

Review Guidelines

Academic Centers and Non-degree Granting Units that Support Academic Degree Programs

The administrative guidelines for periodic program review stipulate that the Provost may initiate reviews, as necessary, for all academic centers and non-degree granting units that support academic programs. Centers that are non-degree-granting and academic in nature could include research centers (eg: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education) or academic support units (eg: University Writing Center). These reviews may be done a companion review to a degree-granting program a unit supports or in the same academic year as a program or unit to which they are affiliated.

These reviews will include:

1. A self-study that addresses issues specific to the unit under review and provides quantitative and qualitative indicators of unit quality.
2. An external review that includes an on-site visit with recommendations for improvements that are realistic and that can be monitored.
3. A plan for continual improvement that provides the unit with clear expectations for improvement that can be reviewed annually with the Dean or Senior Administrator responsible for the unit, the Provost, and President.

The self-study prepared by the Center or Unit will include information about the unit's mission, services, staff, organizational structure, resources and overall effectiveness. Each self-study should draw on official University data, information collected by the unit, and other sources appropriate to the unit's mission and services. The key areas to be addressed are:

1. Vision and Mission

- a) What is the unit's purpose?
- b) What functions does the unit perform to carry out this purpose?
- c) How well does the program articulate its vision and mission?
- d) Are the vision and mission consistent with the actual functioning of the unit?

2. Strategic Direction

- a) Has the unit translated its vision and mission into a strategic plan that includes specific goals to achieve the vision and mission?

Working Draft (fall 2005)

- b) Has the unit defined its specific goals in measurable terms, so that progress toward achievement of the objectives can be evaluated by the unit and others?
- c) Has the unit established intermediate benchmarks for each goal that are steps to the full achievement of the strategic plan objectives?
- d) Has the unit identified time lines for achieving the intermediate benchmarks and the full goals that are necessary to achieve the vision and mission for the unit?
- e) Has the unit developed a resource plan for achieving each of the goals necessary to fulfill its mission and vision? Has the unit articulated the sources of those resources and a time line for assembling the necessary resources?
- f) Has the mission and vision as well as the strategic goals and resource plan been reviewed with the appropriate officers (Dean, Provost, President or others) whose support may be helpful in achieving the mission and vision of the unit? Do they support the mission and vision as well as the strategic goals?
- g) What is the relationship of this unit to other units within the University? Outside the University?

3. Faculty and Staff

- a) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current staff for the unit?
- b) How well do faculty and staff in the unit interact with each other and with academic and administrative units to carry out the vision and mission?
- c) Are faculty and staff appropriately attentive to their role in serving students or departments?
- d) Are faculty, staff and graduate students committed to engaging in scholarship, research and other creative activities and integrating these achievements into their work?
- e) How are staff being trained, retained, and developed to meet the unit's vision and mission?
- f) How are staff reviewed in terms of performance and the overall ability of the unit to achieve its mission?

4. Commitment to Diversity

- a) What is the unit's commitment to a diverse population of faculty, staff, and graduate students?
- b) What curricular, research, or service elements provide diverse perspectives and sub-disciplinary balance within both the undergraduate and graduate curricula? (The indicators might include services, workshops, seminars, etc...)

Working Draft (fall 2005)

5. Academic Activities and Services

- a) How well do the activities and services performed by the unit reflect current knowledge in the field?
- b) How well do these services support Temple students in accordance with the mission of the unit?

6. Assessment Methods

- a) How does the unit assess its user's needs on an on-going basis?
- b) To what extent does the unit use systematic assessment methods to improve its effectiveness and efficiency?
- c) How does the unit assess user satisfaction with its performance?
- d) What improvements have been made in the delivery of services or overall functioning of the unit as a result of assessment?
- e) Where applicable, to what extent does the academic unit have systematic methods for determining the learning outcomes for students?
- f) Where applicable, how often and in what ways does the unit consult with other academic units or programs to discuss how to use outcome measures for improvement of the unit to meet the needs of other entities served by the unit?

7. User Qualifications and Outcomes

Regular review must include an appropriate mix of measures to assess who uses the unit's services or resources, the outcomes and to compare this information to national norms and benchmark programs.

All units will address questions about who uses its services and resources, and the resulting outcomes, including performance and satisfaction.

- a) Data about users
 1. Number of users (total visits, visits by user, etc...)
 2. Characteristics of users (gender, class level, major etc...)
 3. Academic abilities of users (placement data, cGPA)
- b) Outcomes
 1. Performance of users v. non-users
 2. Academic achievement (cGPA, course GPA, GPA in major)
 3. Performance in courses or related experiences
 4. Pass rates on professional, licensing or certification examinations in areas related to services provided (eg: MCAT scores for MSRC users v. non-users)
 5. Retention, graduation or time to degree
 6. Portfolio, Performance, Internship and/or Field Placement reviews

Working Draft (fall 2005)

7. Professional accomplishments, such as publications, presentations or other evidence of professional recognition and achievement
- c) Satisfaction
 1. Quality of service
 2. Suggestions for improvement

8. Identification of Benchmarks

- a) How does the unit compare to equivalent units in peer institutions?
- b) What are the current trends in the unit's service area nationwide?
- c) What institutions does the academic unit view as comparable "peer institutions" for their services / work?
- d) What institutions does the unit view as realistic to emulate in the next 5-10 years.
- e) What information is available from learned societies and/or accrediting bodies and national organizations, both within and outside the discipline, that evaluate or rank units that conduct like activities in this area?

9. Relationship of Size and Resources

- a) How does the unit organize its operations and functions?
- b) Have any significant staffing or organizational changes taken place? How have these changes affected the unit?
- c) Given the size of the student body, is the staffing appropriate?
- d) Are the program's facilities adequate for the size and scope of the program?
- e) Is the size of the support staff and the distribution of administrative resources (including personnel budgets) suitable for the scope of the program?
- f) Do comparable units elsewhere have independent funding for support of students? If so, are the Temple unit's resources for the support of students similar to the resources at comparable universities?

10. Overall Functioning of the Unit

The quality and standing of a center or non-degree granting unit depends primarily on the quality and reputation of the program. The external reviewers will be charged with examining the productivity of the unit under review. The cognizant administrative unit or school/college will be asked to demonstrate how it supports and rewards excellence and encourages improvement. Therefore, the self study will include the assessment, where appropriate, of factors such as:

Working Draft (fall 2005)

- a) The effectiveness of the unit's staff (academic advisors, laboratory coordinators, career counselors, etc.)
- b) The quality of resources decisions
- c) Management of assessment activities
- d) Effectiveness of communication
- e) Effective use of facilities
- f) Strategic use of new technologies
- g) Ways in which faculty and staff are offered professional development opportunities and are rewarded for achievement
- h) Clarity about how resource allocation decisions are made.