UNITED STATES UNIVERSITY

Program Review Manual Version 2.0

Approved by Faculty Senate: January 2017
Administrative Updates: February 2017, September 2018, August 2024

Introduction

United States University (USU) is committed to examining how programs meet stated outcomes; to this end, it has established a system of regular program review (for other assessment activities, refer to the [Assessment Handbook](#)). All programs are reviewed every five years, according to the program review schedule (Appendix A).

Reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate, this manual guides program review teams in developing a program review report. Ultimately, the faculty hold primary responsibility for assessing programs, with assistance from academic administration.

Purpose and Principles of Program Review: Improving Quality and Maintaining Currency

A program review is a cyclical process for evaluating and continuously enhancing the quality and currency of programs. The evaluation is conducted through a combination of self-evaluation and peer evaluation by reviewers external to the program or department and often external to the organization. It is a comprehensive analysis of the program, analyzing a wide variety of data indicative of quality and viability. The results are then used to inform follow-up planning and budgeting processes at various levels in the institution (e.g., program, college, university) and incorporated into the institution's overall quality assurance system.

The foundational principle of the program review process is to provide faculty with the opportunity, time, and resources for thoughtful reflection and conversation about the quality and currency of their programs with the goal of continual improvement.

Program Review Process

The program review process aims to provide a structure to foster continuous program improvement aligned with departmental, college, and institutional goals. The timeline of program reviews is designed to provide information on resources required to implement recommendations for quality improvement in sufficient time for consideration in budget development.

Faulty owns the program review process; however, several other key players are involved, as described below.

Role	Responsibility
Faculty Senate	Approves Program Review Manual
Program Review Team	Assembled by Dean. The Program Review Team includes the Program Director, faculty, and one member of OIRA. If appropriate, the Team may also include Deans.
Team Chair	The Program Director is typically the Team Chair (although a designee may be assigned). The Team Chair is responsible for managing the program review process
Provost	The Provost provides input regarding

	findings and oversees budget allocation for improvement plans
OIRA	Provides relevant data for the Program Review Team by request using the [Data Request Form](). OIRA may also assist with statistical analysis to assist with understanding the data
Dean/Assessment Committee	Provides feedback during key points in the program review process
External Reviewers	Review all relevant documentation and prepare a written report, which may include recommendations not cited in the Program Review and is completed by the Team

Each program is given flexibility in completing the process; however, a suggested timeline is presented below. This timeline is designed with an early conclusion to permit a reasonable process extension as needed. Resource recommendations must be made available by the end of August to permit consideration in the following year's budget development.

Fall I (before the year the review is due): Preparation
- OIRA notifies the Dean about the upcoming review.
- The Dean creates the Program Review Team, including at least one Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) member, to assist with data collection. The Program Director serves as the Team Chair.
- A preliminary meeting of the Program Review Team is held to confirm or adjust the schedule and review institutional research needs,
- A request for required data is made to OIRA using the [Data Request Form]().

Fall 2: Analysis
- OIRA provides the Team Chair with requested program data for the last five years (e.g., enrollment and retention data, alumni and student satisfaction results, average class size, finance, etc.)
- Program Review Team commences analysis of data.

Spring I: Drafting the Program Review
- Program Review Team drafts the program review, identifying the strengths and limitations of the program and suggesting solutions for identified problems.

Spring 2: Finalizing Preliminary Program Review and Planning External Review
- The Program Review Team completes the preliminary review.
- Program Review Team assembles a list of potential External Reviewers and forwards the review with the list to the Dean (including a rationale for why each reviewer is qualified and their CVs).
- Dean provides feedback and selects external reviewer(s).
- The Program Director organizes external review and coordinates payment (honoraria comes from the Provost's budget).

Summer I: External Review
- External review is conducted.
- External report is sent to the Program Review Team to correct factual inaccuracies and draft a cohesive plan for program improvement.
- The revised Program Review is submitted to the Dean and Assessment Committee for input.

Summer 2: Institutional Actions
- Program Review Team incorporates feedback from the Dean and Assessment Committee and shares with the Dean and Provost.
- OIRA organizes a meeting of program representatives and the Provost to discuss resource allocation.
- Program Review Team revises the report, including budgetary considerations, and submits it to OIRA for implementation, tracking, and archiving.

Progress Report
A brief Progress Report is due to OIRA each Summer that a Program Review is not due, documenting how the changes proposed with the previous review are implemented and the results.

Specialized Accreditation Reviews
Discipline Accreditation or Certification Reports may substitute for portions of the Academic Program Review if the Dean determines they sufficiently address the elements required in the program review process. If the discipline accreditation does not include the elements required, they may be addressed in a supplemental report. This report can then be submitted with the Discipline Accreditation Self-Study to OIRA and considered in the Improvement Plan. If the discipline accreditation does not include elements required, they may be addressed in a supplemental report submitted with the discipline accreditation self-study to OIRA and considered in the Improvement Plan.

Program Review Report Suggested Outline

Introduction - Create an overview of the program, including the following:
1. Description of Program: College, Degrees Granted, Concentrations, Modalities in which the program is offered, and Relationship to other USU programs if applicable. How and when was accreditor approval for this program obtained?
2. Program Mission and Learning Outcomes: List the program learning outcomes and describe how they were developed; include any alignment with related educational organizations (e.g., programmatic accreditors, other national/international organizations related to the course content area).
3. Relation to Institutional Mission, Vision, and Values: How does this program align with and further USU's mission, vision, and values?
4. If an undergraduate program, how do the program's learning outcomes align with the core competencies required by WASC?
5. Brief history of the program/description of changes since the last review (if relevant); document the approval of these changes.

Analysis of Evidence about Program Academic Quality - Include in this section the following elements:

1. Student demographics: What is the demographic composition (gender, ethnicity, age) of students enrolled in this program in the Fall of the review year? How do these demographic characteristics align with the mission and values of USU? Other indicators related to mission/vision/values should also appear here.
2. Faculty:
   a. Terminal degree proportion.
   b. List of faculty specialties within the discipline (and alignment to program curriculum).
   c. Diversity of faculty: Include information on the gender and ethnicity of faculty teaching in your program. Do the demographic characteristics of your core and adjunct faculty align with USU's commitment to diversity and the demographic characteristics of the students in your program?
   d. Faculty evaluation: What is the process of evaluating prospective core and adjunct faculty? How does the program ensure that faculty assigned to courses are qualified by education and experience to provide quality instruction?
   e. Other academic quality indicators (e.g., external funding awarded to faculty, record of professional practice, services, awards, and recognition, etc.)
   f. Include the current vitae of core faculty in an appendix.
3. Closing the loop:
   a. List changes made since the last program review and how these have been assessed. What evidence do you have that changes have improved student learning/success?

Curriculum and Learning Environment - Include in this section the following elements:
1. Curriculum Map: Along with the curriculum map, it will describe how the curriculum addresses the learning outcomes. These documents will describe the levels of achievement expected at different levels of student progress through the program.
2. Comparisons with peer institutes: Comparison to the curriculum of selected other institutions and/or disciplinary/professional standards as appropriate.
3. Scaffolding: Describe how the program assures student progress is sequential and cumulative. How does the program facilitate students enrolling in courses in which initial achievement in an outcome is expected prior to enrolling in courses in which higher levels of achievement are expected?
4. Integration: Describe how the courses in the program provide students with the opportunity to integrate knowledge and skills and how achievement of integration is evaluated.
5. Pedagogical Approach: Describe how various learning modalities and learning preferences are addressed.
6. Student Course Evaluations: How are student evaluations of courses used? What are the results of the most recent course evaluations? (Use at least the previous term's data, but you may include additional information from prior terms.)
7. Programmatic changes: Describe any changes in your program resulting from these evaluations and how you track these changes.
8. Co-curricular experiences: Description of co-curricular learning experiences and student participation in those experiences (as applicable).

Student Learning and Success - Include in this section the following elements:

1. Results: Annual results of direct and indirect outcomes assessment. Include annual assessment reports in the appendix.

2. <u>Assessment process</u>: How and when are program learning outcomes assessed?
3. <u>Student retention and graduation rate trends</u> (disaggregated).
4. <u>Student satisfaction</u>: Provide information on the results of the most recent student satisfaction survey from students in your program. How have these results impacted program activity?
5. <u>End of program and/or Alumni Surveys:</u> As available.
6. <u>Job Placements:</u> As available.
7. <u>Student Achievements:</u> As available.

Analysis of Evidence about Program Viability - Include in this section the following elements:
1. Demand for the Program
   a. <u>Enrollment Trends</u>: What are the Fall I enrollment trends for the previous 5 years (including the present year)? Is enrollment increasing, decreasing, or holding steady? What are the Fall I new enrollment trends for the previous 5 years (including the present year)? Is new enrollment increasing, decreasing, or holding steady?
   b. <u>First Years</u>: What are the current first-year retention rates for the prior year? How does this compare to benchmark institutions' persistence rates? Are there significant demographic differences between students who continue and those who do not?
   c. <u>Graduation Rates</u>: What data are available for graduation rates? Do the graduate demographics align with program demographics?
   d. <u>Enrollment Information:</u> How does the enrollment information above impact the program's ability to become/remain fiscally sustainable? What changes would be needed to improve the program's fiscal stability? What resources might be required to accomplish this?
   e. <u>Retention/Graduation:</u> How does the retention/graduation data provided above impact the program's academic quality, particularly concerning student demographics? What changes would be needed to improve the program's retention and graduation rates, if applicable? What resources might be required to accomplish this?
2. Profession/Community/Society Developments
   a. How does the program maintain/improve its position in the current educational and societal environment? What changes might be necessary to improve the program's position in the educational marketplace? What resources might be required to accomplish this?
3. Allocation of Resources
   a. Faculty
      i. <u>Full-time faculty</u>: How many full-time faculty does the program currently employ? What are their ranks? What are their responsibilities? Faculty workload, including sufficient time for course development, administrative duties, etc.
      ii. <u>Adjunct faculty</u>: How many adjunct faculty currently teach in the program? What are the responsibilities of adjunct faculty? How are adjunct faculty incorporated into the program development and learning outcomes assessment processes?
      iii. Full-time-to-adjunct ratio
      iv. Student-faculty ratio
      v. Faculty review and evaluation process: What is the process by which full-time and adjunct faculty are evaluated? What are the results of the

most recent evaluation process?
  vi. What is the mentoring processes for new and/or continuing faculty? Are faculty engaging with this process?
  vii. <u>Faculty Development:</u> What resources are provided for faculty (full-time/adjunct) professional and pedagogical development?
- b. Student Support
  i. Orientation
  ii. Academic and career advising programs and resources
  iii. Tutoring, supplemental instruction
  iv. Basic skill remediation (if applicable)
  v. Financial support (scholarships, etc.)
  vi. Support for engagement in campus community
  vii. Support for research or engagement in the community beyond campus (fieldwork, internships) (if applicable)
- c. Information and Technology Resources
  i. Library
  ii. Technology resources available to support the pedagogy in the program
  iii. Technology resources available to support student's needs
- d. Facilities
  i. Classroom space/labs (if applicable)
- e. Financial Resources
  i. Operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends 3-5 year period

Summary Reflection
1. Based on the information in this Program Review, conduct an analysis of the program's academic quality and sustainability. In each of these areas:
   a. What are this program's strengths? How can these improve the program's position academically and fiscally?
   b. What are this program's weaknesses? How can we work to improve these areas?
   c. What are the program's opportunities? How can these opportunities be made realities?
   d. What are the program's threats? How can these be neutralized? What are the most significant changes to be made? What are the resources required to implement change?

Future Goals and Planning for Improvement - Include in this section the following elements:
1. Evidence-based plan for strengthening the program:
   a. Goals for the next 5 years
   b. Plan: List deliverables/measures, target dates, and resources required (costs and personnel). To remain within the budget, prioritize the recommendations in order of importance, demonstrating how certain activities have the most significant potential to create improvement and, therefore, should be accomplished and funded first. If needed, update this section following the External Reviewers/Assessment Committee review.

Findings and Recommendations from External Reviewers and Assessment Committee - Include in this section the following elements:
   1. Findings and recommendations from the External Reviewer and Assessment Committee: Were there any discrepancies between what the Program Review Team

found/suggested and the other reviewers?

Improvement Plan - In this section, include the following elements after funding has been secured:
1. What changes will be made, when will they be made, and who will oversee them? (include a calendar/Gantt chart in an appendix).
2. What data needs to be collected to determine that the changes had the expected impact (how will you close the loop)?

Progress Reports - Each summer that a Program Review is not completed (the 4 years between scheduled Program Reviews), a Progress Report is due. The following elements are included:
1. List each change listed in the Improvement Plan and provide a summary of:
   a. An implementation update
   b. Evidence of the impact of the change
   c. Any modifications made due to the evidence

Appendix A: USU Program Review Five-Year Cycle (2022 - 2026)

Program Review Schedule

College	Program	Date of Last Review	Next Review Due
COBT	MBA	2024	2029
COBT	iMBA	2024	2029
COBT	DBA	New program launched 2023	2028
COBT	iDBA	New program launched 2023	2028
COE	TCPP	2020	2025
COE	MAT	2020	2025
COE	BSEE	2020	2025
COE	MAED	2023	2028
COE	EdD/EdS	New program launched 2023	2028
CONHS	RN-BSN	2022	2027

CONHS	MSN	2022	2027
CONHS	DNP	New program launched 2023	2028

Appendix B: Revision Log

Title:	Program Review Manual
Approved by:	Associate Provost, Curriculum and Accreditation
Effective date:	September 18, 2018
Original issue date:	March 7, 2017
Current Version	v2.0 Revised to reflect the creation of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) and the Assessment Committee. Updated to refer to the revised Assessment Handbook and includes updated Program Review Calendar.
Previous Version	v1.0 Revision of the 2014 manual
Previous Version:	v1.1 Revisions: self-study activities schedule revised (from month by month to session by session); self-study activities refined (all based on feedback from faculty using v1.0)
Previous Version:	v1.2 Revisions: Updated Assessment and Program Review Schedules (2018-2023); documents/forms list (location and addition of items); font and logo