

TO: Faculty Review Team Members

FROM: President's Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Planning

RE: Directions for the preparation of reports and the review process for academic planning

DATE: December 7, 2010

Introduction

The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Planning is providing some guidance to assist the Faculty Review Teams who will be reading the reports and providing feedback to departments.

Mark Fregeau, the Chair of the President's Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Planning will coordinate assistance from the committee membership to work with those department chairs who would like guidance in the preparation of their departmental report.

Directions for the Faculty Review Teams

The charge to the Faculty Review Teams is to provide to the department written feedback on each criterion as outlined in the Program Review Criteria so that the department can enhance and strengthen the departmental report. To that end, the department will be best served by providing a thoughtful analysis for each criterion. It might be useful for the review team to be considered as a peer editor or friendly reviewer working on behalf of the department, one who would fill much the same role as a colleague to whom one sends a draft of a manuscript for feedback. The general instructions and review criteria to the departments are included below for information purposes.

Academic Planning Process Timelines

December 6, 2010:	The Advisory Committee assigns faculty to the Faculty Review Teams
December 13 & 16, 2010:	The Advisory Committee holds workshops for Faculty Review Teams
January 7, 2011	Departments submit full report to Review Teams
January 28, 2011	Faculty Review Teams comments to Departments

Directions for Department Reports

The goal of the departmental report is to provide a concise but comprehensive picture of the status of each academic department and to present a plan for the future. In developing the plan, a department is encouraged to incorporate the information and data from their indicator report and to: (1) look for efficiencies in current undergraduate and graduate programs such as the elimination of flow sheets and programs (i.e., majors*, minors**, concentrations***, or certificates of competency****) that are no longer current, (2) consider how the curricula might be streamlined, modified, or updated, and (3) recommend proposals for new programs, initiatives or interdisciplinary opportunities that address internal and external demand and regional market needs. We must consider how to most effectively use our limited resources. This may mean contraction in some areas and enhancement in others.

It is recommended that:

- the departmental report responds to each component of the seven (7) Program Review Criteria as approved by Salem State University Governance. Please use the 7 criteria as the major sections of the report.
- the length of the report is 15 double spaced pages, but departments are not restricted to this page length.
- departmental enrollment data be provided including data from AY2009.
- the attached tables be used as a guide for presenting quantitative data in the report.

Definitions (page 8 of SSU Catalog):

*A MAJOR is the academic discipline in which a student works in depth as part of a particular approved degree program.

**A MINOR is an academic discipline outside of the major, in which a student develops a subsidiary specialization.

***A CONCENTRATION is a particular block of courses or course pattern within a major, intended to provide an emphasis on a specific area within the major curriculum.

****A CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCY is a sequence or group of courses that focuses upon an area of specialized knowledge or information and is often used for professional advancement.

A list of available majors, minors, and concentrations appears on pages 9-11 of SSU Catalog.

Program Review Criteria

No all measures within each criterion apply to every program

Include both qualitative and quantitative evidence to provide a comprehensive picture of the program.

Criterion 1: Support of Mission

- To what degree is the program consistent with the mission, vision, values, and goals of Salem State?
- Are there relationships between program and external constituencies, e.g., articulation agreements, interagency services agreements, that advance the mission?

Criterion 2: Internal Demand

- What are the enrollments and enrollment trends in courses required for other programs, including general education?
- Does the program offer elective courses with high demand? Specify courses and enrollments.
- Identify the demand for specific skills achieved by students in your program that are essential building blocks for continued success, e.g., quantitative literacy.

Criterion 3: External Demand

- How does this program advance the region's cultural, social, and economic development?
- Is there external demand for graduates? What are employment prospects in the short-, medium, and long-term for graduates of this program? What supports this, e.g., specific skills or knowledge students learn, demographic data, labor statistics?
- Are there state, federal, or accreditation mandates that affect this program? If so, how do these mandates affect our ability to deliver the program?

Criterion 4: Program Inputs and Processes: These metrics must be evaluated in the context of program resources specified in criterion 6 (e.g., number of full-time faculty members and number of APR's provided for research or teaching)

- Indicate the degree to which faculty are active and engaged in professional development (publications, presentations, performances, externally funded grants, professional service, other scholarship)?
- Specifically describe how the curriculum and instruction have been updated to address: currency with the field, diversity, globalization, technology, learning styles, and instructional delivery.
- What has the program done to encourage enrollment, retention and timely graduation? To what extent have these efforts been effective?

Criterion 5: Outcomes

Student Learning (Submitted to Provost in March 2010 for NEASC)

- Specify student learning outcomes for the program.
- What methods have been used to assess these outcomes?
- How are assessment data used to provide feedback to the program? Provide examples if available.

Program

- Provide data on student/alumni outcomes and student/alumni satisfaction where available, e.g., employment placement, graduate school placement, GRE or other graduate exams, pass rates on licensure exams
- Has the program received special recognition or have notable visibility that speaks to its quality? E.g., World Tourism Certification, Quinn Bill approval, Irene Dunn Award.
- What evidence exists of how faculty and student scholarship in the program will help meet regional, state or national needs?
- If available, provide evidence of alumni contributions to the program, profession and region, e.g., service on advisory boards, community leadership.
- If external accreditation is available, is the program accredited, if not, why not?

Criterion 6: Program Statistics - 5 years (Data will be provided by Academic Affairs or appropriate office. Where appropriate, indicate which resources belong exclusively to this program and which resources are shared with other programs.)

- Full-time faculty, in ratio to day credit hours generated. Indicate the percentage of day sections taught by full-time faculty members and whether the department has been in compliance with section XX.C.10 of the day contract (the “15% rule”).
- APRs and other course releases awarded, to be broken down into the categories of APRs for support of (a) research, (b) assessment, (c) teaching, and (d) other.
- Staff support
- Other data needed in order to properly assess the program

Criterion 7: Departmental Strategic Planning. Comment on how resources have helped or hindered the success of this program and on what the program could accomplish with enhanced resources.

- Plans for new or revised majors, concentrations, or minors. Indicate (a) the rationale for these new programs by referencing criteria 1-6, when appropriate, and (b) what additional resources, if any, would be required to support the programs.
- Plans for new or revised courses, and the rationale for the new courses. Could these new courses be taught by the current full-time faculty members?
- Plans for substantial and uncustomary purchases (e.g., atypical and significant purchases to upgrade or replace laboratory equipment, sports equipment, stage equipment, and musical instruments)
- Plans to eliminate flowsheets or courses.
- Additional faculty lines that will be requested, and the rationale for these requests.
- Other likely department initiatives related to student activities, civic engagement, assessment, etc.
- Anticipated changes in classroom, office, laboratory, studio, rehearsal, or conference space (e.g., as a result of the completion of the new library and learning commons)

