

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES
Medgar Evers College, CUNY**

**Office of Academic Affairs
&
Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance
2008-2009**

Table of Contents

Purpose 1

General Guidelines for Program Review 2

Overview of Program Review Process 3
Coordination with Accreditation and CUNY Performance Management Process

Program Review Report 5
(General Guidelines for use by Departments and Program Review Teams) 5

 Cover Sheet 5

 Program Description 5

 Program Activities 5

 Program Resources 7

 Program Summary 7

College Review Team Report (General Guidelines) 9

2007-2008 Time Line 10

 Master Schedule of Programs Under Review 11

 Reviews Currently Pending Completion, Spring 2008 11

 Reviews to be Initiated, Spring 2008 11

 Program Reviews: Accounting, Biology, Business Administration, Computer Information
 Systems, Psychology and Social Work (Pre-Candidacy)

 Reviews to be Initiated Fall 2008 11

Purpose

The institution of academic program reviews will move Medgar Evers College closer to its goal of establishing a regular reporting cycle across all areas. These reviews will facilitate the planning and budgeting processes required by CUNY as part of the PMP process as well as provide the foundation for facilitating continuous program improvement and cultivating a culture of excellence. Further, as the College continues its scheduled implementation of program reviews, the process will provide evidence of planning efforts, successes and the effective implementation of assessment cycles.

The purposes of the academic program review process are to assess the current level of program quality, improve program quality, gauge program productivity, and review the relationship of the program to the mission of the School and the College. A program review is, in effect, a self-study of a program performed by that department in which it is housed. The School Deans, in conjunction with the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance (OAQA) and the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), will be responsible for scheduling and monitoring the progress of program reviews within their respective Schools. When completed, the Department's review will be submitted to the School Dean, the Office of Academic Affairs and Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance. The approved program self-study document will be used as the foundation document for Program Review.

The program review process will:

1. Reflect the effectiveness of operational plans that drive each program/administrative area to improve and advance so that benchmarks established by CUNY, MEC, and other bodies are met or exceeded;
2. Identify how well the budgeting process supports program priorities;
3. Enable a process for change based on critical program analysis; and
4. Move the College further toward the goal of an integrated planning process.

General Guidelines for Program Review

The following processes, strategies and activities should be incorporated into the Self-Study:

- Use prior Program Reviews, Annual Reports and internal and external benchmarks (if available) to highlight program achievements and improvements.
- Pay particular attention to recommendations for change made in previous Program Reviews.
- Assess the extent to which the program has successfully addressed the concerns of the previous evaluation.
- Describe clearly the academic planning done by program faculty, including strategic planning, program development, decision-making processes, governance and program goals and objectives.
- Describe the profiles of the program, faculty and students.
- Describe how assessment informs programs and student performance and retention.

- Clearly document the program’s assessment plan for student learning outcomes achievement and the process for implementing change based on assessment results.

Coordination with Accreditation and the CUNY Performance Management Process

The City University of New York follows a performance management process that links planning and goal setting by the University and its 22 colleges and graduate schools, measures annual progress towards key goals, and recognizes excellent performance. Program reviews directly support and provide evidence that we are meeting University Performance Goals.

When possible, program reviews will be scheduled to coincide with accrediting agency self-studies, which include the Middle States review, ACBSP, NLNAC, CSWE and NCATE activities. When applicable, departments should use prior accreditation self-study reports and accreditation team site visits as a foundation for the program’s self-study.

Overview of the Program Review Process

1. The department or program under review will identify a Program Review Leader who is responsible for leading the program self-study effort to completion. The department chair may serve in this capacity. When complete, the Program Self-Study Report is forwarded (hard copy and electronic) to the School Dean, the Provost and the Executive Dean of the OAQA.
2. The School Dean will appoint a College Program Review Team and identify its chair. The Team will consist of members, usually three, from within the School but outside the department under review. The Provost will appoint a School Dean and may appoint an external consultant from outside the college. This Team will review the department’s self-study and supporting evidence. When the review and analysis are complete, the Team will submit a Program Review Team Report (hard copy and electronic) to the School Dean, the Provost and the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance.
3. Upon receipt of the Program Review Team Report, the Dean will prepare a Dean’s Summary Report which will be informed by the Self-Study Report and the Program Review Team Report. The Dean’s report will include specific recommendations for future action and follow-up.
4. The Dean will forward to the faculty of the program under review copies of the Program Review Team Report and the Dean’s Summary Report in order to give faculty the opportunity for a written faculty rejoinder, if desired or appropriate.
5. All documents will then be forwarded to the Provost and to the Executive Dean of OAQA. The Provost will schedule a meeting of the Dean, the Chair, and the Executive Dean of the OAQA to discuss and respond to the recommendations. A written summary of the meeting will be prepared and a final report submitted to the Provost and President.

6. External evaluations may be used at the discretion of the Office of the Provost and the President. An external evaluator can provide an independent, balanced, discipline-related perspective. External evaluators may also be of particular value for newly established programs and/or those that have undergone extensive reorganization. If an external evaluation is approved, program faculty will submit names of potential external evaluators to the Dean who, in consultation with the OAA, will name the external evaluator. At the discretion of the OAA, more than one evaluator or multiple campus visits may be deemed appropriate. The Dean is responsible for assuring that the external evaluator receives appropriate materials in a timely manner. It is also the Dean's responsibility to assure that adequate communication takes place between the external evaluator, the program faculty, and the Dean. Remuneration for external evaluators will be shared by the Dean's office and the OAA. The OAA, the School Dean, the Department Chair and OAQA will determine the appropriate materials and issues to present to the external evaluator. External evaluators will be asked to provide a clear and objective analysis of the program being reviewed and to follow the recommended format for the Program Review Report.

Program Review Report

General Guidelines for use by Departments and Program Review Teams

- *Cover Sheet*

- Indicate program or degree program under evaluation in the Program Review Report
- Identify the Program Review Leader
- Indicate the academic years covered in the Program Review Report
- Indicate the date the Program Review Report was completed
- Indicate the last review period or whether this is the initial program review

- *Program Description*

- Mission

- Describe the present mission of the program within the context of the department, college and university missions and strategic plans and/or University Performance Goals.
- If the mission has changed in the last five years, or in response to external accreditation requirements, how have the changes strengthened the program or identified new challenges?
- Describe anticipated changes (if any) in the program's mission and how those changes will support the university's mission and strategic plan.

- Goals

This section reflects the PMP goals set by The City University of New York Master Plan, the College's PMP goals, the accreditation or licensure body's goals, and those goals set by the President for Cabinet members as related to your departmental and college strategic planning.

- Review the achievement of program goals since the last Program Review or Accreditation Self-Study or since the submission of University Performance Goals.
- If the program goals have changed, how have the changes affected the program? What future changes to goals are anticipated?
- What are the major obstacles encountered by the program in achieving its goals?

- *Program Activities*

This section addresses the coordination of the following processes with respect to your program. The overarching questions would include: how your program/area "closes the assessment loop;" assessment of the major; assessment of general education; specialized accreditations and Middle States accreditation. Most importantly, you must provide evidence and documentation for each of the areas listed below. Documentation will include records related to performance, retention, curriculum mapping, grade submission, graduation, committee assignments, faculty research, syllabi, and course descriptions from College catalogues, departmental minutes, scholarship reports, faculty conferences, program booklets, program reports, etc.

- Curriculum

- Describe the curriculum, including general education and service courses. Provide evidence of the quality of the curriculum. Map expected student outcomes to courses.

- Describe the development of the curriculum. How has the curriculum changed since the last review? How have the changes influenced student learning? Provide relevant data.
- How does the curriculum provide sufficient flexibility to address the needs of individual students? Give specific examples.
- What program areas are identified for improvement, elimination, or restructuring? How does the program faculty expect to accomplish the improvement or restructuring? Provide a realistic timetable to implement the changes identified.
- What special programs, independent study credits, colloquiums, and/or professional associations and programs are open to students outside of the classroom?
- How does the department recognize student accomplishments in writing and research outside the program?
- How does the curriculum reflect societal changes? Give examples.
- Faculty
 - Describe the faculty. Relate their ability to achieve the mission of the program. Identify and describe the pedagogical philosophy that undergirds faculty teaching practices. Describe pedagogical practices that respond to different learning styles that are incorporated by faculty.
 - What faculty changes have occurred since the last program review? How have the changes affected the ability of the programmatic faculty to carry out its mission?
 - What changes in the faculty, if any, are necessary to accomplish the goals and/or curricular changes identified above?
 - Describe the accomplishments of program faculty members in carrying out their mission of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service. Describe the assessments utilized (direct and indirect assessments at the classroom, program, and department level). Provide evidence in support of each area.
 - Describe changes that have occurred in the use of part-time faculty and lecturers since the last program review. If no changes, discuss how part-time faculty and lecturers are utilized and why changes have not occurred.
- Students
 - Document and explain enrollment trends, including the number of majors and graduates for the review period by academic year. How has the student population of the program changed? Using the program's relevant discipline(s) or field(s), what are the trends for student interest, employment, and graduate education for this program?
 - Describe efforts to maintain or improve the recruitment and retention of students.
 - Describe clearly all activities being used to assess student achievement. Link assessment findings to improvements in curriculum, instruction, and student learning. If no linkage or feedback loop has been made, explain why not and provide a plan for linking assessment findings to improvement strategies.
 - Describe/discuss evidence that assessment strategies evaluate student learning.
- Department Governance

- Provide a copy of your department governance procedures with reference to the college-wide Governance Plan. Are policies and procedures being followed? Provide evidence.
 - Is the program in compliance with College and University policies, procedures, regulations, and guidelines? Explain.
 - Describe the process and implementation of the peer review evaluation process in the department? What are the criteria for faculty who conduct peer reviews?
 - Are expectations for promotion and tenure clearly stated? Provide a written copy or a timetable for their development.
- Collaborative Relationships
 - Describe collaborative relationships with other units or academic programs within the College, both formal and informal. What changes, if any, have affected the curriculum or structure as a result of these relationships?
 - Describe collaborative relationships with other institutions and agencies, both formal and informal. What changes, if any, have impacted on curriculum or structure as a result of these relationships?
- *Program Resources*
 - Describe significant changes in the program's physical resources since the last Program Review and explain anticipated future needs (including replacement schedules) for:
 - Budgets
 - Space (new and renovated)
 - Personnel
 - Major Equipment
 - Consumable supplies
 - Other
 - Describe significant changes in program staff and operating resources since the last Program Review and explain anticipated future needs for:
 - Administrative Assistance
 - Communications
 - Travel
 - Library Acquisitions
 - Facilities, i.e., cleanliness of classrooms, bathrooms, etc.
 - Other
 - Describe what internal resources may be reallocated and what new resources will be needed to achieve the anticipated future needs identified above.
- *Program Summary*
 - Key results
 - Strengths
 - Areas of Concern
 - Opportunities
 - Evidence
 - Recommendations for Action

COLLEGE REVIEW TEAM REPORT (General Guidelines)

The task of the College Review Team is to prepare a College Review Team Report. Based on the current Program Review Report, the Department's strategic plan, and the previous self-study and review documents, the Team will evaluate the program within the context of the team's best professional judgment for what is reasonable and appropriate for the students, faculty, program, College and the future of the University. The College Review Team Report should ascertain that:

- the Program Review Report has met the general expectations and guidelines outlined above;
- the recommendations and conclusions offered are reflective of developments occurring since the previous program evaluation (if any);
- the goals of the program appear achievable over the next five years and are in line with the department's strategic plan;
- assessment of student learning is fully integrated into the program's planning and goals; and
- the future quality of the program is adequately assured.

The College Review Team Report should assess the program's strengths, challenges and weaknesses (based upon the following general criteria) and make recommendations for future action.

- **QUALITY.** Based upon curriculum, faculty, students and resources, does the program show evidence of the level of quality expected from a program of its nature? Are there reasonable assurances that the teaching, research, and service activities contribute to the mission of the College in a way that maintains the College's reputation as a college committed to positively transforming the lives of the community it serves by providing open access to excellent educational opportunities?
- **CENTRALITY.** How is the program central or peripheral to the mission of the department, school, college, and the university?
- **FOCUS.** Is the program sufficiently focused to accomplish its mission and objectives? Is the breadth of the curriculum appropriate for the department's mission, for trends in demand, employment, and graduate education?
- **OTHER.** Does your review substantiate the conclusion about the program set forth in the program's Program Review Report? Are program strengths and areas of concern adequately identified?

2008-2009 TIME LINE

Responsible Party And Due Dates					Activity
Department or Program Being Evaluated	College Evaluation Team	OAA/School Dean	OAQA	External Evaluator (if any)	
					OAA announces undergraduate programs to be reviewed in AY 2008-09.
					Department submits name of Program Review Leader to OAA and OAQA.
					Program Evaluation Team begins work on Self-Study Report.
					School Dean appoints (in consultation with Department) members of the College Program Review Team and submits names to OAA and OAQA.
					OAA appoints external faculty member to College Program Review Team.
					Self-Study Report submitted to College Program Review Team.
					<i>If external evaluator used</i> , external evaluator names are submitted to OAA and OAQA for approval.
					College Program Review Team conducts program review.
					College Program Review Team submits recommendations to department/program.
					Faculty Rejoinder submitted to Dean and/or Team (if applicable).
					Self-Study Report and College Program Review Team Report submitted to Dean.
					<i>If external evaluator used</i> , report due from evaluator.
					Dean forwards to OAA/OAQA all review materials with the Dean's Summary Report.
					OAA/OAQA schedules meeting with Dean and program chair/director.
					OAA/OAQA submits summary results to Office of the President.

MASTER SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMS UNDER REVIEW

Review Completed, Fall 2007

School of Science, Health and Technology

Departments of Nursing (BSN and AAS/PN Reaccredited by NLNAC and NYSED, October 2007)

Reviews to be Initiated, Spring 2008

School of Business (school-wide reaccreditation by ACBSP)

Program Reviews: Accounting, Business Administration, Computer Information Systems

School of Liberal Arts and Education

Program Reviews: Psychology, Social Work (Pre-Candidacy review by CSWE)

School of Science, Health & Technology

Program Review: Biology

Reviews to be initiated Fall 2008

(Areas to be identified.)