



Academic Program Review Policy

Policy Number:	1.6.430	Date Approved:	April 28, 2022
Approving Authority:	President/Rector	Effective Date:	July 1, 2022
Responsible Executive:	VRAA	Next Review:	June 30, 2025

Revision History

Revision Number:	Description of changes made*:	Date:
Initial version	-	April 28, 2022

A. Purpose

Sampoerna University is committed to academic excellence in higher education and strives to provide high quality programs through periodic and ongoing evaluation of those programs. Academic program reviews ensure continuous quality improvement (i.e. enhancement of teaching/learning process, program level practices, and assessment/evaluations) of all programs, including those that may be reviewed through an external accreditation process. Thorough, systematic review of academic programs demonstrates that they are in alignment with University mission and strategic initiatives and identifies program strengths and areas that need improvement. The program review process should be congruent with established academic unit and university assessment efforts and should support long-term academic unit planning and strategic initiatives. Additionally, program reviews demonstrate the quality of academic programs and assessment efforts to key constituencies, including current and prospective students; current and prospective faculty and staff; the University Council; University-level accrediting organizations; donors, alumni and others. In summary, academic program review is a process through which faculty, staff and administrators collaborate to promote academic excellence, visibility, accountability and transparency through:

- Identifying and prioritizing specific recommendations/actions needed for program improvement
- Identifying opportunities and rationales for program growth
- Identifying interdisciplinary collaborative opportunities
- Ensuring alignment with University mission and strategic initiatives



The outcomes of program reviews should greatly inform strategy at the program, academic unit, and University level.

B. Academic Programs for Review

The unit of direct review in all SU academic program reviews will be the academic study program; indirectly, critical elements of the administrative unit in which a program is housed (typically the Faculty) will be reviewed, as well. All academic programs at Sampoerna University are subject to the same program review and process. This includes:

- All Bachelor's and post-graduate programs
- Majors, minors, certifications, etc. within a degree program
- All co-curricular activities associated within a degree program

While there may be similarities between a given program's disciplinary/specialized accreditation (i.e. AACSB, ABET, etc.) requirements and those of the University-directed program review, expectations of Sampoerna University's program review will typically be more comprehensive, and more contextually specific. Programs subject to external accreditation should apply any reports, data, and disciplinary standards from their accreditation process toward the requirements of this process, as appropriate.

C. Administration of Academic Program Review Process

The Office of the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs supports and insures a consistent and effective academic program review process. The program review process ensures that all programs, including those subjects to external accreditation, engage in reviews that incorporate, but do not duplicate, recent and concurrent assessment efforts. The process also respects disciplinary and programmatic distinctions through a relatively standardized process to ensure procedural equity. Programs should involve faculty and students in the review process, particularly during the data gathering and self-study stage. The Vice Rector for Academic Affairs is responsible for convening the academic program review process according to a pre-determined timetable. The Vice Rector for Academic Affairs, supported by Institutional Research, will provide an annual developmental workshop, an initial stakeholder meeting for programs initiating reviews, and distribute materials and resources to assist in the implementation of the Program Review Process. The Program Review Protocol includes the following components:

- **Annual Developmental Workshop**

Academic Affairs, supported by Institutional Research, will annually provide a developmental workshop on the program review process and self-study guidelines for all Deans, Heads of Study Programs, and Deans/Directors of Centers. Additional stakeholders may be invited as needed.

- **Initial Stakeholder Meeting**

Prior to the start of the academic program review process, the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs will host an individual meeting with the Dean, Head of Study Programs, and related staff of the academic unit(s) scheduled for academic review the following year. The VRAA and his staff will



discuss the process, the academic program's strategic initiatives, and alignment with the University's strategic plan.

- **Program Self-Study**

The self-study will be a constituent-conducted (faculty self-study team), data-informed analysis guided by an agreed-upon set of questions, disciplinary standards and evaluation methods identified in the Initial Stakeholder Meeting. The self-study is designed to result in recommendations for improvement in program quality and visibility. The evaluation is led by the Head of the Study Program and/or Program Director and conducted against program/academic unit defined educational and operational outcomes, as well as against academic unit expectations for program quality. The academic unit faculty self-study team must include the Head of the Study Program and at least one senior faculty member from the program. The team is selected or elected according to the established governance process of the academic program. Once the team is identified by the Head of the Study Program, the respective Dean of the academic unit must approve the proposed membership.

- **External Academic Program Review and Site Visit**

A review will be conducted by a team of expert faculty colleagues (typically 3 members) external to the University incorporating multiple perspectives from key campus stakeholders into the program review. The external reviewer(s) can identify and contextualize global environmental trends and future directions for the discipline. The external reviewers will prepare a summary report, to be submitted within 30 calendar days of the visit, addressing program strengths and areas for improvement. The department/program under review nominates at least three to five external reviewers, which may be based on discipline or professional qualifications, for the Dean's selection in consultation with Academic Affairs. The final selection of external reviewers must be approved by the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs.

- **Head of Study Program/Director of Academic Program Review of Self-Study and External Review Summary Report**

The completed internal self-study and external reviewer summary report are submitted to the Head of Study Program/Director of Academic Program and program faculty for review and comment prior to review by the Dean. Once the review is complete, the Head of Study Program/Director of Academic Program forwards the self-study, external reports, and departmental responses, and his/her own response and recommendations to the Dean.

- **Dean Review of Program Self-Study and External Review Summary Report**

The completed internal self-study and external summary report are submitted to the Dean of the academic unit for review and comment prior to review by the Academic Affairs Subcommittee on Program Reviews. Once the Dean's review is complete, it may be returned to the Head of Study Program/Director of Academic Program for additional comments in consultation with program



faculty. When complete, the Dean forwards the self-study, external reports, any department responses, and his/her own responses and recommendations to the Chair of the Academic Affairs Subcommittee on Program Reviews.

- **Academic Affairs Subcommittee on Program Reviews**

The Academic Affairs Subcommittee, which operates under the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs, has the responsibility of reviewing all internal and external materials relevant to the program review and making recommendations to the VRAA. The Academic Affairs Subcommittee on Program Reviews will include the Director of Institutional Research and at least three faculty members recommended by the University Senate. Additional faculty members, heads of departments, and members of University leadership with specific experience or expertise may be asked to assist with the review process. The Program Review Subcommittee reviews the internal self-study, external reviewers' summary report, external accreditation documents (if applicable), feedback received from the Dean, Head of Study Program/Director of Academic Program and program faculty and the academic program's strategic initiatives outlined in the initial stakeholder meeting. Based on the information provided, the Subcommittee will prepare an overall academic program review summary report. This summary report will be sent to the Dean to provide feedback from the program area. The summary report and feedback are then submitted to the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs and will be the focus of the VRAA Review.

- **Vice Rector for Academic Affairs Review**

The VRAA will review the Academic Affairs Subcommittee on Program Reviews Summary Report and meet with the respective Dean, Head of Study Program/Director of Academic Program and the Academic Affairs Subcommittee on Program Reviews. Their collective focus will be developing consensus on action plans, prioritizing chosen actions, and establishing a schedule for reviewing progress made toward accomplishing their goals. The final report from the Vice Rector's review and meetings are returned to the Dean and Program for review and implementation. These reports are considered confidential and are not to be distributed outside of the academic program, the Dean's Office and the Office of Academic Affairs.

- **Action Plan Implementation**

The action plan based on the internal program self-study and comments from all review groups will be discussed during the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs Review. Subsequently, on a schedule determined by the stakeholder group, the respective Dean and Head of Study Program/Director of Academic Program will be responsible for implementing the action plan. On an annual basis, progress on the action plan will be reported to the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs. Formal reviews of program accomplishments will be through the submission of one-and three-year action plan follow-up reports to the Dean and VRAA.



D. Review Cycle

All academic programs shall undergo formal academic program reviews on a typical 5-year cycle.

- The initial formal review of new programs will occur in the third year of operation, and every five years thereafter;
- Newer programs that began operation within two years of the date of the adoption of this process and have not yet engaged in formal program review will be the first programs scheduled for review;
- “Related” undergraduate- and post-baccalaureate-level programs (i.e. an undergraduate major in business and a master’s in business) are to undergo review simultaneously unless accreditation or other circumstances dictate otherwise.

The Office of Academic Affairs will work with each academic unit to develop and publish a rolling, academic program review schedule. Whenever possible, the academic program review cycle shall be coordinated with any external accreditation review requirements so long as the reviews occur at a time no longer than the 5-year University cycle. The Office of Academic Affairs may move up or delay reviews to best facilitate coordination with external program accreditation activity.

E. Academic Program Review Oversight

Although most elements of the academic program review process are to be faculty and program driven, there is a need to dedicate administrative, fiscal, and human resources in support of the reviews. The Office of Academic Affairs has the responsibility for supporting the academic review process and will:

- Fund external reviewer(s) honoraria and travel expenses;
- Oversee and coordinate the academic program review process (including establishing the scheduling of academic program reviews, communicating to the academic programs about the review, providing orientation to the process, and maintaining files/records of self-studies and related program review reports; and
- Ensure that other associated units provide all necessary data and guidance to support programs undergoing review.



APPENDIX A

Self-Study Topical Guidelines

The following guidelines provides the arrangement of data and prompts that will guide you in the preparation of your self-study. Please be aware that these prompts are arranged in such a way to compel a formative self-assessment. They are also designed to give reviewers insight into all your programs at the undergraduate and post-baccalaureate level (if applicable). In some cases, you may find that some of the questions do not apply to your own programs undergoing the review process. In these instances, we ask that you simply skip over the non-relevant materials and/or questions. In the preparation of your self-study, the prompts are arranged into three broad categories, which are more fully explained below:

1. This is our program
2. This is who we are
3. This is what we think of our program

Responses to the first two categories could be written by a smaller subset of faculty. Responses to the third category of questions (a SWOT analysis) should be compiled after a faculty workshop in which there is full participation by the entire faculty in the program area. To facilitate this process, it is recommended that the first two sections be completed and that responses to these sections are distributed to all faculty at least one week prior to the workshop.

Table of Contents for the Program Self-Study

1. This is our program

- a. Cover page: Use the standard SU logo on your cover page
- b. Executive Summary
 - i. Identify the program(s) within the agreed upon curricular scope of the self-study (associated undergraduate and post-baccalaureate degrees, if applicable)
 - ii. Summary of the self-study document (one page)
 - iii. List of persons who were responsible for the preparation of the document
- c. Brief History of the Program (one paragraph). Address aspects of the program's history or character that provides key context for interpreting this self-study.
- d. Mission Statement, Program Goals
Reflection Question to Prompt Development of Narrative: Do program mission and goals shape and give direction to the program?
- e. Program Description (repeat for multiple associated programs)



- i. Enrollments: Declared majors and graduates; class sizes (and impact on program quality and delivery). Data: # of majors, average class size, # grads per year over the past five years.
Reflection Question to Prompt Development of Narrative: Are your enrollments adequate to sustain the program?
 - ii. Program requirements: common courses, concentrations, and electives. This would include critical pathways required for the major.
Reflective Question to Prompt Development of Narrative: Are the curricular offerings adequate to justify the number of options within the program(s)? Are the program requirements appropriate? Is there evidence of periodic curricular review, introduction of new courses, retiring of other courses, and updating of course syllabi?
 - iii. Discuss if/how the program or courses from the program were developed in collaboration with other partner institutions. Address the nature of the relationship/ collaborations between faculty in your program and those at any partner institution.
 - iv. External accreditation, rankings and awards (provide bulleted list). Summarize the program's current accreditation status. Attach any related documentation (self-studies, accreditation team reports, status letters, etc.) as appendices.
 - v. Peer and aspirant benchmark programs: Identify the programs at other institutions you have designated as benchmarks that inform your program improvement efforts. Describe key program characteristics or measures of performance that you benchmark against.
- f. Assessment and Curriculum
- i. Attach the program's current Assessment Plan (including rubrics, where applicable), plus the related Assessment Reports for the past two years.
 - ii. Address any aspect of your program's assessment efforts that you feel provides needed context for or explanation of the data requested above.
 - iii. How does the curriculum help support the achievement of the program learning outcomes?
 - iv. Describe how ongoing assessment has improved the curriculum in the program.
 - v. To what extent have program faculty come to understand, value and use assessment to improve the program.

2. This is who we are

- a. Student Information
 - i. Student success in program (retention and graduation rates, time-to-degree completion, etc.)



- ii. Summarize the program's recruitment and retention efforts. Include a brief discussion about how the program collaborates with associated units to address these goals (i.e. Student Recruiting, Student Affairs, etc.)
- iii. Identify any notable academic/professional awards or accomplishments that current students or alumni have earned in the last 3 years. Note any ways in which other SU units contributed to the accomplishment.
- iv. Post-graduate success (employment data, graduate school enrollment, etc.).
Reflection Question to Prompt Development of Narrative: How do the number of concentrations and electives within the program affect overall program quality?

b. Faculty

- i. Faculty Expectations and Quality (teaching, research, community service, etc.)
 1. Summarize notable professional honors and awards (list faculty honors/awards). Note any ways in which SU contributed to these awards.
 2. Research expectations for faculty (include workload reports)
 3. Community Service expectations for faculty (include workload report)
 4. Teaching expectations for faculty (include workload report)
- ii. Faculty size, composition (Rank, full-time/part-time) and distribution of responsibilities.
Reflection Question to Prompt Development of Narrative: Provide a narrative summary of faculty quality relative to expectations in each area that is applicable to your program.

- iii. Faculty service to the Program area, Faculty, University, community and/or profession. Summarize into a list the major service activities of faculty within your program.
 1. Summarize notable professional honors and/or awards (List faculty and honors/awards).
 2. Number of student theses directed per faculty member.
 3. Number of advisees per faculty member.
 4. Summarize notable community service projects that received external recognition (list those projects that secured external funding and/or received notable attention from the government or media).

c. Administrative Personnel

How---and how well---are administrative responsibilities distributed among staff? What needs are not currently being met, and why? Attach an organizational chart showing all program staff.



- d. Major Changes in Program (within the last three years and anticipated for the next three years)
 - i. Discipline or field (Summarize change over the past three years, provide a speculative summary of changes you anticipate in the discipline and how you plan to respond).
 - ii. Student demand (Summarize changes you have observed and answer the question: "Are students now asking for something different than what you currently offer?")
 - iii. Employment demand for graduates (Summarize changes over the past three years and projections for the next three years and how you plan to respond).
- e. Current and future areas of concern for the program (one page summary of concerns (one page summary of concerns moving forward)).
- f. Resources currently available (past three years). Reflect on the resources that are currently available to you and whether they are adequate for you to achieve your programmatic goals.
 - i. Personnel: Bulleted list of all program faculty/staff with brief description of duties.
 - ii. Specialized facilities (labs) and major equipment.
 - iii. General expense budget.
 - iv. Adequacy of library and information resources available for students and research.
 - v. Other auxiliary resources (if applicable).
- g. Plans to Modify Resources over the Next Three Years (differentiate desired and necessary resources and include a plan for acquiring additional resources, if needed)
 - i. Personnel
 - ii. Facilities and equipment
 - iii. Other auxiliary resources
 - iv. Connection to program goals
 - v. Anticipated sources of resources

3. This is what we think of our program

- a. Current strengths that support the achievement of program goals.
 - i. List and describe.
- b. Current weaknesses that impede the achievement of program goals.
 - i. List and describe.



- c. Future opportunities to explore in the achievement of program goals.
 - i. Summarize any opportunities that remain unexplored in achievement of program goals.
- d. Future threats to overcome in the achievement of program goals.
 - i. Summarize any areas of concern members of the faculty may have about a program.



APPENDIX B

Guiding Questions for On-Site External Reviewer(s)

1. Programs and Curriculum
 - a. Does the program have a well-defined mission and an appropriate corresponding statement of goals?
 - b. Do the mission and goals shape and give direction to the program?
 - c. Are the program requirements appropriate?
 - d. Is there evidence of periodic curricular review, introduction of new courses, elimination of older ones, and complete course syllabi?
 - e. Are the program's plans and/or goals appropriate given the internal and external environment?
 - f. Highlight the strengths and areas of improvement for the program.
2. Faculty
 - a. What is the overall attitude/morale of the faculty?
 - b. Is there evidence of faculty productivity, of standing nationally, of initiative in seeking support for research opportunities and/or community service?
 - c. Is the program's experience in recruiting and retaining faculty appropriate or successful? Is the faculty workload reasonable? Are teaching resources adequate?
 - d. Is there effective leadership of the program?
3. Students
 - a. Is the program successful in the advising and counseling of students?
 - b. Does the program appropriately monitor the progress of students?
 - c. Does the program have appropriate Student Learning Outcomes, assess these regularly, and use the results to make improvements?
4. Physical Facilities and Other Resources (library, information services, institutional research, etc.)
 - a. Are the computing and information technology resources appropriate and adequate to support teaching and research?
 - b. Are library and information services appropriate and adequate to support teaching and research?
 - c. Is the level of institutional support for professional development adequate for the programs?
5. Areas of Excellence: Are there areas of excellence or innovation that are meritorious?
6. Areas of Concern
 - a. Are there areas of concern?
 - b. What recommendations are appropriate for the program at this time?



APPENDIX C

Standard Data Required for Program Review Process

It is the responsibility of Academic Affairs to ensure that each program undergoing a Program Review have access to the data required to complete the self-study. Data will be provided by the appropriate offices including Institutional Research, Academic Registry and Student Affairs, among others.

1. Program Student Information
 - a. Declared majors over a three-year period
 - b. Any concentrations (if applicable)
 - c. Number of graduates over a three-year period
 - d. Average class size by level (for three years)

2. Student Success Data (for the last three cohorts)
 - a. Retention (by year by cohort)
 - b. Four-year graduation rate (by cohort)
 - c. Five-year graduation rate (by cohort)

3. Faculty Teaching Load (for the last three years)
 - a. Full-time (by rank)
 - b. Part-time