Academic Program Review Guide

International Technological University

Fall 2017 - Fall 2020

Approved by ALC on April 12, 2017

Table of Contents

The ITU Academic Program Review Guide provides an overview of the ITU program review process and outlines the minimum requirements for a complete Program Review report. However, each department should use the program review process as an opportunity to answer any essential questions about the quality of their degree programs and the resources needed to support them. Departments are encouraged to include additional materials to address requirements from programmatic accreditors or other external stakeholders. Additional areas of inquiry or documents may also be required or suggested by the Provost.

Developing a Program Review Committee

The first step in the program review process is to establish a Program Review Committee. The role of the committee is to guide the program review process, including the collection and analysis of evidence, coordination of the external review, and completion of the Self Study and Program Review reports.

The Program Review Committee should contain the department chair or assistant chair and at least one core faculty member. Programs are encouraged to include adjunct faculty on the committee. Departments reviewing more than one degree program should have faculty on the committee that represent all of the degrees under study. At the beginning of the program review cycle, the department chair should submit the final list of committee members to the Provost.

Overview of the Program Review Process

The program review process has four major components:

- Self Study
- External Review
- Summary of Strengths
- Action Plan

Self Study

The major portion of the program review is the Self Study. The Self Study is a comprehensive review of the program's history, curriculum, student outcomes, and resources for teaching and learning. During the Self Study process, the Program Review Committee will need to work with the program faculty and administrative offices at ITU to gather relevant evidence related to various aspects of the program.

In the Program Review Report, this section should summarize the conclusions drawn from the analysis of collected evidence and address any changes that the reviewed

programs have undergone since the last Program Review, especially any changes made to improve the curriculum and address target areas for improvement from the last Action Plan.

External Review

Each program should have at least two external reviewers who are asked to evaluate the program's quality in the light of disciplinary best practices, current trends in the related industries, and (as relevant) quality relative to peer and aspirational peer programs. The external review team should have members that represent both scholars in relevant academic disciplines and industry professionals from relevant fields. In the Program Review report, the external reviewers' final report and deliverables should be included as appendices to the report. When budgeting for a program review, departments should budget for potential travel, lodging, and honorarium costs for their external reviewers.

Summary of Strengths

The Summary of Strengths is an opportunity for the department to reflect on the Self Study and External Review reports and highlight the areas where the program excels.

Action Plan

The Action Plan outlines the target areas for improvement that the committee has identified after having completed the Self Study and the External Review processes. The Action Plan should outline how the department plans to address each target area before the next Program Review.

Executive Summary and Appendices

The final Program Review report should begin with an executive summary. The Academic Leadership Council will receive the executive summary when the committee presents an overview of its findings.

The final report should include appendices that contain copies of the External Review reports, data or artifacts used to inform the Self Study and External Review, and minutes from Program Review Committee and relevant faculty meetings.

Multiple Degree Reviews

For departments that have multiple degrees under review in the same year, the Self Study and final Program Review Report should reflect a balanced reflection of all of the programs under study. Departments can write separate reports for each degree program if the needs of each program are highly divergent.

Program Review Cycle

All degree programs in operation for more than three years that have current enrollment are required to complete a program review every three years. The following table outlines the program review cycle. New programs will be assigned a slot in the cycle by the end of the academic year in which they enroll their first students. Program review cycles can be adjusted to align with programmatic accreditation or other external review requirements.

Academic Year	Degree Programs Under Review
2017-2018	MS in Digital Arts MS in Software Engineering
2018-2019	Master of Business Administration Doctorate in Business Administration
2019-2020	MS in Electrical Engineering MS in Computer Engineering PhD in Electrical Engineering MS in Engineering Management
2020-2021	MS in Digital Arts MS in Software Engineering MS in Computer Science

Suggested Timeline

The following timeline is provided to help departments manage the program review process. Departments are encouraged to begin planning for their program review during the academic year prior to their year of submission.

May - June (Prior Academic Year)

Meet with the Provost and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment about program review logistics, budget, and planning.

Prepare a list of committee members of the Program Review Committee.

Submit the final committee list to the Provost.

July - August (Prior Academic Year)

Submit to the Provost a list of external reviewers.

Provost reviews and approves reviewers.

Once approved, make arrangements for external reviewers to come to campus in January or February.

Begin to draft External Review Plan(s).

August - December

Complete the Self Study.

Below are some suggested activities that might help you prepare your Self Study Report.

- Review the last program review report and subsequent annual reports. Identify what improvements to the program have been made since the last program review.
- Meet with program faculty about program strengths and potential target areas for improvement.
- Discuss with the academic advisors the common student challenges that they have observed.
- Review data provided by Institutional Research and Assessment. Request additional data or schedule an appointment with their office as needed.
- Engage students and alumni of the programs to learn about their perception of the program's quality.

January

Provide a copy of the Self Study Report to the Provost, program faculty, and the external reviewers.

Finalize the External Review Plan(s) and visit schedule.

January - February

External Reviewers visit campus and provide their final observations. Provide copies of the External Review Report(s) to the Provost.

Begin to draft the final report.

February - March

Submit the complete draft to the Provost for review and approval of the Action Plan.

Once the Action Plan is approved, create the final Program Review Report, including an executive summary.

Include any immediate steps from your Action Plan in your next Operational Plan and Budget.

March - April

Present an overview of the final report to ALC.

Submit a copy of the final Program Review Report to the Provost and Institutional Research and Assessment[1].

May

Begin to prepare for next annual report. Use the annual report to address a target area from your completed program review.

[1] The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment is creating a central archive of all program reviews.

Self Study Content Guide

The following section outlines the areas that should be addressed in the Self Study report. Each section contains a set of guiding questions to help you to reflect on the essential issues in each area. In each section, describe the department's strengths and areas for improvement and support any claims with data or artifacts that the committee has collected.

Program History and Context

This section should address the history of the program and its context within ITU (CFR 2.2).

- When was the program founded?
- Why was the program founded?
- What has emerged as signature features of the program?
- What is the program's mission?
- How does the program support ITU's mission?
- What major changes have been made to the program since your last program review?
- What impact have those changes had on the quality of the program and on student outcomes?

Curriculum

This section should describe the curriculum, its structure, and its overall effectiveness (CFR 2.2b-2.4).

- What are the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)? Why were they chosen? If they have been revised since the last program review, why and how were they modified?
- What are core courses for the program and why were they chosen?
- How are the capstone and thesis courses structured? How do they add to the program's curriculum?
- How does the program's curriculum reflect ITU's commitment to industry relevant education?
- Is there a regular rotation of elective courses? If so, how is it maintained?
- How do the course offerings and requirements further the PLOs and ILOs[2]?

[2] Institutional Learning Outcomes

- Are there courses that are frequently canceled or severely under-enrolled? If so, what has been done to address the underlying issues?
- How does the program's curriculum compare with peer programs?
- What are the strengths of the curriculum? What areas are in need of improvement?
- What role does the ITU internship program play in the curriculum for this program? How are students encouraged to integrate their internship into their overall academic experience?
- How are Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) developed? How does the department support the faculty in creating quality CLOs?

Please include the following documents in appendices to your report:

- Current Program Learning Outcomes
- Syllabi for Core, Capstone, and Thesis courses
- Course Learning Outcomes for Core, Capstone, and Thesis courses
- Course Offerings and Enrollment Data
- Relevant Faculty Meeting Minutes about Curriculum

Assessment

This section should describe how the department measures the quality of teaching and learning for the program. Provide examples of how the department has used assessment data to inform decisions about teaching and learning (CFR 1.2, 2.4-2.5, 4.3-4.4).

- How are the PLOs assessed? What processes or tools are used to collect this data?
- How do you communicate the PLOs to students?
- How are signature assignments and capstone projects reviewed to improve teaching and learning?
- What goals or benchmarks are used to measure students' success in achieving the PLOs? How often do faculty review data about the program's progress in meeting the established goals or benchmarks?
- What processes are in place to ensure that program graduates have reached the desired mastery of the PLOs?
- What processes are in place to review and ensure course quality?
- How is data from course evaluations used?
- What programs at other universities, if any, are used as peers or aspirational peers? How and why were they chose?

- How has the department used data from their peer programs to make improvements?
- How is CLO data used in the program?
- What support is given to groups of faculty to collaborate when assessing common courses?

Please include the following documents in appendices to your report:

- Current PLO rubrics
- Current CLOs rubrics for core, capstone, and thesis courses
- Current Curriculum Maps
- Rubrics and assignment descriptions for signature assignments
- Documentation of how assessment data is used
- Relevant Faculty Meeting Minutes about Assessment

Admissions, Retention, and Enrollment

This section should address the trends related to admitting, enrolling, and retaining students in the program. Emphasis should be placed on what the data says about the health of the program (CFR 2.2, 2.2b, 2.10).

- What are the current admissions requirements for the program?
- What does admissions and enrollment trend data say about future enrollment?
- What strengths and challenges does ITU have when recruiting students for this program?
- How does enrollment in this program compare to similar programs at other institutions?
- What initiatives, if any, have been put in place to increase retention and enrollment?
- What trends, if any, are there among students who withdraw from this program?
- What is the profile of a successful student in this program?

It may be helpful to consult with the Admissions and Academic Advising as you work on this section. You will also receive data exhibits from Institutional Research and Assessment related to enrollment and retention trends.

Please include the following documents in appendices to your report:

- Program Enrollment Trends
  - Term-to-Term Enrollment
  - Average Annual Enrollment
  - Enrollment by Concentration (if relevant)
  - Newly Enrolled Students
  - Enrollments by Gender
  - Total Term Units Earned
  - Program Units as a Percentage of Total University Units

- Program Retention Data
  - Retention within 2 Terms by Cohort (Retained by the University)
  - Change of Program Trends

Student and Graduate Outcomes

This section should describe the analysis of student and graduate achievement data (CFR 2.6, 2.10).

- What trends are there in student achievement? Are there any particular student populations that struggle or excel in the program? What factors might contribute these trends?
- What factors correlate with successful completion of the program?
- How does the program's time to degree and graduation rates compare to peer programs and ITU as a whole? What factors may have contributed to these numbers?
- How does the program use data about graduate's academic and professional success after graduation? What trends have you found?

Please include the following documents in appendices to your report:

- Program Graduation and Time-to-Degree Data
  - Number of Degrees Conferred by Term
  - 2 and 3 Year Graduation Rates
  - Average Time-to-Degree by Entering Cohort

- Graduate and Alumni Survey Data

Faculty

This section should address faculty staffing, engagement, and quality (CFR 2.1, 3.1-3.3, 3.5, 4.4).

- What are the academic and professional backgrounds of the current faculty who teach in the program?
- Based on current and projected enrollment and the ITU's Faculty Adequacy Model[3], do you have the appropriate number of faculty to provide the required teaching and academic administrative services necessary to support the program?
- How does the expertise of the current faculty support the program's mission and curriculum?
- What is the breakdown of core and adjunct faculty?
- How is core and adjunct faculty time used in the department (percentage of teaching vs. administrative duties, core vs. elective courses etc.)?
- How are faculty engaged when making curricular decisions?
- How does the department support the professional development of its faculty?

Resources for Teaching and Learning

This section should address how the department uses its budget and institutional resources at ITU to support teaching and learning (CFR 2.10-2.13, 4.4-4.7).

- How does the department's budget reflect its academic priorities? What budgetary challenges has the department faced in supporting teaching and learning? How has the department addressed those challenges?
- Other than enrollment, what internal or external factors is the department monitoring that might affect its budget?
- How does the program faculty collaborate with academic advisors to ensure students are provided with effective guidance?
- What library resources exist to support information literacy for the program?
- How does the faculty work with ITU Research Librarian to improve information literacy skills among students in the program?
- How does the faculty work with Student Success Program to support the English language and academic skill development of students?
- How does the faculty work with Career Services to connect academic learning and career readiness skills?

[3] This is provided in Appendix B.

External Review Planning

Responsibilities of the Department

The Program Review Committee should work with the Provost to select two external reviewers who can speak the quality of the academic program. Ideally, the members of the external review team should be balanced between academics and industry professionals who can speak to the quality of the program. When the department develops its budget for the year of its Program Review, departments should budget for potential travel, lodging, and honorarium costs for their external reviewers.

Once the Provost has approved the reviewers, the department should make arrangements for the reviewers to come to campus to discuss the program with faculty and other institutional stakeholders. In cooperation with external reviewers, the department should develop and agree upon an External Review Plan[4], including a deadline for the final report and other deliverables. Before the reviewers' arrival on campus, the department should provide the external reviewers with a complete draft of the Self Study.

While on campus, the external reviewers should be given reasonable access to anyone involved in the quality of the academic program. Opportunities should be provided to interview key stakeholders and request access to additional information.

Expectations of the External Reviewers

External reviewers are expected to provide their best objective assessment of the program in light of current academic and industry standards. Reviewers should keep the institution's context in mind when assessing the program and making recommendations. While they are asked to address the specific issues outlined in the External Review Plan in their final deliverables, they are encouraged to highlight any additional strengths or areas of concern that they feel are important for the program's growth and future viability. If reviewers need to adjust either the External Review Plan or visit schedule, they are encouraged to make alternative arrangements with the Program Review Committee.

Drawing Conclusions and Developing Next Steps

The final steps in the Program Review process call for the department, led by Program Review Committee, to reflect on what they have learned from the Self Study and External Review processes and draw conclusions about the current strengths of the program and what areas they would like to target for improvement. The Summary of

[4] Appendix A to this document contains a sample External Review Plan document.

Strengths and Action Plan sections of the Program Review Report will show the result of the committee and department's deliberations and resulting plans for the future.

Summary of Strengths

The Summary of Strengths section is an opportunity for the department to highlight the areas in which the Program Review shows that the program excels. This section should be a bulleted list organized by Self Study topic. Each area of strength should cite the evidence that shows that area as a strength.

Action Plan

The Action Plan is a companion to the Summary of Strengths. It identifies key areas where the program faculty want to target efforts for improvement and outlines the steps the program will take to address these areas. For each target area, the department should describe their plan to address that area, the metrics that will be used to measure success, and a tentative timeline for implementation. Please note that the Action Plan must be submitted to and approved by the Provost before the report is considered final.

Sample Program Review Organizer

The following section provides a sample outline of how a Program Review Report might be organized.

I. Title Page
   a. Department Name
   b. Degrees under Review
   c. Completion Date
   d. List of Program Review Committee Members

II. Executive Summary

III. Self Study
   a. Program History and Context
   b. Curriculum
   c. Assessment
   d. Admissions, Retention, and Enrollment
   e. Student and Graduate Outcomes
   f. Faculty
   g. Resources for Teaching and Learning

IV. Summary of Strengths
   a. Program History and Context
   b. Curriculum
   c. Assessment
   d. Admissions, Retention, and Enrollment
   e. Student and Graduate Outcomes
   f. Faculty
   g. Resources for Teaching and Learning

V. Action Plan
   a. Target Area One
      i. Description of Target Area
      ii. Proposed Action Plan and Measures of Success
      iii. Proposed Timeline
   b. Target Area Two
      i. Description of Target Area
      ii. Proposed Action Plan and Measures of Success
      iii. Proposed Timeline

c. Target Area Three
    i. Description of Target Area
    ii. Proposed Action Plan and Measures of Success
    iii. Proposed Timeline
d. Target Area Four
    i. Description of Target Area
    ii. Proposed Action Plan and Measures of Success
    iii. Proposed Timeline

VI. Appendices
a. External Review Reports and Deliverables
b. Key Data and Artifacts Collected

Appendix A: External Review Plan Template

International Technological University

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
2711 N 1st Street San Jose, CA 95134

EXTERNAL REVIEW PLAN

Planning Document for External Reviews of ITU Degree Programs

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for an ITU Program Review. Your input and expertise are invaluable to helping our institution improve the quality of its academic programs. The External Review Plan describes the guidelines and expectations for the External Review Visit and subsequent deliverables.

As an external reviewer, ITU expects you to provide your best objective assessment of the department and programs under review in light of current academic and industry standards. Please keep the institution's context in mind when assessing the program and making recommendations. While you are asked to address the specific issues outlined in the External Review Plan in your final deliverables, you are encouraged to highlight any additional strengths or areas of concern that you feel are important for the program's growth and future viability. If you need to adjust either the External Review Plan or visit schedule, please contact the Program Review Committee as soon as possible to make alternate arrangements.

Program and Reviewer Information

ITU Department Name

Degrees under Review

Program Review Year

Self Study Completion Date

External Reviewer Name

Employer or Institution

Date(s) of External Review Visit

External Reviewer Professional Biography

Please provide a brief professional biography that we can include in any official documents about the External Review.

International Technological University
Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
2711 N 1st Street San Jose, CA 95134

Program Strengths and Potential Areas of Improvement

After completing our Self Study, these are the areas that we have identified as our strengths and potential areas for improvement.

Strengths	Potential Areas for Improvement

Areas of Special Interest

In addition to our area outlined above, we would like you to examine the following areas.

Area of Special Interest	Department or Program Importance

International Technological University
Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
2711 N 1st Street San Jose, CA 95134

Expected Deliverables

After your visit, we are expecting to receive the following documents:

Deliverable Name

Deadline

Deliverable Description

Deliverable Name

Deadline

Deliverable Description

Appendix B: ITU Faculty Adequacy Model

ITU

International Technological University
2711 North First Street - San Jose, CA 95134
Phone (888) 488-4968
www.itu.edu

FACULTY ADEQUACY MODEL
Last Revised 02/09/2017

Purpose

The following principles shall serve as a guide to the recruitment and maintenance of sufficient faculty to support degree programs at International Technological University (ITU).

Regarding Faculty Workload

For the purposes of this staffing and adequacy model, the maximum academic workload per faculty full-time equivalent (FTE) shall be no more than forty (40) hours per week averaged over any consecutive fifeteen (15) week period. Activities requiring direct student contact, preparation of educational materials, academic administration and research shall be included in workload calculations.

In keeping with policy and good management, ITU has developed the following model containing formulas to address the adequacy of its faculty for teaching, research, and administrative work.

Assumptions

1. Full-time faculty are available as follows: Faculty work three consecutive15-week terms for 45 weeks annually. 45 weeks x 40 hours/week = 1,800 hours/year.
2. Allocation of faculty time is divided among the following: teaching, research, and administrative work.
3. Each faculty member negotiates with the Department Chair and Provost the percentage allocation of time to each component. These time allocations vary among faculty members depending on their contract type and the needs of the department.
4. A multiplier is calculated for each instruction hour: classroom teaching requires 2 hours of effort for each hour in class.
5. Administrative time is allocated based upon the contract percentage for full-time administrators. Faculty who are doing some administrative functions are assigned hours for each activity.

6. Research time is calculated as a residual after calculating teaching and administrative hours.
7. All full-time administrators were omitted from calculations.

Available and Actual Hours

The stated contract percentage allocation for teaching for each faculty in a department is calculated and converted into “available hours” by multiplying the contract percentages by 1,800.

This figure is then compared with “actual hours.” Computations should be based on course scheduling and registration data. The total “actual hours” can be divided by 1,800.

This faculty adequacy model compares the total number of faculty hours necessary and the number of total hours available to deliver the curriculum. Department Chairs determine the number of faculty hours available for teaching, class preparation, research, scholarly activity, committee work, advisement, and other activities deemed critical to fulfill ITUs mission. The distribution across these activities may vary among individual faculty members.

Lecture Hour Threshold

One hour of lecture time requires 2 hours of preparation time (for a total of 3 hours). Preparation time includes creating course materials, lesson planning, grading assignment and exams and other teaching related activities.

Faculty Adequacy Model Assumptions

- 70% of faculty time is spent in teaching-related activities.
- A full-time load = 1,800 hours (45 weeks x 40 hours/week)

If a faculty member has 1,800 hours in a year, and if 70% of their time is available for teaching (1,260 hours), their scheduled lecture hour threshold is (1,260/3) 420 lectures annually. If each class is 45 hours, then faculty can teach 9 classes annually.

If a faculty member is teaching 100% of their time, their scheduled lecture hour threshold is (1,800/3) 600 lectures annually. If each class is 45 hours, then faculty can teach 13 classes annually.

Sample Faculty Adequacy Model Application

Number of FTE Faculty	Full-Time Load	Total Capacity
45	1,800 hours	81,000 hours

Total Capacity	Teaching Percentage	Teaching Capacity
81,000 hours	70%	56,700 hours

Teaching Capacity	56,700 hours
***Required to Deliver Curriculum**	53,811 hours
Excess Capacity	2,889 hours

*Required to Deliver Curriculum hours are calculated from actual class offerings.

Model Exception - Lecture Hour Threshold (class size variants)

Assuming a class size of 45, one hour of lecture time requires 2 hours of preparation time (two hours of prep & one hour of delivery for a total of 3 hours). This calculation is determined appropriate for class sizes of approximately 45 students. For larger or smaller class sizes, the prep time estimate can be adjusted appropriately based on the actual number of students. If the number of enrolled students is less than 15-20, faculty may be able to teach multiple sections of the same class or additional classes.

Model Exception - Faculty Teaching Multiple Sections of the same class

If faculty are teaching multiple sections of the same class (assuming the same course materials) then out-of-class prep time is reduced. In this case, faculty may be able to teach multiple sections of the same class or additional classes.