TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

Title: Periodic Program Review
Policy Number: 02.60.11
Effective Date: July 28, 2003
Issuing Authority: Office of the President

I   Purpose

The purpose of periodic program review is to provide a regular process for encouraging schools and colleges to reflect on how to improve their teaching, service, and scholarly and creative activities. The specific goals are to: 1) assess what programs do, 2) clarify rationales for teaching, research and service missions, 3) review indicators of the quality of programs and student outcomes, and 4) establish action plans for improvement and for monitoring progress toward measurable objectives for improvement. The first round of reviews should both evaluate programs and develop a baseline of data on which future reviews can build.

It is not the intent of a periodic program review process to recommend closing programs. Rather, the review process is intended to encourage schools/colleges to take steps to ensure that programs serve the University's mission and strategic direction and to foster excellence as defined by the discipline, nationally, the department, the college in which it is housed, and the University.

Institutional Support for Periodic Program Review

Periodic program review will be administered by the University administration in consultation with the deans, the Faculty Senate, and other appropriate faculty bodies. The administration will provide adequate funding and administrative support for conducting the external components of each review and will also provide institutional data in a timely manner for programs to use in the preparation of their respective self-studies.

Components of Program Review

All regular program reviews should include:

1.   A self-study that addresses issues specific to disciplines in the areas under review and provides quantitative and qualitative indicators of program quality;

2.   An external review that includes an on-site visit with recommendations for improvements that are realistic and that can be monitored;

3.	A plan for continual improvement that provides faculty and department chairs clear expectations for improvement that will be reviewed periodically with the dean, Provost and President.

II   Coordination of Program Review and Accreditation Report

Because accreditation serves a somewhat different function from program review, accreditation is not a substitute for program review. However, recognizing the burden of repeated reviews, the University will work with academic units that are subject to accreditation visits to coordinate the two processes. Whenever possible, the accreditation self-study should include the same data required for program review. Program representatives should consult with the appropriate administrative office in advance of preparing both the accreditation and program review self-study to reduce or eliminate duplication of effort. If the accreditation self-study is rigorous, and includes most of the data required for program review, the accreditation self-study can be used for program review. If the accreditation self-study does not include all required components of program review, the additional components should be presented as an addendum to the self-study. Program review plans for improvement should include review of any interim reports required by the accrediting organization and be part of the process of monitoring in consultation with the Dean of the School/College, the Provost and President.

III   Program Review Self-Study

The self-study prepared by the unit will include information about the curriculum, teaching, scholarship, and service as well as a review of student learning outcomes as appropriate to the program(s) under review. Each self-study should draw on official university data, information collected by the school, college/department annual reports, reports from nationally recognized academic organizations, and other sources as appropriate for the discipline(s). Utilizing internal advising documents, reports, and institutional data, academic programs will be asked to answer broad questions and where appropriate, make comparisons with benchmark programs and national norms. The key areas to be addressed are 1) Vision and Mission, 2) Strategic Direction, 3) Faculty, 4) Commitment to Diversity, 5) Curriculum, 6) Assessment Methods, 7) Qualifications and Performance of Students, 8) Identification of Benchmarks, 9) Relationship of Size and Resources, and 10) Overall Functioning of the Unit.

1.	**Vision and Mission**
	a)	How well does the program articulate its vision and mission?
	b)	Are the vision and mission consistent with the actual functioning of the unit?

2.	**Strategic Direction**
	a)	Has the unit translated its vision and mission into a strategic plan that includes specific goals to achieve the vision and mission?

b)   Has the unit defined its specific goals in measurable terms, so that progress toward achievement of the objectives can be evaluated by the unit and others?

c)   Has the unit established intermediate benchmarks for each goal that are steps to the full achievement of the strategic plan objectives?

d)   Has the unit identified time lines for achieving the intermediate benchmarks and the full goals that are necessary to achieve the vision and mission for the unit?

e)   Has the unit developed a resource plan for achieving each of the goals necessary to fulfill its mission and vision? Hs the unit articulated the sources of those resources and a time line for assembling the necessary resources?

f)   Has the mission and vision as well as the strategic goals and resource plan been reviewed with the appropriate officers (Dean, Provost, President or others) whose support may be helpful in achieving the mission and vision of the unit? Do they support the mission and vision as well as the strategic goals?

3. Faculty

a)   What are the current strengths and weaknesses of faculty in the academic unit in teaching, scholarship or creative work and service? (The indicators to be used will include those used for promotion, tenure, and merit in the unit under review.)

b)   How well do faculty in the unit interact with each other and with academic and administrative units to carry out the vision and mission?

c)   Are faculty and graduate students appropriately attentive to their role in educating undergraduates?

d)   Are faculty and graduate students committed to engaging in scholarship, research and other creative activities and integrating these achievements into their teaching?

4. Commitment to Diversity

a)   What is the academic program's commitment to a diverse population of faculty, staff, and graduate students

b)   What curricular elements provide diverse perspectives and sub-disciplinary balance within both the undergraduate and graduate curricula? (The indicators will include course offerings, degree requirements, syllabi, and curricular materials.)

5. Curriculum

a)   How well does the curriculum of the academic unit reflect current knowledge in the field and prepare Temple students in accordance with the mission of the unit?

b)   Does the curriculum provide students coherent grounding in the core discipline as well as in specialized areas?

6. Assessment Methods

    a)   To what extent does the academic unit have systematic assessment methods for determining student outcomes for its majors?

    b)   Where applicable, to what extent does the academic unit have systematic methods for determining the learning outcomes for students who are not majors, but who may be required to take courses in its undergraduate or graduate program(s) to fulfill general education or degree requirements of other programs?

    c)   Does the academic unit make good use of assessment outcomes for the improvement of its academic program(s)?

    d)   Where applicable, how often and in what ways does the academic unit consult with other academic units to assess the relevance of course evaluations and discuss how to use outcome measures for improvement of the academic program to meet the needs of other entities served by the unit?

7. Student Qualifications and Performance

Regular review must include an appropriate mix of measures to assess the strength of applicant pools, matriculated students and graduates and compare these to national norms and benchmark programs. In a diverse institution, students bring various strengths, points of view, and talents that contribute to the intellectual environment. While standardized tests and examinations with national norms are important indicators of the qualifications of the student body, some programs require a wider range of indicators. In the arts, for example, measures that reflect externally adjudicated or juried creative performance are needed to demonstrate qualifications and performance specific to the discipline. In applied fields, pass rates on licensing and certification examinations are particularly appropriate measures.

All programs will address questions about the qualifications of students and about the performance of current students and graduates using indicators that are appropriate to the level of the students, the disciplines, and the mission of the unit. Prior to undertaking the self-study, the appropriate University office will meet with the dean, chair(s) and other appropriate personnel to specify the appropriate indicators to be included in the review.

    a)   What are the qualifications of students upon entry to Temple?

        1. Cumulative high school, undergraduate and/or graduate grade point average;

        2. Standardized Test Scores (high school, undergraduate, graduate and/or professional tests);

        3. Performance on specialized evaluations (e.g., in the arts, measures that reflect externally adjudicated or juried creative work or performance);

        4. Other measures of student qualifications and achievement.

b)	What are the indicators of student performance after they arrive at Temple? The review will include indicators that are appropriate to the level and discipline of students such as:
1.	Cumulative undergraduate or graduate GPA;
2.	Performance in capstone courses or other capstone experiences;
3.	Standardized Test Scores (undergraduate/graduate and/or professional tests);
4.	Pass rates on licensing or certification examinations in discipline;
5.	Time to degree (compared to appropriate benchmarks by institution type and discipline);
6.	Portfolio, Performance, Internship and/or Field Placement reviews;
7.	External adjudication of creative works;
8.	Professional accomplishments, such as publications, presentations or other evidence of professional recognition and achievement;
9.	Scholarships, prizes and honors from learned societies;
10.	Exit Interview and satisfaction surveys;
11.	Placement data for graduates;
12.	Teacher and Course Evaluation Surveys, in the case of graduate students who are Teaching Assistants.

8.	**Identification of Benchmarks**
a)	What institutions does the academic unit view as comparable "peer institutions" for their research programs? For their graduate programs? For their undergraduate programs?
b)	What institutions does the academic unit view as realistic to emulate in the next 5-10 years.

c)	What information is available from learned societies and/or accrediting bodies and national organizations, both within and outside the discipline, that evaluate or rank programs in the academic unit?

9.	**Relationship of Size and Resources**
a)	Given the size of the student body, measured by FTES numbers, is the faculty of appropriate size? Does the number of faculty conform to – or is it smaller or larger than provided by the University's enrollment formula, where applicable? If not, has the budgeting entity (college or University) provided a rationale for the disparity?
b)	Is the size of the program's facilities adequate for the size of the program, measured by enrollments, external grants, and other specific activities of the program? The space available to comparable Temple programs as well as space that might be available to comparable programs elsewhere should be considered.

c)   Is the size of the support staff and the distribution of administrative resources (including personnel budgets) suitable for the scope of the program as measured by enrollments, external grants, and other specific activities of the program?

d)   Do comparable units elsewhere have independent funding for support of students? If so, are the Temple unit's resources for the support of students similar to the resources at comparable universities?

10. Overall Functioning of the Unit

The quality and standing of a school/college and academic program depend primarily on the quality and reputation of the faculty and their effectiveness in delivering excellent teaching and research programs. The external reviewers will be charged with examining the productivity of the unit under review. The school/college will be asked to demonstrate how it supports and rewards excellence and encourages improvement. Therefore, the self study will include the assessment, where appropriate, of factors such as:

a)   The effectiveness of the unit's staff (academic advisors, laboratory coordinators, career counselors, etc.)

b)   The quality of investment decisions
c)   Management of development activities
d)   Effectiveness of communication
e)   Effective use of facilities
f)   Strategic use of new technologies
g)   Ways in which faculty and staff are offered professional development opportunities and are rewarded for achievement
h)   Clarity about how resource allocation decisions are made.

IV   External Review Teams

The review of the program should include an external review by outside disciplinary experts as well as outside generalists. The reviewers should come from academe and from sectors of society that are affected by or make use of graduates. Alumni and employers of graduates may be asked to contribute in some specific areas. Academic reviewers should be selected independently of the academic unit being reviewed. The appropriate University office should obtain nominations from learned societies, national disciplinary organizations, and national higher education organizations. Where appropriate, an accreditation site visit team may be used as the external review team. Deans and chairs should be given the opportunity to indicate whether any of the nominees is unsuitable because of academic interests or biases, previous involvement with the University or academic program, or for other reasons. Review teams should include an external reviewer who is sensitive to issues related to under-represented faculty and students in the discipline. The critical elements in the selection of academic reviewers are:

1. Independence from the University and the program(s) to be reviewed;
2. National stature in the field and/or national stature in the field of higher education;
3. Understanding of the role of a public research university with an urban mission;
4. Understanding of the role of the public urban university;
5. Where possible, reviewers should have a record of accreditation or program review experience that demonstrates ability to evaluate performance fairly as well as rigorously.

The reviewers should be asked to provide a realistic, unbiased view of how the program compares to other regional and national programs that have similar missions and resource constraints. In addition to reviewing the quality of program, the scope or currency of the curriculum and the performance of faculty and students, the external review team should, above all, recommend key components of a Plan for Improvement (described below).

V Plans for Improvement

A program review must yield a clear Plan for Improvement, developed through the process of conducting the self-study, recommendations of the external review team, and consultation among the appropriate University academic officers, the cognizant dean, and the chair of the academic unit. A Plan for Improvement should include:
1. Recommendations for program improvement
   a) Without the allocation of additional resources
   b) With a one-time allocation of additional internal funding
   c) With additional steps that might be taken if the Program itself is able to generate additional resources through external funding
   d) With additional allocations from the University to the continuing resource base of the program;
2. Recommendations for ways in which the academic unit might increase its resources independent of the University's budget, through private development, seeking government or institutional grants (e.g., from foundations, corporations) or expanded auxiliary activities (such as continuing education or other community activities that produce revenue);
3. Recommendations for the ways by which the unit will strengthen its curriculum, teaching, scholarship or creative work, and service.

All recommendations for improvements should provide a statement of the priority order for such investments. Under each of these conditions, the external reviewers should identify the improvements (outcomes) that are expected as a result of additional allocations of resources and specify the criteria (measures) needed to determine the degree to which improvements have been realized.

VI Monitoring Improvements

All reviews must culminate with a meeting with the Office of the Provost, the dean of the school/college, and, where appropriate, the department chair and/or other administrative unit heads to agree on the action that the academic program will take to improve its quality and performance in each area of endeavor; curriculum and instruction, scholarship or creative work, and service. Deans and chairs or other administrative unit heads will establish a calendar and plan for monitoring progress. Such monitoring is essential for program review to have credibility, integrity, and efficient utilization of institutional resources including faculty and administrative time and effort.

Notes

1. **Dates of official enactment and amendments:**

    Adopted by the President on July 28, 2003.

2. **History:**

    None

3. **Cross References**

    None