

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES

Version 4.1

May 5, 2006/rev. February 19, 2007

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction, p.2

- II. Academic Program Review Questions, p. 3
 - A. Summary, p. 3
 - B. Academic Department, p. 3
 - C. Students, p. 4
 - D. Faculty. p 4
 - E. Program Quality, p. 5
 - F. Departmental Support and Resources, p. 6
 - G. Suggested/Required Supplementary Materials to the Academic Program Review Self-Study, p. 7

- III. Academic Program Review Process, p. 8
 - Appendix I: Process and Timetable, p. 9
 - Appendix II: Role of the Review Teams, p. 11
 - Appendix III. Sample Schedule and Activities for the External Review Team's Visit, p.12
 - Appendix IV. Information normally supplied by the Office of Institutional Research, p. 14
 - Appendix V: Supplemental Materials Normally Sent to External Reviewers, p. 15
 - Appendix VI: Questions for External Reviewers in Loyola College in Maryland's Academic Program Review Process, p. 15

I. Introduction

Loyola College’s Academic Program Review Guidelines arise out of the College’s mission, vision, and core values. Loyola aspires to be among the top Jesuit Catholic universities in the United States, committed to “providing undergraduate students with a liberal education that transform them, that ensures they place the highest value on the intellectual life, and that instills in them an understanding that leadership and service to the world are intimately connected.” Loyola also aspires to be “a recognized leader in graduate education, offering programs which are responsive to the needs of the professional and academic communities it services, inspiring its graduate students to leadership, and inculcating in them the knowledge that service to the larger works is a defining measure of their professional responsibilities fully understood.” From this vision stems our Core Values, particularly the constant challenge to improve our academic excellence, with a focus on the whole person.¹ From this mission and vision and these core values, our 2002 Strategic Plan concluded that all academic departments should engage in periodic internal and external review (III.A.7). A first edition of these Academic Program Review Guidelines was issued in 2002. With the help of departments and programs who have completed the review process, these Guidelines have been revised almost every year since that time.

Program review enables the College to focus attention on academic programs and to ensure that its strengths and resources are being used most productively. Most importantly, however, it affords the faculty an opportunity to reflect on their work as teachers and scholars and to engage in discussions about the future of their departments.² Thus, program review affords a department the opportunity to review and evaluate its academic program(s), to reflect on and refine its vision, to exchange ideas and best practices with others, and as a result to strengthen and improve existing programs. Additionally, ideas for new programs, or innovative solutions to old problems, may also evolve. This document outlines general procedures and criteria for program review and provides a timetable for the review process. However, the questions below sometimes overlap, and each department’s approach to program review will undoubtedly vary. For example, programs/departments that are also completing self studies for discipline accreditation may turn in very abbreviated program reviews. Departments should discuss

¹ See Loyola College’s Vision and Core Values at [Loyola.edu/Academic Affairs](http://Loyola.edu/Academic%20Affairs). The Core Values center on Academic Excellence and Focus on the Whole Person, which along with the other core values, “are bound together by the characteristic Jesuit striving after the ‘greater good,’ the ‘better thing’” (Vision and Values, p. 3 – 4). Other Core Values such as Justice, Leadership, and Discernment are also background convictions for Program Review.

² NB: While the review process most often involves departments, academic programs of various types are also required to undergo review. Such programs are reviewed in exactly the same manner as departments. Please substitute the word ‘program’ for department in such cases.

proposed variations with the Dean. If the Guidelines are to achieve their end, programs must follow “the letter” of the Guidelines with “the spirit” of achieving that academic excellence, with a focus on the whole person, as central to Loyola College’s Core Values as a Jesuit Catholic university. Academic programs should use these Guidelines not simply to collect the data necessary for program review but also to reflect on this data and then develop plans for improving the academic program.

II. Review Criteria: The Academic Program Review Self-Study

The following outline provides the structure and content for the academic program review self-study. The self-study report should be no more than 20 pages, excluding appendices. **NB:** *Please include a copy of the Academic Program Review Guidelines (including the Review Criteria outlined here) your department is using as an Appendix to your self-study.*

A. Summary

After the department has created its report please summarize it in one page, highlighting the most salient points of the self-study. Place emphasis on strengths and weaknesses, plans, new directions, and pressing needs.

B. Academic Department. The questions below deal with your department’s or program’s recent history as well as its overall goals in relation to the College’s goals.

1. Making use of the department’s records and memories as well as any longitudinal data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (Appendix III), outline the department’s history since its last external review. In what ways have its goals, its students, its faculty, its programs, and its support changed, either for better or worse, during this time period? (Departments or programs may summarize their history here – or choose to restrict its history to its overall goals, while incorporating any history of its faculty and students and programs into the appropriate sections below. If the department has a mission statement, please append it.)
2. What are the department’s overarching goals for its program(s)? How do these relate to the College’s mission, core values, and strategic plan? (Please note that specific learning aims for the program will be requested in the Section D of the Guidelines, **Program Quality**.) Evaluate how well the College Catalogues/websites (undergraduate and graduate) as well as any recruiting or admissions materials articulate the Departmental and program goals in relation to College-wide goals. What can the Department or the administration do to improve these documents?

3. Identify at least three colleges and/or universities that provide targets of academic aspiration for the department or program. Normally, one Jesuit university should be included in this group. Because a department or program that is a “target” in one respect may not be in so another, departments and programs should take account of the quality and number of students and faculty as well as program quality and departmental resources and support. In what ways does the department wish to be comparable to the target programs?

C. Students. The questions below ask for your analysis of the types of students the program aims to admit.

Some of these questions presume that the department or program has articulated its learning aims, as requested in Section E. below.

1. **Entering Undergraduate students.** Using the data provided by Institutional Research (Appendix III on numbers of students you teach in undergraduate core and major programs, applicant pool and eventual yield from this pool) and your own knowledge of your students, profile the students who have recently entered your program. What has been the quality and number of students who enter your programs, including their diversity by gender and race/ethnicity? How do you plan to change or maintain the quality and number? Do you have targets in any of these areas?
2. **Entering Graduate Students.** Using the data provided by Institutional research (undergraduate schools attended, GMAT and GRE scores, and applicant pool size and yield) and your knowledge of your students, profile the students who have recently entered your program. What has been the quality and quantity of students who enter your programs, including their diversity by gender and race/ethnicity? How do you plan to change or maintain the quality and number? Do you have targets in any of these areas?
3. **Recruitment.** What procedures are used to recruit students for undergraduate and/or graduate program(s) if applicable? How is the department involved? Is the program competing well for very good students? What changes are you planning in the department to maintain or improve student recruitment?

D. Faculty. The questions below ask for your analysis of the type of faculty the department or program recruits, the support you provide the faculty, and the evaluation of the faculty.

1. **Current Faculty.** Using the resumes of your faculty in your appendix and the information provided by the Office of Institutional Research on Faculty

- Demographics, profile and analyze strengths and weaknesses of the program's faculty in terms of teaching and research expertise as well as other characteristics such as highest degree, tenure status, years of experience, and years at Loyola, gender, and ethnicity. Include all tenure track and full-time or 4/5 time affiliate faculty members.
2. **Distribution of Faculty by Type.** Analyze the proportion of full time, part-time, tenure-track, and affiliate faculty. Is the distribution of faculty among these types an optimal distribution? If not, how should it be changed?
 3. **Evaluation.** How does the program evaluate the teaching, research, and service of its faculty for annual review, tenure, and promotion? Please attach your department's guidelines for annual review (including criteria for the standard rankings "meeting expectations, exceeding expectations, and outstanding"), and the department's guidelines for tenure and promotion as an appendix to your report. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the department's guidelines? Of the process of mid-term evaluation? And of the tenure and promotion guidelines? For example, how does the program take into account the multiple evidences of success in teaching, research, and service listed in Faculty Handbook section on Preparation for Tenure and Promotion (IV.K.)? What are the strengths and weakness of the program's faculty in terms of background qualifications, teaching, research, and diversity?
 4. **Current Faculty Development.** What special efforts does the department make to mentor junior faculty and keep them informed annually of their progress toward tenure? What special efforts do the department and College make to nurture the continuing development of tenured faculty? What further efforts does the department or program or College need to make to help tenure-track and tenured faculty improve teaching, research and service?
 5. **Affiliate Faculty.** Profile the program's affiliate faculty not included in D.1. above. How does the department hire, support, and evaluate affiliate faculty? What special efforts does the department make to nurture the continuing development of affiliate faculty?
 6. **Coverage.** Using the data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (Appendix III), summarize recent trends in enrollments and class size as well as percentage of full-time coverage by section and by student credit hour in the program's courses in the past six years. Given current resources, is this the optimal use of these faculty members? Why? If not, how should it be changed?

E. Program Quality – Student-Faculty Interaction (*complete for each program.*)³
The questions below deal with how well the program is achieving its educational or learning aims.

Note: An academic program is defined as a course of study that requires the completion of a specified number of credits from among a prescribed group of courses and leads to a degree. At the undergraduate level, an academic program is generally a major; at the graduate level, an academic program is generally the degree itself. At the undergraduate level, program review encompasses all of a department's undergraduate offerings, not just courses for the major. This is particularly true for those departments that have extensive offerings in the Core.

1. **Undergraduate Core Learning Aims.** Does your program have courses in the College's core curriculum? What are the learning aims of your contribution to the College core curriculum? How do these aims contribute to the College's undergraduate learning aims? How do the department's aims in its core courses contribute to the learning aims for the core curriculum?
2. **Program Learning Aims.** How well are the program learning aims incorporated into courses and the sample syllabi in the appendix to this Program Review? How do these aims contribute to the College's undergraduate or graduate learning aims?
3. **Program Curriculum.** How do the structure of the program's curriculum and its degree requirements meet the program's aims and the legitimate needs of the students? If not covered in A.1. above, describe any changes which have taken place over the last six years. What changes are needed in the future? Evaluate how well your curriculum contributes to the College's special initiatives (e.g., the diversity requirement, service-learning, the Alpha program, internships, *practica*).
4. **Jesuit Mission.** Evaluate how well your curriculum reflects the unique Jesuit Catholic mission of the College, and how is it different from the curricula found at secular colleges and universities?
5. **Program Assessment.** How well is the program achieving its learning aims? Include "multiple means of assessment"⁴ to support an answer to this question for core, major, and graduate programs. If the program contributes to the undergraduate core, how well is it achieving the appropriate aims of the core?

³ As explained in the Note, a department that teaches only undergraduates and offers only one major should replace the word "program" with "major" or "department," as appropriate, throughout this section.

⁴ See Middle States Commission on Higher Education, Student Learning Assessment. Options and Resources (MSCHE, 2003), p. 41. The vocabulary and assessment strategies may differ in programs with different accrediting agencies.

6. **Program Plans for Improvement.** How does the program use what it learns from prospective, current, and graduated students to improve its program? What does the program do and plan to do to improve how well it achieves its learning aims? Include a calendar for ongoing assessment and continuous improvement of your program.
7. **Faculty-Student Interaction.** What are the opportunities for faculty-student interaction and for interaction and dialogue related to the program among students in addition to that which occurs in the classroom?
8. **Advising.** How are the students in the program advised? How is effectiveness of advising measured? How are these results being used for improvement? How many of your faculty are involved in core advising?
9. **Students Completing the Program.** Using the data provided by Institutional Research (Appendix III), what do the ongoing accomplishments of students tell us about how well the program is achieving its aims?
10. **Response to Accreditation Reports.** Describe improvement efforts in response to the most recent accreditation report (if applicable) and the response from the VPAA and the Dean to your last Program Review (if applicable).
11. **Scheduling of Classes.** Please analyze whether your course schedule (fall, spring and summer sessions) is optimal in using hours per day and every week day to make class times available to students using classroom space.

F. Departmental Support and Resources. The questions below ask for your analysis of the support your program receives from the College.

1. **Support Staff.** Describe and evaluate the department's current level and type of technical and office support staff. (Please do not evaluate individuals in your response that support the program)
2. **Support Services.** Describe and evaluate the services the support the program outside of the department.
3. **Facilities and Equipment.** Describe and evaluate the department's facilities, equipment and other support services that affect the department's teaching, research, and service programs. What future needs do you envision? Why?
4. **Grants.** What external grants have the program or its faculty received over the past six years? What are future opportunities and plans to improve?

G. Supplementary Materials to the Academic Program Review Self-Study

1. Information contained in Appendix IV of these Guidelines
2. The final report from the most recent accreditation visit (if applicable) and the final response letter from the VPAA and Dean from the most recent Academic Program Review.
3. CVs of all full-time faculty members
4. Departmental faculty annual evaluation criteria
5. Departmental tenure and promotion criteria
6. Selected course syllabi
7. Course schedules for the last three years.
8. Departmental publications or brochures
9. Information about programs at benchmark institutions
10. A copy of the Loyola Academic Program Review Guidelines used in the creation of the self-study.

III. Academic Program Review Process. Briefly describe the process by which the program completed the review.

- Who are the main authors of the self-study?
- How long did the review take?
- How did the department divide the work?
- How many meetings did the whole department or a subset of the department have to write the self-study?

The later letter from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Dean will ask your recommended changes to the process, once the process is complete. But you are also free to mention any proposed changes to date here.

APPENDIX I: Process and Time Table Timetable

The timetable below is intended as a guide to help those involved in the program review process. While not all departments may be able to meet suggested deadlines, it is highly recommended that the timetable be followed as closely as possible. Doing so will ensure that the review process will go more smoothly and help others involved in the review to stay abreast of your progress. Should you find that you are unable to meet deadlines or that you are having other problems meeting the timetable, please notify your dean so that adjustments can be made. Each program review is unique, and it is not unusual for delays of various kinds to occur.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TIMETABLE*		
April	The VPAA notifies the Department that the review will take place the next academic year, giving the Chair the timetable for the review and other important information as well as asking the Chair to set up a meeting with the Dean and the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs before the end of the school year. The Chair meets with the Department to sketch plans for completing the Program Review, including discussing potential internal and external reviewers. (Please see Appendix II: The Role of Review Teams , and Appendix III: Sample Schedule and Activities for the External Review Team's Visit). NB. In October the Assistant VPAA notifies IR of the impending review and informs IR that data must be submitted to that department by July 1. (Please see Appendix IV: Information Normally Supplied by the Office of Institutional Research).	
September	The Dean meets with the Department Chair and, in the case where the Chair is not leading the review, the person who has been assigned this task, and the Assistant VPAA to review the timetable, answer questions, discuss the Department plan for coordinating the drafting of the various sections of the report with department faculty, as well as discuss potential internal and external review teams. The Assistant VPAA and Dean select internal review team members shortly after the end of	

	<p>this meeting: the external review team is selected in September (see below). At this time the Chair (and faculty member leading the review, if appropriate), as well as the Assistant Dean, will meet with the Departmental Administrative Assistant and discuss the program review timetable and other matters of importance related to the program review, particularly the planning of the visit of the external review team.</p>
September, October, November	<p>The Dean's office contacts possible internal review team members; once they accept orally, the Dean writes them a letter reviewing their responsibilities and outlining the Department calendar. The Chair contacts possible external review team members, asking them for resumes and any other pertinent supporting materials. These materials are forwarded to the Dean and the Assistant VPAA.</p>
September	<p>The Chair arranges another meeting with the Dean and Assistant VPAA to give a progress report on the self-study, to discuss candidates for the external review team, and establish tentative dates for campus visits for the external review team.</p>
October 1	<p>The external review team (normally two in number) is selected by the Dean after consultation with the VPAA and the Chair. The Dean sends a formal letter to members of the external review team (copied to the Chair) outlining their duties, provides them supplementary materials (Please see Appendix V: Supplemental Materials Normally Sent to External Reviewers), and asks for their Social Security numbers. The Chair begins to arrange the dates for the external review team visits; see Appendix III for the individual and groups who must be scheduled.</p>
January 15	<p>The Department Chair (or faculty member leading the self-study) completes a draft of the self-study and forwards it to the internal review team and the Assistant VPAA.</p>
December 15	<p>The Chair finalizes dates and appointments for the external review team visit in consultation with the Office of the VPAA and the Dean.</p>
January 10	<p>The Assistant VPAA calls a meeting with the internal reviewers to discuss the self-study draft.</p>
January 15	<p>The internal review team responds to the draft of the self study in writing and meets with key members of the departmental Program Review team. The Department revises the Self Study as needed.</p>
February 15	<p>The department sends its Self Study and the internal review team's written summary to the VPAA (two copies), Dean, and external reviewers.</p>
March -April	<p>As arranged by the Chair and administrative assistant, and in collaboration with the Office of Academic Affairs, the</p>

	external review team visits campus, meets with the department, Dean, VPAA, students, and other members of the college community whose work relates to the department.	
May 1	The external review team sends an electronic copy of their report (including answers to the questions found in Appendix VI of these guidelines) to the Chair, who forwards it to the Dean and VPAA. The office of the VPAA arranges for payment of the honorarium to external readers.	
June 1	The VPAA and Dean write a final memo to the department and arrange a meeting with the Chair to discuss how the Department can incorporate the results of the Program Review into its yearly plans.	
June	The Department writes an assessment of the Program Review process for the Dean. The Department also begins planning its future in the light of their Program Review and the VPAA/Dean letter, incorporating follow-up into the Department's annual report.	
<p><i>*Ideally, all the tasks assigned for a particular month would be completed in that period. However, this calendar can be adjusted if Department, Dean, and VPAA agree.</i></p>		

APPENDIX II: Role of the Review Teams

Internal peer review of program reviews is essential for building an academic community that teaches and learns from one another on the many issues raised by program review. The role of the internal review team and the external reviewers is similar: to help the department or program think about its current strengths and challenges with respect to the major areas of the Program Review Guidelines so that the department can set priorities for the future. These areas include the College's mission, vision, educational aims, and values statements as well as the strategic plan as they relate to the department. Good reviews balance an appreciation of strengths with a recognition of challenges. The department, in conversation with the offices of the appropriate dean and the VPAA, determine what to value most highly in the reports of internal (or external) reviewers.

The role of the internal review team (usually made up of two senior faculty members, one from an allied department and one from a different division) is to provide a university-wide perspective external to the department's. One of the team's functions is to assist the program in the latter's preparation of its self-study. As such, the internal review team should read an early draft of the self-study and provide the program with suggestions for improvement.

After reading the self-study, the internal team will meet with appropriate members of the department⁵ to discuss the self-study, ask any questions that are pertinent to the review, and share initial impressions. The team will hold follow-up meetings with the department

⁵ In the case when the Program Review is limited to one program within a department, the review team may meet with the Program Director and other faculty who teach in the program.

or subsets of it, as the team deems appropriate. In its report, which will be shared with the department and the external consultants, the internal review team will comment on the department's self-study and will include any recommendations it may have. The review team will meet with the external review team when the latter visit campus.

The external review team (normally two in number) is selected by the Dean after consultation with the VPAA and the Chair. Members of the external review team should be nationally recognized experts in the program under consideration, and also have some experience in the administration and (ideally) program review or consultation for similar programs. Department members should disclose to each other, the Dean, and the VPAA any close personal or professional relations with proposed reviewers. Selecting external reviewers who have a close personal connection to faculty in the program under review is discouraged. Before the composition of the external review team is finalized (normally in September of the year of review) CVs of each review team member should be forwarded to the Dean and VPAA.

Although their written report can take whatever shape they may wish, the external review team will be asked to include in their report answers to a list of questions based on the Academic Program Review guidelines. A copy of these questions is included as APPENDIX VI in these guidelines.

APPENDIX III: Sample Schedule and Activities for the External Review Team's Visit

Chairs should begin the scheduling process as early as possible after the external review team is select on or about October 1. The appointments with the VPAA and Dean and as many others as possible should be made by the December 15 prior to the visit.

Day 1: Mid-afternoon

- Initial meeting of the external review team (45 minutes)
The reviewers will meet, become acquainted with one another, and share their initial impressions of the self-study.
- Initial meeting with the dean and other administrators, as appropriate (45 minutes)
The purpose of this meeting is to welcome the reviewers, review the purpose of the review as needed, and respond to any questions the reviewers might have about the College as a whole.
- Tour of facilities (1 hour)
The tour should include a general tour of campus as well as departmental space. The latter may include department offices, seminar room, laboratories, classrooms frequently used by the department, and offices of other departments or support services with which the department interacts.

Day 1: Evening

- Dinner with members of the department
This informal meeting should be large enough to include multiple perspectives but small enough so that genuine collegial exchange can take place about the past

, present and future of the department or program. The reviewers may want to provide department members with a short list of structured questions for the interviews on the following day.

Day 2: Morning and Early Afternoon (until approximately 2 PM)

- Individual/group interviews with departmental faculty members (30 - 45 minutes each)

Depending on the size of the department and time constraints, the reviewers may meet with department members individually or in small groups. Depending on their area(s) of expertise, the reviewers may conduct these interviews together or individually.
- Group interview with students (1 hour)

This might be scheduled as a breakfast or lunch meeting.
- Interview with internal review team (30 - 45 minutes)
- Interviews with other relevant campus representatives (20 minutes to 1 hour)

Such interviews might include meetings with faculty from related departments.
- Meeting with the department chair (30 - 45 minutes)

Day 2: Mid to Late Afternoon (approximately 2 - 5 PM)

- Development of the preliminary oral report (1 hour)

The reviewers will meet to collect their thoughts, discuss their conclusions, and develop a preliminary oral report.
- Final meeting with the department (1 hour)

The reviewers will provide the department with a preliminary report of the major findings from the review. Time permitting, the department can discuss these findings. The purpose of this meeting is not to adjudicate these findings but to help assure that any findings are based on the best information available.
- Final meeting with the dean and other administrators, as appropriate (30 minutes - 1 hour)

The reviewers will provide a preliminary report of the major findings.

After the Visit: Within three weeks of their visit the external reviewers will submit their written report.

APPENDIX IV: Information Normally Supplied by the Office of Institutional Research

The basic information and data required for the department self-study will be provided by the appropriate College and divisional offices. In particular, the offices of the VPAA and the appropriate dean, through the Office of Institutional Research, will furnish to the department a packet of information that includes the following data, as applicable to the program. Departments should discuss with the Dean how to respond to questions if some of this data is not readily available.

Data	Self-Study Question(s)
Undergraduate Major Advising Survey Results	E.8
Current Faculty Demographics (Gender, Race/Ethnicity, FT/PT, Highest Degree, Rank, Tenure Status, Tenure Year, Time at Loyola)	D.1
Student Headcounts by Gender and Race/Ethnicity	C.1
Degrees (Major and Minor) and Certificates Granted by Gender and Race/Ethnicity	C.1
For Undergraduate Programs: Average SAT Scores of Undergraduate Majors and Minors	C.1
For Graduate Programs: Undergraduate Schools Attended; Undergraduate Grades; GMAT and GRE Scores	C.2
For Graduate Programs: Applicant Pool Size and Yield	C.2
Undergraduate Degree Recipients Attaining Phi Beta Kappa, Beta Gamma Sigma, and/or Latin Honors at Graduation	C.1
Summary Statistics from Career Development and Placement's "Annual Follow-up Report" for Undergraduate Majors	C.1
Historical List of FT/PT Faculty FTEs	D.1
FT/PT Faculty Coverage of Course Sections	D.6
Course Sections, Student Enrollments, Student Credit Hours, and Average Course Size by Location and Course Level	D.6

Whenever possible, this data will cover a 6-year time period.⁶ For comparative purposes of undergraduate programs, the data packet also will include 6-year summary data for the College as a whole and for the division in which the department is located.

⁶ In the pilot phase it may not be possible to provide six years of data for all indicators.

APPENDIX V: Supplemental Materials Normally Sent to External Reviewers

The Dean's Office normally will supply external reviewers with the following materials:

Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs
 The Viewbook
 Brochures of the Program and other Publicity
 Loyola College Vision and Values Statement

APPENDIX VI: Questions for External Reviewers in Loyola College in Maryland's Academic Program Review Process

Although the written report can take whatever shape they may wish, external reviewers are asked to include in their report answers to the questions below. The questions follow the basic format of the Self Study Report Guidelines.

Please note: while the review process most often involves departments, academic programs of various types are also required to undergo review. Please substitute the word 'program' for department in such cases.

I. Summary [Self Study Section A]

1. Evaluate the department's summary of their self-study. Comment on the department's strengths and weaknesses, plans, new directions, and pressing needs.

II. Academic Department [Self Study Section B]

1. How does the department compare with others of similar institutions, including those selected as targets of aspiration by the department? [B.3]

2. Does the department have appropriate goals and aspirations? Do they match up with the College's mission, core values, and strategic plan? [B.2]

III. Students [Self Study Section C]

1. Is the number of majors reasonable for Loyola? Comment also on the diversity of students (by gender and race/ethnicity). What is your opinion of the department's plan to change or maintain the quality and number of majors? [C.1., C.2, C.3]

2. Does the department have a realistic vision of what needs to be done to recruit and retain the best students? [C.3]

IV. Faculty [Self Study Section D]

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current faculty members? [D.1]
2. Is the current system of faculty evaluation (teaching, research, and service), and the criteria for promotion and tenure appropriately clear and rigorous? If not, what changes would you suggest? [D.3]
3. How well are the department and College supporting faculty members? If more support is needed, what suggestions would you make? [D.4]
4. How well are the department and College supporting its affiliate faculty members? If more support is needed, what suggestions would you make? [D.5]

V. Program Quality [Self Study Section E]

1. If the department has courses in the undergraduate core curriculum, assess the program's learning aims. Do these aims contribute to the College's undergraduate learning aims? Do the department's aims in its core courses contribute to the learning aims for the core curriculum? [E.1]
2. Is the department's curriculum rigorous and up to date? Does it meet the program's learning aims and the legitimate needs of the students, given the mission of Loyola? [E.1, E.3]
3. Are the department's curriculum and learning aims ambitious and realistic? How do they fit into the College learning aims and special initiatives (e.g., the diversity requirement, service-learning, the Alpha Program, internships, *practica*)? [E.1, E.3]
4. How well does the department's program reflect the Jesuit Catholic mission of the College? [E.4]
5. Does the department have an adequate system to assess its own programs? How well is it using multiple means of assessment to improve its core, major, and graduate programs? [E.5]
6. Does the department have reasonable plans for improvement? Is the department using assessment results to propel improvement? What is the likelihood of the department realizing its plans for improvement? What role (if applicable) will recent accreditation reports have in this process? [E.6]
7. How well is the department doing in the areas of faculty-student interaction and advising? [E.7]

VI. Departmental Support and Resources [Self Study Section F]

1. Does the department have adequate support staff and support services? [F.1, F.2]
2. Are facilities and equipment needs being met? If not, what improvements need to be made? [F.3]