
Response
The goal in responding to the concerns of the external reviewers is to do so in a way that preserves the excellent opportunities also cited by the reviewers while continuing to improve these for students, staff and faculty.

In this past academic year, the following steps have been taken to address concerns raised by the reviewers. Many of these steps began prior to receiving the report and are a response to our self-examination.

1. **Add faculty members in Biochemistry and Chemistry Education.**
   We had two searches this past year. The search for a Biochemistry faculty member was successful, but the search for a Chemistry Education faculty member was not successful. Salary was one factor in the unsuccessful search, but a more critical factor was the unusually large number of positions available. We lost potential matches from the pool before we could get them to campus for an interview. The remaining candidates were, as a group, weak. In addition, salaries nationally for candidates in Chemistry Education are much higher than the salary we were able to offer.

2. **Revise and implement new SOA plan.**
   The SOA committee has a plan developed, but not implemented or fully communicated to the faculty. Questions remain about whether we should examine the DUCK from the ACS Exams Institute. Beginning in summer 2011 and continuing into the fall, Department Head needs will work more closely with the SOA committee to finalize and implement the SOA for the department.

3. **Review and revise P&T document.**
   The P&T document has been revised and adopted by vote of the faculty, effective this past April 2011. The document greatly increases the clarity at both the Assistant to Associate level and the Associate to Full level. The significant role of research in the department is clearly articulated. In addition, a pathway to promotion for faculty with outstanding service work is now articulated.

4. **Increase flexibility in upper-level course offerings.**
   In this year’s curriculum cycle we have proposed changes to the Biochemistry I and II sequence and proposed a course in laboratory safety that will be a requirement for our undergraduate majors. We are continuing to explore curricular options allowed by new ACS guidelines. We are increasing online course offerings, for example offering a section of Biochemistry I in fall that is in an online format. Additional online courses at the upper and graduate level are in the works by appropriate faculty. We also have an online version of Molecules in Life and a blended-version of Organic Chemistry I.
5. **Improve efficiency in entry-level course offerings by consolidation of similar classes.**
   Applied General Chemistry and Principles of Chemistry have been combined into a single course under the “Principle of Chemistry” name and number. This reduces the need for adjunct instructors and provides a more efficient use of space and materials.

6. **Reconstitute recruiting pipelines to high schools and establish connections with community college programs.**
   The past two years have seen summer workshops for high school teachers provided by our faculty. This spring was a first Update for chemistry teachers in many years.

7. **Identify professional development opportunities for staff.**
   This has been discussed with the staff and will be implemented in the next academic year.
Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 4, 2010. They are due no later than December 14, 2010, to the Executive Vice President and Provost’s office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa

Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Ed.D. – Educational Doctorate

2b. List date(s) of program review: April 5-7, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___X___ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No ___X___

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No ___X___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
BOARD OF REGENTS SUMMARY REPORT

Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by **December 4, 2010**. They are due no later than **December 14, 2010** to the Executive Vice President and Provost’s office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution________University of Northern Iowa___________________________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:__M.A. Speech-Language Pathology

2b. List date(s) of program review:________April 26-27, 2010____________________________

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes  ___xx___ No  _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: _2____

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  Yes __XX____ No ______

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.
Increase in demand for the profession, due to shortages of speech-language pathologists within Iowa and nation-wide has led to excellent employment opportunities. Our graduate applications have doubled and our program has grown as a result. In addition, we have had a reasonably aggressive recruitment effort for the past four years. Students also learn that 100 percent of our Master of Arts SLP graduates pass the national competency examination and 100 percent of the SLP graduates are employed or have been employed since graduation.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  Yes _____ No ______XX____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No ______

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

A. Changes due to student outcome assessments.

a. Moving to blocked schedule to increase clinical training opportunities during the semesters the students are in residence on campus. (E.g., fall 2010 all academic courses on Thursday and Friday).

b. Initiated new training agreements with agencies and service providers across the state (and nationally) to accommodate students clinical training on MWF. AEAs in Iowa are particularly interested in this block schedule so that they can provide clinical training and recruit speech-language pathologist to their system.

c. Implementing a web based academic and clinical training tracking system to enable students to continuously monitor progress toward meeting national standards and for students to be able to demonstrate to potential employers their clinical training records in more detail.

d. We are moving two courses from the undergraduate program to the graduate program (Introduction to Fluency Disorders and Clinical Examination) to reflect three realities: (1) higher levels are training in these two areas were identified in the student outcome assessments; (2) moving them to graduate level more closely reflects emerging national standards and (3) moving them to graduate level made additional academic space at the undergraduate level to improve the curriculum in speech science which was identified as a weakness both in student outcome assessment and our own internal review.

B. APR recommendation regarding resources devoted to Undergraduate training and its effects upon graduate training.

a. Web based tracking system to eliminate duplication of training activities.

b. Initiated shared teaching experiences with University of Iowa Speech and Hearing program in undergraduate education (T. Bohnenkamp of UNI and G. Moon of UI are sharing experiences in Anatomy of Speech and Hearing.)
c. Establishing closer relationships with community service agencies such as Scottish-Rite which is supporting a UNI training for pre-school aged children with language disorders such as autism and Cedar Valley Sertoma which is raising money for scholarships for students in Communicative Disorders.

d. Dean Joel Haack and the CSD Department Head have begun discussions to solve our space issues that have arisen from the dramatic increase in enrollment.
BOARD OF REGENTS SUMMARY REPORT

Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 4, 2010. They are due no later than December 14, 2010 to the Executive Vice President and Provost’s office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Communicative Disorders Major Bachelor of Arts Major

2b. List date(s) of program review: April 26-27, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes xx No 

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes xx No 

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.
The undergraduate program has more than doubled in numbers in the past 3 three years. Several factors contributed. First, a reasonably aggressive recruiting effort by the Department and the College has been put into place. Second, a high national ranking among undergraduate programs in CSD has been obtained. Third, UNI CSD students have excellent job prospects due to the national shortage of speech-language pathologists, growth in the elderly population and expanding scope of practice. Fourth, undergraduate UNI CSD students have a highly successful graduate school acceptance rate.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes No xx

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes No 

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

A. Changes due to student outcome assessment and APR review comments

a. Undertook a curricular review which revealed that we needed to change the undergraduate curriculum. We are moving two courses from the undergraduate program to the graduate program (Introduction to Fluency Disorders and Clinical Examination) to reflect three realities: (1) higher levels of training in these two areas were identified in the student outcome assessments; (2) moving them to graduate level more closely reflects emerging national standards and (3) moving them to graduate level made additional academic space at the undergraduate level to improve the curriculum in speech science which was identified as a weakness both in student outcome assessment and our own internal review.

b. Initiated shared teaching experiences with University of Iowa Speech and Hearing program in undergraduate education (T. Bohnenkamp of UNI and G. Moon of UI are sharing experiences in Anatomy of Speech and Hearing.)

c. Developing a web based tracking system to eliminate duplication of training activities and to enable to students to access training records more easily in order to apply to graduate school.

d. The Department Head and the Clinic Director have identified equipment needs based on student outcome measurers, scope of practice and wear and tear and have developed a priority list of equipment. We are utilizing funds from a variety of sources from community service organizations (e.g., Sertoma) and the modest internal funds created through the delivery of services. The College has also provided funds to upgrade equipment.

B. Due to the large increase in the number of majors, space has become a major concern. Presently, we are meeting with Dean Joel Haack seeking solutions to the space issue. A longer solution is to identify resources to construct a new facility or remodeled space within an existing facility.

C. Preliminary discussions have begun with respect to beginning a clinical doctorate program in audiology.
BOARD OF REGENTS SUMMARY REPORT

Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 4, 2010. They are due no later than December 14, 2010 to the Executive Vice President and Provost’s office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed

School Counseling MAE
Mental Health Counseling MA

The counseling program moved fall 2010 to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the new School of Applied Human Sciences, approved by the Board of Regents August 2010.

2b. List date(s) of program review

April 29-30, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes _____ No X

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:    0

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes X No _____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

Enrollment has increased in the past 3 years. The program has a large well qualified and diverse applicant pool. Iowa has shortages in the counseling field, especially school counseling. Over the next 5 years that are expected to be 1200+ openings for school counselors in Iowa, mostly due to retirements. Also, the mandate for school counselors was reinstated into legislation in the summer of 2007. Fall 2009 there were around 100 applicant files opened (24 admitted) and 80 for the fall 2011, (18 admitted). Our CACREP accreditation standards (2009) state that the ratio of core faculty to students should not exceed a 1:10 ratio. With a robust pool of qualified applicants the program
faculty hoped that additional faculty lines would develop via demonstration of a strong program. We are now reducing our admissions to move closer to the CACREP 1:10 ratio. For fall 2011 reduce from 24 to 18 admits and have suspended spring admission of school counseling applicants.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?
   Yes ______ No ______ X

Our program has been preparing counselors at UNI since 1953.

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

External Reviewers:

Dennis R. Maki, Ph.D., CRC
Professor and Chair
Department of Counseling, Rehabilitation and Student Development
The University of Iowa

Nona L. Wilson, Ph.D., LPC
Associate Professor
Counselor Education and Educational Psychology
Saint Cloud State University

Comments edited directly from the external reviewers report:

Recommendations
Administrative:

1. The most urgent challenge to the Programs is to bring them in-line with CACREP requirements.
   A. The CACREP Standard is no more than 10 student’s to 1 full-time, core faculty member. Both the School and Mental Health Counseling Programs are not in compliance with this crucial accreditation requirement….We suggest considering a two-phase process in which the programs temporary restrict admissions while simultaneously doing everything possible to add new faculty or have previous faculty lines restored. We also encourage the Program to seek Clinical Faculty appointments that would allow for higher teaching loads, freeing other faculty members to address program delivery, scholarly productivity, and administrative issues;

   B. CACREP Standards (2009) also require that the number of credit hours delivered by noncore (Adjunct) faculty must not exceed the number of credit hours delivered by core faculty. Currently, there are 3 core faculty and 8 Adjuncts. If the number of credit hours delivered by Adjuncts exceeds the
number of credit hours delivered by the three core faculty, the Programs are not in compliance with this crucial accreditation requirement.

2. A comprehensive audit of the Programs relative to all 2009 CACREP Standards should be conducted immediately and strategies put in place because next year the Programs will need to complete a CACREP Self Study. The Programs should be given the necessary resources and supports to ensure a successful reaccreditation.

3. The administrative demands on faculty are considerable and are especially troubling given the understaffed nature of the programs. The CACREP Standards address not only curricular but also administrative issues-- from recruitment through graduation. Meeting those administrative standards requires significant attention to gate-keeping functions, mentoring and advising, ongoing assessment of student progress, specialty area coordination, and oversight of clinical experiences. Currently, faculty members are juggling these demands on top of their full-time teaching and over-sized advising loads. This creates a kind of intersection where too few faculty, too many students, and insufficient reassigned time collide. There should be clear descriptions of administrative/coordination responsibilities and corresponding reassigned time should be provided for faculty so that they can accomplish those duties. We recommend that one faculty be designated Coordinator and Clinical Coordinator of the School Counseling Program and another designated Coordinator and Clinical Coordinator of the Mental Health Counseling Program in addition to the current designation for Coordinator of the Counselor Education Programs. Doing so would also clarify who is responsible for what, would help individual faculty document their service to the programs, would help streamline the process for students seeking faculty assistance as they progress through their program, and quite importantly would be in keeping with the spirit of CACREP standards.

4. Appropriate clinical space with the necessary technology is critical to the students’ development. The core faculty have developed such space in the College of Education building. With the relocation of the Programs to the new college building, it is critical that the Programs retain control of this space until a similar space can be constructed in their new building.

5. The 2009 CACREP clearly state that faculty should engage in activities of the counseling profession and its professional organizations, including all of the following: a. development/renewal (e.g., appropriate professional meetings, conventions, workshops, seminars); b. research and scholarly activity; and. service and advocacy (e.g., program presentations, workshops, consultations, speeches, direct service). Resources including financial support should be provided to the Counselor Education Program faculty to meet these expectations. This is especially critical for untenured faculty.

Programmatic:
1. Review and continue to reduce the School Counseling Program’s requirements while meeting the 2009 CACREP Standards.

2. Reduce the current Mental Health Counseling Program’s Internship requirement from one year to no more than is required by accreditation or 600 hours (at least
until the programs are adequately staffed and the faculty to student ratio no longer exceeds CACREP standards).

3. Formalize the process by which you solicit and use feedback from adjunct faculty and local practitioners. We encourage the Counselor education Programs to create an Advisory Board with a clearly defined mission to provide external evaluation and feedback to assist and support the Programs and their ongoing development.

4. Review the Programs; Exit Requirements, and prioritizes initiatives and out-of-class requirements. It is evident that faculty members have been working on reducing such requirements, and we encourage them to continue in that direction. Especially given the faculty to student ratios, we suggest faculty identify what is essential for students to do in order to complete their programs and to eliminate any and all other requirements. If new initiatives are pursued, consider first identifying what will be terminated in order to create room for them.

5. Consider instituting a clinical course fee structure in order to enhance the support of the Programs and to enhance the resources and opportunities available to students and clinical site supervisors in the community.

6. Formalize the process by which faculty assess student dispositions. The Annual Student Progress Review information indicates that faculty members will review each student’s progress in the area of personal growth/interpersonal skills. We encourage you to develop a rubric that clarifies exactly what is expected and the standards which students will be evaluated.

**Conclusion:**
The Counselor Education Programs are signature programs among the Graduate Programs at UNI, an institution with a proud tradition of undergraduate education. Both Internal and External Reviewers over the program’s history have recognized The Programs’ strengths. Our 2010 Academic Program Review concludes that these programs not only continue their well earned reputation but under the leadership of the current Coordinator have become strategically positioned for the future. The current faculty has developed, with creativity and collaboration, a vision for the future that aligns with the new 2009 CACREP Standards and would meet a critical need in the state of Iowa for qualified School and Mental Health Counselors. Achieving that vision will require the institution’s ongoing support.

**Program Adjustments Based on APR Reviewers Comments:**

**Administrative**

1. As stated earlier, we have reduced admissions to move closer to the faculty to student 1:10 CACREP ratio. With support from the Provost’s office we will have a temporary hire for 2011-2012 academic year and expect to have a faculty search fall 2011. This will bring our core faculty to 4.

2. We now meet the CACREP standard stipulating that the majority of courses cannot be taught by adjunct faculty. This is accomplished by a reduced admission and changes in the course rotation. The additional faculty member fall 2011 eases the adjunct needs as well.

3. In fall 2011, faculty will begin an examination of curriculum and the needed adjustments to come in compliance with the 2009 CACREP standards. Our CACREP
self-study will be due Spring 2013, site visit will be Fall 2013, and our accreditation is good through March 2014.

4. Administrative demands are still excessive for the program director/coordinator, especially with teaching loads. Faculty will continue to work with the School Director and Dean to make adjustments and distribute roles.

5. All intentions are for counseling to maintain the clinical space in the Schindler Education Center, which was expanded and updated with funds from the Provost’s Office in the summer of 2008. Counseling faculty work in collaboration with programs in Schindler to share these resources when possible. We hope to engage in community outreach with counseling services with additional faculty or clinical faculty resources. There are unmet needs in the Cedar Valley which could be supported.

6. Counseling faculty believe that all indicators are that the move to the School of Applied Human Sciences and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has been positive. The counseling program has physically moved to Sabin Hall and feel that the needed support and resources will come.

Programmatic

7. As noted, efforts are under way to reduce the credit requirements where possible. The school counseling curriculum was reduced 3 credits for the 2010-2012 catalog to 51 credits; the program will be reduced an additional 3 credits the next opportunity to 48 credits. For years the program has been 54 graduate credits and CACREP requirements are 48 graduate credits. The UNI program will reduce to the 48 credits.

8. As noted, under the leadership of the current program coordinator/director (2007) efforts have been made to streamline the program requirements and to reduce the outside requirements for students, this helps to transition students to graduation and the job market more quickly. These efforts will continue.

9. Faculty/program director are currently working on the current evaluation form to develop a rubric for the annual evaluation of students. This will make the process more efficient and provide numeric indicators for professional development for both faculty and students.

Student Outcomes

10. Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE)
   a. In the fall of 2007 the CPCE exam was implemented as our program exit exam requirement. The CPCE is used in over 290 universities and colleges that prepare graduate students for the counseling profession. The exam is based on the 8 CACREP core areas for counselor preparation.
   b. This CPCE exam provides a longitudinal self-study for program evaluation
   c. Provide national normative data for curriculum assessment to determine the knowledge level of our graduate students at the time of graduation.
   d. Students received detailed information on their results to determine their strengths and areas for improvement.
   e. By the spring 2011 testing, 100 counseling students have taken the CPCE examination. The program continues to have 100% pass rate, with 78% of our graduate students scoring above the national mean. At each testing UNI has several top national scores.
BOARD OF REGENTS SUMMARY REPORT

Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 4, 2010. They are due no later than December 14, 2010 to the Executive Vice President and Provost’s office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Criminology Program: Master of Arts

2b. List date(s) of program review: February 24-26, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X  No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes X No _____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes X No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Recommendations

The external reviewers made four key recommendations for the Criminology MA program, which are summarized below:

1. The program needs to increase in size. It will have difficulty growing, however, without substantial increases in graduate student funding, a clearer marketing plan that reflects shared faculty priorities for student recruitment, and a course reduction for the Graduate Program Coordinator so this expanded effort can be enacted.

2. The members of the Criminology faculty need to negotiate their differing perspectives on the goals and future of the Criminology M.A. program. It can continue to grow into a strong program that allows for both pre-doctoral education and basic and applied theses if the faculty reach consensus on the value of such activities.

3. The program should consider merging with another graduate program, such as the Sociology M.A. program. While the department could grow without such a merger, combining the program with the Sociology M.A. program could strengthen both graduate programs and be a reasonable and efficient way to address faculty constraints and class size demands.

4. The program’s curriculum could be reevaluated and altered to allow for greater flexibility and timelier completion of the M.A. degree. This may necessitate fewer required courses, greater diversity amongst seminar/course offerings (including 100-g courses), and restructuring of the stages of the thesis process. To improve progress, faculty could consider the value of the prospectus defense and/or consider whether the proposed Proseminar would be beneficial during Semester 2 to jump start thesis research.

Program Improvements

We agree with the reviewers’ assessment of the present situation and have engaged in a series of conversations about the future of our graduate program. Since one of their specific recommendations was to consider combining our M.A. programs in criminology and sociology, a number of faculty discussions exploring this possibility took place last spring. These discussions culminated in a departmental vote where the overwhelming majority of faculty members (13 to 1) were in favor of proceeding “with a shared commitment to developing a new, combined program” that would include elements of both the sociology and criminology master’s programs. In consultation with the CSBS Dean, our department head worked with faculty members to set up a steering committee to discuss and develop a plan for a combined graduate program. The steering committee met regularly from June through September, and it developed a proposal for the structure of the combined program. The committee presented this proposal to the entire faculty for review and discussion on October 20, 2010. At that meeting, the faculty voted 12 to 1 in favor of “adopting in principle the general framework proposed for a combined graduate program.”

As we proceed with refining and implementing the combined program, we will pay careful attention to the issues identified by the reviewers. We agree that we need to increase the size of the program and, in turn, we will develop a more focused and aggressive plan for recruiting students. In doing so, we will devote greater attention to internal recruitment of social science majors at UNI and external recruitment of students from regional liberal arts colleges. We also agree that a major challenge we face is a lack of graduate student funding. While it is unlikely given the present budget situation that we will be able to secure additional funding at the college or university levels, we will continue to pursue these possibilities. We will also strive to expand our newly created teaching internship program at Hawkeye Community College (HCC) to provide more funding opportunities for our graduate students specializing in criminology. Most crucially, we view the HCC internship program as a valuable source of external funding, and we look forward to increasing the number of students who participate in the teaching internship program in the coming years.
In its proposed form, the combined graduate program will offer a multiple-track curriculum which includes elements of the existing sociology and criminology master’s programs. Thus, it will incorporate the reviewers’ recommendation to have thesis and non-thesis options for enrolled students. The proposed program will offer two degrees (sociology and criminology) superimposed on three tracks: applied, pedagogical, and traditional academic. Students choosing the traditional academic track will complete a thesis. Those opting for the pedagogical track will prepare and defend both a teaching portfolio and a pedagogically-related research paper. Those students choosing the applied track will complete an evaluation research paper or a policy paper. We agree with the external reviewers that this multi-track program will not only attract more students but also help students complete their M.A. requirements in a more timely way.

As we continue to move forward with our plans to combine the criminology and sociology programs, we will pay heed to the external reviewers’ recommendation to “allow for greater flexibility” in courses, to reduce the number of required courses, and to restructure the curriculum and stages of the thesis process so that they facilitate timely completion of the requirements of the M.A. degree.

Conclusions

The departmental faculty appreciated the thoughtful recommendations proposed by the external reviewers regarding the Criminology M.A. program. We are pleased to report that we have started the process of implementing these recommendations, particularly through approving a plan (described above) to combine our graduate programs in criminology and sociology. We believe that this plan will allow us to create and sustain a strong graduate program that is congruent with the core mission and strategic goals of the Graduate College and the University.
BOARD OF REGENTS SUMMARY REPORT

Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2009-2010 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 4, 2010. They are due no later than December 14, 2010 to the Executive Vice President and Provost's office.

Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution  University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Anthropology Program: Bachelor of Arts

2b. List date(s) of program review: February 24-26, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No ___

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ___3___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Recommendations

The external reviewers made six specific recommendations for the Sociology B.A. program, which are summarized below. The recommendations marked with an asterisk (*) are related to student outcomes assessments.

1. Appoint an Anthropology Program Coordinator to call meetings, establish committees if necessary, and serve as a liaison between anthropology faculty and the department head.

2. Revise the assessment methods to provide better information about the extent to which majors are learning general critical skills in anthropology.*

3. Increase the number of upper-level courses in anthropology.*

4. Provide clearer criteria for promotion to full professor.

5. Provide greater incentives for promotion to full professor.

6. Have the library purchase Anthro Source and the ethnographic collection of the Human Relations Area Files.

7. Provide a central place in the department with information for students about internships, foreign language training, archaeological field schools, and graduate schools. Also, provide links to such opportunities on the program website.

8. List nonwestern liberal arts core courses taught by anthropologists under the department major.*

Program Improvements

The Anthropology faculty members have taken, or plan to take, the following actions in response to the recommendations listed above:

1. We have appointed an Anthropology Program Coordinator to call meetings, coordinate unit activities, and serve as a liaison between the program faculty and the department head.

2. We have decided to review and revise our current student outcomes assessment (SOA) objectives and assessment methods per the recommendations of the external reviewers. Top priority will be given to the development of e-portfolios for all anthropology majors and minors and a protocol to assess embedded measurements. We also intend to revisit our program goals and objectives and include broader critical thinking skills into our outcome objectives and assess these outcomes in the SOA plan.

3. We would like to increase the number of upper-level classes in the program but, because we have 65 majors, it is difficult to fill six upper-level classes in the same semester (assuming each professor taught one upper-level course) and meet the minimum university requirement for class size. We will also examine the current upper-level courses, considering what courses might be dropped and what new courses we could add that would be more relevant for UNI students.

4. and 5. Neither of these recommendations is under the discretion of the Anthropology faculty. Department and University PAC committees, United Faculty, and the University Administration provide the necessary guidelines and incentives for promotion to full professor.

6. The Anthropology faculty unanimously agreed to support the recommendation for the library to purchase Anthro Source and the ethnographic collection of the Human Relations Area Files. The issue is the level of library funding, which has decreased over the last several years. We strongly believe that both of these resources would enhance the educational experience of our undergraduate students.
7. The program faculty support the recommendation to improve the communication between instructors and students about course offerings, opportunities for field experience, graduate school, and study abroad opportunities. We have already implemented several of the reviewers’ helpful suggestions about how to improve communication between professors and students and how to provide more ready access to information.

8. We will continue the policy that we have already implemented regarding non-western Liberal Arts Core courses counting toward the Anthropology major. That is, if an anthropology student takes either China, taught by Professor Lee, or Japan, taught by Professor Dunn, that student is given anthropology credit for the course.

Conclusions

The Anthropology faculty is pleased with the outcome of our most recent program review. In particular we strongly agree with the external reviewers’ conclusions that the anthropology “major consists of a solid, well-worked-out series of courses … that thoughtfully incorporates training in the four subfields of anthropology with instruction in general anthropological theory and methods.” We can improve the student experience through more hands-on research experiences, both on and off campus. Our critical review of the current SOA will be guided by how we can better identify and assess many of the critical learning skills that our majors are already acquiring, and how we can more forward and help our students articulate these skills in future careers within and outside of our discipline.
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Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Criminology Program: Bachelor of Arts

2b. List date(s) of program review: February 24-26, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No ____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes X No ____
Enrollments increased by 44% from 214 majors in May 2008 to 308 majors in December 2010.

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.
Criminology is an attractive field of study nationwide; the criminology faculty are cited as the reason for many students selecting this major at UNI.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ____ No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ____ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

December 3, 2010
Recommendations

The tone of the external review is generally positive, noting that “the Criminology B.A. program is operating efficiently and effectively on behalf of their students.” The external reviewers made eight significant recommendations for how we might be able to improve our program. In the order they appear in the external review, the recommendations proposed by the outside review team are listed below. The recommendations marked with an asterisk (*) are more or less directly related to student outcomes assessments.

1) Acquire a specialist in the area of law and courts.*
2) Reduce the service burden of junior faculty for at least their first 2-3 years.
3) Select a faculty member to serve as the undergraduate unit coordinator.
4) Select specific competencies to review during each student outcomes assessment cycle.*
5) Expand course offerings in the Group 4 elective category of the major.*
6) Hire an internship coordinator.*
7) Create a criminology honors society for undergraduates.
8) Facilitate greater sharing of courses between sociology and criminology.

Program Improvements

It is somewhat early to delineate program improvements resulting from this review. However, some preliminary actions have been taken by the Criminology faculty in response to the recommendations listed above. Specifically, and in the same order as the above list:

1) We intend to ask for a new faculty hire specializing in law and courts.
2) The criminology faculty are examining the service burdens of all members; we agree in principle to put a heavier load on senior faculty, but partially disagree in that some service work by junior faculty is both necessary to the institution and beneficial to the professional development of these faculty members.
3) We have implemented this suggestion.
4) We respectfully disagree, finding it easier to comply with institutional policy and easier to interpret the data when all competencies are measured.
5) Our proposed curriculum changes address this issue, as does the next item.
6) We are in the process of requesting that an instructor-level line be added to the department in order to hire an individual with a relevant Master’s degree and experience in criminology related professional work. This individual would be responsible for some freshman and transfer advising; developing and supervising student internships; working with the cooperative education program; and teaching one or two courses to lower-level undergraduates.
7) This recommendation has been discussed, and we have momentarily tabled it. We will give it further consideration in the future.
8) The members of the criminology faculty agree in principle to discuss greater sharing of courses with the Department Head and our sociology colleagues. The next curriculum statement of the major will include selected sociology courses.

Conclusions

The Criminology faculty views the process of academic program review as useful, and we are pleased with the recommendations and conclusions offered by the external reviewers. We are particularly pleased that the reviewers indicated that our Criminology undergraduate program is a “well-designed, cost-effective” program that “services a large number of majors and minors” and “reflects the state of the
discipline.” Indeed, the Criminology major at UNI is one of the most popular programs in our college and it continues to attract and educate students across Iowa who are interested in working in fields related to the justice system. We would like to significantly improve the student experience in our area by providing more experiential internship opportunities. The hire of a part-time internship coordinator would not only provide students with significant “hands-on” opportunities but it would also enhance the reputation of the department, as well as the university, among community and state organizations who would work with our undergraduates. We look forward to continuing to make important contributions to the department, college, university and larger Iowa community in the future.
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Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Sociology Program: Bachelor of Arts

2b. List date(s) of program review: February 24-26, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No ____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

December 3, 2010
Recommendations

The external reviewers made six specific recommendations for the Sociology B.A. program, which are summarized below. The recommendations marked with an asterisk (*) are related to student outcomes assessments.

1. The program has an excellent but labor intensive set of student outcome assessment (SOA) procedures. The program’s procedures could serve as a model for many other programs at UNI and other universities. In the future, the program faculty might want to streamline the procedures by narrowing their annual SOA focus to a small set of specific high-priority areas for in-depth analysis (e.g., student advising policies).*

2. The undergraduate major experience would benefit from the development of a senior “capstone” course in Sociology focused on the application of theory and methods to specific substantive topics. Faculty are aware of this need, but the program does not currently have instructional resources to implement this curricular change. Nonetheless, development of a pilot capstone course could pave the way toward implementing this change in the future.*

3. The program should create a Sociology undergraduate coordinator to facilitate (1) communication and planning of Sociology curriculum and (2) communication and planning with the rest of the department, especially with the Criminology program.

4. The Sociology and Criminology faculty should initiate a discussion about ways to better integrate the two programs—recognizing their distinctive contributions while also acknowledging their fundamental overlap in theory, methods, and many areas of substantive focus (e.g., social inequality). This would be particularly valuable for faculty who contribute to both programs.

5. The achievements in improving faculty diversity since the last program review should be followed by continuing support and mentoring of both Assistant and Associate Professors (all of whom are presently either women or minority status). In consultation with the College administration, a workshop and mentoring process should be developed to help Associate Professors develop strategic plans for progress toward promotion to Professor.

6. The College should address the issue of low faculty salaries. If this problem is not addressed, it is likely to lead to the loss of high-performing junior (and even senior) Sociology faculty members over time.

Program Improvements

The Sociology faculty members have taken, or plan to take, the following actions in response to the recommendations listed above:

1. While continuing our exemplary SOA procedures, we have streamlined our SOA activities somewhat by devoting more attention to “specific high-priority areas for in-depth analysis,” particularly student advising policies for our majors.

2. We have continued to discuss the development of a sociology capstone course for our majors. We believe that our majors would benefit greatly from taking a capstone course that would require integrative thinking and focus on “the application of [sociological] theory and methods to specific substantive topics.” However, as the external reviewers noted, we have not had sufficient faculty or instructional resources to implement this curricular change. Unfortunately, this situation is likely to persist in the near future. Thus, we are unlikely to adopt this recommendation despite our strong desire to do so. Instead, we will offer upper division courses with a substantive focus (e.g., the Sociology of Gender; the Sociology of Culture; and Health, Illness, and Dying) that will offer students a capstone-type experience. We have also encouraged our majors to enroll in one of the University capstone courses that have a sociology focus. These courses—Analysis of Social Issues and Medicine, Morality, and Society—are taught by our faculty.
3. In recent years the Sociology program has had a unit leader who, in many respects, has served as the Program Coordinator. The unit leader has called meetings, coordinated SOA efforts, facilitated other unit activities, and maintained close communications with the Department Head. We have now formalized this role and granted the title of Sociology Program Coordinator to the person who fulfills it. However, we will continue to have a separate person oversee the unit’s curricular planning. This person will serve as the “Unit Curriculum Chair” and as a member of the SAC Curriculum Committee.

4. We have discussed greater sharing of courses with our criminology colleagues. The next curriculum statement of the major will include more criminology courses, including courses that will count in some of the required categories of the major.

5. We do not think that the associate professors in our unit need workshops and mentoring processes to secure promotion. However, they are willing participate in workshops or mentoring activities sponsored by the college. Both of the associate professors in the Sociology program have clearly established themselves as award-winning scholars and teachers. They are also taking the steps necessary to ensure their promotion to the status of Professor in the near future. The primary challenge they face in building their scholarly records is finding sufficient time to devote to their research, particularly given the demands of their heavy service loads and significant leadership roles.

6. We support and endorse the reviewers’ recommendations for the College and University to address the problem of low faculty salaries. While we understand that larger market conditions make it challenging for CSBS, UNI, and the BOR to increase faculty salaries, we hope that they do what they can to address the issue. As the reviewers astutely point out, if salaries are not increased for the Sociology faculty, we risk losing highly talented teachers and scholars to other institutions. We fear that the loss of these faculty members would have a notably detrimental impact on the quality of the Sociology B.A. program (as well as the Sociology M.A. program).

Conclusions

The external reviewers provided a highly favorable assessment of the Sociology B.A. Program. They stressed that it “more than exceeds expectations” with respect to the criteria of quality, centrality, demand, and cost. They also emphasized that the “program offers high educational value consistent with UNI’s stated goals and mission,” and it “is central to the articulated missions of the Department, the College, and the University.” Moreover, the reviewers noted that the “research productivity of the Sociology faculty is impressive, especially in light of their heavy teaching and administrative responsibilities.” We strongly agree with these assessments. We also appreciate the reviewers’ recognition of the commitment that we show to serving the Liberal Arts Core, implementing meaningful SOA procedures, and exercising important leadership roles at several levels, including the department, college, university, and larger profession. Finally, we concur with their assertion that the Sociology program’s student outcomes assessment program’s (SOA) procedures “could serve as a model for many other programs at UNI and other universities” and that “investment of university funds in this program pays high dividends.” We are pleased to point out that the number of Sociology majors and minors has increased from 119 in August 2008 to 154 as of December 2010. Based on the feedback that we have received from students, we believe that this sizable growth is an outcome of the high quality of the Sociology faculty and program.
Board of Regents Summary Report
Humanities Program

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Humanities Major, B.A.

2b. List date(s) of program review: academic year 2009-2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes __X__ No ____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?

Yes _____ No __X____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?

Yes _____ No ___X___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ____ No _____ N/A

6b. If not, why? N/A

7. List the conclusions, recommendations, and anticipated program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

We are acting on all four of the recommendations of the external, non-institutional evaluators. These are as follows.

1. Creation of a Center for the Humanities, charged with coordinating and strengthening interdisciplinary studies within the humanities at UNI as well as administering the Humanities Major. This Center would not be dependent on student numbers or faculty lines. However, this Center would provide a clear and more high-profile identity for the humanities at UNI and be the venue for fostering cooperation among UNI departments.

2. Creation of an Advisory Board to govern the Center for the Humanities. The Advisory Board would be composed of faculty from appropriate departments (e.g., Philosophy and World Religions, History, English Language and Literature, Modern Languages) and presided over by the Director of the Humanities Major. The Advisory Board would be responsible for overseeing the activities of the Center, including faculty and curriculum development, as well as student recruitment and assessment for the Major.
3. **Office Space** for the Center for the Humanities. The Humanities Major is currently located in one rather dingy and uninspiring room. The Center for the Humanities should be relocated in a better space, perhaps in the building that houses the administrative offices of CHFA, to demonstrate institutional commitment to the humanities.

4. **Humanities Lecture Series** presented through the Center for the Humanities. A lecture series of UNI faculty was proposed in the Self-Study as a way to attract majors. We recommend expanding this series to include distinguished external speakers as a way to raise the profile both of the Humanities Major and other UNI humanities and fine arts departments, not only on the UNI campus, but in the community and state at large. The Center might consider offering a for-credit course in connection with the series as a way of attracting community members and K-12 teachers desirous of continuing education.

We are also currently continuing to develop appropriate assessment procedures for the major, with the Office of Assessment at UNI.
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Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Marketing major; B.A.
2b. List date(s) of program review: March 21-23, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___X___ No_____
3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ___2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes______ No__X____
4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change. NA

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes_____ No__X___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? NA; Yes ______No ______
6b. If not, why not? NA

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

A. Strategic Planning – The Department of Marketing is distinctive and separate from the other four College of Business Administration departments and from the other 28 departments on campus in the following manners: 1) A theoretical knowledge-based and ethical learning activity orientation, combined with a real-world, customer-focused, and results-oriented philosophy of doing business is emphasized in each of the 18 Marketing classes, and 2) All Marketing classes, with the exception of Consumer Behavior, will require at least one experiential, hands-on learning activity provided in and/or outside the classroom environment. The students’ experiential, hands-on learning activity to be with a real business or organizational situation.

B. Curriculum – The four emphasis areas of the Marketing major, proposed to start in the fall of the
2012 semester, is in direct response to the self-study, changes in the nature of 21st century business environment, current marketing thought and practice, in response to the 15-member Marketing Advisory Board recommendations, and the expertise of the faculty. These four emphasis areas will guide faculty hiring decisions that will strengthen the department and the student’s learning and career opportunities. They include: 1) Advertising & Digital Media, 2) Sales Management, 3) Marketing Management, and 4) Global Marketing.

C. Emphasis on Student Skill Development – The faculty will attempt to improve students’ quantitative skills, writing capability, critical thinking, and integration of marketing concepts into the other functional areas of business. At least one experiential, hands-on learning activity is already a formal component of each marketing class, save Consumer Behavior, and the pedagogy does indeed permeate throughout the curriculum.

D. Student Outcomes Assessment – The Department of Marketing is recognized for being a leader on campus in learning assessment interest, advancement, and implementation (circa 1992). The Department of Marketing is the only department on campus that requires a student outcomes measurement in each and every course (n = 18) at least once every four semesters (usually more frequently) and this practice will be continued. The student outcomes and learning assurance assessment is comprehensive and is conducted at three levels: 1) course level – each and every Marketing course has at least one formal assessment occurring at least once every two years, 2) program level – every four years a survey of alumni who graduated two, six and 10 years previously evaluates the overall long-term Department of Marketing program effectiveness, and 3) program level – every four years exit interviews of graduating Marketers assesses the overall short-term Department of Marketing program effectiveness.
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THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Sociology Program: Master of Arts

2b. List date(s) of program review: February 24-26, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Recommendations

The external reviewers made eight specific recommendations for the sociology MA program. They are summarized below.

1. Develop a more focused and concerted plan for recruiting students into the MA program. This can include increased internal recruitment from social science programs at UNI and external recruitment, especially from regional liberal arts colleges.

2. Explore new funding opportunities for prospective students. At least one additional graduate stipend/tuition waiver is needed from the College. Further, funding through other programs and departments across the university should be considered.

3. If the promising current teaching track proves successful, the faculty should explore the possibility of funding a similar position for one or two second-year MA Sociology Teaching Associates at UNI. This strategy could be both cost-effective for undergraduate instruction and meet funding needs for sociology MA students.

4. If there is a significant increase in recruitment efforts and/or the introduction of Sociology Teaching Associates at UNI, the work of the Graduate Chair is likely to increase significantly as well, especially if the Graduate Chair assumes responsibility for supervising Teaching Associates. In that case, a course reduction for the Graduate Chair is vital to facilitating the additional responsibilities.

5. If the Sociology M.A. program does not increase enrollment, it should consider combining with another MA program. Two particular possibilities were recognized by Sociology faculty and the university administrators with whom we spoke. First, the program could be combined with the Criminology MA program. Alternatively, the Sociology program could be combined with the Women’s and Gender Studies MA program.

6. At the programmatic level, the Sociology MA program faculty should revisit the recommendation made by the 2003 external reviewers that a two-tier MA program be created with more academically-oriented students (esp. those intending to pursue further graduate study) writing a thesis and more applied students pursuing a terminal MA having the option to take comprehensive exams instead of writing a thesis.

7. The achievements in improving faculty diversity since the last program review should be followed by continuing support and mentoring of both Assistant and Associate Professors (all of whom are presently either women or minority status). In consultation with the College administration, a workshop and mentoring process should be developed to help Associate Professors develop strategic plans for progress toward promotion to Professor.

8. The College should address the issue of low faculty salaries. If this problem is not addressed, it is likely to lead to the loss of high-performing junior (and even senior) Sociology faculty members over time.

Conclusions

The external reviewers concluded that the MA program “more than meets expectations in terms of quality,” and it “offers a rigorous curriculum taught by a highly qualified, research-active faculty.” They also found the program to be central to several of the university’s stated goals including “the fostering of community engagement and appreciation of diversity.” At the same, they concluded that the program is too small to be viable over time and recommended that the program should either increase enrollment or merge with another program.
Program Improvements

We agree with the reviewers’ assessment of the present situation and have engaged in a series of conversations about the future of our graduate program. Since one of their specific recommendations was to consider combining our M.A. programs in criminology and sociology, a number of faculty discussions exploring this possibility took place last spring. These discussions culminated in a departmental vote where the overwhelming majority of faculty members (13 to 1) were in favor of proceeding “with a shared commitment to developing a new, combined program” that would include elements of both the sociology and criminology master’s programs. In consultation with the CSBS Dean, our department head worked with faculty members to set up a steering committee to discuss and develop a plan for a combined graduate program. The steering committee met regularly from June through September, and it developed a proposal for the structure of the combined program. The committee presented this proposal to the entire faculty for review and discussion on October 20, 2010. At that meeting, the faculty voted 12 to 1 in favor of “adopting in principle the general framework proposed for a combined graduate program.”

As we proceed with refining and implementing the combined program, we will pay careful attention to the issues identified by the reviewers. We agree that we need to “develop a more focused and concerted plan for recruiting students into the MA program.” This should involve increased attention on both internal recruitment of social science majors at UNI and external recruitment of students from regional liberal arts colleges. We also agree that a major challenge we face is a lack of graduate student funding. While it is unlikely given the present budget situation that we will be able to secure additional funding at the college level, we will continue to pursue this possibility. We are also reluctant to propose the creation of teaching positions for our master’s students at UNI, but we are committed to expanding our newly created teaching internship program at Hawkeye Community College (HCC). In doing so, we could include MA students specializing in criminology as well as those specializing in sociology. Most crucially, we view the HCC internship program as a valuable source of external funding, and we look forward to increasing the number of students who participate in the teaching internship program in the coming years.

In its proposed form, the combined graduate program will offer a multiple-track curriculum which includes elements of the existing sociology and criminology master’s programs. Thus, it will incorporate the reviewers’ recommendation to have thesis and non-thesis options for enrolled students. The proposed program will offer two degrees (sociology and criminology) superimposed on three tracks: applied, pedagogical, and traditional academic. Students choosing the traditional academic track will complete a thesis. Those opting for the pedagogical track will prepare and defend both a teaching portfolio and a pedagogically-related research paper. Those students choosing the applied track will complete an evaluation research paper or a policy paper. We agree with the external reviewers that this multi-track program will not only attract more students but also help students complete their M.A. requirements in a more timely way.

The external reviewers directed their final recommendations toward the College administration. First, the reviewers argue that a course reduction is essential for the graduate the reviewers argue that a course reduction is essential for the graduate coordinator. We strongly agree with this recommendation, especially with the additional responsibilities that a combined program is likely to create. In turn, we will work with the dean to explore this possibility. Second, the reviewers suggested that the department work in consultation with the college to develop a workshop and mentoring process to help associate professors make progress toward promotion to full professor. While we don’t think workshops and mentoring processes are necessary for the associate professors in our department, we are open to participating in those sponsored by the college. Finally, the reviewers indicate that the College administration should address the issue of low faculty salaries, especially to prevent the loss of high-performing faculty members. While we understand that larger market conditions make it challenging for CSBS and UNI to increase faculty salaries, we strongly agree with the reviewers’ recommendations that College and University administrators should do everything in their power to address the issue of low salaries. As the reviewers astutely point out, if we do not enhance salaries for the faculty, we risk losing highly talented teachers and scholars to other institutions. We fear that the loss of these faculty members would have a notably detrimental impact on the quality of graduate education offered by our department.
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Board of Regents, State of Iowa
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Principalship–Master of Arts in Education

2b. List date(s) of program review: April 14-16, 2010

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No ___

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ___2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

Conclusions:
This team of reviewers finds many strong aspects of the UNI Principal Preparation Program. The department has responded well to the need for change presented by practitioners, professional organizations, and state departments. The faculty demonstrates unified commitment to, and support for, the program they have developed. For that, we highly commend them for developing and implementing a rigorous and relevant preparation program for aspiring principals in the 21st Century.

The reviewers found the Principals Preparation Program benefitted greatly from the use of student outcome data to assess and make appropriate revisions in the experiences students receive throughout the program. The university’s Student Performance Outcomes are broadly defined, which these reviewers believe is a strength of the University’s overall Student Outcomes Assessment program. The Principal Preparation Program area has implemented, at five points during the program (entry, orientation, following one year and a summer on campus, and following years two and three) a number of routine processes for collecting, analyzing, and modifying (as appropriate) those curricular or internship experiences received by aspiring school leaders.

The preparation program, however, is highly labor intensive for faculty and could easily work in opposition to them achieving tenure and promotion within the University. That concern led to recommendations to explore ways in which faculty might be provided opportunities for research and publication as well as expanded opportunities for professional development and service with professional organizations.

A direct link to ISSL and ISLLC standards ensures that the program places heavy emphasis on field practice that is current and responsive to the needs of aspiring school principals.

Feedback from the Principal/Superintendent Advisory Council provides ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of the Principal Preparation Program as well as feedback regarding current trends/issues faced by school leaders. The result has been development of a preparation program that is rigorous, has high appeal for those students who recognize the need and have a desire to gain relevant practical experiences in a variety of school state environments.
The program emphasizes administrative practice/internship hours. An effective management system—worthy of being shared with other Principal Preparation Programs—has been developed to track individual student performance in completing assigned papers, practicum experiences, and assigned work.

**Recommendations:**
The UNI Principal Preparation Program has been designed in response to needs for more hands-on practicum and internship experiences than has been true of previous programs. The result is a program of high quality, but one that is also quite labor intensive for the faculty. Opportunities to minimize some of that labor intensive work through the employment of non-instructional faculty should be prioritized within the College and University, particularly if the faculty is to have opportunities to become more productive in the areas of research, publication, and service. Support for faculty professional development and travel to attend as well as present at professional conferences. Possible expansion of non-instructional faculty to assist with meeting the demands for monitoring practica/internships and development/management of portfolios of student performance.

Reviewers identified concerns with the viability of the Iowa Communications Network for program delivery to distance education students. As a result, the program is collaborating with Continuing and Distance Education to pilot an alternative on-line delivery system to be tested in the spring of 2012.

Reviewers noted an increasing emphasis on principals’ role in instructional leadership. This topic will receive explicit attention in a newly designed course. Reviewers also noted a need for greater emphasis on specific theories presented in courses. This is an area of attention as courses are revised and as a search for a new faculty member is underway.
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THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution___University of Northern Iowa ______________________________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Postsecondary Education: Student Affairs MAE

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2009-10

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___ X ____ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2 ___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No ___ X___

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No ___ X___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

Please see attached timeline for responses to APR recommendation.
Recommendations
The following recommendations with rationale were adopted as a result of the program review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations Adopted</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify sources of financial support sufficient to sustain the Ed.D. program.</td>
<td>The program is currently utilizing the talents of a few which are taxing other program offerings. Need to determine how to equalize talent across all faculty members. We will consider differentiation of tuition and remuneration for faculty who lead doctoral dissertations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop strategic and business operations plan for the Ed.D. program.</td>
<td>Need to specify an organizational structure; re-evaluation of mission, vision, goals; alignment of the coursework to those goals; work with marketing and graduate college on marketing to diverse student populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create and implement an assessment program for the Ed.D.</td>
<td>The program will benefit from have baseline data, formative assessments throughout the program, and summative exit feedback to inform the program’s continuous progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop processes for regularly monitoring the voice of your constituents.</td>
<td>As an assessment program is created, it would incorporate feedback from constituents to inform instruction and program viability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions
The program faculty members have crafted a proposal entitled Reorganization Proposal Educational Doctorate in response to a campus mandate. The College of Education Intensive Studies Graduate Committee created this plan. At present the Committee has orchestrated a reevaluation of the doctorate beginning with a series of surveys of faculty and alumni. In the fall all Ed.D. Intensive Studies Area faculty will come together to establish new goals, objectives, and indicators for the
program. This process will serve as the foundation of the creation of a new assessment program to assist with continuing program improvement as well as a time to reevaluate the purposes for the program through the lens of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) process.

Human resources are required to enhance the Ed.D. program. There are a limited number of faculty members who teach at the doctoral level. These faculty members are also needed to teach at the undergraduate and master’s level. There is no load differential for teaching at the doctoral level or participating on doctoral committees; therefore, faculty members are feeling overtaxed and underappreciated.

Program Improvements

1. An overall assessment process will be implemented once new goals, objectives, and indicators are in place.
2. The Ed.D. core courses sequence will be re-evaluated in light of the new goals, objectives, and indicators to be developed in Fall 2011.
3. Discussions are underway concerning faculty loads regarding work with doctoral students to eliminate off load work such as independent studies and dissertation committee work.
4. Three Intensive Studies Area programs within the School of Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services are combining to strengthen their offerings and support of students.
# Timeline for Postsecondary Education: Student Affairs Academic Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Person(s)/Department Responsible</th>
<th>Suggested Program Improvements</th>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Improve student outcomes assessment procedures   | PSE:SA graduate program           | 1. Revisit PSE SOA plan competencies to be assessed in light of new competencies identified by professional associations.  
2. Develop a rubric for evaluating students’ understandings of the competencies as portrayed in their learning portfolios and as discussed in their exit interview with faculty.  
3. Aggregate the results gleaned from the use of the rubric for a meeting with the larger Postsecondary Education faculty group.  
4. Faculty will review the results of the aggregated portfolio findings to discuss implications for the graduate program, be they curricular or co-curricular enhancements.  
5. An additional assessment measure will be folded into the larger faculty review, that being themes and comments from a review of practicum and internship evaluations done that year. Information from those evaluations will be aggregated for faculty review as part of a feedback loop designed for ongoing continuous improvement of the program. | Develop spring-summer 2011. Implement 2011-12. |
<p>| 2. Reinstitute a second full-time faculty member     | Provost/COE Dean                  | Develop an online version of this master’s program. A second faculty member will help operate this and the on campus program with judiciously selected adjunct faculty.                                                               | Search and hire 2011-2012. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Increase assistantships</td>
<td>Dr. Terry Hogan and Dr. Mike Waggoner</td>
<td>The Division of Student Affairs is working with the PSE: SA graduate program to identify additional graduate assistantships and to establish funding for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Institute Interview Day for graduate assistantships</td>
<td>PSE Partnership (Division of Student Affairs and PSE:SA graduate program)</td>
<td>The Division of Student Affairs is working with the PSE: SA graduate program to conduct the first such days in February and March 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Consider fund-raising for program expenses like student travel and adjunct professional development</td>
<td>PSE:SA graduate program</td>
<td>Meet with COE constituent fund-raiser to develop plan to raise money beginning with program alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Develop online version of master's program (This did not emerge from the APR, but from the campus-wide Academic Program Assessment that had been conducted previously. The PSE:SA master's program was identified for enhancement.)</td>
<td>PSE:SA graduate program and Continuing education</td>
<td>Plan for three cohort program to be delivered online to distant part-time students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>