

KUTZTOWN UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE Program Review Subcommittee

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Overview

This document addresses the instructions, process, and standards related to the review of academic programs* at Kutztown University, as required in Pennsylvania's State System Board of Governors *Policy 1986-04-A: Program Review* and *Policy 1990-06-A: Academic Degrees*. Further guidance is provided in the State System's Procedures document, *Review of Academic Programs and Programs in Support of the Student Experience, 2024-58*.

To ensure the quality of the educational experience provided to our students, all programs shall be evaluated at least once every five years. When deemed necessary, the President (or designee) may require a shorter review interval for given programs.

The Office of the Provost determines the schedule for all programs that will be inclusive of all majors, minors, and concentrations offered at the University. This schedule of program reviews shall be posted on the Kutztown University website. Departments that contain multiple programs will be consulted on whether it is desirable to conduct multiple reviews simultaneously or in different years.

Programs with external review (accreditation, state licensure review, or specialty program review) conduct a modified review. They submit a copy of their most recent external program review and response of reviewers. The program will also need to provide additional documentation to address criteria described in this document that are not part of their external program review. For example, if the external program review includes analysis of student outcomes, but not of budget, the program would need to complete the budget sections described in this document. As long as the general area is addressed, even with different criteria or a different format, the program does not need to address that area for this program review. The Dean and department chair/program leader meet to determine which criteria of this document still need to be addressed. Appendix F provides guidance to determine the expectations.

Rationale

The purposes of academic program review (APR) are to:

* For purposes of this process, an academic degree program, hereafter referred to as a program, can best be described as academic and disciplinary programs. Programs can be a single major, a single concentration, or a grouping of majors/minors/concentrations, etc., that are normally discipline specific, share a common curriculum and purpose, and are commonly indicated by a common four-digit CIP code. Programs cannot include both graduate and undergraduate degrees, majors, or concentrations

1. assure opportunity for deliberate reflection on the program to include consideration of appropriateness of offerings and improvement in student educational experiences.
2. ensure deliberate and continuous attention to the enhancement of the quality of academic programs and the mission centrality of academic programs.
3. provide analyses using quantitative and qualitative data, including student learning outcomes, to assess academic program sustainability and program effectiveness to contribute to both University and State System planning.
4. provide the University stakeholders and accrediting bodies, including the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, with assurance that programs are being assessed in a systematic fashion and that plans for making continuous improvements are developed, implemented, and communicated.

The Program Review Process

APR involves the following three-year process. (See Appendix A for detailed timeline.)

1. At the start of each academic year, the Office of the Provost shares the list of each program scheduled to begin the process with the respective dean.
2. For programs with specialty accreditation, the dean and program leader/department chair determine the elements needed for a modified review.
3. The Office of the Provost provides an electronic folder of data to the dean and the chair of the department in which the program resides.
4. Program personnel meet with the dean to receive orientation to the program review process.
5. Program personnel select a program review committee or decide to work on the review process as a committee of the whole.
6. The program review committee completes a draft of the self-study and submits the document to the program's faculty, chair, and dean for review.
7. If necessary, the self-study report will be revised and resubmitted to the dean.
8. The program review committee recommends candidates for external evaluators to the dean. (See Appendix B for further information on external evaluators.) The dean, in consultation with the provost, will typically select two external evaluators. Except under special circumstances, external evaluators are to be from outside the State System.
9. External evaluators conduct an onsite visit and submit a report to dean, department chair and program review committee.
10. The dean completes a summary and meets with the department chair and program review chair to review the findings. (See Appendix E for the template.)
11. The dean's office submits all documents to the Associate Vice President for Accreditation, Assessment and Curriculum, who takes the review to the APR sub-committee and then to the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee (SPRC).
12. After receiving a recommendation from SPRC, the Provost convenes a meeting of the department chair, dean, program review committee chair, Institutional Research director, Director of Assessment, and AVP of Accreditation, Assessment and Curriculum to discuss recommendations and future directions.
13. The Associate Vice President for Accreditation, Assessment and Curriculum submits to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs in the Office of the Chancellor an

annual report of all programs that completed reviews, as well as an executive summary of each review.

14. The university president appraises the Council of Trustees of all program reviews and their respective outcomes.

Contents of Program Self-Study

These guidelines are intended to provide a template for a program self-study. The program may create appendices in the form of additional pages added to the end of the report and/or may create folders containing required documents and data.

A. Introduction and description of program

1. List the degrees and credentials within the program; this should include all majors (along with all tracks/concentrations), minors, and certificates under review as part of this program. With each program, include the award (B.A., B.S., B.S. Ed, M.S., M.B.A., Ed.D, D.S.W., certificates, etc.) along with the number of credits required for completion, the CIP code, and all approved delivery methods (face-to-face, online, etc.).
2. Provide the names, titles, and relationship to the program for every member of the review team.
3. Provide the program description from the University catalog.
4. Describe how the program supports and is aligned with the department, college, and university missions. Please list each mission statement.

B. Faculty and students

1. Provide an overview of the demographics of the faculty, including an underrepresented/gender breakdown, as well as how many faculty members are tenured, tenure-track, and temporary. This can be a chart, list, or narrative as the program determines.
2. Describe the efforts the department will undertake to ensure that all future faculty and staff hiring pools include diverse candidates.
3. Provide a list of professional development activities, including those in support of DEI initiatives within the program.
4. Include highlights of any notable student achievements, such as publications, conference presentations, awards, etc.
5. Describe the extent to which graduates of the program demonstrate success in their chosen careers. Include any evidence such as certification exams, employer surveys, alumni surveys, etc.

C. Advising

1. Address the scope and quality of the program's academic advising, focusing on procedures and collective impact.
2. How are the program faculty assigned advisees? Is the advising load equitable? What is the distribution of advisees per individual faculty member in the program (omit faculty names)? Do any temporary faculty serve as advisors? Please explain any unusual differences in the distribution (i.e., if someone is on phased retirement, for example).
3. Discuss the program's expectations for advisors. How does the program promote excellence in advising? What training is provided for advisors, for instance?
4. Does the program hold any group advising sessions for students in the major/minor?
5. Are any assessments of the program's advising conducted, such as student surveys? If yes, please discuss the results of those assessments and any changes made to effect continuous improvement in the program's advising. If the program is not gathering student feedback, please outline a plan for collecting that information.
6. Evaluate the ways the program ensures that all students have equitable access to accurate and timely information as well as holistic support to promote student success,

D. Budget and resources

1. Describe investments that have been made for the program over the review period. This list should include some or all of the following, as applicable:
 - new positions
 - educational/instructional technology enhancements
 - educational/instructional equipment and/or supplies
 - facilities/remodeling
 - travel
 - faculty (conferences, professional development)
 - expenditures for undergraduate and graduate students (conferences, professional development, etc.)
 - investments that benefited the program but were not departmental/program expenditures (i.e., Technology Tuition Fee Funds, University renewal/replacement funds, etc.),
2. Provide an analysis of the program's personnel, physical, and financial resources. Are the resources meeting the needs of the program's goals or student learning

outcomes? Are there factors that are contributing to some of the program goals or student learning outcomes not being met? Are there budgetary challenges that have impacted achieving program goals and overall program performance?

E. Appraisal of program performance

1. Provide an overview and analysis of any results from previous program goals (goals established in the previous review). Note: program goals may be related to student learning outcomes, or they may be additional outcomes for other important program endeavors, especially related to student success for diverse groups of learners. If there were challenges in working toward the goal(s), detail these challenges.
2. Provide data (use table/chart) relevant to the performance of the program including:
 - Enrollment data
 - Completion data
 - Student credit hours
 - Four-year and six-year graduation rates
 - Second-year, third-year, and fourth-year retention rates
 - Program Completion Metrics(Generated by Institutional Research and provided via the Provost's Office. See Appendix D).

Provide an analysis of all data listed above. If the previous program review identified goals associated with any metric, indicate if the goal was met and, if not, what challenges or external factors existed that prevented the goal from being met.

F. Student learning outcomes (generated from annual reports)

1. Provide a five-year assessment report on student learning outcome as an appendix. (Provided by the Office of the Provost). These assessment reports include:
 - a. How each student learning outcome was measured.
 - b. When each student learning outcome was measured (e.g., year 1, year 2, year 3, year 4, and year 5).
 - c. The results from each student learning outcome assessment.
 - d. Any actions taken based on the results from the assessment.
2. After reviewing the last five years' assessment reports, provide an analysis of the program's use of data to drive continuous improvement related to program-level student learning outcomes, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. Are students meeting the program's learning outcomes at the planned level?
 - b. If not, what should be changed to achieve the desired results?

- c. How has the program incorporated the results of the assessment back into the curriculum or program; i.e., closing the loop on identified issues?

G. Current trends

1. Describe how DEI has been incorporated into the existing curriculum and how it will be considered in curricular development/revisions.
2. Describe any other current trends pertinent to your program, including, but not limited to:
 - top trends in the discipline/field or related discipline/field. How do they relate to the existing curriculum and co-curricular experiences? If appropriate, include the following: online delivery, experiential learning, internships, research or service opportunities, external advisory boards, collaborative program delivery, and partnerships.
 - developments within the profession, region being served, or the Commonwealth that identify an anticipated need, or lack thereof, for the program in the future. Include market research, if applicable.
 - any trends in technology (or how technology is used) that have, or will have, an impact on the program.
3. Describe any collaborative efforts or community engagement activities. This could include articulation or affiliation agreements, memorandums of understanding, preferential admissions (if graduate program), advisory councils, exchange programs, community outreach programs or social justice initiatives.

H. Planning

Based on data and the analyses provided, please list areas of improvement where previous program goals were not met and/or new priorities for the program. Using the table below as a template, provide a five-year strategic/action plan that includes:

1. List all program goals for the next review cycle.
2. Describe the action plan needed to address each goal. Describe how progress will be measured (for each goal) using direct and indirect measures, where applicable.
3. What are the milestones and expected dates?
4. What are the anticipated resources?
5. Align each programmatic goal to a goal in the University's Strategic Plan.

Goals	Action Plan	Timeline	Resources	Alignment to KU Strategic Plan

I. Appendices

Provide a list of all appendices in the document's table of contents. Appendices should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Curriculum overview/check sheet for the program being reviewed. An example can be found in Appendix C.
2. Eight-semester planner, if appropriate, that outlines the course sequence for full-time students and, if applicable, a course sequence if the program is designed as a degree completion program.
3. CVs for all program faculty
4. Any additional enrollment and completion data (other than those data provided by Institutional Research)
5. Five-year assessment report on student learning outcomes

External Reviewers' Assessment

The purpose of the external team review is to garner additional perspectives on program strengths and areas for improvement from individuals in the field, or closely related fields, who are affiliated with other institutions. External reviewers have a unique opportunity and obligation to bring an outside perspective to the program review process. They are encouraged to be constructively honest as they (1) evaluate processes and procedures within the program; (2) recommend improvements or alternative assessment methods; (3) evaluate program strengths as well as opportunities for growth; and, (4) articulate recommendations for program improvement.

The external evaluators' report should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. General introduction, detailing the particulars of the visit (date, activities during the visit, and a brief overview of the organization of the report).

2. Mission and goals: whether the program goals are appropriate; if the program is accomplishing its mission and achieving its goals; whether the program is appropriately using results from assessment measures, both direct and indirect, to inform decision-making.
3. Students: identify and evaluate efforts to support students and their success, to provide any career or job placement opportunities and to foster and support undergraduate research/creativity/internships.
4. Faculty: size of regular faculty compared to similar institutions; faculty diversity in gender and ethnicity compared to peer institutions; evolving strategies for peer evaluation and mentoring junior faculty to improve pedagogy and student engagement.
5. Curriculum: assess the curriculum with regard to the projected needs and best practices of the profession; resource allocation with regard to curriculum (i.e., how large should the faculty be considering the number of majors, minors, FTEs).
6. Assessment: consider the program's assessment plan.
7. Space and facilities: are they adequate and appropriate?
8. External relations: connections with key internal and external constituents in the advancement of the program's mission and goals.
9. Conclusions: summary of the major strengths of the program and any opportunities for improvement; viability of the action/strategic plan; list of recommendations.

Program Response to External Review

Upon receipt of the external evaluation, programs may wish to provide a brief response to the document or update the action plan.

Dean's Review and Summary (see Appendix E for template)

University Program Review (conducted by SPRC and the Provost's Office)

If the program is not meeting the criteria or is a program of concern, in addition to the analysis, the University must include one of the following recommendations:

1. The University may determine the program is meeting the mission and goals of the University and State System as currently offered and recommend no changes occur.
2. The University may recommend a reorganization or other modification with the intent of increasing the program's long-term sustainability. This could include curricular modifications and or changes in the promotion and recruitment for the program. The University will determine if a program will be placed into moratorium during this process.
3. The University may recommend a program be placed into moratorium and initiate the moratorium using established curriculum processes and subsequently discontinue the program.
4. In consultation with other universities, a collaborative approach may be recommended for similar programs across multiple universities.

Revised and approved by Strategic Planning and Resources Committee: March 2025

Presented to University Senate: April 2025

APPENDIX A TIMELINE

YEAR ONE

- By August 30: Notification of Program Review is sent to the department chair of the associated program by the dean. The department forms a Program Review Committee.
- By September 30: The Provost's Office and the Office of Institutional Research provide data described above as a folder of documents to the dean and the department chair.
- By April 1: The Program Review Committee completes the Self-Study Report with the action plan and related appendices and forwards them to the dean.
- By April 15: a list of potential external reviewers is submitted to the provost by the dean.

YEAR TWO

- By September 15: The external reviewers are formally invited by the department; one member is selected as chair and is responsible for the report from the external members of the review team. Arrangements are made for a visit prior to the end of the fall semester.
- One to two months after the site visit, the reviewers submit their report to the department.
- By March 15: The Program Review Committee prepares its response to the report and submits all review documents to the dean.
- By April 15: The dean completes the Academic Program Summary Form.
- By May 15: The dean meets with the program review committee chair(s) and the department chair to discuss the summary and the review.
- By May 30: The dean forwards the signed Academic Program Summary Form, Self-Study, external evaluators' report, and program response to the external review report (if applicable) to the Office of the Provost. The Office of the Provost, in turn, forwards the Academic Program Summary Form, Self-Study, external evaluators' report, and program response to the external review report to the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee's Academic Program Review Subcommittee.

YEAR THREE

- September and October: SPRC's Academic Program Review Subcommittee reviews all documents.
- November and December: SPRC reviews the subcommittee's recommendations and remits APR to Provost's Office.
- Spring Semester: the Provost convenes a meeting of department chair, program review chair, dean, Associate Vice President for Accreditation, Assessment and Curriculum, the Academic Financial Manager, and the Director of Institutional Research to discuss final recommendations for program.
- May 30: the Office of the Provost submits annual report and executive summaries to the Office of the Chancellor.

APPENDIX B
EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

1. During the first year of the cycle, the faculty shall recommend a maximum of three external evaluators to the dean. When a department is conducting multiple program reviews in the same year, the Provost's Office will determine whether different evaluators are required for different programs.
2. Except under special circumstances, external evaluators are to be from outside Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education.
3. The dean forwards the curriculum vitae of potential external evaluators recommended by the program review committee to the provost for final approval.
4. The program review chair will contact the recommended individuals and make arrangements concerning duties, timeline, and compensation (travel and honorarium).
5. Four weeks prior to the visit, the program review chair will send the external evaluators the program's self-study report.
6. Usually a one- or two-day visit by the evaluators is planned.
7. The external evaluators will generally meet with the program faculty, program chair, dean, Associate Vice President for Accreditation, Assessment and Curriculum or designee, current and former students, as well as representatives from the community who employ or provide field experience sites for program students.
8. The opportunity for structured as well as unstructured meetings with program faculty should be planned for the external evaluators.
9. The external evaluators' written report should be submitted within six weeks of the visit to the program director and department chair.

APPENDIX C
CURRICULUM OVERVIEW

SAMPLE TO ILLUSTRATE CURRICULUM FORMAT

BS Degree

Major and major-related courses (60 credits)

100/200 level prerequisites and requirements	15 credits
300/400 level requirements	27 credits
Specialization courses	12 credits
Major electives	3 credits
Seminar	3 credits
Total	60 credits

General education courses (42 credits)

First Year Seminar	3 credits
Communicating with Others	12 credits
Understanding Self and Others	9 credits
Understanding Science and Technology	9 credits
Understanding and Creating Ideas	9 credits
Total	42 credits

Free Electives	18 credits
----------------	------------

Total	120 credits
-------	-------------

Include all major and major-related courses. If concentrations/tracks are offered, please list all courses associated with each concentration/track.

APPENDIX D: PROGRAM DATA

The following information is compiled by Institutional Research and provided to the Provost's Office early in the semester in which the program is scheduled to begin the self-study. Information is provided electronically.

Program Data – Based on the Self-Study year indicated by the Office of the Provost, insert relevant program data related to the program under review in the blank rows.

	Insert Appropriate Academic Years Below				
	SS -1	SS -2	SS -3	SS -4	SS -5
Student Enrollment – Annualized FTEs					
Student Credit Hours Lower Division					
Student Credit Hours Upper Division					
Majors Enrolled – Fall Headcount					
Program Graduates (Completions)					
Average Final GPA for Graduates					
Average Cumulative Credits for Graduates					
Four-Year Graduation Rate					
Six-Year Graduation Rate					
Retention Rate (Freshman to Sophomore)					
Continuation Rate 2 nd Year					
Continuation Rate 3 rd Year					
Continuation Rate 4 th Year					

APPENDIX E

DEAN'S SUMMARY Academic Program Review

University:

Degree(s) Offered:

Division/Unit:

Program:

Date of Last Review:

Completion Date of Current Review:

J. Action Plan as Defined by Program

Goals	Action Plan	Timeline	Resources	Alignment to KU Strategic Plan

II. Dean's Summative Assessment and Recommendation for Program, including, but not limited to, the following: viability of major program and any associated minors; three-five particular strengths of program; three to five recommendations for short-term improvement; principal future issues.

Department Chair

Date

Dean

Date

Dept. Program Review Chair

Date

Provost/Vice President Office

Date

**APPENDIX F: MODIFIED REVIEW FOR PROGRAMS WITH
SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION**

(Accreditation, state licensure review, or specialty program review)

Program:

Year of modified program review:

Organization conducting external review:

Year of review:

Results of review:

Contents of Modified Review

Program Review Requirement	Completed as part of specialized accreditation?	Needed for Modified Review
A. Introduction and description of program		
B. Faculty and students		
C. Advising		
D. Budget and Resources		
E. Appraisal of program performance		
F. Student Learning Outcomes		
G. Environmental analysis		
H. Planning		

Is an external program reviewer needed for this modified review? _____

Signatures:

College Dean Date

Program Leader Date