

Responsibilities of the review team in UGA academic program review

The primary responsibility of the program review team is to evaluate and respond to the information put forward by the unit faculty in the self-study regarding the quality, viability, and productivity of its academic and other programs. The self-study should be confirmed and considered in context as established through additional information gathered through interviews, surveys, or other forums with unit faculty and other stakeholders, as appropriate.

The results of this evaluation should be a brief report that includes advisory recommendations regarding the continuation of each academic program in keeping with requirements of the University System of Georgia Board of Regents (BOR). The report should also include formative feedback on the student learning outcomes assessment practice for each program and recommendations to guide improvement in other areas identified by the unit faculty for evaluation.

Additional responsibilities of the review team include:

1. Set and maintain a review schedule that conforms to the Program Review Procedures provided at the charge meeting
2. Review survey responses to gauge need for group meetings within the unit and learn about cohesiveness and departmental health.
3. Meet with appropriate stakeholders, who may include the Dean or Vice President with oversight, unit administrators, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and others as determined relevant to the review
4. Communicate with the Office of Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE) at regular intervals regarding the progress of the review

Review Team Report Outline

The review team report generally follows the format of the self-study provided by the unit faculty. In addition to addressing each academic program, it responds to any additional areas included in the scope of the self-study.

1. Preface—title, draft date, review team members; review procedures/meetings held/timeline followed
2. Brief overview of the unit and its programs/additional unit context
3. Academic Programs—for each:
 - BOR template recommendation with brief rationale
 - Student Learning Outcome Assessment feedback rubric
4. Additional elements—for each:
 - Brief summary of strengths and challenges
 - Recommendations for improvement in the area
5. Summary of recommendations
 - Findings from faculty recommendations beyond the scope of academic programs.