

## MEMORANDUM

To: James L. Cullen, Chairperson, All-College Committee

From: Michelle Sweeney, Chairperson, Curriculum Committee

Re: 10:263 – Program Review Criteria, President’s Advisory Committee on Academic Planning

Date: May 12, 2010

Thank you for providing the Curriculum Committee with the materials detailing the submission of proposal 10:263, Program Review Criteria. Per the request of the All-College Committee, we have reviewed and discussed the criteria. The committee supports the proposal, subject to the revisions provided in the enclosed document. We hope the All-College Committee will incorporate these suggestions into its own recommendations.

cc: Members of the Curriculum Committee

## Program Review Criteria

(Proposed additions are underlined. Strikethroughs show suggested deletions. Footnotes explain the Curriculum Committee's rationale for recommended changes.)

~~All criteria may not~~ Not 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 in 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?<sup>1</sup>
- Is there external demand for graduates? What are the employment prospects in the short-, medium-, and long-term for graduates of this program?<sup>2</sup> 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?

---

<sup>1</sup> The earlier draft of this criterion only focuses on economic factors, but the mission statement of the college states that SSC should be "a resource to advance the region's cultural, social and economic development." The Curriculum Committee strongly believes that its proposed additions to this section make the criterion more aligned with the college's mission and prevent the program review process from inadvertently handicapping programs that play an important role in promoting the social and cultural development of the North Shore.

<sup>2</sup> While demand for graduates is an important metric for evaluating pre-professional programs, the economic value of most liberal arts programs cannot be reduced to the immediate demand for graduates of those programs (as if most graduates with, say, an English degree secure jobs that advertised for English majors). Furthermore, liberal arts programs' graduates often have more trouble finding jobs right out of college than many pre-professional majors and frequently earn lower initial salaries, but by mid-career many liberal arts majors earn more than mid-career graduates of pre-professional programs (see <http://www.payscale.com/best-colleges/degrees.asp>); to get an accurate picture of how each program contributes to the economic development of the region, the program review process must evaluate employment prospects of graduates over their entire careers and not only shortly after graduation.

**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 APRs provided for research or teaching).

- Indicate the degree to which faculty are active and engaged (publications, presentations, performances, externally funded grants, professional service, other scholarship)?
- Specifically describe how the curriculum and instruction have been updated to address: currency within 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, and if not, why not?

**Criterion 6: Program Statistics - 5 years (Data will be provided by Academic Affairs. Where appropriate, indicate which resources belong exclusively to this program and which resources are shared with other programs.<sup>3</sup>)**

- Enrollment trends
- Graduates
- Credit hours generated
- 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
- Annual budgets, including funds from the Salem State Foundation
- Number of dedicated classrooms (in ratio to credit hours generated), physical condition of the classrooms (including adequate number of electrical outlets, lighting, and other electrical resources), and classroom features such as computers, interactive whiteboards, wireless Internet access, and digital projectors.
- Number and adequacy of science labs for teaching and research in terms of physical condition, space, equipment, staffing, and supplies
- Number of dedicated computer labs, in ratio to credit hours generated, and their adequacy in terms of physical condition, space, equipment, staffing, and supplies
- Other dedicated facilities for the program (e.g., simulation/practice areas; rehearsal or performance spaces for music, theater, or dance; athletic facilities; art studios; the math lab; and the foreign language lab) and their adequacy in terms of physical condition, space, equipment, staffing, and supplies
- Number of offices for full-time faculty members and for part-time faculty members; average number of full-time faculty members per office and average number of part-time faculty members per office
- Student lounges or study areas, departmental conference areas, and other program spaces
- Adequacy of library resources to support student and faculty scholarship.
- Student scholarships awarded
- Graduate assistants assigned

---

<sup>3</sup> The amount of resources provided to and required by different programs varies greatly, so the program review process must evaluate what a program has accomplished *in light of its resources*. The Curriculum Committee believes that when the Academic Planning Committee identifies deficiencies in programs, the Academic Planning Committee must examine whether those deficiencies are attributable to inadequate resources and that those judgments can be made only by also looking at the types of data that the Curriculum Committee has suggested be added to criterion six. This is consistent with the President’s charge to the Academic Planning Committee on 10/14/09, which includes, “Ensure that the criteria are broad enough to address the strengths and weaknesses of programs (taking into account such things as... resources...” [sic]. In addition, according to the 7 April 2010 cover letter sent to the All-College Committee from Provost Kristen Esterberg and Prof. Mark Fregeau, the mission of the program review process includes “to strengthen existing programs”; consequently, a thorough review of a program’s resource requirements versus actual resources is necessary so that the Academic Planning Committee can identify programs in need of additional resources.

- Funding from Institutional Resources
- Research and creative activity mini-grants awarded

**Criterion 7: Strategic Planning<sup>4</sup>**

- 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)

---

<sup>4</sup> The Academic Planning Committee cannot thoroughly evaluate a program without also considering the program's plans for the future. In addition, part of the mission of the Academic Planning Committee is to recommend the development of new programs, so the addition of criterion 7 would provide a way for departments to propose and justify the creation of new programs, which the Academic Planning Committee could recommend be pursued or not pursued. Finally, the Academic Planning Committee's charge to strengthen existing programs requires that the committee examine what additional resources, if any, would be required to support the program's strategic plan.