INTRODUCTION –WHAT IS PROGRAM REVIEW?

The primary purpose of Program Review is to ensure academic quality. Program Review gives university faculty an opportunity to examine the current condition of an existing program, to review its objectives, and to make recommendations about its future.

A Program Review also provides the university with a framework for collecting information on human and financial academic resources, as well as student outcomes. Program Review serves as an important component in university planning and resource allocation processes.

The entire program review process lasts two years. During that period, the program under review will prepare a packet for submission that consists of:

- the self-study document
- the external reviewer report
- the internal reviewer report
- the dean's review of the reports
- documentation of departmental self-assessment.

This report will be submitted to the Senate Program Review Committee (PRC), which will review it and decide whether the report should be accepted, or if the committee needs more information, before sending the report forward. Once the report is accepted, it is then reviewed and voted on by the Senate body. Finally, it is sent to the provost. The form departments should use to submit their report, the **Cover Profile & Tracking Page**, is included in the appendix.

A program review requires an extensive time commitment on the part of a department and it is important that the self-study committee take advantage of resources provided by the Provost's and Dean's Office as far as data for assessment, funding for an external reviewer, secretarial support for the outside reviewer visit, and so forth.

PROGRAM REVIEW CYCLE

Programs are reviewed in a seven-year cycle by the Program Review Committee (PRC), under the direction of the Faculty Senate and in coordination with the Provost's Office. The seven year cycle includes two years of active Program Review work followed by five years of implementation before the next self-study begins. When a program group consists of more than one program of study, as in a department with multiple majors, a thorough review of *each* program or of its constituent programs should be made as part of the review.

The PRC schedule for reviewing all university programs is maintained at the Faculty Senate web site. [blogs.shu.edu/senate/] Each May, the PRC will notify each program scheduled for review in following year. Departments are expected to take from September to February to complete the self-study and February to May to complete the internal and external reviews, in time for review by the dean of the school. Submissions, complete with dean review, received in May will be processed and completed during the up-coming academic year. Submissions later than June will be processed as the PRC resources allow. See Appendix B for an example timeline.

UNDERTAKING THE PROGRAM REVIEW

ROLE OF THE SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE

The first step of Program Review is for the chair (or equivalent position) to set up self-study committee(s). The self-study committee will work with the dean, program director, or chair to prepare all the documentation necessary for the review. The self-study committee is responsible for the following with the understanding that the chair (or equivalent leader) will deliver the final product to the Program Review Committee:

- Collect the necessary data and prepare the self-study document
- arrange for the external reviewer report
- arrange for the internal reviewer report

INTERNAL REVIEW—Overview of Purpose

The internal review is prepared by a faculty member from another department in the university. It is recommended that the reviewer be from a related or similar discipline. Program representatives should avoid any perceived conflicts of interest when selecting the internal reviewer. Reciprocal reviews are not permitted.

Internal reviewer selection criteria - The reviewer shall:

- be chosen by the program director or chair with consultation with the program members;
- have no apparent bias either in favor or against the program;
- have a good understanding of how the program works.

Internal review process guidelines:

- The reviewer should be familiar with the accreditation procedures, if they exist in the discipline;
- The reviewer should read the self-study report and all pertinent documentation; should interview program faculty, students, and staff; and should submit their review in writing to the program director. The internal review is included with the final self-study document forwarded to the Program Review Steering Committee and to the dean;
- the internal reviewer's report should correspond to, and comment upon, each of the areas in the self-study report;
- the reviewer should submit her/his report to the department within 15 days of the visit
- the program may respond in writing to the internal reviewer's report and included in the program's self-study report package.

EXTERNAL REVIEW – Overview of Purpose

The external review is prepared by a subject matter expert outside the university organization or university affiliates. The dean selects the external reviewer from at least three nominations submitted by the program members.

Note: An external reviewer is not needed if there has been an accreditation reviewer *in the same year*; however, the accreditation reviewer needs to be informed that her/his review will be used for in-house program review and should therefore respond to the specific guidelines and requirements of for program review.

External reviewer selection criteria - The reviewer shall:

- be a recognized authority in the field or discipline encompassed by the program he or she is to evaluate, and have some previous experience in a consultative role;
- have no known personal or professional bias either in favor of or in opposition to Seton Hall University, any of its subdivisions, programs, or faculty;
- have teaching experience in the discipline in an institution of higher learning with a comparable program;
- be familiar with the accreditation procedures where they exist in the discipline;
- be as locally based as possible, while meeting the criteria of eligibility, to help keep expenditures down.

External review process guidelines:

- The chair or program director shall provide the external reviewer, in advance of the visit, with the self-study document and a copy of this document. The external reviewer may also request further information, such as catalogues, syllabi, examples of faculty publications and student work.
- The visit of the external reviewer shall be scheduled for a full day and shall include meetings and interviews with faculty, students, the dean, and any others involved in the preparation of the report.
- Within fifteen days of the visit, the external reviewer shall submit her/his written evaluation to the program, with a copy sent to the dean. The role of the external reviewer's report is to give assistance to the program and dean in developing and improving the academic program, in the light of the specific discipline's norms and expectations, and of the materials provided by the program in its self-study.
- Funds are provided for payment of external reviewers by the Provost's Office.
- The external reviewer's report should correspond to, and comment upon, each of the areas in the self-study report.
- The program may respond in writing to the external reviewer's report. Any such response should be included with the final submission of documents to the Program Review Committee.
  .

THE USE OF DOCUMENTATION FROM RECENT ACCREDITATION REPORTS

Professional standards from federal or state funding agencies, accrediting agencies, or professional associations within the discipline should be used if available. Programs with external accreditation bodies may attach recent accreditation reports as part of their self-study.

DATA USED FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

In order to do meaningful self-assessment and to plan for the future, departments need access to accurate data. The provost's office, in addition to providing other data departments may request, will generate the following historical data, made available to the department at the start of its program review. This report will include data covering the period since the last review, or covering the previous 5-7 years for new programs or those who have not yet been reviewed:

- Number of majors
- Number of minors
- Number of service courses for other departments or college/university cores
- Course hours generated
- Cost per credit for each program

In addition, departments should compile data reflecting faculty, administrative, and staffing levels and test passage rates (if applicable) since the last program review.

THE SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT

The Self-Study document prepared should consist of 6 Sections. Sections 5-6 should be completed after the internal and external review reports have been received:

1. Cover Profile and Tracking Page
2. Mission
3. Staffing
4. Program Assessment
5. Summary of external and internal reviews
6. Closing Comments

The following is meant to provide guidance on how to approach each section.

1. ***Cover Profile & Tracking Page*** – this page is used to track the key contact information and the status of this program review during the yearlong review life cycle. See APPENDIX.

2. ***Mission***– each program is expected to have a written mission statement. The purpose of a mission statement is to assist the program in maintaining consistent focus within itself and promoting external alignment with the university mission as a whole.

3. ***Full and Part Time Faculty, Staff, Resources, and Utilization of Resources***

A. Faculty listing by name, title, indication of teaching load, major publications and service affiliations. Vitas are not needed

B. Discuss the relative roles and include the approximate percentage of each faculty member's self-identified contribution to the program
   i. Teaching
   ii. Scholarship
   iii. Service

C. In cases where there are several programs and the percentages differ, explain the reason for the discrepancy

D. Describe faculty course releases and the reason for these releases

E. List support staff included within the program and external to the program.

4. ***Program Assessment*** –
   a. Include course offerings with a checklist of the course's primary role: major/minor requirement; service course for another program; course for a core requirement; general elective
   b. Describe the curriculum requirements of each program
   c. Summarize staffing levels since last program review identifying number, title, and year-over-year percentage of new individual program members (i.e., 1 replacement adjunct in a group of 10 would be 10% change).
   d. Place the program within a national context of three similar programs in peer institutions (size of student body and faculty number, degree offerings, ranking) that serve as benchmark schools for your report. Include a chart that compares the curriculum of the programs at benchmark schools to the program at SHU.
   e. Describe any program curricular changes since last review. If there are none, explain why the program offering is stable.
   f. Evaluate the historic cost per credit of the program using the data provided by the Provost's Office. Explain reasons for increases (reduced majors, faculty promotions) or decreases (increased class sizes, increased adjunct reliance)
   g. Provide data chart developed by the Provost's Office that includes numbers: majors, minors, credit hours, graduation rates, double majors and what they are. Provide commentary on increases and decreases
   h. What are the current goals of the program? How are these goals measured?
   i. How do the goals relate to disciplinary norms (e.g. those provided by accrediting agencies, discipline-specific professional associations, comparable programs, elite programs, etc.)?
   j. Have the operational goals changed significantly since the last program review? If so, why and how?
   k. Are any significant changes to the program outcomes anticipated to be implemented in the next 3 academic years?
   l. Summary of Outcomes Assessment Processes and Results since the prior program review

5. ***Summary and Response to External, Internal, and Dean's review***: Provide a brief summary of the results of the reviews and any response to items that were brought up in the reviews.

6. ***Closing Comments***
    a. **Conclusion**: briefly integrate the findings, program strengths & weaknesses, sharing plans within a time horizon of 3-7 years forward to build on strengths and address weaknesses.
    b. **Future Plans:** briefly list proposed program changes addressing each of the following items.
        i.   Name of this future change and description of change
        ii. Existing base resources and incremental resources required to implement this change
        iii. Expected outcome with metric for assessment.

SUBMISSION PROCEDURES AND SUBSEQUENT PROCESS – When and how is the documentation submitted to the PRC?

One completed electronic copy of the self-study document should be submitted to the Program Review Committee (current PRC chair posted on Faculty Senate web site).

Submission Package

- the self-study document, which includes opportunity to respond to internal, external, and Dean review
- the external reviewer report
- the internal reviewer report
- the dean's review of the reports
- documentation of departmental self-assessment.

Note: Changes may be made to the self-study after it has been submitted as an addendum. Please date the addendum and indicate program member approval.

RIGHT TO APPEAL: A program is welcome to submit a response to the findings of the PRC report and/or the decision by the Faculty Senate to accept or reject the PRC's recommendations. This response should be made in writing to the Provost within one month of notification in writing to address any findings of the PRC report and/or Faculty Senate decision to the Provost within one month of notification.

- The Provost communicates her/his decision in writing to the chair of the Faculty Senate, the chair of the Program Review Committee, the dean of the college involved, and the head of the reviewed program.
- The Faculty Senate may appeal the Provost's decision to the President; notification of the intent to appeal and the basis of the appeal must be made within one month.

- The recommendations of the Program Review Committee that have been endorsed by the Faculty Senate and accepted by the Provost are sent by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to the appropriate university committees for their information and implementation of any recommended changes to the program.
- Responsibility for the implementation of these recommendations resides with the Provost.

Appendix A

Cover Page

College Housing Program:	**Dean of College:**
Department:	**Chair:**
Program(s):	**Director(s) (may be Chair):**
Date of Request:	**Contact Telephone:**

Contact Email (if not shu.edu):

Date of Last Completed Review of this program:

Date of Scheduled Review:

Date of Final Review and PRC vote of support:

Date PRC final review was sent to Faculty Senate:

X_____ Date: _____

Chair/ Director of Program

X_____ Date: _____

Chair of Program Review Committee

PRC Audit Trail Use Only

□ **Information Received**   □ **Approved**   □ **Denied**   □ **Need More Information**

Next Target PRC Review Date for this program: _____

Appendix B

EXAMPLE: PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

The Psychology Department in Arts & Sciences has 4 primary programs (BA, BS, Minor, MS) that would be reviewed simultaneously. The rationale for doing one review of all programs in a department is that decisions in one program often has an impact on another program. For example, adding a required graduate course means a faculty member has reduced availability for undergraduate courses.

TIMELINE FOR A DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM REVIEW BEGINNING IN 2017

The department is notified in May 2017 that it should start its self-study with a full report and documentation to be submitted to the Program Review Committee in May 2018. As referenced in the introduction this consists of a self-study document; an external reviewer report; an internal reviewer report; the dean's review of the reports; and documentation of departmental self-assessment. The PRC completes the assessment process including Faculty Senate review submitted to the Provost, the Board of Regents, and the University Planning and Budget Committee by July of 2019. Thus there is one academic year for self-assessing and documentation and one academic year for review.

Date	Task
May 2017	Psychology Department Notified of Forthcoming Program Review
Sept 2017-Feb 2018	Psychology Department formulates self-study document that covers four programs (BA, BS, Minor, MS)
Feb 2018-April 2018	Internal and External Reviews are conducted; Dean Letter Created
May 2018	Full Self-Study Report is completed and forwarded to Program Review Committee
Sept 2018-Feb 2018	Program Review Committee Creates Report
Feb 2018-May 2018	Program Review Recommendations brought to Senate for Endorsement and then forwarded to Provost Office
May 2018-July 2018	Provost Response to Program Review