

Program Review Handbook Pittsburg State University



**Prepared by:
Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Updated 2019**

**PSU Academic Program Review Guidebook
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Chapter 1 Overview

- Program Review at PSU..... 3
- Kansas Board of Regents Criteria for Review..... 4
- Program Review Committee..... 5

Chapter 2 Review for Academic programs

- What to Expect.....6
- External Reviewer’s Report..... 8
- External Review and Site Visit..... 8
- Self-Study Submission and Beyond..... 9

Chapter 3 Review for Accredited Academic Programs

- What to Expect.....11
- Site Visit Report and Findings.....11
- Self-Study Submission and beyond.....12

Chapter 4 Review for New Programs

- Progress Review.....13
- The First Official Review.....13
- Self-Study Submission and beyond.....13

Chapter 5 Certificates and Minors abbreviated review

- Abbreviated Review Process.....15
- Self-Study Submission and beyond.....15

Chapter 6 Templates

- Academic Program Review Template.....17
- Accredited Academic Program Review Template.....19
- New Program Progress Review Template.....21
- Abbreviated Certificate and Minor Review Template.....22

Attachments.....25

CHAPTER 1

OVERVIEW

Program Review at PSU

Program review is the periodic and comprehensive self-assessment of all academic programs offered. The Pittsburg State University program review process is formative in nature and designed to enhance overall institutional quality and accountability. The focus is on providing campus-wide input to help departments align programs with the institutional assessment process, institutional strategic planning, and resource allocation. Program review is the primary opportunity that departments have to conduct a comprehensive self-study in order to demonstrate that their programs are current, of sufficient size and quality, and help the institution serve its mission. It is also the major process departments have to demonstrate their resource needs and make their case for significant enhancements.

Before 2011, all programs within a department were reviewed together on a six-year cycle. PSU developed a new cycle to reflect the recommendations of the 2011 Program Review Task Force. Among the recommendations adopted were that programs be reviewed by discipline rather than by department and that non-accredited programs be evaluated by an external reviewer. In addition, the review process has been updated to include all stand-alone certificate and minor programs.

All academic degree granting programs (associate, bachelors, masters, post-masters) are reviewed through the program review process. In addition, academic programs such as minors and certificates that do not mirror a degree program/curriculum already slated for review participate in an abbreviated review process. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) coordinates the program review process. This includes but is not limited to the following:

1. providing Kansas Board of Regents minima data;
2. supplying self-study documents for programs under review;
3. meeting with the programs and providing additional information and support as needed for completion of the review materials;
4. posting program review documents for committee access and evaluation;
5. organizing meetings for the program review committee;
6. maintaining the program review section of the PSU-OIE website;
7. forwarding committee recommendations to the Provost; and
8. responding to the Kansas Board of Regents Program Review reporting requirements.

The Director/Chair is responsible for preparing and submitting all program review documents. The OIE strongly recommends involving faculty who teach in the program as well as the appropriate college Dean.

Kansas Board of Regents Expectations for Review

Per the Kansas Board of Regents policy, a regular program review cycle and process that will allow the university to demonstrate on an ongoing basis that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission will be established. Regular program review is institutionally based and follows the departmental or unit structure of the institution. Review of institutional reports will include consideration of the Board-approved minima tables.

KBOR expects that the university review process will address:

- the program's centrality to the mission of the university;
- the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty;
- the quality of the curriculum and impact on student learning;
- external demand and student need for the program;
- service and benefit provided by the program; and
- the overall quality of the program.

Program Review Committee

The Program Review Committee (PRC) will conduct the review and provide a response to the Provost's office. The committee composition is intentionally broad and includes as follows:

- 5 Faculty (Appointed by Faculty Senate)
 - 2 - Arts and Sciences (Arts/Humanities and Sciences)
 - 1 - Business
 - 1 - Education
 - 1 - Technology
- 3 Directors/Chairs (Appointed by Provost)
- 1 Academic Dean (From the College not represented by a Department Chair)
- Director of Assessment, serves as Committee Chair

Terms of service established for the Program Review Committee include:

- All members are slated to serve a three-year term, with the exception of the Director of Assessment.
- No member can serve two consecutive terms, unless by specific Provost appointment.
- Faculty members must have tenure.
- The Director of Assessment serves as the Chair of the Program Review Committee.

Members of the PRC can expect to commit a significant amount of time through the year to this service. Once received from the program, program review documents will be posted in a designated Canvas page for committee review. The time commitment represents reading these materials as well as attending committee meetings.

In addition to preparation time, each program will require a series of meetings. These meetings include conversations to identify questions for the program, a face-to-face discussion with the Directors/Chairs and faculty members representing the program, and follow-up exchanges for the prioritizing of the committee's response for each program. Members are expected to attend having reviewed the posted materials in preparation for active participation. The PRC may meet as a whole for a retreat to finalize feedback reports and review any annual reports due from past program reviews.

Members of the committee recognize the worth of this service and often comment on how much they learn about the university and their peers through the committee's work.

Chapter 2

Review for Academic Programs

What to expect

The academic program participating should expect to spend a significant amount of time on the review process. While the process and the templates have been designed to integrate unit level planning, mid-term assessment reporting, and programmatic accreditation documentation where applicable, it is not intended to be a perfunctory exercise in paperwork completion. The focus is formative and has been designed as a method to help programs identify areas for improvement and innovation. The singularly summative aspect of the process is found in the PRC's review of this cycle's self-study in comparison to the previous committee's recommendations as supported by the Provost. The more thorough the program review document and the more attention paid to its preparation, the more a program can expect to benefit from the process.

Copies of the self-study and all templates are included in Chapter 6 of this guidebook. A brief description of all materials requested to be submitted is also provided. Questions regarding documentation should be directed to the chair of the PRC.

External Review and Site Visit

All programs not meeting the definition of an accredited program must utilize an external reviewer. To be an allowed accreditation for the Pittsburg State University program review process, the accreditation must meet all of the following:

- Accrediting body: recognized by Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) or, benchmarked in use at other major universities;
- Accreditation is directly related to a specific degree program (discipline specific);
- Accreditation has significance to the reputation and continuation of the program; and
- Accreditation process includes:
 - a comprehensive self-study,
 - a site visit,
 - assessment criteria as a core component, and
 - a comprehensive feedback mechanism.

The Division of Academic Affairs will cover the cost of agreed reviewer honoraria as well as documented accommodation and travel expenses. All arrangements should be overseen by the Director/Chair.

External reviewers should meet the following credentials:

- hold the highest degree in the appropriate discipline;
- have a distinguished track record in related teaching research, scholarship, and service;
- demonstrate experience with program review, institutional effectiveness, assessment and/or accreditation;
- document administrative experience;
- serve at an institution with the same/similar programs as those being evaluated;
- hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher;
- be employed at (or have retired from in the last 5 years) an institution outside of Kansas; and
- have no existing conflicts of interest.

Programs selecting an external reviewer will provide the names, contact information, and a brief bio of up to four candidates to the Dean of the college. It is recommended that a list of potential reviewers be drawn up, with an informal contact to each to determine interest in serving as an external reviewer and availability during the visit window. Interest should be indicated by receipt of a current curriculum vita from the candidate. No contractual commitment should be made until the Dean and Provost have agreed. The Director/Chair should consult with the teaching faculty to list the candidates according to preference. This list will be submitted to the Dean for consideration. The Dean may remove candidates from the list or adjust preferential order, if necessary, before sending to the Provost for feedback on the selection.

The site visit will be at least one full day on campus and should roughly follow the suggested itinerary. The program is responsible for making all arrangements and schedules for the site visit. It is suggested to schedule meetings and rooms as soon as possible.

Calendars fill quickly, especially the Provost's. When scheduling the meetings during the site visit, the very first and very last (exit interview) appointment should be a joint meeting with the reviewer, the Provost, and the Dean. The reviewer's schedule should include separate meetings with faculty (individuals or groups, depending on time), students (preferably separating undergraduates and graduate students), and other relevant groups/individuals on-campus such as the chair of the PRC.

For programs where the curriculum is greatly impacted by a lab or comparable environment, a tour of that facility or equipment should be included. The intent is to give the reviewer exposure that is as broad as possible and allow them opportunity to investigate claims made in the self-study.

It is worth noting that the reviewer's role is that of auditor. Every effort should be made to preserve the reviewer's ability to provide unbiased and constructive feedback. Toward this end, the PRC recommends mealtime interactions be limited to working lunches and such. The reimbursement notes under Administrative Procedures below are worth reviewing.

External Reviewer's Report

The reviewer will submit a report following the PRC format to the Director/Chair within two weeks of the site visit. This report is a significant resource for the committee's review of the program. Topics to be addressed include:

- The program's curriculum,
- Assessment of student learning,
- Faculty and staff,
- Resources and support services,
- Other issues common to the discipline, and
- Specific recommendations.

The Director/Chair is responsible for forwarding a copy of the external reviewer's report to the Dean and the chair of the PRC. If the reviewer has questions while preparing the report, they should be directed to the chair of the PRC.

Administrative Procedures for Site Visit

Paperwork will need to be completed with Human Resource Services to ensure the external reviewer is hired and paid for their consultant work. It is vital to get the process started early because it requires some cooperation from the reviewer in filling out and returning forms.

The documents needed are a W-9 Form, the Independent Contractor Form and the Pay Vendor Form. These forms are to be sent in advance by the Director/Chair to the reviewer for completion and can be found on the Business Office website. If signed copies are not collected prior to the reviewer's arrival, copies should be provided and signed at the day's onset.

The Office of the Provost will reimburse the department \$1,000 for the external reviewer's stipend and up to \$1,000 toward travel expenses incurred by the reviewer. Reviewers may be invited to evaluate two programs if in the same field, such as the bachelor and master degree in a single discipline, with an additional \$500 for the second review. The reviewer will be subject to approval for each program, based upon their experience and credentials. The external reviewer will be responsible to pay all personal and travel costs directly and submit actual receipts to be reimbursed for up to \$1,000. At the time of payment, the department will process a departmental purchase

requisition (DPR) from their account which will be reimbursed by the Office of the Provost.

Programs agreeing to a stipend or travel expenses above the approved amount will be responsible for covering the additional expense. Meals may be reimbursed, while alcohol purchases may not be.

Self-Study Submission and Beyond

Following the timeline outlined by the chair of the PRC, a completed self-study per the appropriate template and any accompanying documents are to be submitted directly to the chair of the PRC via email. Unless size makes it prohibitive, the program's self-study (up to 10 pages) should be saved as a pdf and submitted as one document. A second document containing all attachments appropriate for and following the stated order of the self-study template should also be saved as a pdf and submitted.

Program files are stored in a Canvas page earmarked for PRC members. Files will be reviewed by the PRC only.

After the self-study has been submitted and the external reviewer's report is received, the faculty of each program and Director/Chair will be invited for a face-to-face discussion with the PRC. These meetings will be approximately one hour long (perhaps longer if a department has several different programs under review) and will follow a collegial question and answer format.

Following the conversation with the program, the committee will consider each program, drafting concerns and recommendations based on a complete and thorough review of all material. This deliberation leads to the drafting of a response by the PRC.

This response will be shared with the Director/Chair, the college Dean, and the Provost. This feedback provides a brief list of committee concerns, accompanied by a set of recommendations. Programs may be required to submit periodic updates or even be subject to a follow-up review.

Programs choosing to will have ten working days to forward a rejoinder to the Provost. Calling out to correct an assumption of fact or to describe action(s) taken to address a recommendation specified in the response are the two most common items addressed in a rejoinder.

In the spring of the program's reporting year, a copy of the response for each program is submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents. The acceptance of the programmatic reviews as well as the summary of the annual process by KBOR completes this cycle of the program review process.

Updated 3/23/23

If it was recommended that a program submit a follow up report or have an interim review, the timeframe and submission expectations for this will be stated in the response from the committee.

Chapter 3

Review for Accredited Academic Programs

What to expect

The academic program participating should expect to spend a significant amount of time on the review process. While the process and the templates have been designed to integrate unit level planning, mid-term assessment reporting, and programmatic accreditation documentation where applicable, it is not intended to be a perfunctory exercise in paperwork completion. The focus is formative and has been designed as a method to help programs identify areas for improvement and innovation. The singularly summative aspect of the process is found in the PRC's review of this cycle's self-study in comparison to the previous committee's recommendations as supported by the Provost. The more thorough the program review document and the more attention paid to its preparation, the more a program can expect to benefit from the process.

Copies of the self-study and all templates are included in Chapter 6 of this guidebook. A brief description of all materials requested to be submitted is also provided. Questions regarding documentation should be directed to the chair of the PRC.

Site Visit Report and Findings

Programs that are accredited by a discipline-specific agency should complete the review process in the academic year following their most recent affirmation/reaffirmation. This is to recognize that some of the responses for the self-study template mirror what accreditors typically request in their evaluation. Since all academic programs are to be reviewed during the eight-year internal cycle as instructed by the Kansas Board of Regents and accrediting agencies may follow a different pattern, the review schedule may occasionally need to be revised.

The PRC requests copies of all documentation submitted for accreditation. If it is determined that the accrediting agency's expectations do not align with the PSU academic program self-study template, the committee may request the program respond to the items not addressed in the accreditation report.

It is assumed that the accreditation review includes a site visit and that the final response from the agency incorporates a set of specific program-related findings. The committee requests copies of the descriptive findings which should go beyond a simple statement of compliance or non-compliance. If the accreditation review did not include a site visit, the PRC will expect the program to follow the guidelines for incorporating an external reviewer visit into the review. Details for such a visit are addressed in this guidebook in Chapter 2.

Self-Study Submission and Beyond

Following the timeline outlined by the chair of the PRC, a completed self-study per the appropriate template and any accompanying documents are to be submitted directly to the chair of the PRC via email. Unless size makes it prohibitive, the program's self-study (up to 10 pages) should be saved as a pdf and submitted as one document. A second document containing all attachments appropriate for and following the stated order of the self-study template should also be saved as a pdf and submitted.

Program files are stored in a Canvas page earmarked for PRC members. Files will be reviewed by the PRC only.

After the self-study has been submitted, the faculty and Director/Chair of each program will be invited for a face-to-face discussion with the PRC. These meetings will be approximately one hour long (perhaps longer if a department has several different programs under review) and will follow a collegial question and answer format.

Following the conversation with the program, the committee will consider each program, drafting concerns and recommendations based on a complete and thorough review of all material. This deliberation leads to the drafting of a response by the PRC.

This response will be shared with the Director/Chair, the college Dean, and the Provost. This feedback provides a brief list of committee concerns, accompanied by a set of recommendations. Programs may be required to submit periodic updates or even be subject to a follow-up review.

Programs choosing to will have ten working days to forward a rejoinder to the Provost. Calling out to correct an assumption of fact or to describe action(s) taken to address a recommendation specified in the response are the two most common items addressed in a rejoinder.

In the spring of the program's reporting year, a copy of the Response for each program is submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents. The acceptance of the programmatic reviews as well as the summary of the annual process by KBOR completes this cycle of the program review process.

If it was recommended that a program submit a follow up report or have an interim review, the timeframe and submission expectations for this will be stated in the response from the committee.

Chapter 4

Review for New Programs

Progress Review

Responding to Objective 1.4.2 of the 2019-20 Strategic Priorities which reflect goals established in the Pathway to Prominence strategic plan, the PRC has been tasked with developing "...a progress review of newly instituted degree programs two years after implementation and receive feedback from the respective college Dean, the Provost, and the Program Review Committee Chair."

The PSU Academic Program Review self-study template has been modified to capture the appropriate information for a newly launched program. This progress review template is described in greater detail in Chapter 6.

Only brand-new degree programs will complete a progress review. This review will be scheduled during the program's third fall semester. The focus of the progress review is entirely formative and has been designed as a means to help programs identify areas for improvement and to prepare for the complete review, which should be scheduled for the program's sixth fall semester. Questions regarding documentation should be directed to the chair of the PRC.

The First Official Review

New academic programs will participate in Program Review during year six of the program, allowing for five years of minima data to be collected. The appropriate self-study template should be completed and submitted according to the process outline for academic programs and depending on whether the program has applied for and received discipline-specific accreditation. See the detailed instructions in Chapter 6 and either Chapter 2 or 3 accordingly.

Self-Study Submission and Beyond

Following the timeline outlined by the chair of the PRC, a completed self-study per the appropriate template and any accompanying documents are to be submitted directly to the chair of the PRC via email. Unless size makes it prohibitive, the program's self-study (up to 10 pages) should be saved as a pdf and submitted as one document. A second document containing all attachments appropriate for and following the stated order of the self-study template should also be saved as a pdf and submitted.

Program files are stored in a Canvas page earmarked for PRC members. Files will be reviewed by the PRC only.

After the self-study has been submitted, the faculty and Director/Chair of each program will be invited for a face-to-face discussion with the PRC. These meetings will be approximately one hour long (perhaps longer if a department has several different programs under review) and will follow a collegial question and answer format.

Following the conversation with the program, the committee will consider each program, drafting concerns and recommendations based on a complete and thorough review of all material. This deliberation leads to the drafting of a response by the PRC.

This response will be shared with the Director/Chair, the college Dean, and the Provost. This feedback provides a brief list of committee concerns, accompanied by a set of recommendations. Programs may be required to submit periodic updates or even be subject to a follow-up review.

Programs choosing to will have ten working days to forward a rejoinder to the Provost. Calling out to correct an assumption of fact or to describe action(s) taken to address a recommendation specified in the response are the two most common items addressed in a rejoinder.

In the spring of the program's reporting year, a copy of the response for each program is submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents. The acceptance of the programmatic reviews as well as the summary of the annual process by KBOR completes this cycle of the program review process.

If it was recommended that a program submit a follow up report or have an interim review, the timeframe and submission expectations for this will be stated in the response from the committee.

Chapter 5

Certificates and Minors Abbreviated Review

Abbreviated Review Process

In order to support the assessment and improvement of academic programs that fall outside the curricula of reviewed degree programs, stand-alone minors and certificates will participate in an abbreviated review process. Minors and certificates that are interdisciplinary, that are supervised outside a single academic department, or that have a curriculum independent of a degree program should prepare for review.

Programs that are completing the abbreviated self-study as a stand-alone certificate or minor where the curriculum is not duplicated within a degree program are expected to prepare a report following the abbreviated self-study template as described in Chapter 6. The written response to the outline should be no longer than 4 pages plus attachments.

Self-Study Submission and Beyond

Following the timeline outlined by the chair of the PRC, a completed self-study per the appropriate template and any accompanying documents are to be submitted directly to the chair of the PRC via email. Unless size makes it prohibitive, the program's self-study (up to 10 pages) should be saved as a pdf and submitted as one document. A second document containing all attachments appropriate for and following the stated order of the self-study template should also be saved as a pdf and submitted.

Program files are stored in a Canvas page earmarked for PRC members. Files will be reviewed by the PRC only.

After the self-study has been submitted, the faculty and Director/Chair of each program will be invited for a face-to-face discussion with the PRC. These meetings will be approximately one hour long (perhaps longer if a department has several different programs under review) and will follow a collegial question and answer format.

Following the conversation with the program, the committee will consider each program, drafting concerns and recommendations based on a complete and thorough review of all material. This deliberation leads to the drafting of a response by the PRC.

This response will be shared with the Director/Chair, the college Dean, and the Provost. This feedback provides a brief list of committee concerns, accompanied by a set of recommendations. Programs may be required to submit periodic updates or even be subject to a follow-up review.

Updated 3/23/23

Programs choosing to will have ten working days to forward a rejoinder to the Provost. Calling out to correct an assumption of fact or to describe action(s) taken to address a recommendation specified in the response are the two most common items addressed in a rejoinder.

If it was recommended that a program submit a follow up report or have an interim review, the timeframe and submission expectations for this will be stated in the Response from the committee.

Chapter 6

Templates and Attachments

Academic Program Review Template

All programs under review will follow a self-study template depending on its qualifying status. To reduce confusion, all templates follow the same numbering pattern though not all templates include every item.

For each program, OIE will provide the Director/Chair with the following:

- The Self-Study Template,
- Program Review Timeline, and
- Attachment IX Program Profile (minima worksheet).

Each item on the self-study template is described briefly below.

The **Program Overview** requests that a brief description of the program's current status, including perceived strengths and weaknesses, be given in paragraph form. A summary of significant changes from the immediate past program review should be included. New to the review as of 2019 is the request for narrative of how the program—and related minors, certificates, emphases—support the mission of the university, the college, and the department.

Addressing Minima Requirements responds to the data provided on the Program Profile (minima worksheet). The self-study asks for a narrative response to whether the program is meeting KBOR minima (where applicable) and, if not, what actions have been taken towards that end.

A brief account of significant faculty activities or changes is requested under **Faculty Efforts**.

Students Completing this Program asks for a narrative regarding the success of program graduates, including a forecast of initial placement and long-term opportunities.

Questions related to program content and standards are posed under **Curriculum Review**. A highlight of any significant changes since the immediate past review should be included and the description should reflect the curriculum map and/or course rotation schedule requested as an attachment. If the program is supported by an advisory council, a brief summary of this group's role and recent activities should be provided.

The **Assessment** narrative should respond to the three items listed as well as bring current the activities explained on the Academic Program Assessment Report, which is to be attached to the self-study. If the program has taken action to respond to the feedback from the Assessment report, details should be included.

Under **Summarize Future Planning/Goals**, the program should relate any specific initiatives implemented or goals adopted in the department's current planning document that support an effort toward programmatic improvement. If the action was taken in response to specific data, it should be incorporated.

The attachments that follow the Self-Study are described below.

A. Faculty credentials

Provide an abbreviated, current curriculum vita for each faculty member teaching in the program, noting research, teaching, and service since the immediate past program review. Note that the PRC does not evaluate faculty credentials nor does the review process have any bearing on promotion, tenure, or performance review processes. The PRC will be looking at faculty credentials as they relate to alignment with degree programs offered and adequate coverage of the programs being reviewed. Faculty credentials may be submitted using a report extracted from Faculty Success or in a similar fashion.

B. Mission Statement(s)

Where applicable, provide a copy of the programmatic, departmental, and college mission statements. This is not a request that they be drafted but, rather that they be provided for review if they have already been formally adopted.

C. Curriculum

Submit a full cycle of program requirements that depicts the frequency of courses offered. For the bachelor degree, this should include a depiction of how a student could complete the curriculum within four years. If a curriculum map has been prepared, provide a copy. Likewise, if the program is supported by an advisory group, submit a copy of the last meeting minutes.

D. Assessment

Submit a copy of the programs most recent assessment report. This should be the Academic Program Assessment Report (APAR) completed during this review cycle as well as the feedback the Director of Assessment provided in response.

E. Planning

Provide a copy of the current planning document for the home department. If the Director/Chair or college Dean has provided a response to the plan, include with this document.

F. External Reviewer Report

Submit a copy of the external reviewer's report per this current PSU review cycle as well as a rejoinder should the program have responded to the reviewer. Also, provide a copy of the immediate past external reviewer report and accompanying rejoinder (where available) if this is not the first review cycle for this program.

G. PSU Program Review Committee feedback

Provide a copy of the immediate past PSU program review feedback if this is not the first review cycle for this program.

IX. Program Profile (Minima Worksheet)

Complete the faculty section of the worksheet provided by the OIE and submit as an attachment. Note that minima are calculated as a five-year average for the following:

1. Number of declared program majors enrolled,
2. Number of program graduates,
3. Average ACT of upper level majors enrolled,
4. Junior-to-Senior progression rate (fall to fall comparison) for undergraduate degree programs, and
5. Number of teaching faculty (full time equivalence).

Counts are made per the Census Day (20th day) official reporting. Double majors are counted as a full student in each degree program indicated. Academic year is reported as summer, fall, and spring. Number of program graduates only reflects the first chosen major/degree of the student.

Faculty data is a reflection of budgeted positions in the PSU Annual Budget. Terminally qualified tenure/tenure-earning and part-time non-tenure/tenure-earning positions are reported from Human Resources as of October 1. Programs should provide pro-rated full-time equivalence for faculty teaching in the program.

Accredited Academic Program Review Template

Each item on the self-study template is described briefly below.

The **Program Overview** requests that a brief description of the program's current status in paragraph form. New to the review as of 2019 is the request for narrative of how the program—and related minors, certificates, emphases—support the mission of the university, the college, and the department.

Students Completing this Program asks for a narrative regarding the success of program graduates, including forecasting of initial placement and long-term opportunities.

The **Assessment** narrative should respond to the three items listed as well as bring current the activities explained on the Academic Program Assessment Report, which is to be attached to the self-study. If the program has taken action to respond to the feedback from the Assessment report, details should be included.

The attachments that follow the Self-Study are described below.

A. Faculty credentials

Provide an abbreviated, current curriculum vita for each faculty member teaching in the program, noting research, teaching, and service since the immediate past program review. Note that the PRC does not evaluate faculty credentials nor does the review process have any bearing on promotion, tenure, or performance review processes. The PRC will be looking at faculty credentials as they relate to alignment with degree programs offered and adequate coverage of the programs being reviewed. Faculty credentials may be submitted using a report extracted from Faculty Success or in a similar fashion.

B. Mission Statement(s)

Where applicable, provide a copy of the programmatic, departmental, and college mission statements. This is not a request that they be drafted but, rather that they be provided for review if they have already been formally adopted.

C. Curriculum

Submit a full cycle of program requirements that depicts the frequency of courses offered. For the bachelor degree, this should include a depiction of how a student could complete the curriculum within four years. If a curriculum map has been prepared, provide a copy. Likewise, if the program is supported by an advisory group, submit a copy of the last meeting minutes.

D. Assessment

Submit a copy of the programs most recent assessment report. This should be the Academic Program Assessment Report (APAR) completed during this review cycle as well as the feedback the Director of Assessment provided in response.

E. Planning

Provide a copy of the current planning document for the home department. If the Director/Chair or college Dean has provided a response to the plan, include with this document.

F. External Reviewer Report

Submit a copy of the external reviewer's report per this current PSU review cycle as well as a rejoinder should the program have responded to the reviewer. Also, provide a copy of the immediate past external reviewer report and accompanying rejoinder (where available) if this is not the first review cycle for this program.

G. PSU Program Review Committee feedback

Provide a copy of the immediate past PSU program review feedback if this is not the first review cycle for this program.

IX. Program Profile (Minima Worksheet)

Complete the faculty section of the worksheet provided by the OIE and submit as an attachment. Note that minima are calculated as a five-year average for the following:

1. Number of declared program majors enrolled,
2. Number of program graduates,
3. Average ACT of upper level majors enrolled,
4. Junior-to-Senior progression rate (fall to fall comparison) for undergraduate degree programs, and
5. Number of teaching faculty (full time equivalence).

Counts are made per the Census Day (20th day) official reporting. Double majors are counted as a full student in each degree program indicated. Academic year is reported as summer, fall, and spring. Number of program graduates only reflects the first chosen major/degree of the student.

Faculty data is a reflection of budgeted positions in the PSU Annual Budget. Terminally qualified tenure/tenure-earning and part-time non-tenure/tenure-earning positions are reported from Human Resources as of October 1. Programs should provide pro-rated full-time equivalence for faculty teaching in the program.

New Program Progress Review Template

The **Program Overview** requests that a brief description of the program's current status in paragraph form. New to the review as of 2019 is the request for narrative of how the program—and related minors, certificates, emphases—support the mission of the university, the college, and the department.

Addressing Minima Requirements responds to the data provided on the Program Profile (minima worksheet). The self-study asks for a narrative response to whether the

program is meeting KBOR minima (where applicable) and, if not, what actions have been taken towards that end.

Under **Assessment**, provide a narrative that summarizes assessment results to date, how they have been accumulated, how they will be used to foster program improvement.

For **Summarize Future Planning/Goals**, the program should relate any specific initiatives implemented or goals adopted in the department's current planning document that support an effort toward programmatic improvement. If the action was taken in response to specific data, it should be incorporated.

The attachments that follow the Self-Study are described below.

IX. Program Profile (Minima Worksheet)

Note that these figures are preliminary (minima are calculated as a five-year average) but reflect the program's status to date.

1. Number of declared program majors enrolled, and
2. Number of program completions (where applicable)

Counts are made per the Census Day (20th day) official reporting. Double majors are counted as a full student in each degree program indicated. Academic year is reported as summer, fall, and spring. Program Completions only reflect the first chosen major/degree of the student.

Abbreviated Certificate and Minor Review Template

The **Program Overview** requests that a brief description of the program's current status in paragraph form. New to the review as of 2019 is the request for narrative of how the program—and related minors, certificates, emphases—support the mission of the university, the college, and the department.

Supporting Enrollment and Completion responds to the data provided on the Program Profile (minima worksheet). The self-study asks for a narrative response to whether the program is meeting appropriate enrollment and completion expectations and, if not, what actions have been taken towards that end.

Questions related to program content and standards are posed under **Curriculum Review**. A highlight of the adopted curriculum and its description should reflect the curriculum map and/or course rotation schedule requested as an attachment. If the program is supported by an advisory council, a brief summary of this group's role and recent activities should be provided.

Under **Assessment**, provide a narrative that summarizes assessment results to date, how they have been accumulated, how they will be used to foster program improvement.

The attachments that follow the Self-Study are described below.

A. Faculty credentials

Provide an abbreviated, current curriculum vita for each faculty member teaching in the program, noting research, teaching, and service since the immediate past program review. Note that the PRC does not evaluate faculty credentials nor does the review process have any bearing on promotion, tenure, or performance review processes. The PRC will be looking at faculty credentials as they relate to alignment with programs offered and adequate coverage of the programs being reviewed. Faculty credentials may be submitted using the template or in a similar fashion.

B. Mission Statement(s)

Where applicable, provide a copy of the programmatic, departmental, and college mission statements. This is not a request that they be drafted but, rather that they be provided for review if they have already been formally adopted.

C. Curriculum

Submit a full cycle of program requirements that depicts the frequency of courses offered. For the bachelor degree, this should include a depiction of how a student could complete the curriculum within four years. If a curriculum map has been prepared, provide a copy. Likewise, if the program is supported by an advisory group, submit a copy of the last meeting minutes.

D. Assessment

Submit a copy of the programs most recent assessment report. This should be the Academic Program Assessment Report (APAR) completed during this review cycle as well as the feedback the Director of Assessment provided in response.

IX. Program Profile (Minima Worksheet)

Note that there are no minima standards established by KBOR for minors or certificates. These figures are for reflection on the program's impact on student learning.

1. Number of declared program majors enrolled, and
2. Number of program completions.

Updated 3/23/23

Counts are made per the Census Day (20th day) official reporting. Double majors are counted as a full student in each degree program indicated. Academic year is reported as summer, fall, and spring. Program Completions only reflect the first chosen major/degree of the student.

Updated 3/23/23

Attachments

Academic Program Review Self-Study Template

Programs completing the self-study template for Program Review are expected to provide a written response to the following outline that is no longer than 10 pages plus attachments to the Program Review Committee.

I. Program Overview

- A. Summarize current status of the program, including:
 - 1. Strengths
 - 2. Challenges
- B. Summarize Changes to Program Since immediate past program review Including:
 - 1. Leadership Changes
 - 2. Faculty Changes
 - 3. Emphases/minors Added or Deleted
 - 4. Service Courses to the University
- C. Summarize how the program—including related emphases, minors, and certificates—support the mission of the university, its home College, and its home department

II. Program Information Addressing Minima Requirements

- A. Summarize what your program is doing to match the Kansas Board of Regents' expectations for each of the five areas:
 - 1. Number of Program First Majors/Second Majors – especially describing recruitment and retention activities completed
 - 2. Number of Degrees Awarded – especially describing targeted retention to completion activities completed
 - 3. Average ACT of Majors (Upper level of undergraduate programs)
 - 4. Junior-to-Senior Progression Rate or adopted Graduate program retention rate (TBD)
 - 5. Faculty (Full-Time Equivalence)
- B. Reference page number(s) of department's planning document where responsive action is described if the program is not meeting minima
- C. Summarize what the program is doing to support emphasis areas/minors, especially describing recruitment and retention activities completed:
 - 1. Number of students enrolled in and degrees awarded in each emphasis area of major
 - 2. Number of students enrolled in and completions awarded in minors

III. Faculty Efforts

- A. Summarize significant changes in Faculty Credentials since immediate past Program Review
- B. Summarize Faculty efforts in each area: Research, Teaching, and Service

- C. Summarize Faculty efforts in Professional Development Activities and other training, education, experiences, certifications or licensures to improve teaching

IV. Students Completing this Program

A. Employment after Graduation

1. Summarize information from PSU Post-Graduate Activity Report
2. Summarize the program's identified measures of success for graduates, including any related initiatives taken by the program
3. Forecast future employment opportunities associated with initial placement and long-term success of graduates, including any related initiatives taken by the program

V. Curriculum Review

- A. Demonstrate how your curriculum is aligned to national/industrial standards, an accreditation institution, other professional standards or—if not available—then demonstrate how the program is meeting current requirements in the discipline

1. Include the correlation between the standards and the courses required for the degree
2. Include a summary of the process of reviewing how each course is needed to meet the degree objectives

- B. If the program is supported by an advisory board with membership including local/regional community members and employers, summarize the nature of the board's role and recent efforts

VI. Assessment

- A. Summarize how your program's assessment has Changed Since immediate past Program Review

- B. Summarize how program assessment results have been used to foster program improvement

VII. Summarize Future Planning/Goals

- A. List Initiatives/Goals being implemented by the program/department to foster improvement and move towards being an exemplary program per the department's current plan

VIII. Attachments

- A. Faculty Credentials detailing research, teaching, and service during the covered time period for each faculty member (3 pages or less curriculum vitae)
- B. Program, department, and college mission statement (where applicable)
- C. Curriculum

1. Full Cycle (up to 4 years) of Program Requirements with frequency of courses being offered
2. Curriculum map (where applicable)
3. Minutes from most recent advisory board meeting (where applicable)

D. Assessment

1. Most recent Academic Program Assessment Report (APAR)
2. Feedback given to the most recent Academic Program Assessment Report

E. Planning

1. Current Departmental Planning Document
2. Annual Summaries Since Last Program Review

F. External Reviewer Report

1. Current External Reviewer Report
2. Program's Written Response to External Reviewer Report (where applicable)
3. Immediate past External Reviewer Report
4. Program's Response to Immediate past External Reviewer Report

G. Program Review Committee Feedback from Immediate past Program Review

IX. Program Profile (KBOR Minima data) provided by Institutional Effectiveness

A. Last Five Years Data for:

1. Number of program majors
2. Number of program degrees awarded
3. ACT of Juniors/Seniors enrolled in program major (Undergraduate degrees only)
4. Junior to Senior progression rate for enrolled majors (Undergraduate degrees only)
5. Terminally-qualified faculty full-time equivalent (FTE)

Academic Program Review (Discipline-Specific Accredited Programs) Self-Study Template

Programs completing the discipline-specific accredited self-study template for Program Review are expected to provide a written response to the following outline that is no longer than 10 pages plus attachments to the Program Review Committee. (Note that numbering is aligned with the self-study template for all academic programs.)

I. Program Overview

- A. Summarize current status of the program
- B. Summarize how the program—including related emphases, minors, and certificates—support the mission of the university, its home College, and its home department

IV. Students Completing this Program

- A. Employment after Graduation
 1. Summarize information from PSU Post-Graduate Activity Report
 2. Summarize the program's identified measures of success for graduates, including any related initiatives taken by the program
 3. Forecast future employment opportunities associated with initial placement and long-term success of graduates, including any related initiatives taken by the program

VI. Assessment

- A. Summarize how your program's assessment has changed since immediate past Program Review
- B. Summarize how program assessment results have been used to foster program improvement

VIII. Attachments

- A. Faculty Credentials detailing research, teaching, and service during the covered time period for each faculty member (3 pages or less curriculum vitae)
- B. Program, department, and college mission statement (where applicable)
- C. Curriculum
 1. Full Cycle (up to 4 years) of Program Requirements with frequency of courses being offered
 2. Curriculum map (where applicable)
 3. Minutes from most recent advisory board meeting (where applicable)
- D. Assessment
 1. Most recent Academic Program Assessment Report (APAR)
 2. Assessment Office Feedback Since Last Program Review
- E. Planning
 1. Current Departmental Planning Document
 2. Annual Summaries Since Last Program Review

F. External Reviewer Report

1. Current External Reviewer Report
2. Program's Written Response to External Reviewer Report (where applicable)
3. Immediate past External Reviewer Report
4. Program's Response to Immediate past External Reviewer Report

G. Program Review Committee Feedback from Immediate past Program Review

IX. KBOR Minima data provided by Institutional Effectiveness

A. Last Five Years Data for:

1. Number of program majors
2. Number of program degrees awarded
3. ACT of Juniors/Seniors enrolled in program major (Undergraduate degrees only)
4. Junior to Senior progression rate for enrolled majors (Undergraduate degrees only)
5. Terminally-qualified faculty full-time equivalent (FTE)

Progress Review (New Program) Self-Study Template

Programs that are completing the preliminary review self-study for Program Review are expected to provide a written response to the following outline that is no longer than 4 pages plus attachments. Only brand-new degree programs will complete a progress review. This review will be scheduled during the program's third fall semester.

I. Program Overview

- A. Summarize current status of the program
 - 1. Strengths
 - 2. Challenges
- B. Summarize how the program supports the mission of the university, college, and department

II. Addressing Minima Requirements

- A. Summarize how the program is working to achieve the expectations for each of the following:
 - 1. Number of program first majors/second majors – especially describing recruitment and retention activities completed
 - 2. Junior-to-Senior progression rate or adopted Graduate program retention rate
 - 3. Faculty (Full-time equivalence)

VI. Assessment

- A. Summarize how program assessment results have been accumulated and will be used to foster program improvement

VII. Summarize Future Planning/Goals

- A. List initiatives/goals being implemented by the program to foster improvement and move towards being an exemplary program per the department's current plan

IX. Program Profile provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness

- A. Enrollment Data (Minima Worksheet) including:
 - 1. Number of Program Majors
 - 2. Number of Program Completions

Academic Program Review – Abbreviated Certificate or Minor Review Self-Study Template

Programs completing the abbreviated self-study as an academic certificate or minor, where the curriculum is not duplicated within a degree program, are expected to provide a written response to the following outline that is no longer than 4 pages plus attachments to the Program Review Committee.

I. Program Overview

- A. Summarize current status of the program
 - 1. Strengths
 - 2. Challenges
- B. Summarize how the program supports the mission of the university, college, and department

II. Supporting Enrollment and Completion

- A. Summarize what the program is doing to support each of the following:
 - 1. Number of program enrollees – especially describing recruitment and retention activities
 - 2. Number of program completions awarded

III. Curriculum Review

- A. Briefly describe how the curriculum is aligned to national/industrial standards, an accreditation agency, other professional standards, or if not available, then demonstrate how the program is meeting current requirements in the discipline

IV. Assessment

- A. Summarize how program assessment results have been used to foster program improvement

V. Attachments

- A. Faculty credentials detailing research, teaching, and service during the covered time period for each faculty member (3 pages or less curriculum vitae)
- B. Program, department, and college mission statement (where applicable)
- C. Curriculum
 - 1. Cycle of program course requirements, listing frequency of courses being offered
 - 2. Curriculum map (if available)
 - 3. Minutes from most recent advisory board meeting (where applicable)
- D. Assessment
 - 1. Most recently submitted and reviewed Academic Program Assessment Report
 - 2. Feedback given to the most recent Academic Program Assessment Report

Updated 3/23/23

VI. Program Profile provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness

A. Last Five Years Data (Enrollment and Completions Worksheet) including:

1. Number of Program Enrollees
2. Number of Program Completers