

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) TEMPLATE

SECTION 1: Introduction
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List the academic department, academic program, and year of the APR. 2. Briefly describe the program, identifying any subunits and the specific role each plays at Evangel University (EU). A table or chart would be sufficient. 3. Briefly describe the staffing in a manner that illustrates the organization of staff and that their credentials are appropriate. A table or chart would be sufficient. 4. Identify key stakeholders (students, alumni, employers) that require ongoing attention from the program.
SECTION 2: Identity: Mission, Values and Strategic Plan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Explain how the program advances Evangel's mission, values, EU 20 Outcomes, and/or strategic plans. 6. Describe how the program serves, supports, or collaborates with one or more other EU program(s) to help students succeed. 7. Explain any changes or improvements that have been implemented since the last APR. 8. Describe any adverse effect that the elimination of the program would have on EU's ability to help students succeed.
SECTION 3: Relevance
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Chart enrollment trends and identify the extent to which there is a discernible demand or need for the program and how successfully the program meets it. How is stakeholder interest expected to evolve in the future, e.g.: will it decline, remain the same, increase? Identify the expected impact on the program. 10. Explain how the program has evolved in response to changing demands/needs of today's students or other stakeholders. 11. List the program's strengths (attributes of the program that are helpful to achieving program objectives) and weaknesses (attributes that are harmful to achieving objectives). 12. List the program's opportunities (external conditions that are helpful to achieving program objectives) & threats (external conditions that are harmful to achieving objectives). 13. Discuss how strengths/opportunities have been or can be used to overcome weaknesses/threats.
SECTION 4: Effectiveness
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Attach your most recent PLO assessment data/results. What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved? What have you learned from assessing the changes? 15. Identify the source of professional standards that inform this program. Explain how those standards have been used to assess and maintain ongoing quality and relevance. 16. Report and discuss the post-graduation placement of your graduates. 17. Present and discuss any additional evidence of the program's quality and success. Include evidence of stakeholder (students, alumni, employers) satisfaction along with evidence that the unit has reviewed it & used what they learned to improve the program. 18. If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree.
SECTION 5: Sustainability
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 19. What new revenue opportunities have been (or can be) beneficial to the program? Describe any supporting funding from subsidies, grants, fundraising, etc. 20. To what extent does the program have the personnel, technological, and other resources it needs to meet its objectives? 21. What efficiencies in the way the program operates are (or can be) beneficial to Evangel University as a whole?
SECTION 6: Planning for the Future
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 22. Based on what you have learned from this review, including the SWOT conducted for the "Relevance" section (questions 8-12), identify 1 – 3 strategic objectives that will enable the program to further one or more of EU's strategic goals in the next 5 years OR update and attach your strategic plan. For each objective, please include: Who is the driver responsible for meeting this objective?; Who needs to be involved in accomplishing the objective?; What strategy(s) will be used to achieve the objective?; and When will this objective be accomplished?

Academic Program Review Rubric

RUBRIC: Mission, Values, Strategic Plan				
	Exemplary (4 points)	Competent (3 points)	Emerging (2 points)	Insufficient (1 point)
A. Mission/ Overall Essentiality	Evidence is provided that the program has advanced EU's mission/strategic plans in deliberate and measurable ways.	Program objectives are consistent with EU's mission and strategic plans.	Program objectives are inconsistent with EU's mission and strategic plans.	Program objectives are not formulated.
B. Strategic Planning	The program routinely develops a cohesive Strategic Plan & has demonstrated that it has advanced EU's Strategic Plan.	The program has developed a cohesive Strategic Plan that has or is likely to advance EU's Strategic Plan.	The program has identified short-term objectives.	No evidence of intentional program planning is available.
RUBRIC: Relevance				
C. External Demand (OOH)	Faster than average growth or strong job opportunity is projected	Average growth is projected	Slower than average growth is projected	Decline is projected or no information is available.
D. Enrollment Trend Data	Increasing enrollment trend	Stable enrollment trend	Sporadic enrollment trend	Declining enrollment trend.
E. Opportunity Analysis	The program can provide examples of how they routinely evaluate and use strengths or opportunities to overcome weaknesses/ threats.	The program has identified & evaluated strengths, weaknesses, opportunities & threats & subsequently documented plans to improve.	The program has identified some pros and cons related to the program.	No evidence of opportunity analysis or SWOT self-evaluation is presented.
RUBRIC: Effectiveness				
F. Faculty Credentials	All faculty members hold terminal degrees in the field in which they teach.	All faculty may not have terminal degrees but all have appropriate degrees or tested experience for the courses they teach.	One or more faculty members are close to completing coursework or research that will give them a needed credential.	One or more faculty members are unqualified to teach 1 or more assigned courses.
G. Assessment of PLOs	PLO data from Course Commons has been collected annually & multiple faculty have reviewed findings & used what they learned to improve the program.	PLO data from Course Commons has been collected annually but multiple faculty did not review findings annually for program improvement.	Evidence of program effectiveness is available but not reviewed.	No evidence of program effectiveness is available.
H. External Validation	The program or its members hold membership in a professional organization(s) and use standards and best practices to inform their work. The program has been acknowledged by the organization(s).	The program or its members hold membership in a professional organization and use standards and best practices to inform their work.	The program or its members hold membership in a professional organization or have consulted an external expert.	No evidence that the program has considered its relevance or best practices is provided.
I. Stakeholder Satisfaction	Evidence of stakeholders (students, alumni & employers) is available along with evidence that the unit has reviewed it & used what they learned to improve the program.	Evidence that the unit routinely collects and analyzes stakeholder satisfaction levels is provided.	Some evidence of stakeholder satisfaction levels has been collected in the last 3 years.	No evidence of stakeholder satisfaction with the program is provided.
J. Placement	The program has provided a 3 to 5-year history of placement of majors, including job title and starting salaries.	The program has provided placement information for more than half of their most recent graduating class.	The program has spotlighted successful graduates.	No placement information is available.

K. High Impact Practices https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips	The program curriculum ensures that all majors experience multiple HIPs.	The program curriculum ensures that all majors experience an HIP.	HIPs are available to majors and minors.	No evidence of HIP usage is provided.
RUBRIC: Sustainability				
L. Percent of program graduates to total # of EU graduates in the last four years	Upper 25%	Mid 50-75%	Lower 25-50%	Lower 25%
M. # Attrited from EU in the last four years-Average %/Year	Lower 25%	Lower 25-50%	Mid 50-75%	Upper 25%
N. Resource Acquisition	The program has consistently and actively sought out and/or received new resources	The program consistently seeks and/or receives new resources	The program seeks and/or receives new resources on occasion	The program has not received new resources and none are expected
O. Resource Utilization	The program has provided multiple examples of program evaluation, prioritization & modifications that resulted in reallocating funds to a more strategic purpose within EU.	The program has identified one or more examples of program evaluation, prioritization & modifications that resulted in reallocating funds to a more strategic purpose within the program.	The program has provided an example of program evaluation, prioritization, & modification that resulted in reallocating funds to a more strategic purpose.	No evidence of resource prioritization or reallocation is available.

*Adapted with permission from Graceland University, Dr. Katie Bash