



Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President Academic Program Review Guidelines

Program Review Process

The purpose of program review is to enhance the quality of academic programs, to provide guidance for academic planning and budgetary decisions, and to determine appropriate levels of support for all of Roosevelt University's academic programs.

Program review is an internal process that requires careful organization and planning, recognition of specific program/departmental characteristics, and development of a comprehensive data profile for each program. The review is evaluative as well as descriptive, directed toward improvement, results in specific actions, and is aimed at coordinating programs' objectives with institutional mission and priorities. The outcomes of such reviews will normally address all of the following questions:

1. How well does the program's mission and goals align with institutional mission and priorities?
2. What quantitative and qualitative evidence supports the hypothesis that the program is vital, attractive to students, and meets Roosevelt's productivity standards?
3. What evidence supports the hypothesis that faculty of the program are well trained, current in their field, and are teaching effectively?
4. What evidence supports the hypothesis that the program's curriculum is clearly defined, coherent, intellectually rigorous, and connected to the mission of the university?
5. What are students in this program expected to know and be able to do when they complete the program's curriculum?
6. What measures are used to assess whether or not students are meeting the educational objectives of the program's curriculum? How is assessment information used to improve and/or maintain the quality of the program?
7. Are resources adequate to enable the program to fulfill its mission?
8. How does the program's mission, faculty, curriculum, and student profile compare with those of similar programs at RU benchmark institutions?

During the review process, particular attention will be paid to programs defined as "low-productivity." The University monitors data on enrollments and graduates by major and will identify programs with a five-year average that falls below graduation standards set by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President. Programs in this category must provide commentary on their enrollment and graduation levels, and on the prospects for increasing numbers of majors and graduates. Strategies for improving enrollments and the number of graduates should be incorporated into these programs' self-study documents.

Program Review Steps and Timeline

1. *Spring Semester Prior to Review Year: Appointment of Self-Study Committee and Process Orientation.*

Once the program faculty of a program scheduled for program review is notified, the chair of the department offering the program in consultation with the dean will appoint a self-study committee and a chair of the committee. The self-study committee is responsible for producing the self-study document in accordance with stated guidelines.

2. *By November 1 of Review Year: Institutional Research Distributes Data to Programs Under Review.*
The data report will be available in electronic versions for distribution to deans, committee members, and the provost.
3. *By March 15 of Review Year: Submission of Preliminary Self-Study Report to Dean/s.*
All preliminary self-study documents are due to the appropriate college dean (and the graduate dean in the case of graduate programs) by March 15 of the review year. The appropriate college dean (and the graduate dean in the case of graduate programs) has an opportunity to review the program's report and prepare formal written comments. The graduate dean's comments are forwarded to the appropriate college dean and then are shared with the Steering Committee and provost as part of the final report packet submitted to the Steering Committee. Deans' comments are shared with the program prior to submission of the final version of the self-study to the Steering Committee.
4. *By May 1 of Review Year: Submission of All Review Documents to Steering Committee.*
The final self-study document, comments from external reviewers, and dean's (or deans') comments are due to the Steering Committee by May 1 of the review year.
5. *By June 1 of Review Year: Submission of Steering Committee Report to the Provost.*
The Steering Committee will forward its report and recommendations to the provost in a written report by June 1 of the review year. Copies are provided to the programs under review to check for accuracy. The final report will include 1) the Committee's report and recommendations; 2) the program's self-study report; 3) the dean's (or deans' in the case of graduate programs) response to the self-study; and 4) any responses to the Committee's report made by the program or the college dean or the graduate dean where appropriate.
6. *Academic Year Following Program Review: Actions Taken in Response to Recommendations.*
After reviewing the report and comments, the provost meets with program representatives and the college dean (and the graduate dean at the discretion of the provost) to determine future action related to the recommendations. Subsequent meetings will be scheduled to discuss the progress on recommendations. If ongoing action is required, additional follow-up sessions will be arranged. Actions taken in response to program review recommendations will be reported to the president, the provost, the college dean (and graduate dean where appropriate), the program, and all university parties involved in the planning, assessment, and budgeting processes.

Program Review Participants

Groups involved in the program review process are the provost, the Program Review Steering Committee, the appropriate college dean (and the graduate dean in the case of graduate programs), the department chair, a program review self-study committee, faculty of the program, students in the program, and the external reviewers. The results of the review (self-studies, responses, and reports of the external reviewers) are reported to the president, the provost, the appropriate dean or deans, the department, and other university parties involved in the planning, assessment, and budgeting processes.

Program Review Schedule

Program reviews for all degree programs are scheduled on a seven-year cycle. Programs may request a change to the standard seven-year cycle based on timing of external reviews or other accreditation review.

The university review is not intended to burden departments with an additional review process. In an attempt to minimize the duplication of effort and maximize the value of all review processes, documentation prepared within the last three years as part of a department or program accreditation

and/or external review processes may be submitted or included in the materials submitted for program review. These reports will be reviewed for completeness and alignment with the program review requirements as outlined in this document. Requests for additional information will be made if necessary.

Program Review Steering Committee

Each year of the review cycle, upon the recommendation of each college dean, the provost will appoint members of a committee whose responsibility it is to coordinate the review process and:

1. Review of all the self-study reports submitted by the programs.
2. Negotiate variations in report format and calendar with programs that have recently undergone review by external accrediting agencies.
3. Prepare a brief response to each report to share with the program, its dean or deans, and the provost.

The responsibility of this committee is to promote consistent standards throughout the review process and to give advice and counsel to the program, the appropriate college dean (and graduate dean where appropriate), and the Provost.

The committee will be composed of at least eight members representing a cross-section of University programs and colleges including:

1. One faculty member from each college (from departments whose programs are not under review).
2. One department chair or her/his designee from each department with programs under review.
3. For the review of graduate programs, the Graduate Council shall elect one of its members to serve on the Steering Committee.

The provost shall appoint a chair of the Steering Committee each year. The Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Administration is an ex officio (voting) member of this Committee and also serves as the staff liaison and convener to the Committee.

Program Review Results

The program review results will be used in strategic planning, programmatic planning, and the institutional budgeting process. As a key component of the Academic Strategic Plan, program review supports responsiveness to needs for programmatic development and restructuring and may be modified pending strategic planning outcomes.

Review results will provide critical internal information about size and stability of program, current and future resource needs, market demand, equipment and space needs, strengths and weaknesses, and how the program relates to the Roosevelt University Mission and the Goals and Objectives of the Strategic Plan.

Reviews culminate in recommendations developed by the Program Review Steering Committee in consultation with the appropriate college dean (and the graduate dean in the case of graduate programs). The recommendations are communicated to the provost, who will make a final determination on the response to the self-study document. The recommendation may include a summary statement indicating the strength of program or a statement recommending placing the program in one of the following five categories:

1. Recommend program expansion.
2. Recommend continuation of program in current form.
3. Recommend program continuation, but with adjustments to current funding level and/or program modifications.

4. Recommend special attention to program and continuing review.
5. Recommend the program be discontinued.

The emphasis is on requiring plans for action in response to the reviews: the Program Review Steering Committee might, in the absence of satisfactory findings and adequate plans for remedying deficiencies, recommend sanctions such as the phasing down or reduction of the program.

Outline for the Self-Study Report

The Program Review process focuses on the missions and goals of the programs being evaluated. The self-study report should identify and describe in some detail the program's mission and goals. These should include goals related to instruction, scholarship, and public engagement/service. Next, the report should delineate ways in which the program's mission and goals are consistent with the mission and goals of the university. Finally, the bulk of the report should focus on providing evidence that the program is effectively carrying out its mission and meeting its goals. In this section, issues such as curriculum, enrollment, and faculty must be addressed, as well as measures of student learning outcomes.

In addition, the report should address student involvement and satisfaction, program resources (e.g., library resources, space, technology), comparisons with appropriate benchmark institutions, evaluation of the program by external sources, and program administration and planning processes.

As a general guideline, the program review self-study report will be 12-15 pages in length (single-spaced). Components of the report:

1. **Brief Program Profile. This section orients the reader to the program. It should be no longer than one page in length and include the following:**
 - a. Name and a very brief description of academic program.
 - b. Name and position of the person who is responsible for administering the program. If there is a special coordinator/s for this program, identify the current coordinator/s.
 - c. Any department committees charged with monitoring the program and description of their function with regard to the program.
 - d. A brief summary of any previous reviews of the program and reference to accreditation status from any professional organization.
2. **Program Mission and Goals. This section describes the program's mission and goals. Include goals in each of the following areas:**
 - a. Instruction
 - b. Scholarship
 - c. Public Engagement/Service
 - d. Other. List any goals in other areas (e.g. student-related, university service).
3. **Relationship to Institutional Mission. This section delineates the ways in which the program's mission and goals align with those established by the college and university, specifically RU's Mission and Strategic Plan.**
4. **Instructional Effectiveness. This section provides evidence that the program effectively meets the goals defined in Program Mission and Goals.**
 - a. Curriculum. Which courses taught by the program are designed to fulfill the various goals described in Section 2, Program Mission and Goals?

- i. Does the program provide service courses for the general education program?
 - If so, identify the courses and describe how they relate to the general education category goals.
 - Are the courses offered regularly and at appropriate times to meet the identified needs of students?
 - If not, explain why?
 - How does the department determine the frequency of course offerings for the general education program?
 - ii. Does the program offer service courses for other degree programs?
 - If so, identify the courses and the program or programs for which they are offered.
 - Are the courses offered regularly and at appropriate times to meet identified needs?
 - If not, explain why?
 - How does the department determine the frequency of course offerings for other department(s)?
 - iii. Identify specific strengths and weaknesses in the current curriculum. How does the department address the weaknesses, if any?
 - iv. Describe the role of technology in the delivery of the program's curriculum. Does the program offer any fully online or web-enhanced courses? If so, list and describe.
 - v. Describe use of cooperative education and internships as part of the program's preparation of its students.
- b. Enrollment. Comment on enrollment data provided by Institutional Research. What trends or patterns are significant? Using the data provided:
- i. Project the number of declared majors for the next three years.
 - ii. Comment on the number of students who graduated from the program for the past three years. Project numbers of graduates for the next three years.
 - iii. Provide an estimate of the program's growth or decline in enrollment for the next three years. Explain reasons for growth or decline. What effect will growth or decline have on the program's resources, both instructional and operating?
 - iv. Comment on the program's enrollment capacity. How many majors can the program accommodate? Is the program at capacity?
 - v. Describe the program's recruitment strategies?
 - vi. Identify any admission standards that apply to the program.
- c. Faculty. Describe the faculty assigned to the program.
- i. How many full-time faculty members currently teach in the program?
 - a. List how many of the full-time faculty members are at each of the various faculty ranks (include FT NTT and visiting, if applicable).
 - b. Indicate the percentage of the program's credit hours that have been taught by full-time faculty members.
 - ii. What percentage of the tenured and tenure-track faculty have appropriate terminal degrees, or degrees/credentials appropriate to the mission of the program?
 - iii. How many part-time faculty members currently teach in the program?
 - a. List the percentage of the program's credit hours that have been taught by part-time faculty during the prior year.

- b. Comment on the appropriateness of the full-time versus part-time faculty ratio.
 - c. If the ratio is a problem, identify steps planned to correct this imbalance.
 - iv. What changes have occurred in the program's faculty over the past five years?
 - a. Has the size of the faculty increased or decreased? Explain factors leading to the increase or decrease.
 - b. Are there specific recurring issues surrounding retention and recruitment of faculty in the program?
 - c. Project the program's need for full-time and part-time faculty for the next five years in relation to the projection of program growth or decline in enrollment indicated above.
5. **Learning Outcomes/Goals for Students. This section applies primarily to students who have declared this program as their major field of study.** Each degree program should have an established set of specific learning outcomes for its majors. The learning outcomes should specify exactly what knowledge and skills students are expected to have when they complete the program.
- a. Describe the learning outcomes established for students in the program.
 - b. Explain how the learning outcomes shape the requirements and electives of the program's curriculum.
 - c. Describe the measures used to assess whether or not students are meeting the learning outcome objective of the program's curriculum.
 - d. Describe how the program communicates the learning outcomes/goals to students.
 - e. Discuss the ways the department uses the information gathered through the assessment process to improve and/or maintain the quality of the program.
6. **Scholarship. This section provides evidence that the program is achieving its goals in the area of scholarly activity.** Because scholarly activity is normally conducted by a program's tenured and tenure-track faculty, this section generally will summarize the faculty's scholarly work and highlight some of its most significant accomplishments. It is important to indicate how the program defines scholarship and to demonstrate that the program's goals in this regard are being addressed. It is not the purpose of the Program Review process to evaluate the work of individual faculty members and it is understood that all faculty may not be engaged in meeting the program's goals in all areas. Nevertheless, one indicator of the strength of a program may be the number of faculty actively involved in scholarly activity, public engagement/service or both. Thus, this section should not be limited to the accomplishments of one or two outstanding scholars, but should demonstrate the breadth of faculty participation in scholarly work.
7. **Public Engagement/Service. This section provides evidence that the program is meeting its goals in the area of Public Engagement/Service.** Once again, much of what the program accomplishes in this area will involve the work of its faculty and this section will generally summarize their efforts. It is important to state how the program defines public engagement/service to demonstrate that the program's goals in this area are being addressed, and to indicate the breadth of faculty participation in these activities.
- a. List any special initiatives currently underway with public audiences. What is the scope of such initiatives and who are their audiences?
 - b. What are the outcomes of these initiatives (e.g. special events)?
8. **Student Involvement and Satisfaction. This section describes the program's involvement**

with students and discusses the students' satisfaction with the program. Answer and provide detail for the following:

- a. Does the program have a website that contains information about program requirements?
- b. Does the program have discipline-related student organizations that are sponsored by faculty? If so, describe their activities.
- c. Describe the academic advising process for students in the program.
- d. Discuss the results of any assessment process used to evaluate student satisfaction with the program.

9. Information Resources and Instructional Equipment. This section describes the adequacy of the program's facilities, equipment, and library resources. Provide information on the following:

- a. Adequacy of library holdings for the program.
- b. Strengths and weaknesses of library holdings and department's information resources (e.g. computers and journals for students).
- c. Quality of current facilities and capital equipment used by the program.
- d. Strengths and weaknesses in facilities and capital equipment.
- e. Most pressing unmet needs of the program as related to facilities and equipment. Explain these needs.

10. Program Benchmarking. This section should help the department gather information about best practices used by RU's benchmark institutions. Based on your review of materials gathered from the benchmark institutions, address the following:

- a. Briefly describe the process for gathering information from the benchmark institutions and indicate contacted institutions.
- b. List any significant similarities and differences between your program and related programs at the benchmark institutions. Identify institution and comment on findings.
- c. List features of analogous programs at the benchmark institutions that are not currently practices in your program but that you believe should be considered for adoption by your program. List at least two and explain your choices.
- d. List resources needed to incorporate these features into your program?

11. External Evaluators. The use of external evaluators in program review is required. Selection of external reviewers is made by the provost and executive vice president upon the recommendation of the department chair, college dean, and the graduate dean in the case of graduate programs. Funding for compensating external evaluators and consultants must be requested from and approved by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President.

12. Program Planning. This section should discuss the program's planning process for the next 3-5 years.

- a. Describe current and long-range opportunities and challenges facing the program.
- b. What are the program's strategies for taking advantage of these opportunities and meeting these challenges?
- c. How does the program's strategic plan relate to the Goals and Objectives of the RU's Strategic Plan?

13. Dean's Response and Recommendations. The appropriate college dean (and graduate dean in the case of graduate programs) will comment in writing on the program's self-study and make recommendations about issues raised in the report and a general recommendation as

outlined in Program Review Results section above. College deans and the graduate dean will share their comments with each other during the response and recommendation phase of the review process. The dean's (or deans' in the case of graduate programs) response and recommendations will be attached to the self-study and the two documents will be forwarded together to the Program Review Steering Committee for review (by March 15).