Academic program review is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Summary reports for each program reviewed in 2011-2012 (pp. 20-21) must be submitted to the College Dean by December 1, 2013. They are due no later than December 11, 2013 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 Library Studies, MA

2b. List date(s) of program review: March 25-26, 2013

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? N/A Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not? N/A

7. List the conclusions, recommendations, and anticipated program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Conclusions: Findings in the self-study reveal a consistent demand for graduates of the program. The program has eliminated its undergraduate minor in order to provide a higher quality graduate-level program and to focus on graduate-level education. Data include a high graduation rate (12.4% typical loss due to withdrawal or academic dismissal), consistent enrollment (annual cohort enrollment in MA program 16-23 as well as recent turn-downs to applicants because of limited capacity), and timely MA graduation (average 6.2 terms).

Recommendations: Develop a long-term (five-year) strategic plan in order to "step up" the program to foster leaders who demonstrate professionalism, professional pride, and expertise.

Strategic Plan Potential Goal Areas, resulting from student outcomes assessments (to be revisited with the new faculty member in 2014-15):

- Leadership: Foster leaders in students, who demonstrate professionalism and expertise (from external review)
- Course Technology Integration: Determine whether current integration of technologies across courses adequately prepares students, or whether significant course restructuring or an additional portfolio requirement is needed. (from self-study)
- Annual Assessment: Increase preparation time and attention to Annual Assessment Reports to determine whether we have the right critical performances to ensure students are graduating with necessary skills and knowledge and whether our assessment tools are adequate in detail and rigor. (from self-study)
- Assessment of Course Delivery Modes: Increase attention to assessment of course delivery modes including online, hybrid, face-to-face. (from self-study)
- Collaboration with Methods Faculty: Consider ways to reorder priorities to spend more time in collaboration (may build upon existing guest presentations and sharing of AEA Online resources) with methods colleagues in elementary and secondary disciplines in meaningful ways that may also involve SLS distance students. (from self-study)
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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: Science Education Undergraduate & Graduate

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2/13 to 5/13

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 _____ Not applicable ___X____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the conclusions, recommendations, and anticipated program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
a. Vision and mission of Science Education will be updated and clearly articulated with some structural and programmatic changes to address the current economic and political realities with the focus on being a leader in Science Education and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM).

b. Science Education remain an interdepartmental and intercollegiate unit with faculty who have dual appointments with their home departments across College of Humanities, Arts and Sciences (CHAS) and College of Education (COE) and Science Education but also include faculty who have 100% responsibilities in Science Education.

c. Meet our teaching and needs and decrease dependency of adjuncts by adding instructor and/or faculty line(s) as well as transferring COE Science Education faculty line(s) to be full time or at the very least increase their time in Science Education. Future Science Education chair may have an appointment totally in Science Education to avoid dual responsibilities between Science Education and a home department.

d. Increase staffing and availability of required Inquiry into Physical Science, Life Science and Earth/Space Science sections of courses for elementary education majors.

e. In regards to faculty and staff, continue to separate the Graduate Coordinator duties from the Chair to make both positions with their responsibilities more manageable for both faculty who have dual appointments. Continue to have a secretary devoted to at least 25 hours for Science Education. Continued support for one and half Graduate Teaching Assistantships currently allotted with hopes to expand to 2 full assistantships.

f. Explore the possibility of an “actual classroom” for Science Education that is needed to offer our methods courses and ease the strain on McCollum Science Hall 112 allowing for additional sections of Inquiry courses to be offered to help meet the demand.

g. Revise Science Education undergraduate programs and courses to address recommendations of state and national education initiatives (e.g., Iowa Core, Common Core, Iowa Teaching Standards, and Next Generation Science Standards) in regards to scientific practices, technology, literacy, safety, etc.; help prepare our students to successfully complete PRAXISS II assessments and other legislative mandates; and include changes in State of Iowa Science Teaching Endorsements.

h. Expand existing professional development and outreach programs to all science areas to recruit Cedar Valley teachers who utilize inquiry-teaching in the science classroom to help with required field experiences in all levels of education courses including our secondary science teaching methods courses.
i. Improve our Master of Arts in Science Education program with the emphasis of K-12 teaching by continuing to restructuring core courses, working with CHAS faculty in increasing content offerings for students, providing on-line courses available through Adobe Connect or through web-based courses, formalizing communication and advising of graduate students, and exploring the possibility of expanding the program to make it attractive to elementary teachers.

j. Revisit Student Outcomes Assessment (SOA) plans for our undergraduate and graduate courses and formalize a better data collection and analysis process.

k. Increase retention and recruiting efforts for our undergraduate programs including doing a better job in advising our students including those who are admitted as Post BA teaching licensure.
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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: Psychology; B.A. and M. A.

2b. List date(s) of program review: External reviewers on campus February 24-27, 2013

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. n/a

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 not? n/a

7. List the conclusions, recommendations, and anticipated program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
General conclusion: the department has excellent faculty and with a few changes can take the department to the next level of success.

Below are the most important adopted recommendations from the external review and program plan for the Psychology department at the University of Northern Iowa. Anticipated program improvements are also discussed.

1) Adopted recommendation: Review, update, and develop departmental mission/vision. Anticipated program improvement: More informed decisions regarding allocation of resources. A coherent department strategy and tactics for moving the program forward.

2) Adopted recommendation: Formalize research opportunities for undergraduates, with specific web-based information on how to collaborate on research projects. Anticipated program improvement: An increase in undergraduates working with faculty on research projects. More successful placement of undergraduates in jobs and graduate school or professional programs.

3) Adopted recommendation: Update and revise the assessment plan, particularly to focus on student learning outcomes. Anticipated program improvement: The student outcomes assessment will provide more useful data which will inform decisions about necessary changes and how to best allocate department resources.

4) Adopted recommendation: Address the enrollment changes in introductory psychology and the related issues of how enrollment affects the availability of participants in the subject pool. Anticipated program improvement: We will be able to determine if changes are needed to the Psychology major to respond to the increase in the numbers of students that arrive with introductory psychology. Also, maintaining and expanding the subject pool will support faculty (and student) research.

5) Adopted recommendation: Advocate for increased faculty travel funding. Anticipated program improvement: Increased funds would allow faculty members to present at more than one scientific meeting.

6) Adopted recommendation: Implement plans for recruiting and attracting high quality students (graduate program). Anticipate program improvement: High quality graduate students would increase the quality program and successful placement of the students in doctoral programs.

7) Adopted recommendation: Follow outlined plan (in department self-study) to revise graduate student outcome assessment (graduate program). Anticipated program improvement: The graduate student outcomes assessment will provide more useful data which will inform decisions about necessary changes to the graduate program and how to best allocate department resources.

8) Adopted recommendation: Explore reasons for drop in graduate students’ acceptance into doctoral programs. Anticipated program improvement: Understanding the reason for the drop in acceptance rates will indicate whether changes are needed to improve the quality of the program and if changes are needed, what those changes should be.
9) Adopted recommendation: Continue to develop plans for improving practica placements for clinical science graduate students. Anticipated program improvement: High quality practica placements will improve the chances of our Master’s program students being accepted into doctoral programs.