

**University of Hawai'i at Mānoa**  
**Guidelines for Program Review Teams**  
Revised July 2005

Program review teams should generally follow these guidelines. The format can be adapted to fit the needs of the program being reviewed.

A self-evaluation of the instructional program during the past five to seven years is provided to review team members. This information should be supplemented by reading the original program description and previous program reviews.

Each review team should interview (a) students, (b) faculty, (c) the department [and/or graduate faculty] chair(s), and (d) the school/college dean, if appropriate. The team should also tour departmental facilities and observe their usage. The results of these interviews and observations, and your review of the self-study report, will form a key part of the team report.

### **GENERAL OVERVIEW**

Relevance: How well does the program meet the Mānoa Strategic Plan?

Suggested Questions:

Is the mission of the program aligned with Mānoa's mission of "Leadership, Excellence and Innovation"?

How effectively does the program advance the core commitments of the Mānoa Strategic Plan?

Is there evidence that the program is implementing the strategic imperatives of the Mānoa Strategic Plan?

Comparison: How does the general quality of the program compare with that of other programs in the discipline/area of study? What is the national or international reputation/ranking of the program? Is the program identified with comparable programs from UH Mānoa's peer or benchmark institutions?

### **CURRICULUM**

Consider the quality of the curriculum and its appropriateness to the program's educational objectives.

Suggested Questions:

How does the curriculum compare to standards in the discipline? Is the curriculum

innovative, consistent with disciplinary standards, behind standards?

Does the field of study have a thoughtfully-designed program for its students?

Are educational objectives of the program articulated? Is there sufficient evidence that educational objectives are being met?

Are student learning outcomes articulated and achievement assessed?

How are assessment results used to continuously improve the program?

Are the courses or degree-related activities appropriate to the level at which they are offered (i.e., lower division, upper division, master's, doctoral)?

Are the courses intellectually challenging and rigorously comprehensive?

## **STUDENTS**

Consider the quality of students admitted to the program, formal courses and seminars, various general examinations (e.g., qualifying, comprehensive, final, etc.), theses, dissertations, and methods used to evaluate student progress.

Note length of time needed to complete degree requirements, attrition rate, ratio of international to American students and the effect, if any, this may have on the program's quality.

Current students as well as students who have completed the program should be surveyed.

### Suggested Questions:

Is the program selective in its admission of students?

Are students admitted conditionally? What sort of deficiencies do incoming students have?

Is written information delineating program and graduation requirements provided to each entering student? Is this information consistent with descriptions in the Mānoa catalog and on the program's website?

Is there a coordinated program of courses and faculty advising to help students reach their goals?

Are students involved in organizations and clubs? To what extent are students involved in the governance of the unit?

Does the department/program take effective action to remedy legitimate student

complaints? For example, what is the result if students report a badly-taught course?

Does the program meet student expectations?

## **FACULTY**

Assess the quality of the faculty using traditional measures of research, productivity, teaching excellence, and service.

### Suggested Questions:

What is the reputation of the program and its faculty? What kinds of journals publish faculty research? Where do faculty exhibit or perform their works? What consultantships have they held? What awards have they received?

Does the faculty use its extramural research funding as a tool to help recruit and support students?

Are the faculty accessible to students both inside and outside of the classroom?

Are the faculty dedicated in their roles as mentors to their students?

Are the faculty conscientious as members of students' degree committees (being available, giving time, providing prompt reactions to thesis and dissertation drafts, being carefully critical, seeing that good quality work and writing are done, being prepared and thorough at oral examinations, etc.)?

What is the faculty workload and is it equitable?

How is teaching evaluated? What priority does the department place on the quality of teaching?

## **DISTANCE DELIVERED PROGRAMS**

Review the distance- or off-campus delivery of programs. Consider whether "distant" students are receiving programs and services of comparable quality to on-campus students.

### Suggested Questions:

What are the qualifications of faculty who are teaching in distance- or off-campus programs? Are their qualifications comparable to faculty teaching in on-campus programs?

Do students in distance- or off-campus programs have adequate access to faculty, academic advising, financial aid advising, library materials and resources, etc.?

Is there sufficient evidence that educational objectives and student learning outcomes in distance- and off-campus programs are being met?

## **CENTERS OR INSTITUTES**

Review any centers housed within the program. How well does the Center achieve its mission and objectives? Is its mission aligned to the Mānoa Strategic Plan? Should the Center be continued?

## **PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS**

Employing reasonable criteria of achievement (e.g., number and quality of graduates, success in obtaining employment, etc.), describe how the program has met its objectives during the review period. Where has it failed? Does the program meet local, national, and international needs? Note especially any community outreach efforts.

## **SUPPORT FUNDING AND FACILITIES**

Consider the quality and extent of the department's relationship to other units of the university; its funding from state, federal, and private sources, including funds obtained for various research and training elements of the program; and physical facilities, e.g., laboratories, departmental reading room, computers and word processing equipment, library holdings.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The final written report should address these broad questions:

- What have been the objectives of the department's instructional program during the review period?
- In what ways has the program succeeded in achieving these objectives?
- In what ways has it fallen short of these goals?

Comment on both positive and negative aspects of the program. Include recommended actions that should be taken. Pertinent problems and deficiencies that were observed during the review should be noted.

The completed report should be checked with the department chair for factual accuracy before it is submitted. A hard copy and an electronic version of the team report (Word format) should be provided to the OVCAA.

If you have any questions at any stage of the review, please feel free to raise them with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or with the Graduate Division. Thanks in advance for your help in this very important task.

**University of Hawai'i at Mānoa**  
**Additional Program Review Guidelines for Graduate Programs**

Besides considering the points raised in the “Guidelines for Program Review Teams,” when the program under review also offers one or more graduate degrees, it is important that the following points also be addressed during the review process:

1. How rigorous and well-enforced are the admissions standards into the graduate program(s)? How do incoming students rate on national measures of quality?
2. How much variance is there in the application of performance standards across students, i.e., do faculty apply performance standards uniformly, are theses and comprehensive exams of a uniform quality?
3. How does the program balance demands of graduate education with teaching and research demands placed on RAs and TAs?
4. Is clear and precise written information on program requirements and expectations available to each entering graduate student? Is faculty advising readily available? How are graduate students oriented/aculturated into the program, e.g., senior student or faculty mentoring, department activities, graduate student organizations?
5. How does the actual program compare with the students' expectations?
6. If this is a doctoral program (or a masters' program with a thesis option), review and comment on the quality of a sample of the theses and/or dissertations (all theses and dissertations are on file in the Hawaiian Collection at Hamilton Library).