



WEBER STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Weber State University  
Five or Seven Year Program Review  
Reviewer Guide and Worksheets

Dear Program Review Committee Member,

Thank you for your willingness to participate on the committee to review one of Weber State University's academic programs. Whether you have come from across the country, within the state, or from here on campus your support and expertise are appreciated and valued. This document contains guidelines, instructions, and worksheets for the program review visit. You may complete either an electronic or a hard copy version of this document.

If you have questions about the review process prior to your visit, feel free to contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at (801) 626-8586.

Name of program under review: **Finance Major – in the Department of Accounting and Taxation**

Name of reviewer: **Benjamin M. Blau**

Reviewer affiliation: **Professor, Department Head, and George S. Eccles Endowed Chair in Finance at the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business at Utah State University**

Committee Member: **Brandon C. Koford, Professor of Economic, John B. Goddard School of Business and Economics, Weber State University.**

## Contents

Purpose of Program Review .....	4
Program Review Process .....	5
Self-study Format and Standards .....	6
Executive Summary .....	6
Self-study Format.....	7
Program Evaluation Worksheet .....	8
STANDARD A - MISSION STATEMENT .....	9
STANDARD B – CURRICULUM .....	10
STANDARD C - STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT .....	11
STANDARD D - ACADEMIC ADVISING .....	12
STANDARD E – FACULTY .....	14
STANDARD F - PROGRAM SUPPORT .....	16
STANDARD G - RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES .....	17
STANDARD H - PROGRAM SUMMARY .....	18
Suggested Questions for Program Review Evaluation Team Members .....	20
Questions for program department chair .....	20
Questions for individual faculty members .....	21
Questions for students – groups or individual .....	24

## **Purpose of Program Review**

The primary purpose of program review at Weber State University is to improve academic programs. An academic program may consist of an entire department which houses several majors, or an academic program may be a component of a department.

Program reviews are not conducted to expressly identify individual programs for discontinuance. Reviews will result in an identification of program strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for change. The program faculty, responsible academic dean, and provost will respond in writing to these recommendations as part of a program-improvement plan.

## **Responsibilities of Program Review Committee**

The program review committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Review of the content of the program to ensure that it is consistent with high standards and practices within the discipline.
2. Review resources (faculty, facilities and selected budgets, such as travel budgets) to ensure that they are consistent with supporting a quality program.
3. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the program.
4. Note any concerns or recommendations about the rates of recruitment of new students, placement of graduates and sensitivity to community and professional needs.
5. Review sufficiency of the evidence of student learning.

## **Program Review Process**

Program reviews are conducted on a 5 to 7 year cycle. Exceptions to this schedule may occur as a result of previous review recommendations or outside accreditation schedules.

The faculty representing a department scheduled for program review develops an extensive self-study report during the fall semester. The final self-study report goes through a series of approvals culminating with sign off from the Dean of the appropriate college. The purpose of the self-study is twofold. First, it provides an opportunity for department faculty to collaborate at a program-level perspective to consider their programs and the status or 'health' of those programs. Second, the self-study document is sent to members of the program review committee to provide them with information and background about the program under study, to help those individuals become better acquainted with the program they are being asked to evaluate.

At the conclusion of the site visit, recommendations and commendations are compiled by the site visit team chair and presented in a report to the department chair. The chair shares the report with the program faculty who is then given an opportunity to formally respond to that report. All reports and responses are then forwarded to the appropriate Dean who also develops a response.

At the beginning of the fall semester following the site visit, the Dean's response along with the self-study, review recommendations/commendations, and faculty response are forwarded to the Provost's Office. Program reviews are then distributed to the institutional reviewing committee (often the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) and a formal review is scheduled with this committee and the department chair(s). The department chair makes a presentation to the committee; the committee asks questions of the department chair; finally, the committee makes a recommendation to the Provost about the program under review.

The final step is development of program review reports by the Provost for distribution to and consideration by the university's Board of Trustees and the Utah State Board of Regents. These reports are developed and delivered during the spring semester.

## Self-study Format and Standards

The most critical element of program review is the self-study that is prepared by the program faculty. The self-study document is both a description and an analysis of important aspects of an academic program. Once this document has been completed, it is reviewed and approved by the responsible Academic Dean prior to its dissemination. The self-study is approximately 25-30+ pages in length, exclusive of appendices, and should follow the format described below. An executive summary of the self-study is also prepared by the Program Faculty. This summary document is 3-5 pages in length, exclusive of the appendices and includes brief information about the program under review.

### *Executive Summary*

- Mission Statement
- Curriculum - types of degrees, number of courses, admissions process
- Student learning outcomes and assessment
- Academic Advising
- Faculty
- Program Support
- Relationships with the External Community
- Student, Faculty, Contract/Adjunct Faculty and Staff statistical summaries (Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research)
- Information of review team members (name - current position - place of employment - contact information)

*Self-study Format*

- I. Cover Sheet/Title Page
- II. Program Review Elements and Standards
  - A. Mission Statement
  - B. Curriculum
    1. Curriculum Map
  - C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
    1. Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses
    2. Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major
    3. Evidence of Learning: High Impact Service Learning
  - D. Academic Advising
  - E. Faculty
  - F. Support (Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library)
  - G. Relationships with the External Communities
  - H. Results of Previous Program Reviews
- III. Appendices
  - A. Student and Faculty Statistical Summary
  - B. Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile
  - C. Staff Profile
  - D. Financial Analysis Summary
  - E. Relationships with External Communities
  - F. Additional information as determined by Program

## Program Evaluation Worksheet

### FOR USE BY PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

This form is to be used by each team member to record program data and information during the team visit. The following quality ratings are suggested:

- S** Strength; especially effective practice or condition
- G** Good; meets expected standards
- C** Concern; action could be needed in the future
- W** Weakness; action needed
- X** Did not evaluate – indicate why the area was not evaluated.

At the conclusion of the visit, leave the original of this form with the team chair, who will use it to prepare the draft statement for the institution.



## STANDARD A - MISSION STATEMENT

Evaluate how effectively the mission statement articulates the following elements.

	<b>Element</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments and/or Recommendations for Change</b>
a.	The expected outcomes of the program need to be clearly defined.	G	The outcomes of the program are included in the mission statement. However, the reviewers would recommend some clarity to be provided about the potential growth of the program. There has already been some inherent growth in the number of student majors. However, some additional clarity might be useful and thinking carefully about the expectations and objectives of the program.
b.	A process by which these accomplishments are determined and periodically assessed based upon the constituencies served by the program.	X	This program review seemed to be a good start in providing regular assessments. Given that this is the first review, current and future accomplishments should be regularly reviewed.
c.	A clearly defined educational program, including a curriculum that enables graduates to achieve the mission.	G	The program provides some clear direction provided in the mission statement and in the review committee's discussion with the department chair. The curriculum seems appropriate given the resource constraints on the number of faculty participating in the program. However, the review committee recommends that faculty and administration obtain external validation of the program by consulting with industry professionals or a advisory board.
d.	The program mission statement must be appropriate to and support the mission statements of both the college housing the program and the university.	S	The mission statement provided in the Self Study is appropriate and direct.

*Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

**STANDARD B – CURRICULUM**

Evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum based on the following elements.

	<b>Element</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments and/or Recommendations for Change</b>
a.	The program should demonstrate that the curriculum for each degree and for any general education/service courses offered by the program is the result of thoughtful curriculum planning and review processes.	G	The outline of the curriculum is appropriate. The review committee discussed with faculty and students a number of additional elective courses that would be appropriate for a typical finance program. Considering the resource constraints, however, the financial curriculum is appropriate.
b.	The curriculum should be consistent with the program's mission.	S	The mission statement's focus on theories, analytical skills, and ethics matches the overall curricular objectives in the program.
c.	The program should be able to demonstrate that there is an appropriate allocation of resources for curriculum delivery that is consistent with the mission of the program, the number of graduates, and the number of major/minor and general education SCHs produced.	G	On one hand, the curriculum delivery is remarkably efficient (144 majors across three full-time faculty). On the other hand, however, the natural growth in student demand, as seen in the increase in the number of majors over the last five years, might be a strategic objective and more resources might be necessary to improve the quality of the program generally and the curriculum specifically.
d.	Courses to support the major/minor/general education/service programs are offered on a regular basis to ensure students are able to complete graduation requirements in a timely manner.	G	The courses seem to allow students to meet the graduation requirements in a timely manner. However, the review committee does acknowledge that careful advisement is necessary to ensure that students take courses in the right semesters to allow for timely graduation. Students and faculty did express concern that some of the courses are offered in a way that aligns with the budgetary constraints but places pressure on students to register appropriately so that timelines are met.

*Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

## STANDARD C - STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

Evaluate the extent to which the program has clearly defined outcomes.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	Learning outcomes should describe the expected knowledge, skills, and behaviors that students will have achieved at the time of graduation (overarching program goals).	S	The discussion of the program’s learning objectives in the Self Study documentation is clear and straightforward. These learning objectives seem to be well thought out and are similar to other traditional finance undergraduate programs.
b.	Learning outcomes must support the goals of the program and the constituencies served.	S	Again, the learning outcome discussion in the Self Study document seems to support the goals outlined in the program’s mission statement.
c.	Learning outcomes should be directly linked to the program's curriculum. An explicit curriculum grid illustrating this alignment, as well as the depth to which each course addresses each outcome, is publicly available.	S	Learning outcomes are nicely aligned to the curriculum in the Self Study document. The review committee assumes that the learning outcome discussion is made public to the constituents of the program.

*Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

Evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment process based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program has a developed set of measures for assessment that are clearly defined and appropriately applied.	S	The overall discussion of learning objectives, achievement measurements, and student performance in the Self Study is clear and well defined. As these assessments continue in the future, the review committee would encourage faculty and administration to close the loop.
b.	Each learning outcome is assessed with <i>at least one direct measure</i> of learning; thresholds for acceptable performance are defined (for each measure) and published.	S	Again, the Self Study document provides a clean approach to evaluating learning outcomes.
c.	Demonstrate that evidence of learning is being gathered on a regular basis across the program, that the evidence is aggregated, and reported at the aggregate.	G	The assessment provided in the Self Study about learning outcomes is straightforward. Since this is the first program review and the first assessment round, the review committee would recommend additional future assessments to ensure programmatic development.
d.	Demonstrate that these measures are being used in a systematic manner on a regular basis and are reviewed against department-established thresholds, i.e., are the program faculty meeting regularly to discuss the evidence?	G	The outcomes, measurement, and performance have been carefully identified. Given that this is the first assessment cycle, it would seem appropriate to ensure that faculty and administration are “closing the loop” before the next formal review.
e.	Demonstrate that the assessment of the program mission and student outcomes is being used to improve and further develop the program. Is the evidence acted upon? Is it clear what drives program change?	G	Again, since this was the first assessment cycle, it is imperative that the obtained materials are used to direct the future development of the program.

Rating: *S* = Strength, *G* = Good, *C* = Concern, *W* = Weakness, *X* = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

## STANDARD D - ACADEMIC ADVISING

Evaluate the following related to the advising process.

	<b>Element</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments and/or Recommendations for Change</b>
a.	The program has a clearly defined strategy for advising their major/minor, or BIS students that is continually assessed for its effectiveness.	G	In our discussions with students, advisement for the program seem to be appropriate. Students did indicate that advisor meetings were somewhat infrequent. Given the lock-step nature of the finance major and that students might get off track meeting graduation requirements, it might be important for continual assessment of the program's advisement.
b.	Students receive appropriate assistance in planning their individual programs of study.	G	The advising staff is available and the department faculty is also willing to help. There was some discussion of assigning students a faculty mentor to assist with advisement. The review committee recommends that the department continue to explore this possibility.
c.	Students receive needed assistance in making career decisions and in seeking placement, whether in employment or graduate school.	G	The program utilizes an in-house Career Service Center, which seems to be adequate. In discussion with students, however, student placement heavily relies on outside networking. Perhaps greater resources could be allocated to career placement, which could help fulfil the program's mission statement to "[prepare students] for careers in finance with capability, confidence, and working ethics".

**Rating:** *S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

**STANDARD E – FACULTY**

Evaluate the extent to which the faculty demonstrates the following characteristics.

	<b>Element</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments and/or Recommendations for Change</b>
a.	Faculty size, composition, qualifications, and professional development activities must result from a planning process which is consistent with the program's mission.	C	Despite the growth in the number of finance majors (86 in 17-18 to 144 in 21-22), it seems that the faculty size has been able to sustain the growth. In discussions with both faculty and students, more resources could be devoted to allow an increase in the number of majors or a reduction in some of the class sizes, which are at an apparent cap.
b.	The program maintains a core of full-time faculty sufficient to provide stability and ongoing quality improvement for the degree programs offered.	S	The program is very efficient with 144 majors provided by three full-time faculty members. Students speak highly of their experience and interactions with faculty members.
c.	Contract/adjunct faculty who provide instruction to students (day/evening, off/on campus) are academically and professionally qualified.	W	During the visit, we had several discussions about the possibility of using adjunct faculty to assist in the offering of more elective classes. However, there was some concern about whether or not the composition of ratios of Scholarly Academics/Practicing Academic to adjunct faculty would violate the AACSB accreditation. The review committee would encourage administrators to think of ways to expand course offerings by potentially using adjunct faculty.
d.	The program should demonstrate efforts to achieve demographic diversity in its faculty.	C	While the composition of the faculty is currently diverse, little information was provided to ensure that efforts to create diversity remains.

**Rating:** *S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
e. The program should have appropriate procedures for the orientation of new contract/adjunct faculty.	X	With the lack of adjunct faculty, little was discussed in the Self Study, or during the site visit, about the orientation of contract/adjunct faculty.
f. Processes are in place to determine appropriate teaching assignments and service workloads, to guide and mentor contract/adjunct faculty, and to provide adequate support for activities which implement the program's mission.	G	Again, the use of adjunct faculty seems to be very infrequent. However, the overall description of faculty evaluation would seem to be appropriate for contract/adjunct faculty.
g. Teaching is systematically monitored to assess its effectiveness, and revised periodically to reflect new objectives and to incorporate improvements based on appropriate assessment methods. For both contract and adjunct faculty, there is evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective creation and delivery of instruction.</li> <li>• Ongoing evaluation and improvement of instruction.</li> <li>• Innovation in instructional processes.</li> </ul>	S	Faculty are evaluated at both the dean and department chair level each year. The department chair provides a specific evaluation of the faculty member's teaching. These evaluations seem to be integral in the process of determining merit increases, which suggests that incentives are aligned with teaching effectiveness.
h. A formal, periodic review process exists for all faculty, and the results of the reviews are available.	G	The evaluative process seems to be straightforward and reasonable. One minor issue is that the Self Study document does not indicate whether or not the results of the review were available to faculty members.

*Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

## STANDARD F - PROGRAM SUPPORT

Evaluate the nature and adequacy of the program support based on the following elements.

	<b>Element</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments and/or Recommendations for Change</b>
a.	The number and capabilities of the support staff are adequate to meet the mission and objectives of the program.	S	The Self Study documentation discusses the adequacy of support staff. One administrative specialist for 13 faculty in the department (three finance faculty) seems reasonable. The Self Study document is careful in describing and providing training opportunities for staff development.
b.	Administrative support is present in assisting in the selection and development of support staff.	S	Again, the Self Study document carefully describes the development activities provided to staff, including various courses and conferences for administrative professionals.
c.	The facilities, equipment, and library support needs are adequate to meet the mission and goals of the program.	C	The adequacy of the facilities and libraries seem to be appropriate. However, in discussions with faculty and the department chair, more resources might be needed for databases to be used on both faculty and student research. For instance, the review team discussed the possibility of obtaining Bloomberg terminals, which are expensive but allow for data to be collected for academic research purposes. The terminals might also benefit student learning through access to a number of databases including financial statements of U.S. firms.

*Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*



## STANDARD G - RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES

Evaluate the relationships according to the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	If there are formal relationships between the program and external communities of interest they should be clearly defined.	C	During the visit, we discussed the need to form an external advisory committee, which was a priority prior to the recent pandemic but has not been revisited.
b.	Such relationships should have a clearly defined role and evidence of their contribution to the program (curriculum, equipment, faculty, budget, etc.) should be demonstrated.	C	The discussion of forming a potential advisory committee occurred at the Dean and Department Chair level. The advisory committee at the college level has a few individuals with a heavy finance background. If those individuals were included on the finance advisory committee, it would be necessary to ensure that the roles at the college level and the program level were clearly defined.
c.	If the program has an external advisory committee, it should meet regularly and minutes of the meetings be made available.	C	Again, the recommendation from the review committee is to form an advisory committee to ensure that industry advisement is included in the development of curriculum and the overall program.

*Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

**STANDARD H - PROGRAM SUMMARY**

Evaluate the effectiveness of the program to implement recommendations and make changes based on previous reviews.

	<b>Element</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments and/or Recommendations for Change</b>
a.	The program must show how it has implemented any recommendations from the previous review and what effect these changes had on the program. If any recommendations were not implemented the program should explain why they were not put into place.	X	This is the first program review. The review committee encourages both the administration and faculty to utilize these reviews to make appropriate changes to improve the overall program.

*Rating: S = Strength, G = Good, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)*

**Please include any other notes you feel are relevant to your review of the program:**

Notes:

## Suggested Questions for Program Review Evaluation Team Members

### *Questions for program department chair*

1. What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the program?
2. How are program goals and objectives assessed?
3. Whom does the program serve?
4. What are the special/unique features of the program?
5. What relationships exist between the program and external communities?
6. Is there an advisory committee? Is it active? What is the meeting frequency?
7. Are any major curriculum changes planned? What? When to implement?
8. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?
9. How much time and what resources are available to the faculty for professional development?
10. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various support departments?
11. Who is responsible for certifying that students have completed requirements before graduating?
12. What are the hiring criteria for adjunct faculty?
13. What type of new faculty orientation is provided to full-time and adjunct faculty?
14. How is the effectiveness of faculty determined in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship?
15. What are the program's advising procedures?



*Questions for individual faculty members*

1. How much time and what resources are available for professional development?
2. How many faculty members teach in this program?
3. Is the administration supportive of the program?
4. Does the program provide appropriate procedures for orientation of new faculty?
5. What professional organizations are you a member of? Are you active? Hold any offices?
6. What are the student learning outcomes for this program? How are they assessed?
7. How are the results of the student learning outcomes assessment used?
8. How do you go about obtaining needed equipment?
9. Is there an effective process for faculty evaluation?
10. What unique or unusual teaching methods are used in your department?
11. Are there formal relationships between the program and external communities?
12. What is the role of the faculty in curriculum revision?
13. What changes should be made to improve the program? To improve the facilities?
14. What advising opportunities are available to the students?
15. What is the role of the faculty in student advising?
16. Is there adequate secretarial and computing service available to you for preparing examinations, handouts, demonstrations, etc.?
17. How large are the classes?
18. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?



*Questions for students – groups or individual*

1. Are the faculty members in the program competent in their fields?
2. Are faculty members available to you at times convenient to you?
3. Are adequate advisement opportunities made available to you?
4. If you have laboratories, are they well equipped? Do you get hands-on experience?
5. Do instructors provide effective delivery of instruction?
6. Do you plan to continue your education after graduation? When? Where?
7. Do you plan to accept a job after graduation? When? Where?
8. What is your overall view of the program? Would you recommend it to a friend?





## Program Review Evaluation Team Report Guidelines

The Program Review Evaluation Team generally appoints one member of the team to prepare a 3-5 page narrative report, consistent with the self-study standards, addressing all self-study standards (A-H, see below), which identifies the following:

- program strengths - reference standard where appropriate
- program challenges – reference standard where appropriate
- program weaknesses - areas where the program did not meet the standards and why - reference standards
- recommendations for change - suggested changes for meeting the standards
- additional recommendations from the review team

Please be explicit about strengths, challenges, and weaknesses.

Standards:

A. Mission Statement

B. Curriculum

C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

D. Academic Advising

E. Faculty

F. Support (Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library)

G. Relationships with the External Communities

H. Results of Previous Program Reviews