In October 2006, the University Senate charged a senate subcommittee to review the program review criteria developed by SCAP (April 2006), make any recommended changes, and rank the criteria according to their importance to the review process.

This document represents the recommendations of the University Senate Subcommittee. A copy of the SCAP (April 2006) document on the program review criteria is attached.

The following criteria are presented in rank order of their relative importance to the review process. The criteria have also been weighted to reflect the subcommittee’s evaluation of the relative importance of the criteria to the program review process. The subcommittee stresses its concern regarding the difficulty of measuring some of the variables included in the program review criteria, especially with respect to issues of mission and vision. The relatively low weight assigned to this particular variable reflects this concern.

Criteria for program review include quantitative and qualitative data originating from many sources within and outside the university. These criteria can be used to review programs for a variety of reasons including review to (1) assure or enhance quality and success of program, (2) decide upon elimination of program, (3) consider program for suspension, (4) consolidate programs to eliminate redundancy in the university, and (5) reorganize programs to meet college and/or university goals. Data used to apply this review will come from many sources within and outside of the university. Sources of information may include Admissions, Student Records, Physical Plant Facilities Management, Institutional Research, Finance and Administration, University Library, Annual Reports for Faculty and Colleges, College Program Reviews, NSSE, peer reports, Accreditation Agency Reviews, Delaware Studies, and others.

1. QUALITY OF THE PROGRAM (Weight: 0.35)
Reputation or overall quality of majors/programs is an overall judgment based on several areas including current and potential faculty quality, demand for graduates, and quality of students participating in the major/program. Judgments concerning reputation by knowledgeable individuals external to the university such as colleagues at other universities, graduate admissions, and employers are also sources regarding reputation. Important elements for review in looking at reputation and quality of program could include (in no particular order):
  • national recognition of program
• recognition of faculty within program for teaching, service, and scholarly and creative work
• demand for, and placement of, graduates
• quality of students in program
• rankings by outside reviewers.

2. OVERALL DEMAND FOR THE PROGRAM (Weight: 0.3)
Program demand is considered along several dimensions: class enrollments, service for majors, non-majors, other programs and the common curriculum, and the competitive advantage created by offering the program at Loyola. Demand for programs can vary over time so it is important to review programs regularly to make sure our mix of programs is addressing the needs of potential students. When researching enrollment information, it is also important to review programs for class sizes at each class level in order to more easily separate demand by majors within the program from demand by other programs, common curriculum and other students. The extent that courses serve non-majors, as well as their own majors, should be included in the review process. It is understood that not all programs will provide service to non-majors. A final set of qualitative judgments relates to a major/program having a location and/or competitive advantage existing in Loyola compared to similar major/programs at other schools. Arriving at this judgment requires using some of all of the other criteria information. Important elements for review in looking at the overall demand for the program could include (in no particular order):
• demand for majors/programs shown in recruitment/admissions information
• actual enrollment statistics including number of majors and minors, number of degrees awarded
• national trend data
• students enrolled at each course level (e.g., 100, 200, 300, & 400 level)
• students enrolled in introductory common curriculum and advanced common curriculum
• extent to which program differentiates us from our competitors
• extent to which program enhances our reputation, and extent to which program attracts superior students.

3. CENTRALITY TO THE UNIVERSITY’S MISSION AND VISION (Weight: 0.25)
The Input from the entire campus community is important in arriving at judgments concerning centrality of programs to the university’s mission and vision. Similar to or in some cases identical with centrality to the university’s mission and vision is a judgment

---

¹ Scholarly productivity is central to the assessment of faculty quality. Publications in refereed journals and other scholarly contributions subjected to external review, grants received in national competition, individual research rewards and recognitions, participation in national events, and offices held in regional and national professional organizations are indicators of attainment. The quality of teaching in the program should be judged on the basis of tangible information to the extent possible, such as student evaluations, alumni evaluations, evaluations made by a reviewing group (for example, by an accreditation team), and special teaching awards and recognitions given to individuals in the unit. Other faculty functions may be included in the assessment of quality but must be addressed in terms of specifics. Public service also may be included in the assessment of quality.
concerning the impact that majors/programs have on our community. Again input from the campus and from the greater community should be included in reaching these judgments. Important elements for review in looking at centrality to the university’s mission, vision include (in no particular order):

- extent to which the program responds directly to the written mission, the president’s articulated vision of the university, and the Quality Enhancement Plan
- extent to which the program responds indirectly to the written mission of the university, the president’s articulated vision of the university, and the Quality Enhancement Plan.

4. REVENUES AND EXPENSES OF THE PROGRAM (Weight: 0.1)

Another major criteria category involves revenue and expenses associated with the offering of majors/programs and courses. Revenue net of financial aid (i.e., net revenue actually received) is important to review. Reviewing instructional expenses associated with faculty teaching individual courses is also important. In addition, instructional expenses related to operations, specialized equipment for the program, library collections and services, space requirements and other resource needs specific to the program must be considered. Information for these analyses may be found in quantitative data that are collected and analyzed by the university through various offices including Admissions, Student Records, University Library, Physical Plant Facilities Management, Institutional Research, and Finance and Administration. External benchmarking of Loyola’s instructional expenses compared to other similar universities is highly desirable where possible. This allows judgment on whether or not a program is in line with other comparable universities. If there are reasons for variations from norms, they will be considered in making decisions. Important elements for review in looking at revenues and expenses of the program could include (in no particular order):

- tuition revenues net of financial aid
- faculty expense for courses, specialized instructional expenses such as those listed above (e.g. operations, specialized equipment for the program, library collections and services, space requirements and other resource needs specific to the program)
- external grant funds received
- impact upon fundraising
- using validated information reported by other universities, comparing with like groups such as other Jesuit universities, peer institutions, and other private institutions.

Respectfully submitted,

University Senate Subcommittee on Program Review Criteria