I. Learning Opportunities – Barbara Adams – documents distributed
   - Barbara Adams discussed all the learning opportunities scheduled through December at the Gumberg Library. They include: Find It in Scopus; Online Collaboration: Sharing Research and Scholarship; and Using the New Pub Med Effectively. Further information can be found at www.duq.edu/library. If anyone is interested in having Ref Works presented to your faculty, please contact your library liaison or call Lisa Sciulli, x5346.
   - Dr. Ulrich recommended that ULC members encourage their colleagues to promote student use of RefWorks.
   - Amelie suggested a librarian attend the next meeting of the Graduate and Professional Student Association on December 3, 2009 to discuss Ref Works.

II. Update on Text-a-Librarian – Barbara Adams
   - This is a new tool the part-time Reference librarians are using for students to contact a librarian. During October, twenty-five questions were submitted and from November 1-11, 2009, ten questions were submitted. If a librarian is unavailable, a canned message is generated. A text can be sent to 66746. The service is available 6-10 pm week nights, 10-6 pm Saturday and 11-7 pm Sunday.

III. Concerns of students – SGA Communication – Stephanie Arntz
Minutes of the SGA Library Committee Minutes were distributed and Stephanie briefed the ULC about the concerns students have about the library. Discussion ensued.

IV. Guidelines for Academic Program Reviews regarding Library Adequacy – Tracie Ballock & Dr. Saunders

- Internal Program Review Guidelines for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs document was distributed and discussed. This document was approved by Academic Council and is available on the Academic Affairs web site. [http://www.sites.duq.edu/academic-affairs/_pdf/program-review.pdf](http://www.sites.duq.edu/academic-affairs/_pdf/program-review.pdf)

The library has developed a list of assessment indicators that provide a framework for investigating the adequacy of library resources. Any faculty asked to work on a program review should be directed to these guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Liermann
11/19/09

Next Meeting
December 10, 2009
3-4 pm
L-202
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
INTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES
FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

The primary goal of an Academic Program Review (APR) is to maintain and strengthen the quality of DU’s undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Academic Program Reviews incorporate both an internal self-study and external site visit. Final written reports are submitted to the appropriate academic dean and the Provost. Graduate programs are also required to present a brief oral report to the Graduate Council.

Academic Program Reviews are conducted on a 7 year rotation unless otherwise requested or deemed necessary by the department chair, dean, or Provost. The schedule for APRs is updated annually and posted on DORI under Academic Affairs. The self-study and external review should address the same major guidelines and should provide both descriptive and evaluative information.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The APR will typically follow a 12-month timeline:

a) self-study: 8 months
b) external review: 2 months
c) final report and recommendations: 2 months.

b) The final report and recommendations should be submitted electronically to the Dean by November 15, and following his/her review and approval, to the Office of the Provost by February 15.

The Provost will provide financial support for 1 or 2 external reviewers for a two day visit on campus. Each reviewer will be paid $1,000 per day and will be reimbursed for travel, lodging and meals. External reviewers should submit their final written report to the academic program review committee and to the Dean within 30 days of the campus site visit. In cases where multiple programs are being reviewed together (undergraduate and graduate) the Provost will provide financial support for 3 external reviewers for a two day visit on campus.

The academic program review committee should submit recommendations for external reviewers to the Dean for his/her approval prior to finalizing plans for a site visit. External reviewers should be from peer or aspirant doctoral institutions with experience and credentials which will enable them to contribute knowledgeably to the review process.
Prior to beginning the self-study, the academic program committee chairperson should schedule a meeting with the Associate Provost/AAVP for Academic Affairs to review the process and sources available to provide support and information to the committee, such as data from Enrollment Management, Institutional Research, and Academic Affairs.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS**

**Evaluative criterion 1—Program Quality**

Describe the history and mission of the program and how it complements the mission of the university. Describe program goals, number and type of degrees offered, tracks or concentrations, learning objectives and outcomes, and how the program may support other programs of the university, such as the core curriculum, Honors College, service learning, Study Abroad, undergraduate research and scholarship symposium, etc. Describe how the program compares with peer and aspirant institutions.

**Evaluative criterion 2—Student Retention, Graduation, and Diversity**

Describe enrollment trends for the preceding 5 years; demographics for enrolled students by class/degree level, race/ethnicity and gender, retention and graduation rates, quality and type of advising and mentoring activities for students. Discuss any notable diversity initiatives, outreach for minority students and faculty, efforts to support recruitment and retention.

**Evaluative criterion 3—Student Learning Outcomes**

Describe your assessment processes and show how assessment of student learning outcomes has resulted in changes in the curriculum, teaching methods, or resource allocation (budget, personnel, staff or faculty time). Provide as much information as possible about the placement of students after graduation and alumni satisfaction with the program for the preceding 5 years.

**Evaluative criterion 4—Program/Curriculum Planning and Review**

Describe the processes employed by the faculty for curriculum review, planning, and revision. Discuss how the curriculum provides sufficient breadth and depth for the baccalaureate degree. Describe learning opportunities for students beyond the classroom, such as internships, observations, etc. and how those interactions support the learning goals for the program.

**Evaluative criterion 5—Adequacy of Human, Financial, and Physical Resources**

Is the program able to meet its learning goals with the current level of resources provided by the library, facilities, information technology, etc.? Describe the activities of the faculty in terms of scholarship, teaching, and service to the department, school, and university. Describe the resources and support available to support faculty development and to mentor junior faculty. Are there sufficient faculty members to meet the goals of the department in each of these areas? To ensure adequate or desirable levels of full-time faculty coverage for teaching and
mentoring undergraduate students in both lower-division and upper-division classes? Is the budget support for the program adequate?

Evaluative criterion 6—Criteria determined by the school

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Evaluative criterion 1 - Program Quality

1. Does the mission of the program contribute to the mission of the school and university?
2. How does the program compare to similar benchmark programs of which you are aware? When possible, please be specific about the benchmark programs being used for comparison.
3. Based on your knowledge, please describe the primary competitors for this program. Where appropriate, please include local, national, or international competitors.
4. Based on your knowledge of similar programs, where would you place this program in a national standing?

Evaluative criterion 2 - Student Quality and Recruitment

1. Is the program using effective recruiting strategies to bring the best and brightest students to the program?
2. Are the average entering admission requirements sufficient to promote success in the graduate program?
3. Is the acceptance ratio of students commensurate with graduate programs of similar focus and size?
4. Is the diversity of the student body within the graduate program commensurate with programs of similar focus and size?
5. Is the financial support for students sufficient to promote success of the program and the students within the program?

Evaluative criterion 3 - Student Productivity and Matriculation

1. Is the enrollment pattern within the program consistent with programs of similar size and focus? Enrollment pattern includes numbers of students at different stages of matriculation and the status of the students (e.g. part-time or full-time).
2. Is the retention/graduation rate consistent with reasonable program rigor and fairness to the students within the program?
3. Is the number of degrees awarded annually reasonable given the rigor of the program, the enrollment pattern, and the focus and size of the program?
4. Is the time taken to earn the degree commensurate with programs of similar focus and reasonable given the enrollment pattern of the program?

Evaluative criterion 4 - Learning Outcomes
1. Does the program have a process for assessing learning outcomes? Is there a process for evaluating student satisfaction with the program?
2. Are the grade distributions, including the annual number of I-grades and W-grades, indicative of a high achievement of learning outcomes?
3. Is student performance on outcome-based exams (e.g., comprehensive exams, licensing exams, certification exams) consistent with a high level of learning?
4. Is the placement of students after graduation consistent with a program that is recognized by employers/educators as accomplishing its learning objectives?
5. Is the feedback from the program’s alumni consistent with achievement of learning outcomes at graduation?

**Evaluative criterion 5 - Program Curriculum**

1. Are there processes in place for curriculum review, planning and revision?
2. Are the program curricular goals consistent with the mission of the program?
3. Are the program curricular goals consistent with the goals and objectives of courses within the curriculum?
4. Is there a process for assessing learning goals within the curriculum?

**Evaluative criterion 6 - Adequacy of Resources (not including budget of the program)**

1. Are there adequate library resources to support the program?
2. Are there adequate laboratory, computer, student and faculty facilities to support the program?

**Evaluative criterion 7 - Faculty Productivity**

1. Is the number of faculty publications consistent with successful programs of similar size and focus?
2. If research funding is required to complete research within the program, is that funding sufficient for success of the graduate program?
3. Have scholarly awards been granted to the faculty of the program indicating their success in scholarship?
4. Are faculty of the program serving as chairs and committee members on thesis and dissertation committees at a level commensurate with success of the graduate program and the faculty member?
5. Is the number of students mentored by faculty commensurate with quality graduate education?

**Evaluative criterion 8 - Fiscal Management**

1. Describe the financial support the program provides for its graduate students.
2. Include comparative data and Library support.
3. Is the number of faculty and staff reasonable for the program: Faculty/student FTE?
4. Is the operating budget/faculty FTE ratio commensurate with successful programs of similar size and focus?
5. Is the research expenditure/faculty FTE ratio commensurate with successful programs of similar size and focus?

*Evaluative criterion 9 – Criteria Unique to School*
Duquesne University
Undergraduate and Graduate Program Review Process
Library Assessment Indicators

How do we operationalize the question: *Are library resources adequate?*

First, schedule an appointment with your library liaison and/or the University Librarian. The library can save you time and enhance the quality of your self-study by providing data and information such as the items listed below.

1. **Descriptive/Quantitative measures:**
   a. Resources owned by Gumberg Library
      i. Number of books in specific areas (by LC Classification)
      ii. Titles of journals, databases, and other specific resources
   b. Budget
      i. Chart current expenditures plus previous 3-5 years
      ii. Benchmark expenditures against corresponding expenditures of peer institutions
   c. Usage data
      i. Resource Sharing (ILL, E-ZBorrow)
      ii. Database/electronic resource use (not restricted by department or school)
   d. Training & Instruction
      i. Information sessions taught to classes
      ii. Instruction sessions for graduate students (special, ETDs)

2. **Qualitative measures:**
   a. Core collections checked against an accepted bibliography
   b. Benchmark collections held by peer institutions or vendor database, including OCLC analysis
   c. Faculty profiles with assessment by specialization
   d. Focus groups of students and/or faculty

3. **Other Assessments/Recommendations:**
   a. If library resources are considered to be inadequate, what specific actions/resources are needed to close the gap?

Rev. 11/16/09