

Kean University

PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES

Overview

Program review is an ongoing process involving the faculty and others concerned with the particular academic program. The guidelines established herewith will ensure that evaluation of the academic programs will occur formally at regular intervals. This document, therefore, describes the guidelines and a timetable for the systematic evaluation of academic programs at Kean University.

Purpose of Program Review

The primary purpose of program review is to foster excellence in education. The review process, therefore, provides an opportunity for programs to identify areas of strength and address areas that need improvements. The program review process is also an important source of data for making some resource allocation decisions. Accordingly, at each level of the review process (program and dean), recommendations will be made that the University preserve the strengths of particular programs or address specific weaknesses.

Overview of Evaluation Procedures for Academic Programs

A. *Scope of the Process*

1. Definition of Academic Program

Academic programs shall be defined as programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the following categories:

- a. degree granting programs (e.g.; B.A. in Psychology, B.S. in Chemistry, Master of Public Administration)
- b. non-degree granting programs (e.g.; General Education, Learning Assistance Program, Developmental Studies)

2. Guidelines for Program Review

If the self-study report developed by the program faculty does not address such significant requirements of the program review process as outcomes assessment, then the program faculty will be expected to address those program review requirements as an addendum to the self-study report. All other programs shall be evaluated according to guidelines in this document, as approved by the Faculty Senate and the President of the University.

3. Frequency of Evaluation

Each academic program that is to be evaluated by the guidelines shall be evaluated every five years. It will be the responsibility of the deans to cycle 20% of those programs to be reviewed each year into the program review process; and, therefore, within five years all programs within the four schools will have undergone review.

4. Selection of Programs to be Reviewed

The Dean of each School will consult with department chairpersons and/or program coordinators to determine the programs that will be selected for the first through fifth

waves of the program review process. The dean will also consult with the Dean of the Graduate School prior to finalizing the graduate program segment of the review schedule. The dean should consider factors which might place some programs at an unfair advantage in the program review process if they were to be reviewed too early.

B. *Methods for the Review Process*

1. Review of Objectives

Each program should review the objectives and activities outlined in its department strategic plan and evaluated in annual planning progress reports. Within the review process, the program should determine whether these objectives and activities reflect the goals of the institution and remain consistent with the University's mission statement, as well as academic and professional standards within the discipline. It is assumed that the Institution will continually modify and adapt its mission to be responsive to the needs of its constituencies and the mandates of the State. To remain viable, a program also needs to be responsive to these changes.

2. Review of Program Operation

Each program should undertake a review of its operation, including its curriculum, administration, and resources to determine whether or not the program is achieving its goals and objectives as outlined in planning and progress reports. The ensuing recommendations would, if appropriately implemented, result in greater success in meeting program goals and objectives and enhanced program quality. More detailed information about the self-study follows in section IV of this document.

The Self Study Document

A. *Initiation and Individuals Involved*

The evaluation shall be initiated as a self-study by the program faculty, under the leadership of the department chairperson or program coordinator. Provisions shall be made to involve in the program review process faculty, students, administrators, alumni, and, where appropriate, employers, and representatives of relevant professional associations.

B. *The Scope of the Document*

The overall emphasis of the program review report shall be on delineating the ways in which the program is meeting its goal and objectives and the relationship of these goals and objectives to the mission of the University. Specifically, the report shall provide descriptive and evaluative information about the program, incorporating relevant data wherever possible. The report should follow the format outlined below.

1. Mission and Strategic Environment

- ◆ Provide the mission statement of the department, along with the purposes, goals and objectives of the academic program.
- ◆ Describe the strategic environment within which the academic program is offered and explain how the program competes in that environment. (Refer to strategic planning documents at the department, School and Division levels)

2. Description of the Academic Program

- ◆ Provide a catalog description of the academic program.

3. Outcomes Assessment Plan

- ◆ For each stated purpose/objective of the academic program, provide (in matrix format):
 - ◆ the intended student learning outcomes;
 - ◆ through what course or courses students are expected to achieve each outcome;
 - ◆ the assessment procedures being used to validate that students are achieving each outcome;
 - ◆ how the department demonstrates that at graduation students of the program possess the requisite knowledge, skills and abilities as specified.
- ◆ For undergraduate programs, show how achievement of general education learning outcomes contributes to achievement in the major. Also describe the provisions that are made to ensure that general education skills and competencies are reinforced throughout the program of study.
- ◆ Provide a summary of the evidence that outcomes assessment data have been used to improve the program.

4. Statistical Data

- ◆ Provide the following statistical and trend data on the academic program for the last five years, as obtained from the Office of Institutional Research.
 - ◆ Enrollment 5-year history
 - ◆ Projected enrollment
 - ◆ Five-year retention history of entering freshmen who return for sophomore, junior, and senior years
 - ◆ Five-year and six-year graduation rates
 - ◆ Information on program participation in meeting foundation core, distribution requirements, concentration and/or capstone requirements for the General Education/Learning Assistance Program.

5. Discussion of Trends

- ◆ Provide a narrative explanation of significant trends in any of the above.

6. Faculty

- ◆ In Appendix 1, provide a roster of all faculty in the department who participate in the academic program, along with the date and academic area of their highest degree, other degrees, the courses they teach, race/ethnicity, gender, and other qualifications or experience. For each person who does not possess the appropriate academic credentials in the subject area they are teaching, provide a brief explanation.
- ◆ Provide information on the degree to which reliance on adjunct faculty affects the overall quality of the program.

7. Students

- ◆ Include a description of the academic profile of the students served and consideration of whether or not the students are reflective of the diversity of the student body as a whole. Student, alumni/ae, and employer follow-up data may also be included in this section.

8. Degree Criteria and Requirements

- ◆ Provide a statement of general education requirements and major program requirements to which students in the program are subject.
- ◆ Discuss the degree to which the curriculum incorporates multicultural content and a focus on critical thinking and writing skills.
- ◆ List the admissions requirements and residency requirements.
- ◆ List any examples of the use of non-traditional instruction where credit is awarded, for example, cooperative education, internships, etc.

9. Nontraditional Course Delivery

- ◆ List any courses taught using nontraditional methods of instructional delivery (web-based courses, interactive television, etc.).
- ◆ List assessment procedures being used to monitor the quality of instruction provided in each course.

10. Accreditation Organizations

- ◆ Specify professional accreditation organizations to which the department may be subject (e.g., NCATE, CSWE, FIDER, etc). For each accreditation organization, list the last date(s) of their visits.

11. Summary and Recommendations

- ◆ Summarize the main elements included in the current review and curricular (and other related) changes proposed as a consequence of this review.

12. Additional Resources Requested

- ◆ Indicate what new resources are needed over the next five years to:
 - ◆ Preserve the strengths of the current program
 - ◆ Address the weaknesses in the program identified by the review
 - ◆ Enhance the current program
- ◆ Indicate whether or not these resource needs are included (or will be included) in the departmental strategic plan and budget requests submitted to the Dean of the School.

Support and Coordination

Consideration will be given to allocations of appropriate released time for faculty to ensure the success of the program review effort.

Use of Consultants

Funds will be made available for the program faculty to retain a consultant after completion of the program review report. (Please refer to established Consultant Guidelines)

Program Review Procedures

A. *Role of the Chair/Program Coordinator*

In accordance with the schedule of program review established in the Review Document, when a program is scheduled to begin its review, the Dean of the School notifies the Chairperson of that Department. In the case of graduate programs, the Graduate Dean is also notified. In consultation with the relevant program coordinators in the Department, the Chairperson selects one (or more, depending on the number of programs to be reviewed within the Department) individual to assume responsibility for the review. This individual is referred to as the Program Review Coordinator in this document.

A program review committee shall be formed within the Department to provide support for the review effort and the Program Review Coordinator shall periodically describe the status of the effort at Department meetings.

At the conclusion of the review, the final document shall be submitted for approval to the Department before it is forwarded to the Dean.

B. *Role of the Dean*

The program review document will be submitted to the Dean of the School. The School Dean will forward copies of graduate program review documents to the Graduate Dean. The School Dean (and Graduate Dean, in the case of graduate programs) will meet with the Department Chair and/or program coordinator, the program review committee, and the authors of minority reports to discuss the findings and recommendations described in the document.

Based on this review and discussion, the School Dean will prepare a brief report. This report will include 1) an evaluation of the findings and recommendations of the department program review report and (2) a discussion of how the recommendations will be addressed within the framework of the School strategic plan and budget requests for the ensuing years. The Graduate Dean will provide a written response to the recommendations, in the case of graduate programs. The Graduate Dean's response will be appended to the School Dean's report.

C. *Role of the Administration in Program Review*

The program review reports completed at the department level will not be transmitted to administrative levels beyond the Office of the Dean. However, before submitting budget requests for any ensuing year, the Provost/VPAA will consult with the deans to ensure that recommendations for resource enhancements emerging from the program review reports are included in the prioritized requests.

In general, the group of documents generated in the program review process will serve as a source of input into the planning process for the academic area and for the University as a whole. The program review process will also provide an opportunity for faculty in the academic departments to receive feedback about the quality of their own academic programs and as well about the quality of academic programs in general. The Office of the Provost/VPAA, in consultation with the deans and appropriate department chairs, will

conduct an annual institute or forum to review and discuss outcomes and trends and what appears to be working or not working in programs reviewed to date. While no references will be made to specific programs, important feedback will be provided to enable faculty and academic administrators to develop programs for continuous improvement.

D. Timetable for Program Review

As stated previously, the program review process will be cyclic in that only 20% of all academic programs within a school will be reviewed in anyone academic year; and, therefore, within five years from the start of the program review process all academic programs will have been reviewed. The timetable below reflects the formal program review process.

TIMETABLE

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>
March 1	Provost/VPAA notifies school Deans and other appropriate offices to initiate the program review process.
March (third week)	Within two weeks of being notified by the Provost/VPAA Office, the School Deans notify 20% of the academic programs within their respective schools to begin the program review process.
April (first week)	School Deans meet individually with their respective department chairpersons and/or program coordinators to discuss the program review process, and select a consultant for the program.
April (third week)	Department and/or program convenes an appropriate committee under the direction of the department chairperson and/or program coordinator to begin planning for the program review.
May - August	Program collects data to document the achievement of learning outcomes. In addition, the committee collects statistical and trend data on the program for the last five years. In consultation with the dean, the committee selects an outside evaluator to write a review of the program 's self study.
September – January	The appropriate departmental committee reviews all available data and prepares draft of self-study report, which is disseminated among the program/department faculty for discussion and revision.
February (first week)	Final Report of the departmental committee, minority report (if appropriate), and the outside evaluator 's report are submitted to the appropriate school dean. In the case of graduate program, dean forwards copies of reports to graduate dean.
February (third week)	School dean meets with department chair or program coordinator, appropriate departmental committee, and authors of minority reports to discuss findings and recommendations.
February (last week)	Dean prepares brief report on the findings and recommendations.
March – April	Provost/VPAA Office conducts annual Institute on outcomes of program reviews.