WHY TEMPLE
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Implementing an Effective Periodic Program Review Process

Gina Calzaferri
Assessment and Evaluation

Rich Hetherington
Data Analysis and Reporting

Institutional Research and Assessment
Overview

Why Important?
Current Model
Data Packet Development
Plans for Improvement Surveys
Review of University Wide Findings and Recommendations

Next Steps
Overview

Temple University At-A-Glance

Why Important?
Current Model
Self-Study
Data Packet Development
Team Visit
Plans for Improvement
Findings
Next Steps

Temple At-A-Glance

- Located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- 18 Schools/Colleges
  - 5 Professional Schools
- 9 Campuses (including Rome & Japan)
- 450+ Academic Programs
- 38,000+ Students
- Approximately 3,500 Faculty
- Institutional Research and Assessment
- www.temple.edu/ira
Why is Periodic Program Review Important?

Ensure quality and strategic relevance of academic programs offered by the university

- Process for reflecting on how to improve teaching, learning, service and scholarly and creative activities

Goals:

- Assess what programs do
- Clarify rationales for teaching, research and service missions
- Review quality indicators and student outcomes
- Establish action plans for improvement and monitoring progress
current model
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Summarize Findings for Senior Leadership

External Review Team Visit

Data Packets Provided

Orientation

Plans for Improvement

Self Study

Determination of External Visit Dates and Reviewers
Self Study

Telling Your Program’s Story

Who are you? → Where have we been? → Where are we today? → Where do we want to go?

Ten Areas to Address

1. Vision & Mission
2. Strategic Direction
3. Faculty
4. Commitment to Diversity
5. Curriculum
6. Assessment Methods
7. Student Qualifications & Performance
8. Identification of Benchmarks
9. Relationship of Size and Resources
10. Overall Functioning of the Unit

Connection to Accreditation
Data Packet Development

Prior State

- Multiple un-validated sources of data
- Unclear data element definitions
- Inclusion of non-informative metrics
- Cumbersome to generate
- Time consuming
Data Packet Development

Centrally Generated Data Packets

• Produced by IRA
• Consistency across reporting cycles
• Consistency of terms and calculations
• Aligned with university strategic metrics
Glossary of Terms and Calculations

- Produced by IRA
- Transparent definition of terms and calculations
- Comparable to university wide metrics
- Communicate in consistent terms
Data Packet Development
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Reduced Longitudinal Data

- From 5 to 3 years
- New ERP and record keeping changes
- Demonstrates similar activity
Data Packet Development
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Review of Data Packet

- Earlier in the PPR Process
- Identification of data anomalies
- Review of programs in scope of review
Data Packet Development

Report Production Mechanics

- Single SQL script
- Rapid packet production
- Excel output using Vlookup
- Easy to scale and adjust reports
- Ability to include charts in self study document
- Breakouts by department and program
External Team Visit

- **Visit dates selected in Fall**
- **Visiting team selected by Office of the Provost**
  - Independent from University and program
  - National stature in the field
  - Understanding of the role/mission of the institution (public research) in an urban setting
  - Record of accreditation or program review experience
- **1.5 Day Agenda**
  - 2 meetings with chair (start/end)
  - Individual meeting with full-time faculty
  - Entrance and exit interview with dean and vice provost
  - Meetings with students (undergrad & grad)
  - Part-time/adjunct faculty
  - Dean’s office administrators
  - Provost staff
- **Review Team Report**

---
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- Plan for Improvement survey submitted 1, 3, 5 years post review
- Focus on short and long term actions being taken to improve
- What has the academic unit accomplished since review? What is the unit aiming to accomplish?

- **Key Questions/Prompts:**
  - How was the external review team report shared and discussed with faculty?
  - Describe actions taken or being planned as a result of the review, that impact: curriculum, faculty, research, students.
  - Describe any other actions taken or being planned as a result of the review.
  - How might the university improve the process going forward?
Recommendations Under Consideration: Curriculum
This section describes actions taken or being planned as a result of the review, that impact curriculum.

In which of the following areas are actions being planned or taken?
Check all that apply.

- Revision of existing course(s)
- Creation of new course(s)
- Revision of degree requirements (e.g., re-sequencing, new requirements, etc.)
- Renaming of program/major
- Creation of new program(s) (e.g., new major, minor, certificate)
- Termination of program(s)
- Other (Please describe)

Please provide specific examples of actions being taken related to curriculum.
Overall Evaluation of the Periodic Program Review process

Please answer the questions below to help the university improve the program review process.

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding the Periodic Program Review (PPR) process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPR helped our department and program(s) think strategically about our future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our self-study provided a realistic assessment of the overall functioning of our unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visiting team report provided a comprehensive assessment of the overall functioning of our unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data provided for the self-study were helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PPR process provided guidance on areas of improvement for us to consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department actively participated in the PPR process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unit was satisfied with the composition of the external review team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How might the university improve the Periodic Program Review process going forward?

[Blank space for input]
Review of University Wide Findings and Recommendations

How do you share recommendations from the external team reports with University leadership?

- Summaries of each report (1-2 pages)
  - Strengths
  - Areas of Improvement
  - Recommendations

- Summaries of common recommendations
  - Research
  - Faculty
  - Facilities
  - Undergraduate Programs
  - Graduate Programs
Next Steps

- Based on this discussion, how might you adapt this model to implement at your institutions?
  
  - Who do you need to bring to the table to make this happen?
  - What challenges might you face?

- Share with a partner…
Questions?