William Paterson University

Academic Program Review Handbook

Updated 2012

Program Review Handbook
Table of Contents

THE ROLE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AT WILLIAM PATERSON UNIVERSITY

The program review process has a long history in higher education and at William Paterson University. It is a way for departments to ensure the quality of their academic major programs and for the University to demonstrate institutional effectiveness to, among others, our regional accrediting body—the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE).

The academic program review manual has been updated to reflect the University's strategic initiatives, the goals of the academic plan including the revised seven-year cycle for program review, an expanded statistical information packet, and a more focused approach to student learning outcomes assessment to ensure program quality.

OVERVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

On a rotating basis over a seven year period, each academic major program at William Paterson University either undergoes program review or self-study for an external accreditation. This process provides an opportunity for departments to reflect on all aspects of their program(s) within the context of the changing needs of students and society, the changing nature of academic disciplines and changes at the University. The following calendar lists when programs begin their program review cycle:
http://www.wpunj.edu/dotAsset/8552966d-a982-42c4-84e2-cab1bdd92f2a.pdf.

Usually, all programs within a department are reviewed simultaneously. Through this assessment process, department and program strengths, areas needing attention and opportunities for future growth and development are identified. Based on the results of program review, departments develop plans to guide their efforts over the next seven years. Progress in implementing these plans is reported annually in departments' year-end reports to the College Dean and in the Dean's annual year-end report to the Provost. The major steps in the program review process are:

1. **Preparation for Self-Study**. Departments review their mission statement, program-level student learning outcomes, course outlines, and assessment plans and activities (see Assessment Resources on pp. 22-38 of this manual) and revise them as needed. Departments also decide how they will organize their self-study and provide a brief written summary of the process to their Dean, along with their mission statement and student learning outcomes for all programs under review.

2. **The Self-Study.** Departments prepare a self-study document following the Self-Study Outline in this handbook (pp. 11-20). The self-study should be a collaborative effort and should involve most members of the Department. It is recommended that students and alumni also be invited to participate.

3. **Selection of an External Reviewer**. Departments nominate three individuals to serve as reviewers for their programs (see pp. 39-41 for information on program review consultants). The Dean, in collaboration with the Provost's office, selects one of the nominees to serve as reviewer.

4. **Administrative Review.** Prior to making final arrangements for the visit of the external reviewer, copies of the completed self-study report and assessment plan (learning outcomes, assessment activities, findings and their uses for program improvement) are submitted to the Dean and Provost for review. The purpose of this review is to ensure that the self-study report and the assessment plan are thorough and follow the self-study guidelines. If the report and/or plan do not meet these criteria, they are returned to the Department for revision.

5. **External Review.** The completed self-study document, along with the Department's assessment plan and activities of its student learning outcomes and other documents are provided to the external reviewer. The External Reviewer visits the campus to meet with Faculty, Students and the Dean and views the facilities first hand. Based on the self-study report and the site visit, the External Reviewer prepares a report outlining strengths as well as areas in need of attention. This report is submitted to the Dean who shares it with the Department and the Provost.

6. **Agreement on Future Directions**. Using the results of the self-study and external reviewer's report, the Department develops a seven-year plan that details its future direction, and the activities, time lines and resource requirements to achieve its desired goals. This plan is reviewed by the Dean and Provost, and, if necessary, revised. When the plan has been finalized, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Department, Dean and Provost indicates mutual agreement to the plan.

7. **Planning, Implementation and Progress Reports**. Progress in implementing the Department's plan is reported each year in the Department's annual report. During the fourth year of implementation, members of the Department review the Plan and modify it, if needed, to reflect current realities.

A checklist of program review activities on the next page will assist Departments in tracking program review activities.

PROGRAM REVIEW CHECKLIST

Please use the following checklist to assist you in keeping track of the activities in the program review process. The dates shown are those recommended in the PR Calendar. These may vary somewhat depending on specific circumstances.

When?	Activity/Event	X=Completed
Spring Prior to PR	Review the mission statement, course outlines and program assessment plans (SLO's, etc.) and revise, if needed	
	Review statistical packets Organize self-study process and submit to Dean a description of the process along with mission statement and assessment plans that: 1. include program-level student learning outcomes (SLOs), 2. demonstrate how students are given an opportunity to meet the SLOs (curriculum map), 3. include assessment activities and findings and 4. demonstrate findings are used for program improvement	
YEAR 1		
September-January	Prepare self-study (SS) document	
February	Submit SS draft to Dean along with assessment plan	
February	Submit recommendations of 3 external reviewers to Dean and Provost (see guidelines and nomination form on pp. 37-41)	
April	Finalize SS document, including title page with names of faculty contributing to its preparation, and make needed number of copies	
	Submit final SS document to Dean, Provost and IR&A	
April	Newly approved programs submit program level student learning outcomes and assessment plans to Dean, Provost and IR&A after first year	
May-June	Assemble the following documents for external reviewer: • Updated program-level assessment plan(s) and activities	
	• Updated faculty vitae • Updated course outlines (or Web URL)	
	• On-line relevant catalogs • On-line fact book and statistical packets	
	Set date for visit of external reviewer in September or October	
Summer	Complete travel arrangements for reviewer Mail or e-mail SS report and accompanying documents	

When?	Activity/Event	X=Completed
YEAR 2		
Sept.-Oct.	Set up schedule for reviewer's campus visit	
	Campus visit completed by October 15	
Oct.-Nov.	External reviewer's report received by November 15	
Nov.-Jan.	Department drafts response to reviewer's report and proposes future directions and resource needs using the resource request form	
	Department representatives meet with Dean to discuss and reach agreement on directions and resource needs	
	Department representatives and Dean meet with Provost to discuss proposed directions and resource needs	
March-April	Based on results of meeting with Provost and Dean, Department develops 7-year plan	
April-May	Department Plan is finalized after input from Dean and Provost and Memorandum of Understanding indicates mutual agreement to Plan	
YEAR 3		
Sept.-May	Implement Seven Year Plan (Year 3) and Assessment Plan	
June	In Year-End Department Report, report on progress in implementing plans	
YEAR 4		
Sept.-May	Implement Seven-Year Plan (Year 4) and Assessment Plan	
June	In Year-End Report, report on progress in implementing plans	
YEAR 5		
Sept.-May	Implement Seven-Year Plan (Year 5) and Assessment Plan. In spring, review plans and, if needed, revise to reflect current realities	
June	In Year-End Department Report, report on progress in implementing plans and append revised plans, if appropriate	
YEAR 6		
Sept.-May	Implement Seven-Year Plan (Year 6) and Assessment Plan	
June	In Department Year-End Report, report on progress in implementing plans	

When?	Activity/Event	X=Completed
YEAR 7		
Sept.-May	Implement Seven -Year Plan (Year 7) and Assessment Plan	
April-May	Prepare for next cycle of program review	
June	In Department Year-End Report, report on progress in implementing plans	

PROGRAM REVIEW CALENDAR

Preparation for Program Review

April. Department is notified that it will be undergoing program review. Department Chair and two other members attend an orientation seminar to learn about the program review process. This seminar is offered by the Provost's Office in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. College Assessment Coordinators and Associate Deans are also encouraged to attend.

May. Department reviews its mission statement and assessment plan including program-level student learning outcomes, and activities and revises them, if necessary. Department submits its mission statement and student learning outcomes to the Dean, along with a brief description of how it will conduct the self-study. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment provides the Department with statistical information about its programs and department.

Program Review Cycle

Year 1

September-January. Department prepares its self-study document according to the WPU Program Review Handbook (pp. 11-20), and submits it, along with the names of three to five possible external reviewers, to the College Dean by February 1 (see guidelines and nomination form for external consultants on pp. 37-41).

February-March. Dean reviews the Self-Study document for completeness and, if necessary, returns it to the Department for revision. The final self-study document is submitted to the Dean by April 1. During this time period, the Dean, in consultation with the Provost, selects an external reviewer or reviewers, and the Department updates and prepares the following documents that will be sent to the External Reviewer(s), along with the Self-Study:
- Updated faculty vitae
- Up-to-date course outlines
- Updated Department Assessment Plan and Activities, including assessment instruments and findings/results.
- Relevant catalogs, admission brochures if available
- Fact Book

May. The date for the campus visit by External Reviewer(s) is established. Ideally this visit will take place in late September or early October of Year Two of the Review Process.

Summer. Travel arrangements are made for the Reviewer, and the Dean's Office mails the self-study, accompanying documents, and review guidelines to Reviewer(s).

Year 2

September-November.   Final arrangements are made for the campus visit by the External Reviewer(s). Dean and Department collaborate on setting up schedule of campus visit. Typically the visit involves meetings with the following: Department Executive Committee, full-time faculty, untenured faculty, adjuncts, other staff, undergraduate students, graduate students (if appropriate), alumni, Dean, Associate Provost. Some departments may also find it helpful to involve the Library staff in the visit.

The campus visit by the External Reviewer(s) is completed by October 15.

The external review report is mailed to the Dean no later than November 15. The Dean immediately distributes the report to the Department where it is distributed to all full-time faculty.

November-January. Department drafts a written response to the external review report, correcting factual errors or misperceptions, if any, and proposing future directions for the Department's program(s), resource needs and a possible time line for implementation. Department Executive Committee meets with the Dean to discuss the draft response and proposal.

Department incorporates suggestions from the Dean, as appropriate, and develops a final response and proposal. This document is sent to the Dean and Provost by January 31.

February. A meeting is held with the Department Executive Committee, the Dean and Provost to discuss the Department's proposal and to reach general agreement about future directions of the Department.

March-April.   Based on what was learned in the Self-Study and from the External Reviewer, as well as the results of the meeting with the Provost and Dean, the Department prepares a five-year plan that details the future direction of the department, and the activities and time lines to achieve the desired goals. This plan is submitted to the Dean and Provost by April 15.

April-May. The Dean and Provost provide feedback on the Plan. If necessary, the Plan is modified and a final plan put in place by commencement. A memorandum of understanding between the Department, Dean and Provost indicates mutual agreement to the Plan.

Year 3

Department begins implementing its Seven Year Plan (year three), and reports on progress in implementing it in Department's year-end report.

Year 4

Department continues implementing its Seven Year Plan (year four) and reports on progress in its year-end report.

Year 5

Department continues implementing its Seven Year Plan (year five). During the spring semester, members of the Department collaboratively review the Plan, taking into consideration the progress made, as well as changes that have occurred in the Department, University, discipline, external environment, etc. that affect the original plan. The original plan is fine-tuned, if necessary, and submitted to the Dean and Provost for review, comment and approval. A report on progress in implementing the original plan and a copy of the revised plan is included in the Department's year-end report.

Year 6

Department continues implementing its Seven-Year Plan (year six), including any revisions made at the end of the previous year, and reports on progress in implementing its revised plan. In March or April of Year 6, three members of the Department attend a Program Review orientation seminar sponsored by the Provost's Office and IR&A.

Year 7

Department continues implementing its Five-Year Plan (year seven) and reports on progress in its Annual Report.

The second round of program reviews begins in September, repeating the activities described in Years 1 and 2, above.

SELF-STUDY GUIDELINES

All undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate programs in the Department are usually reviewed simultaneously. Development of the self-study document should be a collaborative effort involving all members of the Department. Participation of students and alumni provides a perspective that is often helpful and therefore their participation is strongly encouraged.

Prior to their self-study, Departments review their mission statement, program-level student learning outcomes, assessment plans, and course outlines, and revise them, as needed. Departments also decide how they will organize their self-study and provide a brief written summary to their Dean, along with their mission statement and student learning outcomes.

To facilitate preparation of the self-study report, departments will be provided with the Self-Study Outline in electronic form. The final self-study report should be submitted in electronic copy to the Dean, the Provost, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, and the External Reviewer. In addition, one hard copy should be sent to the Provost's office. The cover page of the self-study report should list the names of all Faculty involved in preparing the report.

Each May, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IR&A) provides departments undergoing program review with a *Statistical Information Packet* containing five-year statistics on students, faculty, courses, pertinent survey results etc.; this information will be helpful in preparing the self-study report. IR&A provides this information as a PDF document on the IR&A webpage. Additional information, such as the results of student learning outcomes assessment, will come from the department. Professional associations are a good source of information on trends in the discipline.

Program Review Options

Coordination of Program Review and Accreditation. To the extent possible, every effort will be made to coordinate program review with accreditation self-studies and visits that may also be occurring in the department. The way in which this will happen will depend on a number of factors, including the following:

1. If a department has multiple programs with some requiring accrediting bodies or is going through a transition period and is proposing new degree programs, program review may be helpful in clarifying how programs complement each other and/or the department's readiness to mount a new degree program.
2. If the accreditation self-study does not address all topics in the program review self-study outline, departments will be asked to address those topics in a mini self-study document. Revised course outlines, an assessment plan and activities, and a concluding seven year plan and memorandum of understanding will still be required.
3. If the accreditation self-study addresses all topics in the program review self-study outline and covers all programs in the department, it will serve as a substitute for program review. Revised course outlines, an assessment plan and activities, and a concluding seven-year plan and memorandum of understanding will still be required for the program under accreditation self-study.

Focused Program Review. Departments that have previously completed program reviews and, through annual reports, etc., demonstrate continuous improvement, have the option of proposing a focused program review. This option gives the Department the opportunity to focus its self-study efforts on a special topic that will assist it in enhancing its programs, and to identify an external reviewer with special expertise in that area. Examples of focused reviews might be a major curriculum revision, or design and implementation of a comprehensive assessment plan. If this alternative does not involve all programs in the department, the program not involved will do a traditional self-study. Departments wishing to explore this option should <u>first</u> discuss it with their Dean. If there is mutual agreement to this approach, the Department should prepare and submit to the Dean for review and approval, a detailed description of the design for its self-study. Revised course outlines, an assessment plan and activities, and a concluding seven year plan and memorandum of understanding will continue to be required of departments that elect a focused program review.

PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY OUTLINE

This outline is intended as a guide for your self-study. Not all questions and topics will be equally applicable to all programs and departments. Additional questions and information may be needed and you may elect a different order for parts of your narrative. The goal of the Self-Study report is to tell a fact-based, analytical and coherent story about your department and its programs. This report should be understandable to an outside reviewer who is not familiar with our University.

Introduction

The introduction should orient the reader to your Department and its programs by providing a brief overview of program offerings, special features, recent developments, relation to similar programs in the area, etc. Include also:

- Mission and goals of your department that include program-level student learning outcomes and their relationship to the mission and strategic goals of the University.
- Recommendations from the most recent previous program review and actions taken in response to them.
- A brief description of how the self-study was conducted.

Part I – Program Specific Information and Analysis

While the following questions should be addressed for each academic program or concentration, you are encouraged to organize this section of your report in a manner that offers a coherent picture of the program(s) without undue repetition. Thus, you may wish to respond to the questions in this section separately for each program, or, if programs have a great deal in common, it may be preferable to write this section for several programs simultaneously and point out differences where they exist.

Some of the items below are noted as appropriate for graduate (Grad) or undergraduate (UG) programs and students. Please respond to those questions that are appropriate for your programs.

1. **Curriculum**

    a. **Student learning outcomes**

    (1) What are the program-level learning outcomes (knowledge and skills) for students in this program? List here. How are these outcomes communicated to students? How do these outcomes reflect the University's mission and strategic goals? (If available, include the link to the program's learning outcomes listed on the Department web page).

    (2) Describe how learning outcomes are assessed using assessment measures, what has been learned through assessment and what impact assessment results have had on the program. Please be sure to include results from both direct and indirect assessment measures. The later should include, when provided as part of the

statistical packets, findings from NSSE, the One-Year Out-Alumni Survey and the Graduating Senior survey.

b.   Structure and change

(1)   How is the curriculum organized to support the goals of this program? As part of your response, please include information about the specific courses that contribute to each of the program's student learning outcomes. How do course-level outcomes map to program-level outcomes? (See Assessment Matrix I on page 28 or Student Learning Outcomes by Course on page 32).

(2)   Comment on the flexibility available to students in selecting electives to meet their special interests. What criteria, if any, exist for determining offerings, additions, and deletions of electives?

(3)   How does your program build on the five overall WPUNJ student learning outcomes (ability to express oneself effectively in written and oral form; think critically; locate and use information; integrate knowledge and ideas in a coherent and meaningful manner; work effectively with others) and, for undergraduate programs, how does the program build on outcomes of the University Core Curriculum program?

(4)   Describe recent changes in the curriculum, including changes made as a result of previous program reviews and assessment findings. What has been the impact of these changes?

(5)   How does this curriculum compare to national models and/or standards? Comment on any distinctive features of your curriculum.

(6)   What are the present and evolving trends in your field? Are there efforts made to include industry or graduate school program representatives in these trend discussions? How will you integrate these trends into the curriculum?

c.   Overall assessment

Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the current curriculum and indicate what changes, if any, you anticipate in the next several years.

2.   Student Characteristics

a.   Entering undergraduate and graduate students

(1)   Append (or insert into the text) the relevant tables from the Statistical Information Packet provided by the IR&A office. Comment on trends over the past five years, and whether you expect changes in these trends in upcoming years.

- Number of first-year students and transfers (UG) or number of new graduate students (Grad).
- Academic characteristics of incoming students: high school GPA, SAT scores, and developmental course requirements (UG); scores on graduate entrance exams (e.g., GRE, GMAT) and undergraduate GPAs (Grad).
- Types of institutions from which students transfer and their entering GPAs (UG); institutions from which students received their bachelor's degree, including the proportion from WPU and undergraduate GPAs (Grad).
- Numbers of students who apply for admission to the program, the percentage who are accepted and, of those accepted the percentage that enrolls. Where do students who decline offers of admission to your program enroll?
- What efforts are being made by the department to attract new students?
- Racial/ethnic, gender and geographic diversity
- Other relevant characteristics

(2)   Are there program/departmental criteria for admission? If so, how do these relate to University strategic goals of program quality, graduation and retention in the major?

b.   Currently enrolled majors/graduate students

Append (or insert into the text) the relevant tables from the Statistical Information Packet provided by IR&A. Comment on trends over the past five years and whether you expect changes in these trends. What are the implications of these trends for program planning and course offerings?
- Number of students in the program (UG and Grad) and their distribution across class levels (UG)
- Racial/ethnic and gender diversity
- Distribution across tracks or concentrations in the program
- Number of students seeking teacher certification (UG)
- Other relevant characteristics

c.   Overall assessment

Comment on the number and characteristics of students in your program and their impact on achieving program goals. What changes, if any, do you anticipate in the near future?

3.   Student Progress, Outcomes and Satisfaction

a.   Attrition

What is the attrition rate from your program? Are students at the UG level leaving for another program on campus or are they leaving the University entirely? If they leave the University are students enrolling elsewhere? What reasons do students give for leaving?

b.   Progress toward learning outcomes

How does your department assess student progress toward the program's learning goals as they advance through the curriculum? State specifically how students are assessed at appropriate intervals to determine their achievement of the student learning outcomes. When problems arise, how are they identified and addressed?

c.   Outcomes and satisfaction at graduation

(1)   Comment on trends in the number of graduates over the past five years and whether you expect this to change. (Append the appropriate table from your statistical packet or insert table in text.) Do new first-time, first-year and transfer students typically graduate in four, five or six years?

(2)   Describe the capstone experiences of students completing your program (e.g., thesis, capstone course performance, portfolio assessment). Give a few examples of how the capstone experiences reflect the achievement of program outcomes. Comment on possible implications for program change.

(3)   What are students' job opportunities upon graduation? What types of positions do they take?

(4)   What proportion of your students continue their education in professional or graduate school? Where do they attend?

(5)   How is the satisfaction of graduating students and/or alumni assessed? What has been learned from this assessment and how has it been used to modify, if necessary, teaching/learning, the curriculum, and support services?

d.   Overall assessment

Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the program in terms of the number of students completing the program, their level of achievement, and their satisfaction with the program. What are the implications of these results for the program in the future?

Part II – Departmental Information and Analysis

The following questions address issues that typically cut across programs and affect the entire department. Some items are noted as appropriate for graduate (Grad) or undergraduate (UG) programs and students. Please respond to those questions that are appropriate for your department.

1.   **Curriculum**

  a.   **University Core Curriculum**

    (1)   What are the student learning outcomes for the University Core Curriculum courses offered in your department and how do these contribute to the University-wide student learning outcomes and the outcomes of the University Core Curriculum? (If desired, Matrix 2 on page 30 can be used to organize this information.) Describe how these outcomes are assessed using direct and, if applicable, indirect measures. What has been learned through assessment and what impact, if any, has the assessment results had on these courses?

    (2)   Does your department offer service courses for other programs? If so, what are the student learning outcomes for those courses and how are they assessed? What has been learned through assessment and what impact has this had on these courses?

  b.   **Interdisciplinary courses and other curricular collaborations**

    Do you share courses, faculty, or other resources with other departments (e.g., cross-listed courses, team taught courses, interdisciplinary programs, etc.)? If so, briefly describe these connections and the impact on your department and programs.

    Is your department the coordinating department for this interdisciplinary program? If so please comment on the program's enrollments, learning outcomes, assessment activities and any difficulties you may have encountered overseeing an interdisciplinary program.

  c.   **Minors**

    Briefly describe any minors offered in your department. What are the student learning outcomes for each minor and how are these assessed? What has been learned through assessment and what impact has this had on the minor?

  d.   **Specific Curricular Issues**

    Does your department support student learning in the areas listed below? If so, cite examples and comment on the effectiveness of these efforts and any differences between graduate and undergraduate programs, if relevant.

(1)   Research experience. Is it an integral part of the program? Are there opportunities for students to actually work with faculty on research projects?

(2)   Information literacy skills, i.e., the ability to locate, evaluate, and use information, including the ability to use library and other information resources and services (those specific to your discipline as well as those that support the UCC SLOs).

(3)   Information technology skills; those specific to your discipline as well as those that support the UCC SLO.

(4)   Application of learning through internships, practicum experiences, learning communities, group projects, etc.

(5)   Understanding of diversity as it applies to this discipline.

(6)   Does your program include on-line courses? Are there any criteria used in deciding if a course will be offered on-line? How is student learning assessed in these courses?

2.   Students

a.   Other students served by your Department

(1)   How many minors are served by your department and do you expect this to change in the next several years? If so, how?

(2)   Comment on enrollment trends over the past five years in courses serving primarily students outside your program and whether you expect changes in these trends. (Append relevant tables from the Statistical Packet or insert tables into the text.)

b.   Support services for students

Briefly describe the support services offered and comment on their effectiveness for undergraduate and, if appropriate, graduate students. Consider, for example:

(1)   Advisement and mentoring

(2)   Out-of-class contact with faculty

(3)   Professional organizations and clubs

(4)   Orientation

(5)   Academic support services (Early Alert, tutoring, writing center, science enrichment center, etc.)

(6)   Special learning opportunities for high achieving students

(7)   Career guidance

(8)   Other

3.   Faculty

a.   Number of faculty and their characteristics

(1)   Append (or insert into the text) the relevant tables from the Statistical Information Packet provided by IR&A. Comment on trends over the past five years, and whether you expect changes in these trends.
- Number of full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty
- Of full-time faculty, the number who are tenured, on tenure track, or on temporary appointment
- Distribution of full-time faculty by rank
- Distribution of faculty credits by teaching, research, and administrative duties
- Academic credentials of full-time faculty
- Gender and ethnicity of full-time faculty and adjuncts

(2)   To what extent does the program depend upon adjunct faculty, half-time faculty or faculty from other programs? How does this affect the quality of instruction? How does the department assure quality? Through hiring procedures? Orientation activities? Review of students' faculty course evaluations?

(3)   Attach current curriculum vitae for faculty in your department and provide a brief profile of each faculty member, including: graduate degrees, institutions from which degrees were granted and the date, and specific areas of expertise.

(4)   Is faculty sufficient in number, academic credentials, and areas of expertise to ensure that:
- Required courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels can be offered on a regular basis?
- Specialists are available in important fields that are within the scope of your graduate and undergraduate programs?
- University Core Curriculum responsibilities can be covered?
- Other service responsibilities of the department can be covered?
- Appropriate levels of advisement and mentoring can be offered to both undergraduate and graduate students?

(5)   Comment on recent faculty searches and the ability of your department to attract faculty with appropriate credentials and expertise.

b. **Faculty accomplishments and reputation**

Drawing from faculty CV's, and recent faculty and department year-end reports, briefly describe and comment on faculty accomplishments in the following areas.

(1) Research, Scholarship and Creative Expression. If appropriate, append statistical summaries of Faculty Achievements in this area from recent Year-End Reports.

(2) Teaching and program/course development

(3) Grant and other fundraising accomplishments

(4) Fellowships, honors and other awards

(5) Active participation in professional organizations and other areas of accomplishment

(6) Service within and external to the University

c. **Faculty Development**

Briefly describe the opportunities available within your department, college and the university to support the continued growth and development of your faculty. Comment on the number of faculty who take advantage of these opportunities and whether the opportunities are sufficient and appropriate.

4. **Pedagogy/Teaching**

a. What is the average class size for different types of courses? Does this influence teaching methods? If so, how? Give specific examples.

b. Briefly describe the types of teaching strategies used in courses in your department. Comment on the effectiveness of these strategies and changes that might enhance teaching and learning.

c. Are high impact teaching strategies such as learning communities, service learning, research projects with faculty, study abroad, internships and senior experiences incorporated into courses when possible?

d. What opportunities are available for faculty to improve their teaching?

e. What efforts are made to create a learning environment conducive to learning by students from diverse backgrounds?

f. What incentives, support, training, or opportunities are provided to encourage faculty to use active and collaborative learning in class?

g.   Is technology and writing integrated into the curriculum? Provide examples.

5.   **Library**

In responding to the following questions, refer to the Statistical Summary Characterizing Library Holdings and Services prepared by the Library for your department. (See pg. 39 for an outline of the information that will be provided.)

a.   Comment on the extent to which Library services and resources adequately support your programs and concentrations at the undergraduate level and, if appropriate, at the graduate level.

b.   While the Library's primary collection emphasis is on curriculum, comment on the extent Library resources and services support the research and scholarship needs of your faculty?

c.   How are your department's needs communicated to the Library and does this process need any improvement?

d.   What Library resources or services beyond those currently available are needed to develop and maintain excellence in your program(s)?

6.   **Community Service**

What services does your department offer to the community?

a.   How do these services relate to department mission and goals?

b.   What is the impact of these services on the community? Your programs? The University? Do the benefits justify the allocation of resources?

7.   **Support Staff, Facilities and Equipment**

a.   Have resources in the following areas been sufficient to develop and maintain excellence? Consider support staff, computers and other equipment, travel, supplies, facilities (classrooms, offices, labs, etc.).

b.   To what extent are resources shared with other departments or programs? How might this be expanded to the benefit of all?

8.   **Efficiency**

a.   What is the relation of income generated by your programs and the programs' direct costs? To what extent does the teaching done by faculty generate tuition revenue in sufficient quantity to offset instructional costs? Are the department programs' direct costs covered by the teaching activity of faculty?

Part III – Overall Assessment of Programs and Department

Reflecting on the information provided in Parts I and II, respond to the questions listed below. Because your responses have direct implications for the future direction of your department and its programs, broad participation in developing them is strongly recommended.

1. Provide an overall assessment of how well your department and programs are meeting their goals. What are areas of strength? What are areas in need of attention?

2. What comparative advantages do your programs enjoy relative to similar programs at other institutions in the region? What possible comparative advantages might be developed in the future?

3. If your department offers more than one program (e.g., graduate and undergraduate or several programs at the same level), comment on the relationship between these programs – how they complement or compete with each other, how resources are allocated among them, etc.

4. Are any of the programs in your department in need of a change in direction? If so, briefly describe the direction(s) being considered and why they are being considered and the challenges you face in implementing these changes. Are these recommendations for changes within the control of the program or do they require action at the Dean, Provost or higher levels?

5. The concluding activity of the Program Review process will be to develop a seven-year plan for moving your department and its programs to the next level of excellence. If you were to write the plan at this point, what are some of the specific issues you would address in the plan? Please provide a vision of where the department would like its programs to be in six years assuming only costs to continue, with no additional resources. Please provide a vision of what the department would like its programs to be in six years, if additional resources are available.

NEW ACADEMIC MAJOR PROGRAMS: THE FIRST YEAR

Deans place the new instructional programs on the program review calendar and send the information to the Provost and the IR&A office. While new programs are not required to undergo program review in their first year they are asked to send the IR&A office the program-level student learning outcomes and the program's assessment plan and activities with a specific timeline for implementation of assessment activities. The chart on page 32, mapping program SLOs to courses should also be included at this time.

DEVELOPING AN ASSESSMENT PLAN

What achievements are expected of your graduates? To what extent are graduates reaching these expectations? How do we know this? What changes need to be made to reach expectations? How does assessment of your programs reflect the University's accrediting body's view of assessment? The Middle States Commission on Higher Education lists 14 standards of excellence. Standard 14 specifically addresses assessment of student learning.

> "Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals."
> *http://www.msche.org/publications/CHX-2011-WEB.pdf*

These assessment questions are central to providing the best possible learning experiences for our students and ensuring that those who complete our programs meet goals for student learning and being successful citizens after graduating. Answers to these questions also form a major section of the Department Assessment Plan that is submitted to the external reviewer along with the Department Self-Study document. The following information will be helpful in reviewing and refining your program-level assessment plan(s). Additional assistance is available from your College Assessment Coordinator, members of the Senate Assessment Council and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Within the context of an academic program, an assessment plan is a plan for determining whether students are achieving the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that have been set for that program. The starting point is a set of clearly stated and measurable student learning outcomes. (**Measurable** should be understood to mean "to reasonably estimate by evaluation or comparison.")

Understanding Assessment Terms

Assessment, in general, is any systematic process used to gather information that can be used to improve student learning through instruction of students, functioning of staff, and administering of institutions of higher education. Ideally it compares actual performance in response to expectations that are clear, shared, and able to be achieved. These expectations are usually stated as goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes.

Goals are general statements about where a department, a course, a lesson is headed. (Example from Biology: "To provide students. . .with the skills that serve to enhance their understanding of the environment. . . .")

Objectives are interpretive statements of goals in concrete terms so that observable evidence of them having been reached can be determined. (Example from Biology: "To acquire specific skills associated with the experimental nature of biological research and experimentation." More than one objective may sometimes be needed to achieve a specific goal.

Student Learning Outcomes are statements of actual performances expected of students as a result of the teaching/learning process, performances that are assessable. Outcomes are critical because they are used to determine if an objective has been reached. They are most usefully expressed in the

form of expectations. For example, "Upon graduation as an Environmental Science major, a student will demonstrate understanding of experimental design including: 1) formulate a hypothesis and propose means to test that hypothesis; 2) make and record observations; 3) identify the assumptions underlying the hypothesis; 4) draw conclusions and make inferences from data; and 5) perform statistical analyses of data."

Another example from Psychology, "when presented with behavioral phenomenon (such as depressed behavior in a student who has not been accepted to graduate school. . .), the graduating student will be able to explain the behavior from a variety of psychological viewpoints, including the behavioral, psychoanalytic, cognitive, psychological, humanistic, and interpersonal approaches."

Again: in the Jazz Studies and Performance Program, at the point of graduation the student will be able to "transcribe solos by performers who play the same instrument as the student."

And finally: in the Teaching Students with Disabilities program, the student should be able to "identify community resources, e.g., professional, government, volunteer, and parent, and augment services provided to handicapped persons in the schools, and guide and counsel parents of students in their use."

Reviewing Your Assessment Plan

Your assessment plan should provide very specific information concerning: 1) the methods to be used in the assessment, 2) the point at which the assessment will take place, and 3) the level of performance expected for each assessment activity. It is important to remember that assessment is formative in nature; that is, it asks how are we in the department doing with the achievement of these outcomes and what changes might be made to do better? Your assessment plan should include for each student learning outcome objective:

> **1. Assessment Methods**
> How will you know if students are achieving the outcome objectives set for them? What type(s) of measures best serve for the assessment of each objective? Assessment findings should also help point to ways of improving the program. A variety of assessment techniques should be used to answer this question. They are usually of two kinds, **direct** and **indirect** measures.   Some common types of direct measures are: standardized instruments such as the ETS Major Field Tests for Disciplines; written or oral examinations that are scored using a faculty agreed-upon rubric; student performance of tasks (e.g., performance on a musical instrument or presentation of a business plan); internship supervisor reports and tracking student behavior/work over time (e.g., portfolios, capstone projects); and locally designed examinations and tests with imbedded common questions across all course sections. Some examples of indirect measures would be interviews, focus group results, satisfaction surveys, alumni surveys and student reported job performance.
>
> **Multiple methods** should be used to increase the reliability of the results, and you should be satisfied that these methods are appropriate for measuring the outcomes you are interested in (i.e., they are *valid* measures). Identifying and developing appropriate assessment methods can take a bit of time and often it is necessary to modify and refine methods as a result of experience. In your assessment plan, the methods for assessing each outcome objective

should be clearly described. Direct assessments of student work are usually the most helpful in demonstrating what students have learned well or what they have not learned well, pointing to areas that need attention. At least **one direct method of student work** must be part of the tools **used** in your assessment methods.

2. Assessment Timetable

When will the assessments take place? Typically **assessments are administered at several points in a program**. This is helpful in identifying needed intervention for individual students as well as changes in the curriculum that may be required if students are not satisfactorily developing the prerequisite skills and knowledge base needed to advance to more challenging courses. A capstone assessment may also be helpful in gauging students' achievement over their academic career. Your assessment plan should indicate exactly when each assessment will take place.

3. Level of Performance

In order to determine if students are achieving the desired outcomes, acceptable performance should be defined for each assessment. Definitions should be very specific and will vary by the assessment method. **Rubrics that define levels of performance in very concrete terms can help to clarify expectations for both students and faculty**.

Implementing Your Assessment Plan

Assessment has been actively pursued at the University for the past several years. At this time plans should be in place and implementation on-going or at the very least in the beginning stages. Please attach an implementation calendar that includes, working backwards:

a. Date(s) by which the department completed its first "cycle" of student learning outcomes assessments.

b. Chronology for when existing assessments were introduced into the student program.

c. Date(s) by which the department will be piloting its assessments.

d. Date(s) by which the department will finalize its initial selection of assessment methodologies and instruments.

Working out these matters usually raises other issues that faculty should anticipate:

a. What happens when outcomes are not achieved? What happens to the student? Does he or she have to take an extra course? What are the implications, if any, for course content, pedagogy, admission standards, grading standards, etc.?

b. The process of developing your assessment plan should be participatory and may be as informative as actually conducting the assessments.

c. Developing and refining your plan should be a continuous, recursive process.

24

        d.   Students should be informed about the learning outcome objectives and assessment methods used, as well as the level of performance expected of them.

A list of assessment resources is found on the IR&A web:
http://www.wpunj.edu/dotAsset/a4464e8d-3d04-4549-89e9-bdea817b1542.pdf

POSSIBLE FORMAT FOR ASSESSMENT PLANS

Name of Program: _____

General Introduction

- Brief description of the program and its purposes
- Basis for student learning outcomes: Department, College, and/or University mission, strategic goals, other sources such as professional or discipline-based associations, societal needs, etc.

Outcomes and Assessment Methodologies

In this section, it is important to be as detailed as possible. Your first priority is to identify clearly stated and measurable learning outcomes for students in your program. See **Developing an Assessment Plan,** above, for examples of outcomes in several programs. Professional organizations and accrediting agencies in your discipline are also an excellent source of examples.

If you have not figured out how you will assess all of your outcomes, you should indicate in your time line when you will finalize all of your assessment methodologies. If you have any samples of assessment instruments, please attach them. To the extent possible, each outcome should have more than one assessment. If a given competency is developed over time (as most are), there should be assessments at various points in time to allow opportunity for intervention if appropriate progress is not being made and/or to modify course requirements, instructional approaches, etc.

If appropriate, you may wish to organize your plan in a hierarchical fashion with broad goals, more specific objectives and then outcome statements (see **Developing an Assessment Plan,** above). At a minimum, you will need to list your outcomes and the methods you will use to assess them. As noted above, there should be multiple assessments for each outcome and these assessments may occur over time as students progress through the program.

The format would be:

Student Learning Outcome #1
- Methods of assessing outcome #1
- Findings from assessment are used to review accomplishment of the program learning outcome

Student Learning Outcome #2
- Methods of assessing outcome #2
- Findings from assessment are used to review accomplishment of the program learning outcome

Student Learning Outcome # 3, 4, 5, etc.

Time Line for Implementing Assessment Plan

This section should spell out in detail a time line for implementing your assessment plan.

- **Academic Year 2012-2013**
  - Activities for fall semester
  - Activities for spring semester

- **Academic Year 2013-2014**
  - Activities for fall semester
  - Activities for spring semester

- **Etc. until plan is fully implemented**

Note the following:

- If you have not developed assessments for each of your outcomes, this task must be included in your time line. Thus in year one, some of your time is devoted to identifying assessment strategies for some of your outcomes.
- You will need to build in time for developing and piloting assessments, reaching agreement on required levels of competency, developing scoring rubrics, etc.
- The time line should be specific in terms of where (e.g., which sections of which courses), when (e.g., middle or end of semester), etc.
- You will need to include in your time line activities that surround assessment, e.g., deciding:
  - how you will orient students to the assessment process and standards
  - how you will use the results of assessment for program improvement

In sum, this plan should guide the department in developing and implementing a meaningful assessment plan that will contribute to enhancing student learning. The assessment matrices on pp. 28-31 may be helpful in organizing your assessment efforts.

MATRIX 1: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND COURSES IN WHICH THE STUDENTS ARE EXPOSED TO THE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS RELATED TO EACH OUTCOME.

MAJOR/PROGRAM/TRACK: _____

SLO No.	DEPARTMENTAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME	IN WHAT SPECIFIC COURSES WILL STUDENTS BE PREPARED FOR THIS LEARNING OUTCOME?

Adapted from SUNY Brockport Program Review Document

MATRIX 2: CONTRIBUTION OF CURRICULUM TO <u>UNIVERSITY-WIDE</u> STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

MAJOR/PROGRAM/TRACK:_____

UNIVERSITY-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME	NATURE OF SUPPORT FOR SKILL IN THE DEPARTMENTAL CURRICULUM	COURSES IN WHICH THIS SKILL IS TAUGHT OR REINFORCED
ABILITY TO EFFECTIVELY EXPRESS THEMSELVES IN WRITTEN AND ORAL FORM		
ABILITY TO THINK CRITICALLY		
ABILITY TO LOCATE AND USE INFORMATION		
ABILITY TO INTEGRATE KNOWLEDGE AND IDEAS IN A COHERENT AND MEANINGFUL MANNER		
ABILITY TO WORK EFFECTIVELY WITH OTHERS		

Adapted from SUNY Brockport Program Review Document

MATRIX 3: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT – ASSESSMENT METHODS AND CRITERION/ STANDARD FOR SUCCESS

MAJOR/PROGRAM/TRACK: _____

SLO No.	*HOW IS EACH STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSED? SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS?*	*WHAT IS THE CRITERION/STANDARD FOR STUDENT SUCCESS WITH EACH ASSESSMENT?*
	COURSE-BASED ASSESSMENT: *OTHER ASSESSMENT MEASURES:*	*COURSE-BASED ASSESSMENT:* *OTHER ASSESSMENT MEASURES:*

Adapted from SUNY Brockport Program Review Document

MATRIX 4: ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND ACTUAL OR ANTICIPATED DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS BASED ON FINDINGS

MAJOR/PROGRAM/TRACK: _____

SLO No.	*WHAT IS THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT OF EACH STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME?*	*WHAT DEPARTMENTAL ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN OR IS ANTICIPATED AS A RESULT OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR THIS STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME?*

PROGRAM LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES MAPPED TO COURSES

Program 1: _____

(Duplicate as needed for each program)

COURSE	Outcome 1		Outcome 2		Outcome 3		Outcome 4		Outcome 5	
Program Level Student Learning Outcomes Addressed in Each Course (Place an **X** in the <u>first column</u> to indicate which outcomes are covered in which course. In the next column indicate whether students are **I**ntroduced to, **R**e-enforce or **D**emonstrate mastery of program student learning outcome skills/concepts)										
Course 1010										
Course 2320										
Course 2410										
Course 3550										
Course 4510										
Course 4750										
Etc.										

High-Impact Educational Practices: A Brief Overview
Excerpt from High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter, by George D. Kuh (AAC&U, 2008)   (Book is available from the IR&A office)

The following teaching and learning practices have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds. These practices take many different forms, depending on learner characteristics and on institutional priorities and contexts.

On many campuses, assessment of student involvement in active learning practices such as these has made it possible to assess the practices' contribution to students' cumulative learning. However, on almost all campuses, utilization of active learning practices is unsystematic, to the detriment of student learning. Presented below are brief descriptions of high-impact practices that educational research suggests increase rates of student retention and student engagement. The rest of this publication will explore in more detail why these types of practices are effective, which students have access to them, and, finally, what effect they might have on different cohorts of students.

First-Year Seminars and Experiences
Many schools now build into the curriculum first-year seminars or other programs that bring small groups of students together with faculty or staff on a regular basis. The highest-quality first-year experiences place a strong emphasis on critical inquiry, frequent writing, information literacy, collaborative learning, and other skills that develop students' intellectual and practical competencies. First-year seminars can also involve students with cutting-edge questions in scholarship and with faculty members' own research.

Common Intellectual Experiences
The older idea of a "core" curriculum has evolved into a variety of modern forms, such as a set of required common courses or a vertically organized general education program that includes advanced integrative studies and/or required participation in a learning community. These programs often combine broad themes—e.g., technology and society, global interdependence—with a variety of curricular and co-curricular options for students.

Learning Communities
The key goals for learning communities are to encourage integration of learning across courses and to involve students with "big questions" that matter beyond the classroom. Students take two or more linked courses as a group and work closely with one another and with their professors. Many learning communities explore a common topic and/or common readings through the lenses of different disciplines. Some deliberately link "liberal arts" and "professional courses," others feature service learning.

Writing-Intensive Courses
These courses emphasize writing at all levels of instruction and across the curriculum, including final-year projects. Students are encouraged to produce and revise various forms of writing for different audiences in different disciplines. The effectiveness of this repeated practice "across the curriculum" has led to parallel efforts in such areas as quantitative

reasoning, oral communication, information literacy, and, on some campuses, ethical inquiry.

Collaborative Assignments and Projects
Collaborative learning combines two key goals: learning to work and solve problems in the company of others, and sharpening one's own understanding by listening seriously to the insights of others, especially those with different backgrounds and life experiences. Approaches range from study groups within a course, to team-based assignments and writing, to cooperative projects and research.

Undergraduate Research
Many colleges and universities are now providing research experiences for students in all disciplines. Undergraduate research, however, has been most prominently used in science disciplines. With strong support from the National Science Foundation and the research community, scientists are reshaping their courses to connect key concepts and questions with students' early and active involvement in systematic investigation and research. The goal is to involve students with actively contested questions, empirical observation, cutting-edge technologies, and the sense of excitement that comes from working to answer important questions.

Diversity/Global Learning
Many colleges and universities now emphasize courses and programs that help students explore cultures, life experiences, and worldviews different from their own. These studies— which may address U.S. diversity, world cultures, or both—often explore "difficult differences" such as racial, ethnic, and gender inequality, or continuing struggles around the globe for human rights, freedom, and power. Frequently, intercultural studies are augmented by experiential learning in the community and/or by study abroad.

Service Learning, Community-Based Learning
In these programs, field-based "experiential learning" with community partners is an instructional strategy—and often a required part of the course. The idea is to give students direct experience with issues they are studying in the curriculum and with ongoing efforts to analyze and solve problems in the community. A key element in these programs is the opportunity students have to both apply what they are learning in real-world settings and reflect in a classroom setting on their service experiences. These programs model the idea that giving something back to the community is an important college outcome, and that working with community partners is good preparation for citizenship, work, and life.

Internships
Internships are another increasingly common form of experiential learning. The idea is to provide students with direct experience in a work setting—usually related to their career interests—and to give them the benefit of supervision and coaching from professionals in the field. If the internship is taken for course credit, students complete a project or paper that is approved by a faculty member.

Capstone Courses and Projects
Whether they're called "senior capstones" or some other name, these culminating experiences require students nearing the end of their college years to create a project of some sort that integrates and applies what they've learned. The project might be a research paper, a performance, a portfolio of "best work," or an exhibit of artwork. Capstones are offered both in departmental programs and, increasingly, in general education as well.

Source: AIR Professional File, Number 105, Program Reviews

LIBRARY DATA SETS FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

The following statistical summary characterizing Library holdings and services will be provided to Departments undergoing program review during the first year in the Program Review process.

A. Book/Media Collection
1. Total number of book and media titles, and number of book and media titles by LC classes relevant to department.
2. Total number of items circulated in the last calendar year, and number of items circulated by LC classes relevant to department. (Streaming and e-circulation will be included in the future).

B. Reference Resources
1. List of general library databases
2. List of databases specific to discipline (Lib Guides and/or Web Resources)
3. List of major print titles (Listed in Lib Guides)

C. Journal Collection and Use
1. Number and list of titles "charged" to that department, in both print and electronic format
2. Usage data on these items (article downloads), including number of points of access

D. User Education
1. Total class sessions taught for College and number for that department and as percentage of the whole College.
2. Total upper level and lower level courses taught for College and number for that department and as percentage of the whole College

E. Reserves (including print, media, and e)

F. Material Expenditures
1. Total dollars expended on print, media and e-resources (Include IRT streaming funds, and total spent on e-books)
2. Total dollars expended for department on print, media and e-resources
3. List of titles received by faculty and librarians for department

P. Theus
Revised 12/12/2011

GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING PROGRAM REVIEW CONSULTANTS

Departments are responsible for proposing to the Dean and Provost three possible reviewers who meet the following criteria:

- Prior experience in program evaluation.
- From an institution with a program comparable to the program they will be reviewing at William Paterson.
- Expertise on the current requirements of any relevant accrediting body if reviewing departments with accredited programs or programs seeking accreditation.
- From a college or university outside New Jersey.
- Not have a personal or professional relationship with faculty member(s) in the Department that would constitute a conflict of interest. Possible conflicts of interest should be described on the nomination form.

For each proposed reviewer, the department should submit a nomination form (see below) and a current CV.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROGRAM REVIEW CONSULTANTS

The primary purpose of program review at William Paterson University is program improvement. During the first phase of this process, each department conducts an in-depth study of the department and its program(s) and prepares a report that concludes with an analysis of strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for future direction.

The external consultant brings an expert and fresh perspective to this process. Based on a review of the self-study report and other documents, as well as information gained from the campus visit, the reviewer is charged with <u>offering a frank assessment of strengths and weaknesses, and making recommendations for moving the department and its program(s) to the next level of excellence</u>.

The culminating activity for the program review process is for the department to develop a seven-year plan with concrete actions and time lines for moving forward in directions that have been mutually agreed to by the department and administration. The external consultant's report is key in identifying those directions.

The outline for the program review self-study report (*WPU Academic Program Review Handbook, pp.11-20* of this document) prompts departments to discuss specific issues under the general topics of curriculum, faculty, students, pedagogy, community service, staff, facilities and equipment. The report of the external consultant should speak to issues of special note (positive or negative) under each of these general topics and raise any additional issues related to achieving excellence. Where possible, the reviewer is requested to offer specific recommendations. A suggested consultant's report format is found on page 40.

Reviewers are expected to submit their reports within one month following their campus visit.

NOMINATION FORM FOR PROGRAM REVIEW CONSULTANT

Please submit a separate form for each nominee and attach a current CV.

Academic unit being reviewed: _____

Name of consultant: _____

Title or rank: _____

Current institution: _____

Please provide the following information <u>if it is not available on the CV.</u>

Degrees   **Subject/Major**   **University/Institution**

_____

_____

_____

Address: _____

_____

Telephone number: _____   Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Describe the qualifications that make this person an appropriate reviewer for your program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Describe any personal or professional relationships between the nominee and member(s) of your department that might constitute a potential conflict of interest.

_____

_____

_____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

CONSULTANT'S REPORT

Sample Format and Coverage

I.	Title Page	
II.	Table of Contents	
III.	Introduction	
IV.	Status of Discipline (national perspective)	
V.	Program	
	- Overall comments regarding existing program	
	- Appropriateness of program goals and objectives, and student learning outcomes	
	- Adequacy of program's self-evaluation mechanisms	
	- Appropriateness of admissions and graduation requirements	
	- Appropriate number of credit hours for degrees	
	- Appropriateness of curriculum; suggestions for improvement of existing programs	
	- Involvement of business and industry in establishing goals, objectives, learning outcomes and curriculum (this item is required for science and technology, education-related program tracks/concentrations, recommended for others)	
	- Articulation with community colleges (AA and AS) for bachelor's programs	
VI.	Students	
	- Articulation Adequacy of enrollment, retention and graduation	
	- Adequacy of advising and other student support services	
	- Evidence of student learning and achievement of program outcomes	
	- Career options	
	- Outcomes, placement and satisfaction of graduates	
VII.	Faculty	
	- Quality and productivity in teaching	
	- Faculty productivity in basic and applied research	
	- Quality of departmental leadership	
	- Appropriate workloads	
	- Adequacy of faculty to deliver program (number and qualifications of faculty)	
	- Use and integration of adjunct faculty	
	- On-going professional development	

VIII.	Resources	
	- Effective use of resources	
	- Adequacy of access to library resources	
	- Adequacy of equipment for existing and proposed programs	
	- Appropriateness of space for existing and proposed programs	
	- Exploration of alternative funding sources (contracts and grants, etc.)	
IX.	Responses to Previous Program Review Recommendations	
X.	Strengths	
XI.	Needs and Recommendations:	
	1) Recommendations that require no new resources, and	
	2) Recommendations that require new resources.	
	Source: AIR Professional File, Number 105, Program Reviews	