



## *Academic Advisory Program Review Committee*

### Humanities Program Review Feedback

November 1, 2023

Dear Blake Slonecker:

Thank you for your Program Review Report submitted in FA/2023.

We, as your colleagues, deeply appreciate your effort in preparing these materials so that we can fully understand your program goals, successes and challenges. As you know, this is a peer-review support process to ensure that all Heritage University academic programs and departments engage in continuous improvement. Our shared goals are “transformational student-centered” learning and achieving our NWCCU accreditation requirements.

The Program Review Committee members each reviewed and commented on your report. The committee as a whole assessed, analyzed, and discussed your report.

In the attached document, we provide a Consensus Summary Report with detailed criterion scores and narrative feedback. Your overall score was **3.8** (out of 4.0).

After much discussion and feedback from Department Chairs and the Provost, we are changing our reporting and protocol process for future Program Review Reports. Please watch your email for additional information and meeting requests from the Provost’s Office or Accreditation Office.

Please see the attached Program Review Feedback Summary/Rubric, provided to assist with ongoing program development.

If you have questions or need support or resources please contact [ProgramReview@heritage.edu](mailto:ProgramReview@heritage.edu) or [CILT@heritage.edu](mailto:CILT@heritage.edu).

We, the members of the Committee on Program Review, appreciate your commitment to continuous improvement,

David Laman, Co-Chair

Melissa Hill, Co-Chair

Matt Kincaid

Blake Slonecker

Gloria Jones-Dance

SaraBecca Martin

Dalia Maraoulaite

Mary James, guest

Jim Dugan, guest

## Program Review Consensus Feedback Summary

Rubric Level 4 (Highly Developed) Descriptor	Focused Summary of Feedback (A score of 3 or above indicates meeting the standard)
<p><b>1. Program Mission and Purpose.</b> Program mission and purpose are explicitly aligned with University mission and includes an explanation of the source and/or process used to develop program outcomes</p>	<p>Score: <b>4</b> out of 4 Strong reflection and specific connection to mission. Explicit alignment between the program mission and purpose and the HU mission.</p>
<p><b>2. Curriculum Map.</b> A clear curriculum map that identifies courses in which student performance data (key assignments/ assessments) linked to program outcomes will be collected for review by program faculty. Data collection for each PLO occurs in more than one course, but not in so many courses as to be unsustainable.</p>	<p>Score: 3.4 out of 4 Well-developed curriculum map aligned to national standards. There are a few gaps, identified and addressed as an area of improvement by the department.</p>
<p><b>3. Assessment of Student Learning.</b> Completed assessment system presented, highlighting collection of a variety of types of student performance data, including collection of other relevant data using multiple assessment instrument(s) including rubrics and surveys. Robust implementation of the system is evident.</p>	<p>Score: <b>3.6</b> out of 4 Elaborate disaggregation of all information available in Anthology Portfolio. The Committee notes strong progress since the last Program Review. Assessment system includes multiple assessment tools to measure student performance and capture student voice.</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment Schedule.</b> A completed assessment schedule presented. A timeline of analysis/review of PLO data is clearly articulated in this section of the report, including narrative describing when review occurred(s) and who among the faculty were involved.</p>	<p>Score: <b>3.6</b> out of 4 Clear and concise schedule of program learning assessment review by all full-time faculty annually. Some narrative would add meaning. This section helps reader understand gaps in curriculum map.</p>
<p><b>5. Change Informed by Data.</b> Analysis of data, disaggregated in categories relevant to equity, by faculty, Chair, and/or other stakeholders leads to documented change in curriculum, instructional methods, or assessment. In addition, evidence of impact of the changes are evaluated.</p>	<p>Score: <b>4</b> out of 4 The department analyzed data with depth. The Change Informed by Data Section is presented in orderly manner: data, analysis, change, results. Gaps in student performance were identified and changes, or plans to implement changes, are clearly articulated.</p>
<p><b>6. Faculty Effectiveness.</b> A completed table of faculty qualifications and load presented. Excessive or variable faculty loads are explained. Clear evidence presented of faculty effectiveness in teaching and advising.</p>	<p>Score: <b>4</b> out of 4 Thorough, balanced view of program size, faculty-student interaction, and the relationship between the History and AIS majors. Program design shows efficient planning for program growth with two faculty. Analysis emphasizes collaboration among History, Criminal Justice, and special grant programs, such as Summer Internship programs. In addition to faculty load and qualifications, the department analyzed course evaluation results from fall 2021 through spring 2023. The department should be commended for inclusion of student voice in determining faculty effectiveness.</p>
<p><b>7. Enrollment and Completion.</b> Report includes thorough, but succinct responses to narrative prompts, shares rich data and narrative explanations, and data disaggregated in categories relevant to equity, to provide a clear profile of enrollment and retention or completion rates.</p>	<p>Score: <b>4</b> out of 4 Report provided rich analysis of enrollment, graduate, and retention data. Inclusion of budget data provided by the business office demonstrates adequate enrollment to ensure sustainability of the program. Future enrollment goals are realistic. AIS program leadership</p>

<b>Rubric Level 4 (Highly Developed) Descriptor</b>	<b>Focused Summary of Feedback</b> (A score of 3 or above indicates meeting the standard)
	identified as program growth area needing institutional support. Staffing needs at Kennewick site is identified as potential future need.
<b>8. Institutional Resources: Learning Environment.</b> Report includes thorough, but succinct response to narrative prompt, and identifies specific program related assets and needs in terms of institutional support for the learning environment.	Score: 4 out of 4 Specific, focused Library resources request.
<b>9. Institutional Resources: Faculty Support.</b> Report includes thorough, but succinct response to narrative prompt, and identifies specific program related assets and needs in terms of institutional support for the faculty.	Score: 4 out of 4 Convincing connection of faculty support needs to research and teaching and learning focus within the History major.
<b>10. Reflection and Plan.</b> Presents reflection on strengths and emphasizes opportunities for continuous improvement, with specific goals and a systematic plan for implementation over the coming year(s). Includes plan of student learning outcome review in between formal program review reports.	Score: 3.8 out of 4 Well thought out reflection. Clear lists for Overall Strengths, Opportunities for Improvement, and Focus and plan for the coming 1-3 years. Some reflection included inside elements listed. Reflection is thorough and concise. Opportunities for improvement are realistic and indicate transparent self-reflection by program faculty. Focus and plan for the coming years are realistic and achievable.

#### Overall feedback

Very detailed report. Informed change by data was explained with depth. Strong narrative in enrollment and completion that adds understanding. Well thought out reflection. A thorough well-written report. This program review illustrates thoughtful, continuous engagement with the teaching and learning process from the point-of-view of student-centered learning and academic growth. In addition, the faculty maintain connection with their own academic interests, by attending conferences and through ongoing scholarship, writing, and publishing. Overall, this program review report was thorough, while also being succinct and clear. Analysis of student performance (learning outcomes) is rich and could be a model for other departments. The Committee is supportive of the request for additional Library resources.

#### Program Review Trend Data

Due to the change in template and rubric, the committee, some criteria only have trend data from 2020 forward.

Year	1. Program Mission and Purpose	2. Curriculum Map	3. Assessment Plan	4. Assessment Schedule	5. Faculty Effectiveness	6. Change Informed by Data	7. Enrollment and Completion	8. Institutional Resources: Learning Environment	9. Institutional Resources: Faculty Support	10. Reflection and Plan
2018	3.6	3.9	3.3			1.7	3.1	3.3	2.3	3
2020	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.4	4.0	4.0
2023	4.0	3.4	3.6	3.6	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8

Year	Overall
2018	3.20
2020	3.7
2023	3.8