



## Administrative Guidelines for Periodic Program Review

The purpose of these administrative guidelines is to provide procedures to ensure the successful implementation of the Policy on Periodic Program Review. (See Document: *Policy #02.60.11.*)

According to the Policy, 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.”

### Roles and Responsibilities of Periodic Program Review

The President and Provost have designated the Deputy Provost as the University official responsible for overseeing the periodic program review process. The Deputy Provost has the responsibility to ensure that the periodic program review process is administered in consultation with the Deans, the Faculty Senate and other appropriate faculty bodies and in accordance with the University Policy. The Office for Periodic Program Review (OPPR), overseen by the Deputy Provost and Director of Periodic Program Review, has the operational responsibility for coordinating the program review process across the University.

*The Office of Periodic Program Review will:*

1. Establish a master schedule of program reviews over a seven-year cycle in consultation with the Deans
2. Establish an annual schedule of program reviews in consultation with the Deans
3. Conduct annual orientation and training sessions for units under review
4. Ensure that units under review are provided with institutional data in a timely manner for programs to use in the preparation of their respective self-studies
5. Initiate and coordinate selection of external reviewers for each review in accordance with the selection criteria in the University policy on program review and in consultation with the Deans and other heads of units under review
6. Review the self-study to ensure consistency with the University’s mission, strategic directions, and policies
7. Provide adequate funding and administrative support for conducting external components of each review
8. Ensure that when appropriate and possible periodic program reviews are coordinated with accreditation reviews in consultation with the affected Deans and academic units

9. Correspond with the external reviewers
10. Coordinate scheduling of the site review
11. Ensure that the report of the external reviewers is sent to the Provost in a timely manner
12. Ensure that a plan for improvement by the unit reviewed is on file
13. Coordinate the monitoring of the implementation of the plan for improvement
14. Conduct an annual review of the periodic program review process to ensure that it is in compliance with the University policy, is accomplishing the objectives established, and that the Office of Periodic Program Review is supporting the needs of units under review.

*The Unit under review will:*

1. Attend orientation and training sessions in the spring semester prior to the year they are scheduled for review
2. Select appropriate leadership within the unit to direct the self-study activities
3. Coordinate planning for the review with the Dean's Office.
4. Collect and utilize department sources of data in accordance with categories outlined in the document "Data for Periodic Program Review"
5. Review institutional data and correspond with the Office of Planning and Policy Analysis to review and correct any inconsistencies
6. Use institutional data in the preparation of the unit's self-study
7. Submit the self-study to the affected Dean according to the agreed upon timeline
8. Submit suggestions for sources or names of external reviewers upon invitation from the Office of Periodic Program Review
9. Assist the Office of Periodic Program Review in the scheduling of the site review, particularly recruiting students to meet with review team members, scheduling faculty interviews, and submitting a guest list for a reception
10. Participate in the activities of the site review
11. Review the report of the external reviewers
12. Submit a plan for improvement according to the agreed upon timeline
13. Annually submit an update plan for improvement a year-to-date from the site visit, every year until the next regularly scheduled review
14. Participate in interviews or surveys as part of the Office of Periodic Program Review's efforts to assess the program review process.

## **Organization and Processes**

### Scheduling

The OPPR is responsible for developing a master schedule of units for review on a seven-year cycle. All degree programs will be reviewed in approximately 60-65 groupings for an average of about 10-11 per year.

In addition, the Provost reserves the right to initiate reviews, as necessary, for all academic centers and non-degree-granting units that support academic degree programs. As appropriate, the review of these units may occur in conjunction with the periodic reviews of the degree programs.

Annually, the OPPR will provide an orientation session for units scheduled for review during the upcoming 12 months. This session will be open to all interested parties, including any other academic unit.

## Self-Study

The academic unit prepares the self-study under the oversight of the Dean. In conducting its self-study, it is the responsibility of the academic unit to ensure that the appropriate consultation occurs within the academic unit and all appropriate academic departments associated with the program under review.

The self-study shall draw upon institutional data from the Office of Planning and Policy Analysis, to the extent possible. The self-study should include comparisons with benchmark institutions and national norms, whenever available. It is the academic unit's responsibility to employ data in accordance with the categories outlined in the appendices of these administrative guidelines. (See Document: *Data for Periodic Program Review*.)

Every self-study of academic degree programs must address ten key areas of questions, as detailed in the Policy. These questions are organized under the following headings: (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.

The self-study should culminate in a document no longer than 40 pages in length, including data tables. (For additional formatting guidelines, see document: *Guidelines for Submitting the Self-Study*.)

It is the responsibility of the academic unit to submit the self-study document to the Dean for his/her review and approval. The Dean will have the discretion to return the self-study to the academic unit for further revision.

Once the Dean has approved the self-study, he/she will send it to the Deputy Provost. The Deputy Provost will coordinate the review of the self-study document among University officials, including the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (for undergraduate programs), the Dean of the Graduate School (for graduate programs) and appropriate University officers. The OPPR will review the self-study to ensure compliance with the Policy on Periodic Program Review, these administrative guidelines, and University policies. After the University-level review(s), the OPPR will forward the document to the external reviewers or return the document to the Dean and unit for further revision.

## External Review

The OPPR is responsible for the selection of external reviewers in consultation with the affected Dean and academic unit head. Normally, three external reviewers will be selected for a review. The Provost shall designate one to serve as review chair.

The OPPR will initiate the selection process by identifying, with the assistance of the Dean and the academic unit being reviewed, appropriate learned societies, national organizations in the discipline, and national higher education organizations associated with the discipline or field of study of the unit being reviewed. It is the responsibility of the OPPR to ensure that the reviewers are selected independently from the academic unit being reviewed to ensure that the reviewers will be able to exercise an independent judgment. The OPPR will review the names of potential reviewers with the Dean and the academic unit to determine whether any of the nominees is unsuitable for any substantive reason.

In selecting the external reviewers, the OPPR will pay particular attention to the reviewers' independence, national stature, understanding of public research universities with urban missions, and sensitivity to the role of a public urban university. Ideally, the reviewers selected will have accreditation or program review experience, including a record of fairness and rigor in that role.

The OPPR shall handle all official correspondence with the external reviewers, and will prepare the University's letter of engagement of the external reviewers, which will be signed by the Provost. Along with the letter of engagement, each external reviewer will be provided a copy of the Policy on Periodic Program Review, the Administrative Guidelines for Program Review and background on Temple University, including a description of the enrollment-based budgeting system of the University to assist him/her in understanding the degrees of flexibility and limitations Deans have in using their resources strategically.

The OPPR will schedule the site review with sufficient lead time for all involved, including the Dean and the academic unit. Typically 5-6 reviews will occur in the fall semester (late September – early December) and 5-6 reviews will take place in the spring semester (February – May). The external reviewers will receive the unit's self-study document approximately 2- 4 weeks prior to the scheduled visit.

The OPPR will be responsible for taking steps to ensure appropriate coordination between the periodic program reviews and any accreditation reviews for a program or group of programs. In doing so, the OPPR will determine the wishes of the Dean regarding sequencing and coordination between program review and accreditation.

It is also the responsibility of the OPPR to ensure that there are clear understandings at the outset among all involved about the intent of program review. Specifically, the intent of the periodic program review process is to encourage schools and colleges to take steps to ensure that academic programs serve the University's mission and strategic direction and to foster excellence as defined by that discipline, nationally, the department, the school or college in which it is housed and the University (cf. the Policy on Periodic Program Review). It is the responsibility of all involved also to understand that the principal purpose of periodic program reviews is to improve the programs within their existing resources or within additional resources that the program itself would generate from external sources.

The OPPR shall make preparations for the site visit of the external reviewers, including transportation and overnight accommodations. The site visit will normally last three days. It will open with a dinner meeting with the Dean and the Provost or his/her designee in attendance. During the site visit, the reviewers will be scheduled to meet with faculty, administrators, staff and students. There shall be at least one session with students in the affected programs. The external reviewers will be provided with sufficient space and support (e.g., phones, access to photocopying, computers).

On the third day, the external reviewers will meet in an exit interview with the appropriate academic officials, including the Provost, or his/her designee and the Dean, or his/her designee. Others may be included at the discretion of the Provost. Whenever scheduling allows, the external team will remain on campus to work on their own to complete a draft of their final report.

## Report of External Review Team

The report of the external reviewers should be modest in length (approximately 15 pages, including an executive summary) and should provide a realistic and unbiased view of how the program compares to other regional and national programs with similar missions and resource constraints. The report should address the strengths and weaknesses of the program and how quality programs can be maintained and strengthened. The external reviewers should include recommendations that can constitute the core of the academic unit's Plan for Improvement. These recommendations shall include a clear statement of priorities for any investments that will be required from all sources.

As outlined in the Policy, the recommendations shall be identified within the following categories:

- Recommendations for program improvement
  - Without new resources (including more creative use of existing resources)
  - With new resources to be generated by the unit
  - With one-time allocation of University resources
  - With additional steps to generate external funding
  - With additional allocations from the University
- Recommendations for ways to increase its resource base
- Recommendations for ways for unit to strengthen its curriculum, teaching, scholarship/creative work and service

Under each of the above conditions, the external reviewers should identify the outcomes expected and specify the criteria for determining the realization of improvement. It is important that the external reviewers make their recommendations with the understanding that there needs to be a balanced emphasis on quality, productivity and self-support improvements, and not simply a request for new resources for the program under review. The external reviewers' report needs to emphasize that much enhancement funding must come from private sources, given the State's modest level of support and the University's responsibility to maintain tuition at reasonable rates.

The chair of the external review team shall send a draft copy of the team's report to the Deputy Provost no later than two weeks following the final day of the team's site visit. In consultation with the Dean, the Deputy Provost shall ensure a review of the draft only in terms of accuracy of data and information and in terms of conformity with the University's policy and administrative guidelines for periodic program review. The Deputy Provost shall confer with the chair of the external reviewers regarding any potential changes in data or information. Thereafter, the chair of the external reviewers shall send the final report of the review team to the Provost.

It is the responsibility of the Dean to provide the Provost with a one-to-two page response to the report, including the priorities the Dean identifies for improvement. Thereafter, the Dean will initiate the process for preparing the Plan for Improvement for the program.

## Plan for Improvement

The head of the academic unit under review is responsible for developing the preliminary draft of the Plan for Improvement in consultation with the Dean and the appropriate University

academic officers. The Plan should be based on the recommendations of the external reviewers and on the Dean's response to the report of the external reviewers. The Plan should be responsive to the strengths and weaknesses identified by the external reviewers. The Plan shall include recommendations that are realistic and able to be monitored. The Plan should be no more than 5 to 10 pages in length and focus on specific actions the academic unit will take to improve its quality and performance in the areas of curriculum and instruction, scholarship or creative work, and service. The major recommendations and their impact should be clearly identified, with a rationale.

The Plan should address the commitment of the program to specific actions for improvement and the steps the unit plans to take over a specified time period. The Plan should include the following components:

1. Actions 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. Actions for ways in which the academic unit might increase its resources independent of the University's budget, through private development, seeking governmental or institutional grants (e.g., from foundations, corporations) or expanded auxiliary activities (such as continuing education or other community activities that produce revenue);
3. Actions by which the unit will strengthen its curriculum, teaching, scholarship or creative work, and service.

All recommendations should include a priority order for any required investments from all sources. The draft Plan should have the Dean's endorsement before the culminating meeting with the Provost.

### Monitoring the Plan for Improvement

A program review culminates with a meeting involving the Provost or his designee, the Dean and the head of the academic unit and/or the head of the appropriate administrative unit. The purpose of the meeting is to secure agreement among all present for the actions the academic unit will take to improve program quality.

Once the Provost approves the Plan and those present are in agreement on the plan of action, it is the responsibility of the Dean and academic unit head to establish a calendar for improvement and a specific plan for monitoring progress. The calendar must include measurable milestones and an annual reporting of progress.

After the Provost approves the Plan, the Dean shall be responsible for making a report to the Council of Deans on the major findings and recommendations of the external visiting team and the Plan for Improvement. The Council shall have an opportunity for comment and discussion about potential University-wide and cross-college implications.

Thereafter, progress on the actions in the Plan for Improvement shall be monitored in three ways. (1) The academic unit shall develop an annual progress report, which should be brief (e.g., about one page in length) and shall be approved by the Dean, who shall forward copies to the

Provost and the President. This report is due 12 months after the site visit by the external reviewers and every 12 months thereafter until the next periodic program review for the unit. (2) Where appropriate, approved recommendations for program improvement should be included in the strategic plan of the school or college. (3) In addition, the Dean should include a summary status report on implementation progress for all programs within the school or college in his/her annual report to the Provost.

#### Review of the Periodic Review Process

At the conclusion of the final review for each academic year, the Deputy Provost shall undertake a meta-review of the periodic program reviews for that academic year. The meta-review shall examine the process and procedures of the periodic program reviews. In this meta-review, the Deputy Provost shall consult with Deans, the heads of the academic units that were reviewed and appropriate representatives or bodies of the Faculty Senate. This meta-review shall be summarized in an "Annual Report on This Year's Periodic Program Reviews," and copies shall be provided to the President, Provost, Deans and the President of the Faculty Senate.



**TEMPLE UNIVERSITY**  
A Commonwealth University