BGSU®

Program/Cluster Review

Guidebook for Academic Programs

Bowling Green State University is committed to the comprehensive review of all academic programs or program clusters as an essential part of improving educational programs for effective student learning, continuous improvement, and ongoing strategic planning.

Program and cluster review is intended to be helpful, meaningful, collaborative, and useful to program/cluster faculty. **The primary guiding principle for program/cluster review is the use of evidence and data to analyze and evaluate specific and critical program/cluster issue(s) and/or question(s) and guide future goals, priorities, and actions to address those issue(s) and/or question(s) aligned with institutional priorities and leading to an improvement of program/cluster quality.** The primary goal of the review and evaluation of academic programs/clusters, therefore, is to gather feedback and engage in a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of programs to inform strategic action planning.

This document outlines the guidelines, general policies, and process for self-study and program/cluster review, incorporating elements from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE), and the Regents' Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS) Guidelines for Graduate Program Review. **Programs (undergraduate and graduate), if not accredited, need to be reviewed every 6 (six) years.**

Table of Contents

Introduction

The primary responsibility for overseeing the program or cluster review process lies with the dean or deans that have administrative responsibility for the program/cluster. The dean(s) may assign a program chair or faculty member (i.e., Program/Cluster Review Coordinator) to lead the program/cluster review process. It is recommended that a small committee be created to allocate data collection and analysis and writing responsibilities. A Provost Office designee will provide assistance with the program review process and data collection.

- Program/Cluster review is an opportunity for faculty of one program or a cluster of programs (example, Arts & Design) to conduct a self-assessment to evaluate and strengthen the quality of a program or cluster of programs by examining specific and critical issue(s) and/or question(s).

- Program/Cluster review is intended to be a focused, formative, and on-going process.

- Program/Cluster review is an activity designed to engage all faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders (when appropriate) in a guided appraisal of the programmatic mission, student learning outcomes, faculty, and activities within the context of the college(s) and institution to address issue(s) and/or question(s) important to the program/cluster.

- Program/Cluster review is an opportunity for closely related programs to identify novel opportunities; consider new interdisciplinary programs; strengthen signature programs; investigate joint hires; investigate program consolidation, repositioning, and/or closure to align with new opportunities; and strengthen petitions for maximizing existing or new resources.

National and State of Ohio Guidelines

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE), and the Regents' Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS)[1] necessitates a periodic review of academic (undergraduate and graduate) programs to ensure that academic programs maintain quality and currency. The review of undergraduate and graduate programs is an institutional responsibility. The process is designed to provide information to faculty and administrators at the local level, so that necessary changes can be made to maintain program quality. Self-study and program/cluster review at BGSU are not meant to be used to compare programs across the University System of Ohio or to determine state funding of undergraduate and/or graduate programs but should[2]:

- Be evaluative and forward looking,

- Be fair and transparent as well as distinct from other reviews, and

- Must result in action.

In September, an annual report of all graduate program reviews must be submitted to the Chancellor and RACGS detailing the review process for the prior academic year.

---

[1] Ohio Board of Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study. (2012, November 30). *Guidelines and procedures for review and approval of graduate degree programs*, p. 23. Retrieved from
https://www.ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/racgs/documents/RACGS_Guidelines_113012.pdf
Hereafter: RACGS
[2] RACGS, p. 23

Timeline & Action Steps for Program & Cluster Review

The timeline and action steps for program/cluster review can be divided into four phases over a 2 academic years (See Program/Cluster Review Timeline & Important Dates):

- MOU Approval

- Completion of Program/Cluster Self-Study & Action Plan

- Program/Cluster Review Team Site Visit & Report

- Review, Revision, and Implementation of Action Plan

Identification of Program/Clusters for Review

The selection of program or program clusters for review is based upon the college or institutional priorities of the dean(s) in consultation with the Provost. A schedule/timeline for program/cluster review every 6-years was created and can be viewed on the Institutional Effectiveness website under the Program Review tab.

- A program or program/cluster can self-nominate for review at any time with the dean(s) approval.
- For graduate programs/clusters, the line dean and the dean of the Graduate College must both grant approval for program/cluster review.
- For programs/clusters that are not administered through a college, the administrator to whom the program/cluster reports should perform the responsibilities identified herein as those of the dean.

If a program or program/cluster needs to delay their review for any reason, a written request must be made from the dean(s) to the Provost. If a delay is sought from the dean(s), the program/cluster and/or college are responsible for any and all costs associated with program review.

Roles & Responsibilities

The following roles and responsibilities are general suggestions of faculty, program/cluster review coordinators, dean(s), and Provost. The dean(s) are responsible for identifying the program/cluster review coordinator and identifying the role and responsibilities of the program/cluster chair or director.

Program/Cluster Faculty:
- Engage in the program/cluster review process and identification of issue/question for investigation.
- Participate in meetings and events to develop the program/cluster self-study and action plan.
- Assist in the collection of data for program/cluster self-study.
- Provide feedback and comments on review team questions, program/cluster self-study and action plan.
- Meet with review team members during site visit.
- Collaborate to create a response to the review team report and assist in the creation of a final action plan.
- Actively participate in the implementation of program/cluster action plan.

- Regularly participate in a semester and annual review of progress on self-study and action plan items.

Program/Cluster Review Coordinator:
- Develop and generate the Self-Study and Program/Cluster Review MOU.
- Communicate data needs to Institutional Effectiveness/Office of Institutional Research and facilitate the collection of additional data needed for the program/cluster self-study.
- Finalize list of questions for review team members (internal and external) and send to dean(s).
- Submit the program/cluster Self-Study and Action Plan by the agreed upon due date to the dean(s) and Provost.
- Submit a list of potential external and internal reviewers by the agreed upon due date to the program/cluster dean(s) and Provost.
- Contact potential reviewers to arrange for site visit once approval is granted.
- Create site visit schedule for the review team in consultation with program/cluster faculty, dean(s) and Provost.
- Distribute materials to external review team members at least one (1) month before the site visit is scheduled.
- Revise program/cluster action plan to incorporate comments/feedback from review team, program/cluster faculty, and dean(s) and submit to the dean(s) and Provost by the agreed upon due date.

Program/Cluster Dean(s):
- Review and approve program/cluster issue/question that will drive the review and action planning process.
- Identify a program/cluster designee (i.e., Program/Cluster Review Coordinator) to oversee the program/cluster review process, write the self-study and action plan, coordinate site visit by review teams, and submit finalized action plan.
- Review and approve program/cluster internal and external review team members in consultation with the Provost.
- Provide and approve fiscal support for the program/cluster review process including the site visit by the review team members.
- Provide feedback and comments on the program/cluster self-study and action plan, external review team report, and final program/cluster action plan.
- Inform Provost of any changes impacting the program/cluster review process.

Provost Designee:
- Serve as a resource throughout the program/cluster review process.
- Review the program/cluster Self-Study and Program/Cluster Review MOU.
- Organize meeting(s) to discuss data needs and collection with the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator.
- Keep signed copies of all program/cluster review documentation (the MOU, Program/Cluster Self-Study & Action Plan, Final Action Plan, External Review Team Report, Annual Action Plan Updates, etc.) for accreditation purposes.
- Share copies of all program/cluster review documentation with the Graduate College in July (for inclusion in September OBOR report).

Provost:
- Review and approve program/cluster issue/question that will drive the review and action planning process.
- Review and approve program/cluster internal and external review team members in consultation with the dean(s).
- Provide feedback and comments on the program/cluster self-study and action plan, external review team report, dean(s) response, and final program/cluster action plan.

Program Review Process

Step One: Creating the Self-Study Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

An initial meeting is scheduled with the dean(s) designee, Program/Cluster Review Coordinator, program chair(s), and Provost Office designee to establish a timeline for program/cluster review and to discuss the following:
- The program/cluster review process,
- critical issue(s) and/or question(s) being investigated by the program/cluster,
- data needs,
- the Self-Study and Program/Cluster Review Memorandum of Understanding (MOU),
- the self-study and program/cluster action plan, and the
- external review process.

If a graduate program or cluster with a graduate program is being reviewed, the dean of the Graduate College (or designee) must also attend the initial meeting to discuss program/cluster review.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
The MOU serves as a mechanism for the program/cluster faculty, program/cluster review coordinator, dean(s), and provost to outline the primary focus or foci for the program/cluster review. In addition to assessing overall academic program quality, the program/cluster review process is an opportunity for a program/cluster to self-assess and gain feedback on action plans to address critical issue(s) and/or question(s).

A partial listing of potential issue(s)/question(s) and alignment with institutional strategic objectives (when appropriate) follows:

- Redefine student success: Provide undergraduate and graduate students (traditional and post-traditional) a demonstrably superior and innovative learning experience that intentionally prepares them to lead meaningful and productive lives (BGSU Strategic Objective I).
- Increasing and connecting our research and creative activities for public good: Support and focus BGSU's research and creative activities to serve the public interest and support our commitment to the public good (BGSU Strategic Objective II).
- Empowering and supporting our people to achieve excellence: Support all individuals to build a quality learning community that fosters diversity and inclusion, collaboration, creativity, and excellence (BGSU Strategic Objective III).
- Advancing our impact through engagement: Expand domestic and international engagement and partnerships to benefit students, academic programs, research, and outreach (BGSU Strategic Objective IV).

- Aligning for excellence and value: Enhance the quality and value of a BGSU education by developing a physical, organizational, academic, and financial infrastructure that ensures the University's short- and long-term vitality and success (BGSU Strategic Objective V).
- Telling our story: Raise BGSU's profile as a national, comprehensive research university that drives the social, economic, educational, and cultural vitality of our region, nation, and world (BGSU Strategic Objective VI).
- Strategically strengthen the relationships among and contributions to other programs and the mission of BGSU.
- Increase the vitality and sustainability of the program/cluster.
- Develop and increase the regular use of program assessment data to drive program/cluster improvements to increase program/cluster quality.
- Explore the feasibility of expanding an existing or creation of a new program/cluster.

Additional questions can be found in Appendix A.

A template for the MOU can be found in Appendix B.

The Program/Cluster Self-Study MOU must be approved by the Dean(s) and Provost. The signed Program/Cluster Self-Study MOU is kept on file in the Provost Office.

Step Two: Program/Cluster Self-Study & Action Plan

The self-study process is an opportunity to engage faculty, staff, administrators, and students in the self-assessment and improvement of the program/cluster to meet the changing needs of students, program goals and priorities, and linking data and evidence with decision-making, and planning by exploring critical issues and/or questions.

The program/cluster faculty, under direction of the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator, is responsible for preparing the self-study and action plan. The dean(s) will work with the program cluster faculty, Program/Cluster Review Coordinator, and department/program chair or school director to ensure that the self-study and action plan are completed in a timely manner. The Provost Office designee and the dean of the Graduate College (or dean designee) will be available to provide guidance and assistance to the program preparing an annual self-study.

The self-study need not be long to be effective. Organization, focus on program planning, and coherence of the document as a whole are essential. The major sections of the self-study are designed to lead up to and emphasize the section on program planning to address critical issue(s) and/or question(s). Program/cluster self-study and action plans should be incorporated into future annual strategic planning.

The final outcome of program/cluster review is an action plan for academic program/cluster improvement that is explicit, action-oriented, and includes a specific time frame. The program/cluster review process should focus on improvements that can be made using institutional and extramural resources currently available to the program. They may also identify extramural resources the unit can generate through the program/cluster's own actions. Consideration may be given to proposed program improvement and expansions requiring additional institutional resources; in such cases, the need and priority for additional resources must be clearly specified and incorporated into annual strategic plans. Please refer to the

Academic Affairs: Strategic Planning Process for guidance to complete an action plan(s) (see section IV) and an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities or aspirations, and threats or results facing the program/cluster (SWOT or SOAR see section III) in implementing the action plan(s).

Data should be used to inform and support the program/cluster review process. Many data are regularly collected by the Office of Institutional Research or the Office of Academic Assessment for accreditation and external reporting purposes (see Appendix C). These data may be requested by the program/cluster. The type of data, who will be collecting data, and additional data needs of the program/cluster will be discussed and outlined at a meeting coordinated by the Provost designee with the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator.

Outline and Content for the Self-Study Report & Action Plan

The connections among the elements of the self-study should be planned carefully. The result should be a relatively brief main document in the range of **10-14 pages**. In all sections, note strengths as well as areas needing improvement especially as they relate to the critical issues and questions being explored by the program/cluster.

I.   Introduction and Overview **(3-5 pages)**
   a.   Executive Summary Program/Cluster Self-Assessment
   b.   Program/Cluster Description, Mission, & History
      i.   Past Program/Cluster Goals and Current Program(s) Learning Outcomes
      ii.   History of the Program/Cluster within the Context of the Institution
   c.   Critical Issue(s) and/or Question(s)
   d.   Narrative of the Data as Relates Critical Issue(s) and/or Questions

II.   Program/Cluster Action Plan **(4-6 pages)**
   a.   Prioritized Goals for Program/Cluster to Address Critical Issue(s)/Question(s) by Area (as applicable)
      i.   Completed Action Plan Tables for each goal (See Appendix D: Program/Cluster Action Plan Template of this Document)
         1.   Identified Action Steps/Strategies to Reach Goals (What will the program/cluster do to reach goals?)
         2.   Responsibilities/Person or Party (Who will be responsible in making sure that actions are completed? Example: Name of Individual or Group within the Program/Cluster)
         3.   Existing Resources (What support is currently available to assist in the action steps/strategies identified? Example: Office of Academic Assessment)
         4.   Metrics/Benchmarks (What data is available to evaluate progress on action steps/strategies? Example: What data dashboard metrics can be used)
         5.   Action Timeline (When is the program/cluster going to complete each identified action step/strategy? Example: Spring 2018)

III.   Analysis of Program/Cluster (SWOT or SOAR) **(2-3 pages)**
   a.   Program/Cluster Strengths

    b. Program/Cluster Weaknesses
    c. Program/Cluster Opportunities or Aspirations
    d. Program/Cluster Threats or Results

  IV. Concluding Remarks **(1 page)**

  V. Attachment(s)
    a. Program/Cluster Data (as Needed)
    b. Prior Program/Cluster Strategic Plans
    c. SAAC Assessment Plans & Assessment Reports
    d. Others as Needed

The Program/Cluster Review Coordinator submits the Program/Cluster Self-Study and Action Plan to the program/cluster dean(s) for feedback and review. The dean(s) review the Program/Cluster Self-Study and Action Plan and provide feedback on goals, priorities, and the feasibility of the action plan within the context of the college and institution. The dean(s) submit a final version of the Program/Cluster Self-Study and Action Plan to the Provost for review and feedback prior to the selection of the program/cluster review team.

Step Three: Program/Cluster Review Team Visit & Report

The program/cluster review team will include 2-4 recognized peers[3] from distinguished programs at other universities and/or professional sectors (when appropriate) and an optional internal review team member from campus (e.g., outside the program/cluster). The Program/Cluster Review Coordinator will work with program/cluster faculty to create a list of potential reviewers (external) that will then be submitted to the dean(s) and Provost Designee. Working from this slate of potential reviewers, the dean(s), dean of the Graduate College (for graduate programs only), and Provost Designee will come to agreement on a list of at least three (3) potential reviewers. All parties will be sensitive to issues of conflict of interest at all levels (See Attachment E: Selection of External Reviewers for Program/Cluster Review).

The Program/Cluster Review Coordinator is responsible for scheduling and coordinating all aspects of the program/cluster reviewers' site visit, including meetings with the line dean(s), dean of the graduate college, and the provost should be scheduled. Opportunities should be arranged for reviewers to meet with faculty members of the program/cluster (individually, if possible), department chairs or school directors of related programs/cluster, program/cluster staff, and a sampling of undergraduate and graduate students. The schedule should be arranged to accommodate the reviewers' need to have time to work individually and as a team. The length of time the team is on campus will vary with the size and complexity of the program/cluster; a 2 day maximum visit should be sufficient for a review of the programs/clusters. The visits will typically be scheduled for the early spring semester so reviewers should be identified and scheduled by late fall.

At least one month prior to the scheduled visit, the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator should provide the following materials to each member of the program/cluster review team.

---

[3] The review team may be larger to encompass various disciplinary perspectives.

1. The Program/Cluster Self-Study & Action Plan

2. Bowling Green State University's Mission and Goals

3. A preliminary schedule for the visit (with the understanding that the team may request additional or follow-up interviews or may otherwise choose to modify the proposed schedule)

4. An information sheet describing the expectations for the focus (i.e., evaluation questions) and content of the program/cluster reviewers' report (see Appendix F: Guidelines for Program/Cluster Review Evaluation Report)

Program/Cluster Review Team Report

A final list of questions for review teams are established in the Program/Cluster Self-Study and Action Plan and are distributed to the members of the review team by the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator. Program/cluster reviewers will be asked to provide specific recommendations and commendations on the program/cluster, based upon documentation and specific evidence provided to reviewers, in response to selected questions.

The final consolidated report from the program/cluster reviewers is due three (3) weeks after the reviewers' visit to BGSU and should be sent directly to the Provost designee who will forward the review to Program/Cluster Review Coordinator, program/cluster chair(s) dean(s), and Provost. The final program/cluster review team report is kept on file in the Provost Office.

Phase Four: Review, Revision and Implementation of Action Plan

Following receipt of the external reviewers' report, the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator shall meet with faculty to discuss the report. The graduate coordinator shall also be included in this meeting. If there are any factual errors in the report, the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator should call these errors to the attention of the dean(s) and Provost designee in writing as soon as they are recognized. Within two weeks of the conclusion of the meeting to discuss the report, the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator shall write a faculty response and forward this to the line dean(s), the dean of the Graduate College, and Provost designee. The Program/Cluster Faculty Response should focus on the recommendations in the external review report, and specifically to any particular recommendations that do not seem likely to lead to improvement for the program/cluster. The faculty response to the external reviewers' report that is agreed upon by the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator and the dean(s) will be formally integrated into the finalized Program/Cluster Action Plan.

Program/cluster faculty may decide to make changes, incorporating feedback of external reviewers, to the Program/Cluster Action Plan. A final Program/Cluster Action Plan will be submitted to the line dean(s), the dean of the Graduate College (if appropriate), and Provost.

The line dean(s) are responsible for writing a report, which synthesizes the information in the self-study and the external report and is informed by and responsive to input from the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator, the dean of the Graduate College, and Provost. The dean's response reflects both the external reviewers' report and the Program/Cluster faculty response. In particular, it focuses on points of disagreement between those documents. The focus of the dean's report is a set of concrete, action-oriented recommendations cast within a specific timeline. These recommendations are guided by the dean's understanding of the following:

- The quality and importance of the program/cluster to the mission of the College and the University;

- The contribution of the program/cluster to the university's strategic plan and the Graduate College strategic plan; and

- The program/cluster's strategic plans, as submitted as part of the University's strategic planning process and described in the action plan section of the self-study.

The response from the dean(s) commits the college to a course of action. The dean's response could endorse the program/cluster review and/or program/cluster report as written; it could commit to only specified parts of the reports; it could adopt revisions suggested by in the program/cluster response; or it could add recommendations overlooked in both documents.

The final Program/Cluster Action Plan, with the dean's response, is to be signed by the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator, dean of the Graduate College, and Provost and one copy will be kept in the Provost's Office. Annual reports by the units will be based on the recommendations in the dean's response and, by reference, to recommendations in the external reviewers' or unit report.

Implementation of Program/Cluster Action Plan

Following consultation with the provost and dean of the Graduate College (for graduate programs), the line dean(s) will meet with faculty and administrators from the program/cluster to discuss the program review and action plan. The discussion should include aspects of the review that concern how the program/cluster contributes to other units of the university and how its activities and goals relate to college and university strategic plans. Following this meeting, the final action plan should be implemented by the program/cluster.

Ongoing program/cluster faculty conversations should occur on the implementation and monitoring of the action plan through the unit strategic planning process. The unit is to make annual reports, via strategic planning, to the dean(s) recording progress on the specific recommendations produced by the series of documents and endorsed by the dean's response.

Contact Information:

Questions regarding program/cluster review should be directed to the dean or academic associate/assistant dean within your college or the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Appendix A: Potential Questions for Program Review

The questions posed in the areas described below are not intended to be all inclusive as the consulting teams, program faculty, or college dean(s)/provost may wish to include questions specific to the issue(s)/question(s) being explored by the program/cluster, to support the goals of the program/cluster, college/institutional priorities, continuous improvement of effective student learning, program/cluster quality, and ongoing strategic planning.

I.   **Program/Cluster Mission, Goals, & Learning Outcomes**

- How does the program/cluster support the institutional mission, goals, and learning outcomes?
- How does the program/cluster (Address all that apply):
  - **Redefine student success**: Provide undergraduate and graduate students (traditional and post-traditional) a demonstrably superior and innovative learning experience that intentionally prepares them to lead meaningful and productive lives?
  - **Increase and connect our research and creative activities for public good**: Support and focus BGSU's research and creative activities to serve the public interest and support our commitment to the public good?
  - **Empower and support our people to achieve excellence**: Support all individuals to build a quality learning community that fosters diversity and inclusion, collaboration, creativity, and excellence?
  - **Advance our impact through engagement**: Expand domestic and international engagement and partnerships to benefit students, academic programs, research, and outreach?
  - **Align for excellence and value**: Enhance the quality and value of a BGSU education by developing a physical, organizational, academic, and financial infrastructure that ensures the University's short- and long-term vitality and success?
  - **Tell our story**: Raise BGSU's profile as a national, comprehensive research university that drives the social, economic, educational, and cultural vitality of our region, nation, and world?
- Do the program/cluster mission, goals, and learning outcomes lead students to a broad, well-integrated knowledge of the discipline(s)/profession(s)?
- Do the program/cluster mission, goals, and learning outcomes reflect the most important skills, knowledge, and values of the discipline/profession?
- Are the program/cluster mission, goals, and learning outcomes realistic within the context of the discipline(s)?
- Is there sufficient support for this program/cluster by related programs/clusters at the institution?
- Is the program/cluster offering courses that are taken by students majoring in other disciplines (i.e., program requirement outside of the major, general education course, etc.)? Does the program/cluster engage with other disciplines to ensure the academic success of students from other programs/clusters?

II.   Program/Cluster Student Enrollment, Demographics, & Characteristics

- Are there an adequate number of students recruited into the program?
- Is the rate of progress of students to their degree satisfactory? If not, why not?
- Is the retention of students acceptable? If not, why not?
- Are the program/cluster strategies and processes to ensure student recruitment and retention adequate?
- Does the record of employment placement and/or admission to graduate programs correspond to program/institutional objectives and the type of program? If not, what are the differences?
- What specific attention is given to recruiting underserved populations? What success has there been in this effort?
- Are program/cluster graduates achieving the goals and learning outcomes?
- What specific attention has been given to recruit students of underserved populations? Have these efforts been successful?

III.   Program/Cluster Faculty & Scholarly Productivity

- What are the qualifications and achievements of program/cluster faculty in relation to the program/cluster mission, goals, and learning outcomes?
- How do faculty members' experiences, knowledge, research, and additional professional work contribute to the quality of the program/cluster?
- What is the caliber of research and publication by program/cluster faculty? How important to the discipline is the scholarly work of faculty?
- Is the faculty's knowledge and understanding of their discipline reflect current scope and board
- Are faculty engaged in scholarly work and invite students to participate in scholarly work in various ways?
- What is the caliber of instruction by program/cluster faculty?
- In what ways are faculty engaged in advising students within their program/cluster? Are their efforts successful?
- In what ways are faculty engaged in recruiting students into the program/cluster? Are their efforts successful?
- What are student perceptions of faculty as teachers? Advisors? Scholars within the discipline?
- Has the program/cluster been successful in recruiting and retaining faculty?
- Has the program/cluster been successful in developing, supporting, and engaging faculty in obtaining professional development goals?
- What specific attention has been given to recruit faculty of underserved populations? Have these efforts been successful?

V.   Program/Cluster Resource Management

- Is the program/cluster effectively utilizing available resources?
- Is the amount of resources available, given the current scope of the program/cluster within the institution, sufficient to sustain a high quality program/cluster?

- Are the facilities and services adequate to meet the program/cluster mission and goals?
- Are resources and services adequate for the future plans for improvement of the program/cluster?
- Does the program/cluster have acceptable resources for administrative and clerical support within the context of the institution?
- Does the program/cluster have success procuring external funding? What activities is external funding utilized for within the program/cluster?
- Has the program/cluster accurately identified and prioritized its most important resource needs to improve the quality of the program/cluster?

VI.   **Program/Cluster Instructional Productivity & Academic Quality**

- Has the program modified the program mission, goals, or learning outcomes in the past three years?
- What is the level of performance required in courses?
- Are students provided with adequate experiences that align with program, cluster, college, and/or institutional goals?
- Are the program/cluster requirements (courses, pre-requisites) appropriate for a high quality program? Are they suitable to program/cluster mission and goals?
- Has the program/cluster curriculum been revised and/or created to reflect advances in the discipline? Institutional priorities?
- Are there specialized curricular offerings (i.e., distance education, weekend courses) in the program/cluster?
- How intentional are co-curricular experiences (i.e., internships, field experiences, co-ops, undergraduate research)? How are they incorporated into the program/cluster curriculum? How are they assessed?
- Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities for students within the program/cluster?
- Is the program demonstrating a commitment to diversity in its student, curriculum, and faculty?
- Is the faculty/student ratio appropriate to support student learning within the program/cluster?

VII.   **Program/Cluster Assessment & Strategic Planning**

- Are student learning outcomes for the program/cluster accessible?
- Are student learning outcomes for the program/cluster measurable? Obtainable within the scope of the program/cluster? Are they reflective of disciplinary standards?
- Is the assessment plan for the program/cluster appropriate and are assessment practices yielding results needed to determine how well students are achieving program/cluster outcomes?
- How is data on student learning being communicated to internal and external constituencies?
- Does the program/cluster make use of assessment results, institutional research, Academic Performance Solutions (APS) data or program/cluster data, and additional information obtained from external constituencies (i.e.,

employers, alumni, students) to inform programmatic/cluster improvements and progress on goals and learning outcomes?
- Is there assurance that students within the program/cluster are consistently meeting the performance expectations that the program/cluster has established?
- Are adequate assessments of student learning being utilized to provide feedback to students on progress through the program/cluster?
- How are assessment results used to improve the program/cluster? Inform strategic planning?

VIII.   Program/Cluster Improvement & Development

- Given current developments within the discipline, profession, and society within the context of the institution, what are the anticipated needs for this program/cluster?
- How would you prioritize the program/cluster goals for the next five/six years? Would you suggest any additional goals for the program/cluster?
- Does the academic structure of the program/cluster foster its mission and goals? Continuous improvement?
- How does the program/cluster's history and plans reflect upon its viability and growth?
- Have past evaluations of the program been extensive or critical enough to impact the maintenance of program/cluster standards or improvement of the program/cluster?
- Is this program/cluster taking into account contemporary changes within the discipline(s) or incorporates future directions/innovation within the discipline(s)?
- Given the existing strengths and weaknesses of this particular program/cluster and the threats and opportunities identified, what strategies or actions would you suggest for improving the program/cluster over the next five/six years?
- How can the efficiency and effectiveness of the program be improved?
- Given the evidence, how would the program/cluster rated compared to other program/cluster within similar contexts? Within the discipline?

Finalizing Questions for External Reviewers

A final list of areas and questions for review team members are established in consultation with the Program/Cluster faculty, Review Coordinator, and dean(s) early in the review process and are distributed to the members of the reporting team with a copy of the Program/Cluster Self-Study and Action Plan, BGSU Mission and Goals, and Visit Schedule. Program/cluster reviewers will be asked to provide specific recommendations and commendations on the program/cluster based upon documentation and specific evidence provided to reviewers, in response to selected questions posed for each area outlined within the Program/Cluster Review MOU document.

Appendix B: MOU Template/Example

BGSU®

Memorandum of Understanding Self-Study & Program/Cluster Review TEMPLATE

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will guide the self-study and review process for the [*program/cluster name here*]. The evaluation of disciplinary/professional excellence of the program/cluster is one outcome of self-study and program/cluster review. However, the primary purpose of the self-study and review is the collection and use of data to investigate and evaluate specific and critical issue(s) and/or question(s) to guide future program/cluster goals, priorities, and actions to address determined issue(s) and/or question(s).

Identification of Program/Cluster Issue(s)/Question(s)

The program or cluster faculty should collaborate and discuss potential issues and/or questions that are critical for the continuous improvement of the program/cluster. Final selection of an issue/question should include multiple stakeholders and be reviewed by program chair(s), dean(s), and Provost.

[*The primary issue(s) and/or question(s) being explored by the program/cluster.*]

Tentative Timeline

Program/Cluster Self-Study & Action Plan Date: _____

Review Team Site Visit Date: _____

Final Program/Cluster Action Plan Submission Date: _____

Signatures

Program/Cluster Review Coordinator

Name: Date

Internal Reviewer (If Used)

Name: Date

Dean(s)

Name: Date

Name: Date

Graduate Dean[4]

---

[4] Required if a graduate program/cluster is being reviewed.

Fall 2019

Name: Date

Provost

Name: Date

Appendix C: Potential Program/Cluster Data

To address questions identified in the MOU (see Appendix B), data needs for the Program/Cluster Self-Study will be identified by the Provost designee and the Program/Cluster Review Coordinator. Data will be collected from various resources including the Office of Institutional Research (IR), the Office of Academic Assessment (OAA), Academic Performance Solutions (APS) platform, and the program/cluster faculty and administrators. Additional data are listed below. This is not meant to be an exhaustive list of data and additional data may be requested and/or used in the Program/Cluster Self-Study as needed.

Enrollment (Undergraduate and Graduate): Fall Census

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions	Data Steward/Source	Alignment with BGSU Strategic Objectives
Enrollment	Career	Undergrad	IR/APS Programs Tab	I, III, V
		Grad	IR/APS Programs Tab	I, III, V
	Status	FT/PT	IR	I, III, V
	Characteristics	First-Time/Transfer	IR	I, III, V
		Gender	IR	I, III, V
		Traditional/Non-Traditional	IR	I, III, V
		Ethnicity	IR	I, III, V
	Type	In-State	IR	I, III, V
		Out-Of-State	IR	I, III, V
		International	IR	I, III, VI
	Quality	ACT	IR	I, III, V, VI
		GRE	IR	I, III, V, VI
	Need	% Pell Eligible	IR & FA	I, III

Scholarly Productivity

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions	Data Steward/Source	Alignment with Strategic Objectives
Scholarly Productivity	Publications of FT Faculty	#, %	TBD	II, III, VI
	Production of Creative Works	#, %	TBD	II, III, VI
	Grants of FT Faculty	#; $	TBD; OSPR	II, V, VI
	Faculty Awards	#	TBD	II, III, V,VI
	R&D Expenditures	$	Program	II, V
	Patents	#;$	OSPR	II, V
	% of Undergraduate Students Involved in Research	%	Program	I, II, VI

Instructional Productivity: Fall Semester

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions	Data Steward/Source	Alignment with Strategic Goals
Instructional Productivity	# Sections Taught per Faculty	# for different faculty category	APS Instructional Staff Tab	I, V
	% Taught by FT/PT/GA	% for different faculty category	IR/Program/ APS Instructional Staff Tab	I, V
	Avg. Class Size	# for different faculty category	IR/ APS Instructional Staff Tab	V
	Avg. Teaching Load	# for different faculty category	IR/ APS Instructional Staff Tab	V
	Sections less than 30	% for different faculty category	IR/ APS Courses Tab	V
	#SCH (per FTE)	# for FT Faculty	IR/ APS Instructional Staff Tab	V
	Student/FT Faculty Ratio	Ratio	IR/ APS Students Tab	V
	Cost per SCH	$	IR/ APS Students Tab	V

Resources/Expenses

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions	Data Steward/Source	Alignment with Strategic Goals
Resources/Expenses	Operating Expenditures	% of total budget	Program/APS Cost Tab	V
	Expenditures for Admin (% of total)	% of total budget	Program/ APS Cost Tab	V
	Expenditures for Advising (% of total)	% of total budget	Program	V
	Misc. Revenue	% of total budget	Program/ APS Cost Tab	V

Additional Data:
- Description of staff resources
- Description of facilities and equipment/instrumentation (available campus- or college-wide, as well as those dedicated to the program)
- Additional financial resources (e.g., SCH's being paid for by Graduate College scholarship dollars/external dollars, budget by funding source; student stipends, scholarships, and fellowships; sponsored funding received, and number and percentage of faculty with external funding)

Student Success:

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions	Data Steward/Source	Alignment with Strategic Goals
Student Success	2-Year Grad Rate	#; %	IR	I, V
	4-Year Grad Rate	#; %	IR	I, V
	5-year Grad Rate	#; %	IR	I, V
	6-year Grad Rate	#; %	IR	I, V
	Time to Degree	#, %	IR	I, V
	Fall/Fall Retention Rate	%	IR	I, V
	Job Placement Rate	%	Grad Survey, Program (OAA[5])	I, V, VI
	# of Hours at Grad	Avg.	IR	I, V

Additional Data:
- Faculty advising loads
- Description of recruitment and retention efforts

---

[5] Office of Academic Assessment (OAA)

- Description of other resources critical to your program

A level of student satisfaction, student accomplishment, and graduate accomplishment exists as evidenced by the following:

- Students express satisfaction with advisement, teaching, and program support services
- The structure and conduct of the program lead to an appropriate degree completion rate and time-to-degree (include number of degrees conferred by semester for past five years)
- The predominant employment of graduates within three to five years after graduation is in fields consistent with the mission of the program or graduates are placed in appropriate doctoral programs (post-master's degree)
- Graduates demonstrate preparation for career-long learning and success as indicated by periodic surveys of career changes, job satisfaction, and relevance of doctoral training to various career opportunities

Graduate programs only:

- Accomplishment and potential of program graduates to generate new knowledge or new initiatives in teaching, public service, and/or other practice

Faculty Demographics: Fall Census

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions	Data Steward/Source	Alignment with Strategic Goals
Faculty Demographic	Headcount	TTF/NTTF #	IR/APS Instructional Staff Tab	VI
		FT/PT	IR/ APS Instructional Staff Tab	VI
		Gender	IR	III, V
		Ethnicity	IR	III, V
		International	IR	III, IV, V
	% w/terminal degree	% by rank	IR	II, VI

Additional Data:

- List of all faculty in the unit, including highest degree, field, and institution and their graduate faculty status (for graduate programs only)
- Faculty retention
- The number and qualifications of undergraduate and graduate faculty members are judged to be adequate for offering the undergraduate and graduate degrees in the specified areas, and faculty supervise an appropriate number of students
- The preparation and experience of the faculty are appropriate for offering the undergraduate and graduate degree in an intellectually challenging academic environment as demonstrated by active scholarship and creative activity judged by accepted national standards for the discipline
  a. Faculty members have achieved professional recognition (nationally, internationally)
  b. Include unit scholarly and creative productivity reports for past five years plus general commentary on quality of scholarship emanating from the unit

Graduate programs only:

c. The faculty garners significant external funding, as defined by disciplinary norms, which enhance the graduate program

d. Directors of dissertations and a majority of committee members generate new knowledge and scholarly and creative activity as determined by disciplinary norms

Program Quality

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions	Data Steward/Source	Alignment with Strategic Goals
Program Quality	Curriculum	Scan Elements	Program	I ,II, III, IV, V
	Review/Revision	UC/GC Docs	UC/GC	I, II
	Alignment with ULO	SAAC Assessment Plans	SAAC (OAA)	I, II
	LO Assessment	SAAC Assessment Reports	SAAC (OAA)	I, II
	Accreditation/Program Review Status	Doc	Program (Provost Office)	I, II, V

Additional Data:
- A summary of the appropriate outcome measures used to assess program quality
- Procedures must be in place to ensure the use of assessment data for continuous quality improvement of the program
- A detailed description of the units' procedures for assessing student learning outcomes (using both direct and indirect methods), using the format developed with the Student Achievement Assessment Committee; include copies of the unit's annual reports and the SAAC's feedback on those reports as appendices, if available[1]

Program Interaction

Academic programs do not exist in isolation but rather in relation to and in comparison to similar programs in the discipline at other institutions and to cognate areas in the same institution. Information regarding appropriate interactions should include:
- The ability of the faculty and students to make a particular contribution in this field
- Interactions, including interdisciplinary, among graduate, undergraduate, and professional programs, as appropriate
- Interactions with and in collaboration with similar programs at other universities and organizations
- Programmatic access to special leveraging assets such as unique on- campus or off-campus facilities, non-university experts or collaborative institutions in the discipline, industrial or other support, endowments, as well as special funding opportunities

Graduate programs only:
Centrality of the program to advanced study in the specific discipline(s) regionally or nationally

Appendix D: Program/Cluster Action Plan Template

Action Steps/Strategies (What?)	Responsible Person/Parties (Who?)	Existing Resources Available (Support?)	Metrics (How will you know if what you did was effective?)	Timeline (When?)

Appendix E: Selection of External Reviewers for Program/Cluster Review

The selection of external reviewers for program/cluster review at BGSU is a collaborative process between the program faculty and leadership, dean (or dean's designee) and the provost (or provost's designee). The role of the external reviewers is to provide independent feedback and insights/suggestions on the program/cluster goals, analysis, action plan(s) and areas of potential growth for the program/cluster.

Selection Process:

Step 1: The process starts with an initial selection of potential candidates (10-15 are recommended) generated by the program faculty and leadership. A list of the following information should first be forwarded to the dean(s) for approval:
   a. Name of the potential Reviewer
   b. Rank/Title
   c. Institution
   d. Link to Professional Website
   e. Any other information that the program faculty and leadership would wish to provide on the potential reviewer.

The program faculty and leadership should include suggestions for external reviewers from aspirational programs.

Step 2: After review by the college dean, the list of potential reviewers is then submitted to the Dean of the Graduate College (or designee) and the Provost (or Provost's designee) for review.

Step 3: The program faculty and leadership, in consultation with the dean(s) and Provost (or the Provost's designee), select a final pool of external reviewers for program/cluster review.

Step 4: The program faculty and leadership contact the external reviewers and facilitate the visitation process. It is the responsibility of the program faculty and leadership to schedule the visitation of external program/cluster review teams with the program/cluster faculty, dean(s) and Provost.

NOTE: It should be noted that the program faculty and leadership should review the qualifications and background of external reviewers to avoid any conflicts of interest.

Appendix F: Guidelines for Program/Cluster Review Evaluation Report

Consulting teams, consisting of two or more external reviewers and at least one internal reviewer, examine all program/cluster documents and make a site visit to evaluate programs/clusters at Bowling Green State University. The structure and guidelines that follow provide some internal consistency to the process.

The consultant's evaluation review of the program/cluster documentation and site visit will contribute to the final programmatic action plan focusing on the critical issue(s) and/or question(s) being explored by the program/cluster. The review team should include documentation and cite specific evidence, identify strengths, weaknesses, threats and potential opportunities for program/cluster improvement within the program/cluster review report.

Suggested Outline for External Report

    I.   Introduction
          a. Should include primary questions being explored by the program as defined in the MOU
   II.   Core strengths of the program
  III.   Main challenges the program faces
  IV.   Feedback and recommendations regarding the departments' plans for program development and improvement
   V.   Review Action Plan
  VI.   Concluding remarks

The final report from the external review consultants is due three (3) weeks after the reviewers' visit to BGSU and should be sent directly to the Provost designee who will forward the review to Program/Cluster review coordinator, program/cluster chair/director(s), dean(s), and Provost.