

Extended Commentary:
**Balancing Curricular Outcomes with Institutional Effectiveness: an Empirical Study of
Academic Program Review**

Academic Program Review (APR) is a regular part of the academic landscape, designed to improve the quality of a curriculum.¹ Academic Program Review emerged from the accreditation movement of the 1950s when the Department of Education sought to regulate higher education with the passing of the GI Bill. But it wasn't until the 1980s and 1990s that program review became a part of everyday language due, in large part, to the emergence of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL),² highlighted in many places, most notably in *Teaching Sociology*, one of the preeminent scholarly journals on pedagogy.

One of the messages in pedagogy journals in general and *Teaching Sociology* in particular was that one of the best ways to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and learning was to develop a culture of assessment, best measured by academic program review.³ Despite this, academic program review has met resistance among faculty who view this as administrative intrusion into their work and infringing upon academic freedom.⁴ There is no question that the occasional top-down initiative may be best described in these terms, but this would be an unfortunate situation since accrediting agencies have made it clear that successful accreditation hinges on developing a culture of assessment. And there is no better way to demonstrate an ongoing effort than periodic academic program reviews.

The purpose of this paper is to encourage the reader to embrace academic program review and to see its benefits. This paper presents data from client departments that provide evidence that program review can result in a successful outcome.

How To

APR is typically a two-part process. There is a program self-study conducted by a member of the program, often an individual in a leadership position, like the chairperson or program director. They review data on the students (majors and minors), curriculum, course offerings, staff, resources, and space. The goal is to describe and reflect on the identity of the program, its strengths and shortcomings, and to establish future goals for continuous improvement.

The second part of a typical APR is an external review by a disciplinary colleague from a similar institution. This person reads the self-study and other program material (e.g., syllabi, course offering schedules, other department documents) and then often visits campus to spend some time observing the program in person, and meeting with the various stakeholders, faculty, students, administrators, and often staff. Following the campus visit, the external reviewer prepares a written report with their analysis of the program that includes strengths and suggestions for areas of improvement. An example of a typical report can be found in an earlier paper that presents a series of recommendations that often emerge from a site visit.⁵ While every program review is different, some items emerge repeatedly that follow best practices and national standards.⁶ In addition, there are many recent papers from popular academic publications that support and encourage APR and provide advice on best practices.⁷

The lead author is a member of the American Sociological Association's Program Reviewers and Consultants, a group that goes through mandatory training as a requirement for membership.⁸ He has been a member of this group and involved with academic program review for over twenty years. During that time, he has served as an external reviewer for over fifty-five academic units, most in sociology, a few joint departments with criminology, criminal justice,

anthropology, and a few with social work. He is also trained as a certification reviewer for the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.⁹

This paper represents an exploratory study of the experiences of individuals who served as the lead on their department's program review. More specifically, it looks at how these programs utilized the recommendations made by the lead author in the final APR report delivered at the conclusion of the review. By summarizing experiences with program review from a small sample of respondents, we hope to provide programs embarking on curriculum review with a formula for how to prepare for a productive process, that will enhance the likelihood of a successful outcome.¹⁰

Data and Methods

Respondents were individuals who had invited the first author to serve as an external reviewer as part of a periodic program review (N=21) over the past twenty years. The sample includes institutions that offer graduate programs (7) but not necessarily in sociology, and institutions that offer only undergraduate programs (14). However, the data only refer to sociology curricula at the bachelor's level. Six of the seven institutions that offered graduate degrees were public; one was private. Twelve of the fourteen institutions that offered only bachelors' degrees were private; two were public.

The sociology programs resided either in stand-alone departments (five) or were a part of a multiple-discipline department (16). Of those that shared an institutional home, six were paired with Anthropology, three were with Criminology, two were with Criminal Justice, and two were with Social Work. One program was paired with both Anthropology and Social Work. One program was part of a Department of Social Sciences and one was part of a Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Potential respondents were sent an email inviting them to participate in the study in May, 2023. They were sent follow-up emails in July, 2023. A final email was sent in August, 2023 yielding the final sample. Seven respondents completed the survey (response rate: 33.3 percent). They were emailed a link to a google form that consisted of 36 questions linked to recommendations made in the final report. The questionnaire sought to follow up on which steps had been completed and if not, why not.

The full list of questions is included as Appendix A. Responses were analyzed by hand and presented in the next section. The design was approved by the (de-identified) Institutional Review Board (IRB2023-03A).

Results

What follows is a summary of the responses to each of the questions in the order in which they appeared in the survey.

Mission Statements

A Mission Statement is now commonplace among colleges and universities.¹¹ Mission Statements are a public commitment and often appear on the institution's webpage. Mission statements identify the values and operating principles of an institution that provide a philosophical foundation from which more specific goals are set, like in the formation of strategic plans and assessment measures. Most, but not all academic units also have them, e.g., Schools or Divisions of Arts and Sciences, but not all departments or programs do. All respondents in this sample indicated that they had Mission Statements and many of them took the program review as an opportunity to revisit it. Two of the respondents indicated the importance of having a mission statement that not only reflected program level goals and the student population but also the larger university mission and strategic plan.

Vision Statements

Vision Statements are less common than Mission Statements.¹² They are aspirational, that is, what a department hopes to be rather than what they currently are (their Mission Statement). Thus, Vision Statements encourage reflection and improvement and direct programs towards attainable outcomes. Universities often have a list of aspirational institutions that have been identified beyond the department and program level (e.g., upper administration). The criteria used to create these lists usually focus on characteristics like enrollment, student demographics (SES, gender, race and ethnicity), student finances and aid, retention and graduation rates, endowment, number of FTE, and Carnegie classification.

All but two respondents indicated that they had a Vision Statement. One respondent said that the program review was an opportunity to create one. A second respondent said that they did not create a Vision Statement but would consider doing so in the future. Similar to the mission statement responses, two of the respondents indicated that due to larger institutional changes, they were either currently revisiting it to verify alignment, or would be doing so in the near future. As one respondent noted, even though they had a recently created vision statement, this prompt in the program review process was useful for them to reflect on their shared vision and goals as a program.

Identity Statements

Identity Statements are even less common than Mission or Vision Statements.¹³ The first author created the task of constructing Identity Statements as a step to help units with the next step (a zero-based curriculum review). Since no department—even in large institutions—can cover the entirety of a discipline, an Identity Statement articulates what are the strengths and interests of the faculty in both their research and the courses they teach.

Not surprisingly, only one of the respondents indicated that their unit had an Identity Statement and of those who responded to the follow-up question, they found this step of the exercise to be helpful in determining what their curriculum should look like and how to differentiate between programs housed in peer institutions. Clearly the findings here indicate that identity statements may not be something that programs think about when reviewing their curriculum. Nonetheless they can be useful.

Curricular Learning Objectives

Curricular learning objectives are a central part of an assessment plan.¹⁴ You can't assess the effectiveness of a curriculum without learning objectives. All respondents except for one indicated they had curricular learning objectives. Three respondents indicated they had revisited them because of the program review process and two others had already been prompted to recently revisit them as part of college level processes. One respondent indicated that their department did not, but they created them. This also satisfied a mandate from their upper administration.

Zero-based Curriculum Exercise

A zero-based curriculum exercise is an activity where the faculty build the curriculum from the ground up.¹⁵ In the case of Sociology, one begins with the standard core courses: an Introductory course, research methods, statistics or data analysis, theory, and a capstone course. Electives should reflect the interests and strengths of the faculty. When the faculty craft an Identity Statement, this will guide the decisions for which electives to include. The point is not to mandate any particular set of electives, but to ensure that each elective is an intentional part of the overall curriculum.

Not every respondent answered this question. One said they did complete a zero-sum curriculum exercise and that it confirmed that the existing curriculum was appropriate, and

another indicated they completed this activity in preparation for the program review. One respondent reported that they did not perform this activity.

Syllabi and Student Learning Objectives

The lead author reviews the syllabi before arriving on campus to see if every syllabus contains student learning objectives (SLOs) that reflect the specific goals of the course and connect back to the larger curricular objectives. One respondent said that SLOs were already on every syllabus. Three respondents reported that not every syllabus had SLOs and this recommendation prompted them to do so.

To ensure consistency in content, the lead author also recommends that every course with multiple sections have the same SLOs, for example with an introductory course that may be taught by a series of full time and adjunct faculty.¹⁶ Two respondents indicated that syllabi for multi-section courses had standardized SLOs. Two respondents said that this was not the case, but the recommendation prompted them to do so. And another respondent said they had standardized SLOs and used this opportunity to revisit and review them.

Assessment

Any accredited institution of higher education in the US must show efforts at assessment and this typically means that each unit offering a curriculum must have its own assessment plan.¹⁷ Every respondent in this sample had an assessment plan. Three respondents indicated that the program review prompted them to revisit their assessment plan. Three respondents indicated that they did not review their assessment plan.

Outcomes

Program reviewers and consultants trained by the American Sociological Association make clear that their role as external reviewers is not to advocate for additional resources on

behalf of the department.¹⁸ Otherwise, every report would start with a request for more faculty lines. Instead, any gaps in the department's curriculum should be the primary focus and by implication, their ability to deliver that curriculum should be implied. Nonetheless, whenever a program review results in additional resources, that is a win for all involved.

Those who responded to this question reported gaining additional resources, including:

- More research start-up funds for new hires
- One or more additional faculty lines
- An increase in the discretionary budget

While it would be presumptuous to assume that these were directly the result of the program review, clearly the entire process helped to put the needs of the unit into perspective, such that the administration saw it appropriate to grant additional resources. Additionally, the majority of the additional resources were connected to faculty positions that were needed to deliver the curriculum. One respondent expressed disappointment that the review did not highlight the structural challenges and lack of resources.

Stakeholder Reflections

The process of program evaluation involves multiple groups, including faculty, chairs, administrators, and sometimes students. While some of these groups like faculty have a more direct role in the formation, revision, and delivery of the curriculum, the response of chairs and program directors and other administrators to the program evaluation outcomes is pivotal. Indeed, evaluating curriculum and programs is a responsibility that often falls more on the shoulders of administrators, despite their distance from the day-to-day delivery of the curriculum. A chair navigates a more complex role as a front-line manager who serves as a representative and advocate for the faculty while simultaneously assisting upper administration to carry out policy and institutional goals that need to align with the curriculum. And as

mentioned previously, some faculty regard program review as an additional task on top of their already overextended responsibilities¹⁹ but the involvement of faculty in the program review process is crucial to its success.²⁰

All respondents indicated that their chairs were enthusiastic about the program review and four respondents said the same of their administration, while two others indicated mixed or unknown impressions. At the faculty level, the responses varied. Two indicated an enthusiastic response from faculty, two revealed mixed responses, one was unsure how faculty felt, and one said faculty were not enthusiastic.

The institutional location of these groups plays an important role in final reflections on the value of the program review process. The majority of the respondents and point-persons for the program review were department chairs (two were faculty members). Indeed, there is a need for more attention in the research literature on the chair and faculty perspectives of program review and whether it serves as an effective tool for program improvement at the faculty and student levels.²¹

All respondents found something beneficial from the process. Two respondents discussed the importance of larger disciplinary support from the American Sociological Association (ASA) in the form of demonstrating alignment with ASA guidelines on Sociology curriculum, and confirmation of the importance and value that the curriculum delivers to students. Respondents also referred positively to some of the activities suggested during the review like the zero-based curriculum exercise and curriculum mapping. Additionally, they pointed to what the reviewer provided in terms of examining the curriculum and presenting recommendations that would address program needs.

When asked about the least useful parts of the program review process, two respondents provided suggestions. One indicated more specific strategies on how to recruit additional Sociology majors would have been helpful. And another pointed to an absence of more vigorous argumentation about staffing and structural problems.

Discussion

Academic program review is an institutionalized part of most institutions of higher learning.²² While there may be tension between stakeholders on definitions of success and the methods for verifying that academic programs are achieving their outcomes,²³ there is usually agreement on the importance of these programs delivering vital knowledge and skills to their students, preparing students for career and post-graduate opportunities, and contributing towards the success of the larger institution.

The results in this study indicate that the majority of the respondents were already following the typical formula for academic program success that the lead author identifies in his extensive history as an external reviewer. All respondent programs had a mission statement and the majority had a vision statement, curricular learning objectives, and assessment plans. While standardized student learning objectives on syllabi was mixed in the sample, comments indicated that respondents viewed this as a positive suggestion. Less common were the identity statement and zero-based curriculum exercise, with only one program having completed each of those things. We believe combining these two things into best practices for the APR process will serve as an useful tool for programs as they balance the teaching and research identities of their faculty, program resources, and disciplinary standards, with the curriculum they seek to deliver to their students.

Client Perspective on Academic Program Review

To provide a firsthand client perspective and offer some additional context for the results of this study, the second author on this manuscript was the point-person and chair during a program review that the first author completed (with another colleague) at her institution. While their program already had some of the above elements in place (mission statement, standardized SLOs on all syllabi, assessment plan, etc.), the opportunity and institutional mandate to do a very intentional review of the curriculum was valuable. Without that mandate and summer funding from the Dean to write the self-study, this task was something that could have easily been relegated to complete at a later point in time. Having structured and compensated time to stop and carefully review the curriculum was vital to both affirming areas of strength and identifying areas in need of development. And the opportunity to have structured consultation time with Sociology colleagues at similar institutions (small liberal arts institutions with Catholic missions) was simply invaluable. Programs in small institutions do not have as many disciplinary colleagues and often carry heavy teaching and university service loads that limit their time and opportunities to build disciplinary networks. In short, they often work in isolation from the larger discipline. The combination of an internal self-study and external review by disciplinary peers along with compensated time for the internal self-study, are important pieces in the program review process.²⁴

The momentum of the program review led to a retreat a few months later where the faculty reviewed and refined some of the SLOs, course descriptions, examined course pre-requisites, and completed the zero-based curriculum exercise. Additionally, the faculty began to work on their relationship and connection to the Marketing office on campus. The focus here was to identify ways to promote the major with an eye towards student recruitment. One tangible

outcome from these efforts was a website feature on a Sociology major, completed by the Marketing office. Next, connections were made in meetings with the Career Services office on campus to learn more about useful resources for Sociology majors. An important recommendation to verify regular classroom observations for full time and contingent faculty was also implemented.

On the other hand, there were some tasks the program (two FTE) did not have the bandwidth to complete. Work began but was not completed on a Sociology brochure, and Identity and Vision statements were never written. Gathering Sociology majors together to explore interest in forming a Sociology Student Club was not pursued. Indeed, the small number of faculty combined with high university level service expectations and administrative responsibilities limited what could be accomplished from the program review recommendations.

Finally, based on one of the program review recommendations, the Dean provided funding for an ASA Department Affiliate membership that has continued as a valuable annual resource for the Sociology program. In conclusion, the program review gave the faculty useful recommendations to strengthen the curriculum and student outcomes. It was helpful to have a variety of recommendations to choose from so they could select ones that could be accomplished within the structural constraints of the program and faculty.

Sociological Observations

The results of this research combined with the first-hand client perspective reveal some important sociological observations. The first is the tension between reflecting the larger institution's direction and who the program/department is at a disciplinary and staffing level. The discipline of Sociology is very familiar with the messiness of social life and the tensions and contradictions that exist in society as well as in academic institutions.²⁵ Respondent commentary

from a number of the open-ended prompts (mission, vision, identity) indicated that they were either revising these statements to reflect institutional mandates or waiting on larger institutional changes to verify alignment. Indeed, a common institutional trend is to connect program review to university strategic planning.²⁶ Yet, on other prompts (curricular and student learning objectives), there was no mention of aligning with larger institutional aims. This brings up the question of how much of a microcosm of the larger institution should (and can) programs be? Is it possible to find a middle ground where any program can align with the larger institution and still remain true to disciplinary standards and best practices?

The second observation is the structural location of programs in the larger institution. A key piece of knowledge that students learn in their Introductory Sociology course is the way in which social structure constrains individuals in their decision making and actions.²⁷ This dynamic is also reflected in the location of academic programs in the larger institutional structure. Programs have to navigate this institutional location where they are often dependent on support from higher levels in the institution. Perhaps one exception would be accredited programs that have required support and resources due to accreditation requirements. However, sociology does not fall into this category.

This study also revealed frustration over structural challenges (staffing, resources, etc.) and the tenuous location of programs in the larger institution. At times, this position impacts their ability to pursue certain program goals and disciplinary directions, that arise in the academic program review process. Additionally, larger changes in higher education will continue to compel institutions to innovate and move in new directions while demonstrating institutional effectiveness to internal and external groups. These forces will be felt at every level of the

institution, even down to the teaching and learning spheres and curricular level that academic program review focuses on.

Conclusion

As long as institutions hope to maintain their accreditation, program review will remain a part of the academic landscape.²⁸ And as institutions adjust to external forces impacting higher education (Covid-19, budget cuts, enrollment decline, demographic cliff, changing racial and ethnic composition of the student population, labor market changes), the importance of fit with an institution's direction and the populations it educates becomes increasingly important.²⁹ Thus, how institutions handle program evaluation may differ. Instead of a focus on alignment with the larger academic discipline, more of an emphasis may be placed on how programs reflect institutional identity and goals, exhibit sustainability, and offer new areas of growth.³⁰ Moving in this direction means institutions may shift away from the common-place practice of hiring external consultants located in the academic disciplines to instead using internal staff, often from outside the discipline. This can also serve as a cost-saving measure for the institution.

The results of this study suggest a looming dilemma for educational institutions. They support the value of academic program review, reveal the usefulness of disciplinary best practices in curriculum, and the importance of an external perspective on the program and curriculum from a disciplinary peer. How institutions balance these elements with larger trends in educational institutions³¹ and external pressures³² to demonstrate institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement, remains to be seen.

Our review of the literature suggests that there are relatively few studies on this topic since it is so difficult to obtain representative data. As higher education continues to evolve, often driven by budget considerations rather than curricular ones, more research needs to be done

as studies like these will become even more important in making evidence-based decisions that are in the best interests of our students.

Appendix: Questionnaire

My first recommendation is usually to create or revisit your program's Mission Statement. If you did not have a Mission Statement, did you create one after the program review? If you already had a Mission Statement, did you revisit it after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

My second recommendation is usually to create or revisit your program's Vision Statement. If you did not have a Vision Statement, did you create one after the program review? If you already had a Vision Statement, did you revisit it after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

My third recommendation is usually to create or revisit your program's Identity Statement. If you did not have an Identity Statement, did you create one after the program review? If you already had an Identity Statement, did you revisit it after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

I often recommend creating or revisiting the curricular Student Learning Objectives. Did you create or revisit your SLOs after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

I often recommend conducting a zero-based curriculum exercise. Did you conduct a zero-based curriculum exercise after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

I often recommend that the faculty put student learning objectives prominently on the syllabi for every course. Did you get all faculty to put SLOs on every syllabus after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

I often recommend that faculty standardize the student learning objectives on syllabi for courses that have multiple sections. Did your faculty standardize the SLOs on syllabi for courses that have multiple sections after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

I often recommend that the faculty create or revisit their assessment plan. Did your faculty create or revisit the assessment plan after the program review?

If you did, any comments? If not, why not?

While as ASA program reviewers, we never promise to be able to help bring more resources to a unit (department/program) such as additional faculty lines or an increase in the discretionary budget, nonetheless, did that happen after the program review?

If yes, what additional resources did the unit (department/program) receive? If not, what resources were you expecting/hoping for that you did not receive?

If you think the program review played a role, how? If you think it did not, why not?

Who was the point-person for the program review?

Who took care of the logistics, e.g., lodging, meals, setting up the agenda, etc.?

Was the chair enthusiastic about the program review?

Was the chair able to use the program review to generate additional resources?

If yes, in what way was the chair able to use the program review to generate additional resources?

Were faculty members enthusiastic about the program review?

Was the unit (department/program) able to use the program review to generate additional resources?

If yes, in what way was the unit (department/program) able to use the program review to generate additional resources?

Was the administration enthusiastic about the program review?

Was the administration able to use the program review to generate additional resources?

If yes, in what way did an administrator play a role in generating additional resources?

Were there other factors not mentioned here that played a role in determining whether or not you received additional resources and support from the institution?

What aspects of the program review were most useful or valuable?

What aspects of the program review were least useful or valuable?

Why did you select me?

How can I improve my service as a program reviewer?

ENDNOTES

¹ Jane Brown, "The Changing Profession: External Reviews," *PMLA* vol. 127 (2012), no. 4: 983-6.

² Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990) & Charles Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene Maeroff. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).

³ Cf <file:///Users/akdmacbookpro/Downloads/20230701-Standards-for-Accreditation-and-Requirements-of-Affiliation-14-edition.pdf>, retrieved 11/19/23.

⁴ Lynne Bowker, "Language and Quality Assurance: A Case Study Highlighting the Effects of Power, Resistance, and Countertactics in Academic Program Reviews," *TTR: Translation and Power: Countertactics*, vol. 29 (2016), no. 2: 177-193.

⁵ Jeffrey Chin, "Curricular Conversations: Make Your Program the Best It Can Be," *International Social Science Review*, vol. 99 (2023), no. 2: 1-27

⁶ Pike, Diane L., Teresa Ciabattari, Melinda Messineo, Renee A. Monson, Rifat A. Salam, Theodore C. Wagenaar, Jeffrey Chin, Susan J. Ferguson, Margaret Weigers Vitullo, Patrick Archer, Maxine P. Atkinson, Jeanne H. Ballantine, Thomas C. Calhoun, Paula England, Rebecca J. Erikson, Andrea N. Hunt, Kathleen S. Lowney, Suzanne B. Maurer, Mary S. Senter, and Stephen Sweet. *The Sociology Major in the Changing Landscape of Higher Education: Curriculum, Employment, and Online Learning* (Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 2017).

⁷ Karlyn Crowley, "Making the Most of External Reviews", *Inside Higher Ed*, May 1, 2019, & Karlyn Crowley, "Advice for Effectively Planning an External Review Visit to Your Campus", *Inside Higher Ed*, June 18, 2019 & Paul Dawson, "Review of Undergraduate Departments: An External Reviewer's Perspective," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, vol. 22 (1989), no. 1: 61-66, & Susan Ferguson, "Preparing for a Program Review," *Department Chair*, vol. 24 (2013), no. 2: 15-16 & Mary Scheuer Senter, Teresa Ciabattari, and Nicole V. Amaya, "Sociology Departments and Program Review: Chair Perspectives on Process and Outcomes," *Teaching Sociology*, vol. 49 (2020), no. 1: 1-16, & Charles Sides, "First-Person Perspective: An Analysis of Informal and Formal External Program Review Strategies," *Technical Communication*, vol. 54 (2007), no. 4: 440-6.

⁸ <https://www.asanet.org/academic-professional-resources/for-department-leaders/asa-program-reviewers-and-consultants/?hilite=program+reviewers>, Retrieved 11/7/

⁹ [https://www.acjs.org/page/OldCertification?&hhsearchterms= percent22certificati percent22](https://www.acjs.org/page/OldCertification?&hhsearchterms=percent22certificati percent22), retrieved 9/26/23.

¹⁰ For an example of a typical set of recommendations, see Chin, 2023.

¹¹ James Davis, John Ruhe, Monle Lee, and Ujvala Rajadhyaksha, "Mission Possible: Do School Mission Statements Work?" *Journal of Business Ethics* vol. 70 (2007), no. 1:99-110 & Christopher Morphew, and Matthew Hartley, "Mission Statements: A Thematic Analysis of Rhetoric Across Institutional Type," *The Journal of Higher Education* vol. 77 (2006), no. 3: 456-71.

¹² Stephen Sweet, and Susan Ferguson, "Vision Statements." <https://www.ithaca.edu/academics/school-humanities-and-sciences/curriculum-mapping-toolkit-sociology/cmts-step-3-developing-and-refining-your-departments-mission-and-vision>, retrieved September 21, 2019.

¹³ Chin.

¹⁴ George D. Kuh, Natasha Jankowski, Stanley O. Ikenberry, and Jillian Kinzie, *Knowing What Students Know and Can Do: The Current State of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment in U.S. Colleges And Universities* (Champaign, IL: National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014), & Janet Huber Lowery, Carla B. Howery, John P. Myers, Harry Perlstadt, Caroline Hodges Persell, Diane Pike, Charles H. Powers, Shirley A. Scritchfield, Cynthia M. Siemsen, Barbara Trepagnier, Judith Ann Warner, and Gregory L. Weiss, *Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major* (Washington DC: American Sociological Association, 2005) & Pike et al. & Grant Wiggins and Jay McTieghe, *Understanding by Design* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1998).

¹⁵ Michael Paulsen, and Bruce Pesau, "A Practical Guide to Zero-Based Curriculum Review", *Innovative Higher Education* vol. 16 (1992), no. 3: 211-21 & William Miller, "Zero-Base Curriculum Revision: A Concept Worth Trying," *The Phi Delta Kappan* vol. 63 (1981), no. 2: 125-7.

¹⁶ Pike et al.

¹⁷ <https://www.ed.gov/accreditation>, retrieved 11/7/23.

¹⁸ <https://www.asanet.org/academic-professional-resources/for-department-leaders/asa-program-reviewers-and-consultants/resources-for-asa-program-reviewers-and-consultants/?hilite=program+reviewers>, retrieved 11/7/23.

¹⁹ Charles Pringle and Mitri Michel, "Assessment Practices in AACSB-Accredited Business Schools. *Journal of Education for Business*," vol. 82 (2007), no. 4: 202-211.

²⁰ Peggy Maki, *Assessing for Student Learning: Building a Sustainable Commitment Across the Institution* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2004).

²¹ Senter et al.

²² Veronica McGowan, "Not Too Small to Be Strategic: The State of Academic Program Review Guidelines and Instrumentation In Public Institutions." *Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research*, vol. 9 (Summer 2019), no. 1: 53-67.

²³ Jeffrey Chin, Matthew May, Honora Sullivan-Chin, and Kaylyn Woodrick. "How Can Social Psychology and Group Dynamics Assist in Curriculum Development?" *Teaching Sociology* vol. 42 (2013), no. 2: 86-94 & Hannah P. Davis, Katherine S. Biddle, and Molly R. Hall, "Academic Program Review: Examining the Experiences of Faculty Members Serving as Internal Peer Reviewers." *Research and Practice in Assessment*. vol. 15 (2020), no. 2: 1-15

²⁴ Senter et al. & Hanover Research, *Best Practices in Academic Program Review* (Washington, DC: Hanover Research, 2012).

²⁵ Jodi O'Brien, "Sociology as an Epistemology of Contradiction." *Sociological Perspectives*, vol. 52 (2009), No. 1: 5-22.

²⁶ Virginia Coombs, "Institutions Should Link Program Reviews to Strategic Plans." *Inside Higher Ed*, 2017, retrieved 11/17/23.

²⁷ Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action* (The Free Press, 1937) & Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (University of California Press, 1984).

²⁸ ²⁸ Chin & Crowley & Crowley & Dawson & Susan Ferguson & Senter et al., & Sides.

²⁹ Ray Schroeder, "Remaining Relevant in a Changing Higher Ed: How Can You Remain Relevant as a Higher Education Employee In 2023?" *Inside Higher Ed*, January 31st, 2023. Retrieved 11/17/23.

³⁰ Senter et. al

³¹ Coombs.

³² Michael F. Middaugh, *Planning and Assessment in Higher Education: Demonstrating Institutional Effectiveness* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009) & Davis et al.