Fitchburg State University
All University Committee

2017-2018 Proposal Form

Date: _Feb 23, 2018_____

I. Proposal Title: _____Revised Program Review Guidelines and Timeline _____

II. Sponsor/Contact Person: _____Dr. Alberto Cardelle_____

III. Sponsor's Department, Phone No., e-mail:_ Office of the Provost, x3421, acardelle@fitchburgstate.edu

IV. Collaborating Parties: _____Pam McCaferty Asst VP for Institutional Research_____

_____ Merri Incitti, Director of Assessment_____

V. Proposal Summary (If applicable, highlight changes from previous policy or practice.): *

The new program alters the structure and the process of the review by

- o Clarifying the roles and responsibilities assigned to departments, Deans and the provost's office.
- o Providing clarity to the process and more directionality with regard to a focus on program assessment.
- o Integrating the program review with the data collected through the Annual Assessment Reports
- o Extending the review period to seven years effective immediately (see new cycle)

VI.   Rationale for the Proposal:

The continual improvement of our internal program assessment. With growing assessment needs and requirements from our regional accreditor as well as state agencies, this new program review assists the departments, divisions and the university in compiling the evidence required to demonstrate a continual assessment loop.

VII. Proposal (Attach a complete proposal): *

Attached

VIII. If this proposal requires the publication of new information in the Catalog, provide the text you propose for how it should appear in the Catalog. If this proposal will require a change to existing material in the Catalog, or a change to a four-year plan of study, show the current wording, and how you propose the new wording appear.

NA

* All proposals that involve curriculum change require review by the Department Curriculum and the Department Chair.

     Vote: _____ / _____ / _____   (For / Against / Abstain)

     Name of Chair, Department Curriculum Committee _____

     Name of Chair, Department   _____

IX. Submitted to Appropriate Dean(s):

Name of Dean(s): All Deans, department chairs as well as faculty representatives to the University Assessment Committee have reviewed this proposal.

PROGRAM REVIEW CYCLE

| SELF STUDY/PROGRAM REVIEW | ACCREDITATION VISIT RECERTFICATION |

<u>Year One: 2015-2016</u> Library	Nursing:10 year CCNE accreditation visit Human Services: Re-accreditation *(5 yr. cycle)*
<u>Year Two: 2016-2017</u> English Math	NEASC Five Year Review
<u>Year Three: 2017-2018</u> Biology Criminal Justice History	
<u>Year Four: 2018-2019</u> Communications Media Exercise and Sports Science Psychological Science	Business Administration : IACBE *(7 yr. cycle) (Spring 2019 or Fall 2019 per Chair)* Honors Program: Five year review by DHE
<u>Year Five: 2019-2020</u> Environmental and Earth Science Industrial Technology Political Science Sociology	Nursing five year report Education: CAEP *(7 yr. cycle)* Computer Science and Computer Information Systems: ABET *(6 yr. cycle)*
<u>Year Six: 2020-2021</u> Game Design Humanities LA&S Review	Human Services: Re-accreditation *(5 yr. cycle)*
<u>Year Seven: 2021-2022</u> Chemistry Economics Geographic Science and Technology Occupational Ed./Vocational Ed. Technology	NEASC Ten Year Review/Visit
<u>Year Eight: 2022-2023</u> First Year Experience Library	

<u>Year Nine: 2023-2024</u> English Studies Math	Honors Program: Five year review by DHE
<u>Year Ten: 2024-2025</u> Biology/Chemistry Criminal Justice History	
<u>Year Eleven: 2025-2026</u> Communications Media Exercise and Sports Science Psychological Science	Computer Science and Computer Information Systems: ABET *(6 yr. cycle)* Human Services: Re-accreditation *(5 yr. cycle)* Nursing:10 year CCNE accreditation visit
<u>Year Twelve: 2026-2027</u> Environmental and Earth Science Industrial Technology Political Science Sociology	Business Administration : IACBE *(7 yr. cycle)* Education: CAEP *(7 yr. cycle)* NEASC Five Year Review
<u>Year Thirteen: 2027-2028</u> Game Design Humanities LA&S Review	
<u>Year Fourteen: 2028-2029</u> Economics Geographic Science and Technology Occupational/Vocational Technology	

Please Note: These dates are subject to change.

Guidelines for Review:
Faculty participation in the review process consists of the preparation of a self-study report and contact with the external evaluator during the review process.

Five Year Fitchburg State University

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS
AY 2015-2020

Attached are the materials to complete the Program Review process. Included is the review packet containing:

1. Self-Study Overview
2. Self-Study Outline and Guidance
3. External Evaluator Selection and Guidelines
4. Final Action Plan

I. THE SELF-STUDY OVERVIEW

Since 1997, Fitchburg State University has been conducting regular program reviews. When programs have outside accrediting agencies, these reviews coincide with the accreditation self-study and use the required format for re-accreditation. This program review plan is an effort to ensure active departmental self-study, renewal of the curriculum, and consideration of the centrality of programs to the university mission. The goal is to provide continuous improvement of programs, and to gain feedback to assist in identifying areas and resources for needed improvement. The Program Review includes undergraduate and graduate programs in the major.

The purpose of Program Review is to ensure that our programs are continually evolving to meet the needs of our students, as well as our external constituents i.e. employers and internship providers. The process provides the department the opportunity to develop a strong vision for where they wish to take the program in the future. The end result should be a strong Action Plan that sets forth a road map for the future.

Program Review will feed directly into the reporting of continuous review and improvement by the University.

Some Suggestions for preparation of the self-study document:

1. To prepare the text of the self-study, use the attached detailed outline. Use the same main topics and subtopics as in the outline as headers for each section.
2. Prepare a table of contents for the text and appendices.
3. All supporting documentation should be placed at the end of the text as appendices.
4. Submit the document electronically to the Dean(s), the Director of Assessment, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or designee.

Self-Study Calendar

April (prior to Review Year)	• Chair, Dean(s) and Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) staff meet to review process and timeline; Chair is responsible for inviting appropriate faculty, including those involved with graduate programs. Enrollment trend data for the most recent four year period is provided to the Chair prior to the meeting.
August (Self-Study Year)	• Enrollment trend data for most recently concluded year is provided to Chair.
September 30	• Deadline for additional data requests from department via the on-line request form to the IRP Office.
January 15	• Electronic draft of self-study report due to the Dean(s) • The Dean(s) use the provided rubric to review and make suggested revisions to the self-study report.
February 1	• The Dean meets with Chair to discuss the self-study, discussion will relate to any concerns or needs for revision/clarification.
March 1	• Final self-study report due to Dean(s), Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Director of Assessment.
May	• The evaluator's report should be received by the IRP office and distributed to the Department Chairs and Dean(s).
September (Action Plan Year)	• The Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or designee, the Dean(s), Director of Assessment and Chair review the evaluator's report and discuss recommendations.
December	• Program Action Plan due to the Dean(s), Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Director of Assessment and the library • Documents to include in submission: final self-study, external evaluator's report and the department action plan.

Programs that are NOT required to participate in Program Review due to specialized accreditation or state certification/review are required to:

1.   Submit electronic copies of the reports required for accreditation or certification to the Dean(s), the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Director of Assessment and the library for archival purposes.
2.   The submission should include any responses from visiting teams or the reports filed.
3.   If the submission dates set forth change, it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to inform the Dean(s), the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Director of Assessment of the new timeline.
4.   If a program that has previously been under a specialized review process removes themselves they must:
   a.   Inform the Dean(s), the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Director of Assessment
   b.   Begin participating in the Program Review process no more than five years from the last accreditation/recertification review.

II.   SELF-STUDY OUTLINE AND GUIDANCE

Executive Summary of Comprehensive Plan for Improvement (1-2 pages)
1. Summary of the self-study findings

Overview and Vision
1. Brief overview of the department (1-2 pages)
2. Program's vision, mission and objectives
3. Relationship to the university mission, vision, and strategic plan and to the university strategic plan (if applicable)
4. Overview of program (Including minors, concentrations, and graduate coursework)
    a. Specify the degree requirements for the program, using the format of the catalog description
    b. Determine if there are discipline specific best practices and whether the department is following them
    c. Explain the balance between breadth and depth designed in the program
5. Internal demand of the program or department
    a. Service courses (as applicable)
    b. Assessments of student learning for the service courses as they relate to the Liberal Arts and Sciences (LA&S) Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
    c. Enrollments in service courses
6. Recommendations and actions from previous five year review
7. Departmental/program initiatives and significant changes during the five years since the last review. With specific focus on:
    a. Interdisciplinary programs
    b. Delivery mechanisms
    c. Service learning and community outreach

Assessment
1. Program Inputs
    a. Program reputation
        • Distinguishing characteristics
        • Describe the congruence between course and program goals and national standards and expectations in the discipline or profession, as appropriate.
        • Local, regional, national ranking, metrics of excellence, and visibility
        • Describe the congruence between course and program and future direction/needs of the profession/discipline
    b. Students by program
        • New student enrollment trends
        • Minimum qualification students must have in the program
        • enrolled student profile
        • Number of majors and minors
    c. Faculty - Use the tables provided in this document to document the following:
        • Number of faculty – part time and full time
        • Faculty diversity

- FTE commitment by program
- Qualifications of faculty – degrees, teaching, scholarship, professional experience, university and professional service, and community engagement

    d. Staff support
- Number of staff - part time and full time
- Job duties required in the role

    e. Resources
- Fiscal
- Other resources- equipment, space, library, learning materials, labs and studios

2. Program Processes
    a. Curriculum
- Process for curriculum development and recent activity
- Curriculum requirements
- Description of curriculum
- Plans of study, two year rotations, handbooks
- Curriculum trends in the discipline, if appropriate
- Course delivery methods
- Learning experiences- internships, service learning, scholarly engagement
- Concentrations and minors
  - Describe how they relate to the program mission and vision
- Department/Program policies or processes that affect curriculum
- Effectiveness of curriculum
- Achievement of objectives from the perspective of students, alumni, faculty and employers

    b. Students-
- Learning expectations and learning supports
- Retention initiatives

    c. Faculty
- Teaching responsibilities
- Advising responsibilities
- Number and types of assignments
- Professional development initiatives
- Faculty retention initiatives

    d. Quality Improvement Initiatives

3. Program Outcomes
    a. Program
- Graduates rating of the program (Graduating Student Feedback survey results will be provided by Director of Assessment)
- Career placement and continuing education opportunities- number and types of career and advanced education
- Alumni Feedback Survey

- Will be administered to alumni at 1, 3, and 5 year intervals *(Survey to launch in Spring 2018)*
- Employer rating of graduates
  b. Student
  - Learning outcomes
  - Assessment overview of the program
    - Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)/Objectives
    - SLO mapping to courses
  - Summary of findings by year (longitudinal data over the most recent five year span)
    - Annual Assessment Report findings summarized here
    - Direct and indirect assessment data and analyzation
  - Ongoing changes made to the program in response to the assessments (based on data collected and analyzed over the most recent five year span)
  - Other possible data
  - Scholarly and creative productions
  - Internship and service learning scores/evaluations
    - Completed by faculty and internship or service learning supervisor
  - Professional and community engagement
    - Include service learning components within the program
  - National certification and examination pass rate
  - Career placement and continuing education opportunities- number and types of career and advanced education
    - Alumni Feedback Survey
      - Will be administered to alumni at 1, 3, and 5 year intervals *(Survey to launch in Spring 2018)*
  - Employer rating of graduates
    - Internship Supervisor evaluations
    - Department or Program Advisory Council feedback
    - Employer feedback
  - Trend Data Reflection/Analysis
    - Time to degree completion
    - Graduation rates

Analysis and Action Plan for the Future
  1. Comparative strengths and distinctiveness, and areas of improvement across all program levels
  2. Opportunities to extend existing strengths and resources in place or needed
  3. Weaknesses found during the self-study
  4. Opportunities for addressing weaknesses
  5. Positioning of program to address future direction of the discipline in the next five years
  6. Action Plan for next five years
     a. Key objectives, and strategies actions to achieve each objective
     b. Timeline, with milestones and measurable outcomes to determine progress and measure success

    c. Method of achieving objectives
- Internal improvements
- Improvements that can be achieved only with additional resources and plans to obtain these resources

    d. Resources necessary to achieve the plan
- Faculty/staff
- Budgetary

Appendices

<u>Student Data</u>

1. Five Year Enrollment Trend Data: admissions, diversity, retention rates, graduation rates, years to graduate, course, major and minor enrollments
   a. Trend data is to be reflected upon and utilized to complete the analysis in the Assessment section of the report.
   b. The following five-year trend data, along with institutional benchmarks, will be provided to the Department Chair by the IRP Office for Program Review (see the Self-Study Calendar above):
      - New Student Enrollments
        - Freshmen
        - Transfer
      - Overall Enrollments
        - Courses
        - Majors and Minors
      - Diversity of Students in the Major
        - Race/Ethnicity
        - Gender
      - Retention Rates
        - Retention in the Major
        - Retention in any Major
      - Graduation Rates
        - Graduation in the Major
        - Graduation in any Major
      - Time to Degree Completion
      - D-F-W Rates*
      - Average Class Size*
      - Admissions Funnel*

      Note: The Office of Institutional Research and Planning will begin providing these three data trends in 2022-2023 Academic Year to the department for inclusion in the reflection on student data.

   c. ***Only include additional data if it is being reflected upon and utilized in the body of the self-study.***
2. Academic Advising
3. Effectiveness of advising from perspective of students, faculty (include a paragraph or two in the text)
4. Integration into department—clubs, departmental committee representation

5.   After graduation—employment, graduate school

Faculty Data
1. Faculty data—number, rank, diversity
2. Description of faculty qualifications

Resources
1.   Operating Budget (note centrally assumed costs such as phone, faculty computers, postage, copiers, salary, etc.)
2.   Library
3.   Space/Facilities
4.   Technology
5.   Equipment/Materials (teaching materials, videos, etc.)

III. SELECTION AND GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

Selection of External Evaluators

Qualified professionals from outside the Fitchburg State University community will be selected to conduct the external evaluation. Appropriate external evaluators are individuals who are familiar with similar programs, have a breadth of experience and a national perspective. Ideally, they are people who are involved in their professional associations, have a record of scholarship, and have achieved some distinction in their disciplines. The external evaluator will receive a $750 stipend for the review and will be reimbursed travel expenses after the review is complete. The steps involved in the selection of external evaluators include the following:

- During the self-study process, the program faculty identifies potential external evaluators and the faculty and the Chair review their vitae.
- Following the review by the program Chair and faculty, the names and vitae of evaluator candidates to be considered are forwarded to the appropriate Dean. The Chair identifies to the Dean any preferences, priorities or special needs the department faculty wish to be considered.
- The Dean will meet with the Director of Assessment to review the submitted materials and select the External Evaluator.
- The Office of Institutional Research and Planning completes the contractual process with the External Evaluator, which will include sending the Self-Study report.
- The Department is responsible for all other correspondence with potential External Evaluators.
- The Department makes the arrangements for the site visit.

Function of the External Evaluator

The function of the review by an outside evaluator is to provide objective feedback and give a broader context to the review. The evaluator, who will be provided with a copy of the review in advance, should assess how accurately the document and the information gathered from faculty, students, administrators, and librarians during the on-site visit present the current state of the program, its relationship to the university mission and the soundness of plans for change and continued improvement. The evaluator should comment on the program's outcomes assessment plan and the use of the information gathered through this process. The evaluator should be able to place the review in the context of regional or national professional norms for the discipline and, if appropriate, for interdisciplinary programs. The evaluator should offer recommendations for improvement to the program and comment on the programs recommendations for self-improvement.

External Evaluator Calendar

February 1	• The Department Chair forwards the names, addresses and vitae for potential external evaluators to the Dean • The Dean meets with the Director of Assessment to review and select final evaluator • The Department Chair notifies the selected evaluator
March	• IRP office completes the contract and forwards the self-study to the external evaluator. • The Department is responsible for making all arrangements pertaining to the site visit.
April	• The external evaluator visit is conducted
May	• The external evaluator's report is submitted to the IRP office (electronic submission preferred) within 20 days of the site visit. • The IRP office will send the report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean(s) and the Department Chair

External Evaluators Guidelines

- Read and review the self-study report prior to the site visit.
- Evaluate self-study and conduct campus visit.
  - Evaluate the self-study in the context of regional or national professional norms for the discipline.
  - Visit program to review student samples, conduct interviews with students, alumni, employers, and faculty.
  - Conduct exit interview with Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or designee.
- Provide a written report, electronically preferred, analyzing the program and making recommendations for continuous improvement and future directions to the IRP office within twenty (20) business days of the visit.
  - Assess current state of the program, assess how well the program prepares students for careers and/or advanced study in the discipline, its relationship to the university mission, the department plans for change and continued improvement,

the effectiveness of the outcome assessment plan and how the department has responded to the recommendations of the previous evaluator.

Questions or clarifications of material in the self-study may be addressed directly with the Department Chair at the option of the evaluator.

IV.   FINAL COMPREHENSIVE ACTION PLAN

Discussion of the External Report

After receipt of the evaluator's report, the IRP Office will forward copies of the report to the Department Chair, the Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or designee. A copy will be sent to the Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education where appropriate. The Dean(s), the Director of Assessment and Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or designee will discuss the report with the Chair, who will discuss them with the department faculty. The result of the discussions is a prepared response to address each of the recommendations and comment on differences from the recommendations in the department self-study. In addition, the Dean has an opportunity to address university issues related to the program that were not addressed in the department self-study.

As a result of the process, the department should discuss and set goals for the next five years. Those aspects of the goals that involve development of resources, including human resources, technology, and other items in support of curriculum and assessment, may be tied to budget requests for future years. The next time the department comes up for review, the self –study report will address how well those goals were met, so that the process is one of continuous improvement.

Final Action Plan Based on Self-Study and External Evaluator's Recommendations

Implementation items should be detailed enough to allow departmental faculty and staff to enact the implementation items in subsequent years. In the table below, please provide detailed information on each action that the department/program plans to take within the next five years to achieve its goals. The table has been created to help you think through implementation items for your program/department. Please use this table format when submitting your final Action Plan based on your self-study and recommendations from the external evaluator.

For each implementation item, describe the following:
1. Specific area where improvement is needed,
2. Evidence supporting the recommended change(s),
3. The specific person(s) responsible for implementing the change(s),
4. The proposed timeline for implementing the change(s),
5. The resources needed to successfully implement the change(s) (e.g. personnel, financial, facilities, equipment, etc.) and
6. The plan to assess the change(s) after implementation.

Action Plan in Table Format

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan
Item#1					
Item #2					
Etc.					

Document Sharing and Archiving

All of the documents from the Program Review should be kept in the Department, the Dean(s) Office, Vice President for Academic Affairs Office, the library archives, and submitted to the Director of Assessment.

Documents to be included:
1. Self-study Report
2. External Evaluator's Report
3. Final Action Plan

SAMPLE SITE VISIT AGENDA

\<NAME\> DEPARTMENT
PROGRAM REVIEW

Date

Evaluator's Name
Title and Institution

Time	Schedule	Location
9:00 – 10:00 a.m.	Meet with Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or designee, Dean, and Dean GCE if appropriate.	Academic Affairs Conference Room, Sanders Building 203A
10:00 – 10:45 A.m.	Meet with Chair	Chair's Office
10:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	Meet with Faculty	Dept. Conference Room
12:00 – 1:30 p.m.	Lunch with Department Chair & Faculty	Holmes Dining Commons
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.	Meet with Students	Dept. Conference Room
2:30 – 3:00 p.m.	Library Director	Amelia Galucci-Cirio Library
3:00 p.m.	Exit conversation with Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or designee, Dean and Dean GCE (where applicable)	Academic Affairs Conference Room Sanders 225A

FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA TABLE

Demographic Faculty Summary	No. of Full Time Assigned to Unit	No. of Part Time Assigned to Unit
Women		
Men		
Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian		
Asian		
Hispanic/Latino		
Black/African American		
American Indian		
International or Other		
Credentials – highest degree held		
Bachelor's Degree		
Master's Degree		
Doctorate		
Experience		
0-3 years		
4-7 years		
8-11 years		
12-15 years		
16-24 years		
25+ years		

FACULTY CREDENTIAL TABLE

Name	Rank	Type of Academic Appointment TT, T, NTT	FT or PT	Highest Degree	Professional Registration Certification	FTE by Program	Very Brief description of Activity		
							Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Ted	*P*	*T*	*FT*	*PhD*	*NA*		*Statistics and actuarial science*	*Actuarial analysis of specialized cohorts*	*Vice-president of NE chapter of the Association of statisticians*

Dean's Rubric for Draft Self-Study for Program Review

Program:
Date:

Rubric Scale:
- Absent: No information is provided, must be completed.
- Developing: Some information is provided, but the description and/or discussion in incomplete, some revisions/additions needed.
- Developed: Information and/or discussion is provided on all key components, no revisions needed.

Executive Summary of Comprehensive Plan for Improvement				
	Rating			**Comments**
Summary of the self-study findings	Absent	Developing	Developed	
Overview and Vision				
	Rating			**Comments**
1. Brief overview of the department	Absent	Developing	Developed	
2. Program's vision, mission and objectives	Absent	Developing	Developed	
3. Relationship to the university mission, vision, and strategic plan and to the university strategic plan (if applicable)	Absent	Developing	Developed	
4. Overview of program (including minors, concentrations, and graduate coursework)	Absent	Developing	Developed	
5. Internal demand of the program or department	Absent	Developing	Developed	
6. Recommendations and actions from previous five year review	Absent	Developing	Developed	

Departmental/program initiatives and significant changes during the five years since the last review.				
Assessment				
1. Program Inputs	**Rating**			**Comments**
a. Program reputation	Absent	Developing	Developed	
b. Students by program	Absent	Developing	Developed	
c. Faculty	Absent	Developing	Developed	
d. Staff support	Absent	Developing	Developed	
e. Resources	Absent	Developing	Developed	
f. Inclusiveness of Trend Data	Absent	Developing	Developed	
2. Program Processes	**Rating**			**Comments**
a. Curriculum	Absent	Developing	Developed	
b. Students	Absent	Developing	Developed	
c. Faculty	Absent	Developing	Developed	
d. Quality Improvement Initiatives	Absent	Developing	Developed	
e. Inclusiveness of Trend Data	Absent	Developing	Developed	
3. Program Outcomes	**Rating**			**Comments**
a. Program	Absent	Developing	Developed	
b. Student	Absent	Developing	Developed	
c. Inclusiveness of Trend Data	Absent	Developing	Developed	

Analysis and Action Plan for the Future				
	Rating			**Comments**
1. Comparative strengths and distinctiveness, and areas of improvement across all program levels	Absent	Developing	Developed	
2. Opportunities to extend existing strengths and resources in place or needed	Absent	Developing	Developed	
3. Opportunities for addressing weaknesses	Absent	Developing	Developed	
4. Positioning of program to address future direction of the discipline in the next five years	Absent	Developing	Developed	
5. Action Plan for the next five years	**Rating**			**Comments**
a. Key objectives, and strategies actions to achieve each objective	Absent	Developing	Developed	
b. Timeline, with milestones and measurable outcomes to determine progress and measure success	Absent	Developing	Developed	
c. Method of achieving objectives	Absent	Developing	Developed	
d. Resources necessary to achieve the plan	Absent	Developing	Developed	
General Comments:				