

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines

The Purposes of Undergraduate Program Review

Undergraduate Program Review at Texas Southern University exists to ensure that programs are functioning at the highest possible levels of academic quality and are operating in ways that are consistent with the mission of the University. The process of Undergraduate Program Review serves as a means to inform faculty, administrators, students, and University governance bodies of the strengths and weaknesses in our programs. Undergraduate Program Review is a tool for critical reflection and change. Through careful documentation and analysis, faculty and students can take advantage of the review process to assess the quality, centrality, demand, and costs associated with specific programs and subsequently develop plans for program improvement. Program reviews should result in a set of recommendations crafted by faculty and endorsed by academic administrators that include concrete strategies and benchmarks for achieving improved quality. In some cases, reviews may point to the need to significantly restructure a program or, in exceptional cases, initiate program closure.

Data for the following tables will be provided to department by Institutional Assessment Planning & Effectiveness (IAPE).

- Table A. Student Credit Hours Produced (SCH)
- Table B. Average Class Size for Lower Division, Upper Division, and Graduate Courses:
- Table D. Number of Full-time Faculty by Rank
- Table E. Student/Faculty Ratio
- Tables F1-F3. , First-time Entrant Student Enrollment, Student Enrollment-Part-time & Full-time and Degrees Awarded by Academic Year
- Table H. Total Student Credit Hours Produced in Spring and Summer Terms

Undergraduate Program Reviews follow a process that includes:

- The creation of an appropriate degree of common standards and performance for undergraduate programs across the University
- The generation of information for departments and related units for their own use in assessing program strengths and weaknesses
- An assessment of the quality of the educational experience of TSU undergraduate students
- An assessment of progress toward strategic goals at the department, college, and university level, including the ways in which undergraduate programs complement and sustain the undergraduate curricula
- Meaningful comparisons with discipline-specific standards, peer institutions, and related TSU units
- The identification of strategies for program improvement
- The dissemination of recommendations to faculty governance groups and academic administrators who have responsibility for setting priorities and allocating resources

Information generated in program reviews may be used by faculty to refine and revise curricula, to recruit new

students, to provide information to accrediting or professional associations, to argue for new or reallocated resources, to bolster proposals for external funding, and/or to modify faculty assignments. The results of reviews may also be used by University administrators to guide strategic decisions regarding program development and resource allocation. Undergraduate Program Reviews occur on a periodic basis, primarily through a process of self-study complemented by external critique. The review process is grounded in both university-wide standards and criteria specific to discipline-based and interdisciplinary programs.

Self-Study

Undergraduate Program Review begins with a self-study by the appropriate Undergraduate faculty. It is advisable that those who know the program best (faculty and students) and those responsible for carrying out the recommendations of the review (undergraduate program coordinators, department chairs and deans) be closely associated with the self-study. Typically the self-study will consist of analyses of descriptive material and contain the following sections:

I. Departmental Context (*Provide a description of the overall departmental context of the program(s) being evaluated including a brief description of each program, track, option, minor, etc., offered by the department. A program assessment plan including student learning outcomes, metrics and findings should be included for the last three years.*)

II. Departmental Enrollment, Faculty, and Resource Data (*With the exception of the table under letter C, the departmental data below are provided by Institutional Effectiveness for the most recent five-year period. Discuss significant characteristics of the department as revealed by the data, paying particular attention to trends. For example, what trends in student credit hour production, average class size, or reliance on part-time faculty are apparent, and how do you account for them? Has the number of departmental faculty increased or decreased significantly, and, if so, how do you explain this, and what impact has it had on programs in the department? Please address each data element separately in your discussion.*)

Table A. Student Credit Hours Produced (SCH)

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
TOTAL SCH					
Courses % on Main Campus					
% at Extended Campuses					
% Distance Learning					
% by Full-time Faculty					
% by Part-time Faculty					

Table B. Average Class Size for Lower Division and Upper Division Courses:

Division	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Lower					
Upper					

Table C. Number of Faculty Holding Rank in the Department (*budgeted lines and faculty by rank*)

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Budgeted FTE Faculty Positions (number of positions)					
Budgeted FTE (the FTE of the above positions)					

Table D. Number of Full-time Faculty by Rank

Full-time Faculty by Rank	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Professor					
Associate Professor					
Assistant Professor					
Other Faculty (Adjunct, Instructor, etc.)					
Total Full-time					

Using the table below, provide a list of all current departmental faculty and an indication of which faculty provide primary instructional support to each program. Other programs supported may include master's and/or doctoral programs. Add rows as necessary.

Table E. List of Faculty and their Primary Program Area and other supporting Programs.

Faculty Member	Primary Program(s) Supported	Other Program(s) Supported

Table E. Student/(All students enrolled in courses offered by your department)/Faculty Ratio:
 (Sum of students enrolled in a courses/ N of all faculty)

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Student/Faculty Ratio:					

Table F1. First-time Entrant Student Enrollment:

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
1st-time Freshmen					
1st-time Transfer					

Table F2. Student Enrollment-Part-time & Full-time:

	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Part-time					
Full-time					
Total					

Table F3. Degrees Awarded by Academic Year

	Fall 2012 to Summer 2013	Fall 2013 to Summer 2014	Fall 2014 to Summer 2015	Fall 2015 to Summer 2016	Fall 2016 to Summer 2017
Degrees Awarded					

Table G. Total Budget and Expenditure Total:

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Budget					
Expenditures					

Table H. Total Student Credit Hours Produced in Spring and Summer Terms:

TOTAL SCH	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Spring					
Summer I & II					

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND CREDENTIALS OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY (*PLEASE PROVIDE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW AND DISCUSS WHERE REQUESTED.*)

III-A. Rank of Full-time Faculty (*Include continuing instructors and other on-going appointments. Provide undergraduate and graduate faculty status as appropriate*):

III-B. Number and Overall Percentage of Full-time Faculty with Terminal Degrees in the Discipline they are teaching:

III-C. List Faculty Holding Rank in the Department who have Non-teaching Assignments (e.g. Research, Administrative, Grants) and Provide an Indication of the Nature of the Alternate Assignment:

III-D. Participation of Faculty in Multiple Programs within the Department or Other Departments:

III-E. Number/Utilization of Part-time Faculty (*Discuss the extent to which the department relies upon qualified part-time faculty*):

III-F. Other Indicators of Faculty Quality (*e.g. certification, licensure, etc.*):

III-G. Special Qualifications of any Faculty Member (Full or Part Time) Whose Credentials do not Meet SACS Guidelines for the Level and Discipline They are Teaching:

IV. Departmental Faculty Productivity (*Please provide the information requested below and discuss where appropriate*)

IV-A. Scholarship (*Provide a brief narrative of the departmental faculty's overall research/creative activity including any specific research initiatives or themes. Incorporate a statement of faculty totals for refereed publications, presentations, books, etc. Attach a listing of significant scholarly activity for each faculty including a description of the relevance and value of the work relative to the discipline, students, university, and/or community. Note: Do not simply attach faculty vitae*):

IV-B. Service (*Provide, in narrative form, a brief description of the departmental faculty's overall service activity. Attach a listing of each faculty's service to the public, university, and professional organizations, presented in summary form. Include a description of the relevance and value of the work relative to the discipline, students, university, and/or community*):

IV-C. Grant and Contract Activity (*Provide a listing of proposals submitted/funded, etc., by departmental faculty*):

V. Program Resources and Facilities

What are the on-campus and off-campus facilities used to support the Undergraduate program (classroom space, laboratory space, and faculty and student office space, computer networks) as well as faculty for their research and scholarly activity?

How adequate are those facilities to achieving program goals?

What library resources are used by the Undergraduate program and are they adequate? (The self-study committee should consult with the appropriate University librarian before preparing this section of the report and should reflect the librarian's input in the self-study report).

VI. Other measures of quality determined by the program, such as:

- national rankings and/or ratings
- visiting and adjunct professors/scholars
- significant outreach and/or public service activities related to Undergraduate education
- external fellowships and awards given to faculty and students by disciplinary and/or professional associations
- special seminars or symposia offered by the program

VII. Self-Assessment

The final section of the self-study is the self assessment *by the faculty* of the program's strengths and areas for improvement. Based on the data collected, as well as other sources of judgment, program faculty will address three questions in this analysis:

- What characteristics of the program should be maintained?
- What characteristics of the program should be ended?
- What characteristics of the program should be changed?

The answers to these questions will then lead to an action plan that sets goals and objectives with specific timelines. If major changes are anticipated, the needed resources and their potential sources should be identified.

A note on standards of quality: The office of Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness has not established a university-wide set of standards applicable to all undergraduate programs. Rather, we have delineated a range of indicators we believe should be used as benchmarks in any assessment of program quality. The interpretation of those indicators and the setting of benchmark standards is the responsibility of individual programs, which will draw on disciplinary standards and established best practices. It is program faculty and peers who will analyze the collected data and make the appropriate judgments regarding overall quality and areas for improvement.

Submission

One copy of the self-study is to be submitted to the Interim Executive Director of Institutional Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness, the Dean of the College or School, and the Provost's Office by December 1 of the academic year in which a program is to be reviewed. At this point, the school/college dean is invited to submit his or her own independent assessment of the program, including comments on the self-study.

The External Review

Upon acceptance of the self-study by the Office of the Provost, an external review panel will be organized. The panel will consist of at least three members—three senior faculty members from other universities with recognized expertise in the appropriate discipline or field – one chosen by the department, one by the dean, and one by the Provost. The external review will be scheduled by the schools and colleges being reviewed in consultation with the Provost's office to ensure amicable scheduling. It will typically take place early in the spring semester. The agenda of the external review panel will generally include:

Initial meeting with the department chair, undergraduate program coordinator, school/college dean, and Executive Director of Institutional Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness or Associate Vice President for Academic and Faculty Affairs to discuss the self-study and orient the panel to the program as well as the schedule:

- Meetings with program faculty
- Meetings with undergraduate students if available, selected undergraduate alumni
- Meeting with the Provost
- Meeting with the University Registrar
- Meeting with the University Librarian
- Tour of program facilities

- Meeting with the school/college dean and Executive Director of Institutional Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness
- Exit interview with the department chair, Undergraduate program coordinator, school/college dean, and Executive Director of Institutional Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness, Provost and members of the University Curriculum Council.

At the conclusion of the visit, the External Reviewers will submit a report within two to three weeks, addressed to the Department Chair & program faculty and copied to the school/college Dean, Associate Vice President for Academic and Faculty Affairs and the Interim Executive Director for Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness. The report will be organized around the following questions:

1. To what extent is this program central to the mission of the Texas Southern University and the school or college and department where it is located? What changes would be necessary to increase the program's centrality?
2. What is the quality of the program's curriculum with respect to scope, depth, currency, and student requirements for degree completion? What changes would be necessary to improve the current level of quality?
3. What is the quality of the program's faculty with respect to teaching and advising effectiveness, scholarly or creative productivity, impact on the discipline or field, and external recognition? What changes would be necessary to improve the current level of quality?
4. What is the quality of the program's students with respect to academic qualifications, diversity, and success after graduation? What changes would be necessary to improve the current level of quality?
5. What is the quality of the program's resources with respect to its teaching, research, and service obligations? What changes would be necessary to improve the current level of quality?
6. How is the current level of demand likely to change in the next three to five years?
7. Are plans clear, appropriate, feasible? Does the panel have recommendations for changes in the plans?

Within two weeks after receiving the report, the Department Chair and program faculty will write a response or rejoinder, addressed to the Executive Director of Institutional Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness, to correct errors of fact or offer alternative interpretations.

Final Assessment

Based on the self-study (including plans for improvement), the report from the external review panel, and any response to the panel's report from the program faculty, the University Curriculum Council will make a final assessment and recommendation to the Associate Vice President for Academic and Faculty Affairs and the Provost. The assessment and recommendation will fall into one of the following categories:

Area of Distinction The plans for improvement should be adopted as put forward, with the commitment of new institutional resources necessary to achieve the goals of the plans

Approval The plans for improvement should be adopted as put forward

Provisional approval The University Curriculum Council makes specific changes in the plans for improvement and sets a date by which implementation of the modified plan will be reviewed, normally within three years

Continuing review/probation The University Curriculum Council believes that there are substantive changes that need to be made in the program and returns the plans for improvement to the program faculty for changes and sets a specific date for the revised Plan to be submitted to the Committee for further review and recommendation

Closure The program should be phased out and the necessary steps taken with respect to program deletion and programmatic displacement of faculty.

Before making a final decision, the Associate Vice President for Academic and Faculty Affairs will consult with the appropriate school/college dean and the Provost. The Associate Vice President for Academic and Faculty Affairs will issue his or her decision by the end of the academic year in which the program review has taken place.

Applicability

These policies and procedures apply to all Undergraduate degree programs offered by the Texas Southern University.

Addendum for Professionally Accredited Programs

For those professional undergraduate programs that choose to seek accreditation from external associations, the process for undergraduate program review will be modified.

The review process will be modified in the following ways:

In general, undergraduate program review will occur in the year *following* the completion of the external accreditation process.

The self-study prepared for the accrediting agency will serve as the internal self-study for the program review process. In some cases, supplemental material may be requested if the self-study does not address critical benchmarks mentioned in this document. It is assumed that the need for supplemental materials will be relatively rare, given the comprehensive nature of the accreditation review process.

At the beginning of the academic year in which the undergraduate program review process is to occur, the program will submit to the office of Institutional Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness *a)* the self-study prepared for the accrediting agency; *b)* the final report of the accrediting agency, including the determination of compliance with standards, official comments on program strengths and weaknesses, the final determination on continuing accreditation, and any materials written by the program as responses or rebuttals to the accrediting agency's findings and conclusions. The program should provide a cross-reference or index that indicates where in the self-study the specific items in Undergraduate School's protocol are addressed.

These materials will be reviewed by the University Curriculum Council to assure that the self-study requirements have been met and to determine whether an external review panel should be a part of the program review process. The University Curriculum Council following acceptance of the self-study and the external reviewers' report (if applicable), will make a recommendation to the deans and the Provost regarding the Final Assessment.