



LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS Academic & Student Affairs

Guidelines for Academic Program Evaluation

We seek your professional review of a graduate program proposal, and your observations and recommendations to build a quality degree program. Based on your review of the proposal, supporting materials about the institution and its faculty and curriculum inventory, and your own professional experience, please respond and comment as fully as possible with your observations, concerns, evaluation, and recommendations. If you need more information or detail about any section, please contact your Board of Regents liaison, and we will provide it as soon as possible.

A. Program Design

1. To what extent does the proposed breadth of course offerings represent a broad, well-integrated knowledge of the discipline?
2. If the program is interdisciplinary, to what extent is it coherent as a program?
3. How well does this program take into account the way the discipline or field is moving?
4. How well do the requirements (curriculum, research, etc) suit the program? Are they appropriate for a program of high quality?
5. How do the program's design and its fit with other offerings in the department or college reflect upon its potential viability and growth?
6. Does the program use alternate, creative forms of delivery? Please address the utility of delivery approaches (including online and/or hybrid) in offering educational opportunities in the proposed program.

B. Need

1. To what extent do the region, state, or nation need students in this discipline, at this level, at this time?
2. To what extent is this program likely to address those needs effectively?

C. Students

1. How realistic do enrollment projections appear to be?
2. Does there appear to be an adequate supply of qualified students in the area? Is there enough financial support budgeted to attract able students to this program?
3. Are the standards for admission and for measuring performance clear and reasonable? Is there a process for removing unsuccessful students from the program in a fair and timely manner?
4. Is the level of performance required in courses and on qualifying and candidacy exams clear and reasonable?

D. Faculty

1. Does the department appear to have sufficient faculty strength and stability to successfully launch and maintain this program?
2. To what extent is the faculty's apparent knowledge and understanding of their areas thorough and up-to-date? Can they cover the proposed range of courses now, adequately?

3. What is your impression of the caliber of the faculty's research and publications? How important to the field is the work being done?
4. Is the faculty generally recognized nationally, e.g., by appointment to national honorary bodies, committee work, editorial service, or by other recognition?
5. Is there any indication that excellence in teaching and mentoring is a major consideration?
6. Is adequate faculty guidance projected for students with regard to program design, advising, research, and opportunities for learning beyond the classroom?

E. Resources

1. To what extent are present library holdings or digital access adequate to initiate the proposed program?
2. What are the limitations of the library in each sub-discipline in which graduate seminars or degree options are offered and theses directed?
3. Are described plans to improve the library's holdings adequate and realistic?
4. To what extent are facilities and services adequate for the purposes of the program? Do you sense or perceive any particular inadequacies?

F. Administration

Does the proposed administrative structure appear appropriate? Are there any obvious advantages or disadvantages to this proposed structure?

G. Accreditation

Is information on specialized, programmatic accreditation presented? If not, should it be?

H. Related Fields

Does the program proposal identify sufficient support from related fields or programs? If not, discuss what sufficient support from related supports might be.

I. Costs

1. Does the proposed budget appear sufficient to launch a quality program?
2. Are projected costs realistic? Are there elements that are omitted or downplayed that should be in the budget for a quality program of this nature?
3. Is the amount of financial support available sufficient to sustain the program at high quality?
4. Is there evidence that institutional support is firmly enough committed for the program to continue at high quality?

J. General Assessment, Comments, and Suggestions

1. Is the proposed program realistic?
2. What are this program's notable strong and weak points?
3. Please make any comments regarding aspects of the program not covered in this review which you think should be described.