



REVISED FALL 2024

PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK

APPENDICES

PREPARED BY: OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
Ohio



Appendix A: Conducting a SWOT Analysis

SWOT Materials

The facilitator is responsible for providing the following materials to the SWOT session. Consider making the following items available:

- Post-Its – LARGE (*multi-colored, minimum of 4 colors, “super-sticky note”*)
- Alternative style sticky note for labeling groups
- Name tags
- Black markers
- Paperclips or binding clips
- Masking tape
- Multi-colored sticker dots

How is the SWOT conducted?

- The facilitator should introduce the group and set some ground rules/ guidelines.
- The facilitator should lead a discussion about the unit/program’s data and how they relate to the unit/program’s performance of its mission. This will help illuminate existing strengths and weaknesses. The strengths and weaknesses should help identify possible opportunities and threats.
- After the discussion of the data, the facilitator should walk the participants through the process of brainstorming about each of the SWOT elements, one at a time (e.g. Strengths first, then Weaknesses, then Opportunities, then Threats). Participants will be asked to relate their thoughts or comments to the data and write them down on the Post Its.
- While conducting the session, encourage participants to use phrases that are clearly understood by everyone when writing out suggestions or comments for posting.
- Clarify SWOT statements during the session to ensure “context” of statement in future discussions and analyses.
- The facilitator should circle the room continuously to collect the post-its. The notes should be placed in a random pattern across the front of the group minimizing and ensuring that they are not “clumped” with or by any bias. When the group seems to have finished with writing topics, the facilitator should then proceed to read aloud the entire list on the wall.
- Next, the SWOT participants should be encouraged to come up and “group” the topics into “themes” or likenesses. The facilitator should next work with the participants to collectively come to an agreement and agree on a “title” for each of clusters. There may be a massaging of the groupings upon the themes that are brought out. After the groups are titled, the facilitator re-reads the clusters to ensure that the consensus is that all topics fit under that them.
- Next, the facilitator should hand out to the participants an apportioned set of sticker dots. The participants use the dots for ranking (i.e., critically important versus not important at all, etc.). The participants can use them to rank either the group themes or individual topics within the cluster. The facilitator then collects and stacks the clusters, ensuring to stack so that report writing can be one easily. Upon completion of the STRENGTHS portion, the facilitator may encourage a brief break or move onto the next section. Once all statements have been reviewed on the board, for the purpose of more efficient and accurate processing/ reporting, the facilitator should stack the Post-its according to the identified categories. This will allow the person creating the SWOT report to quickly (and more reliably) input the data.

What's NEXT?

The SWOT analysis should result in a list of the issues that are the most pertinent or salient for the program/unit at this time. It might be helpful to consider each issue in relationship to the College's and University's strategic plans. These will form the basis for the MoU.

Appendix B: Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) TEMPLATE

This Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) will guide the Self-Study and review process for the [program/cluster of programs -- name here]. The evaluation of disciplinary/professional excellence of the program/cluster of programs is one outcome of Self-Study and program 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 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), College Dean(s)/Associate Dean(s), OIE Provost Designee, and Provost.

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

Tentative Timeline

SWOT Analysis Completed: _____

Program Self-Study & Action Plan (Submission to OIE) Date: _____

Approval of Selected External Reviewers Date: _____

Review Team Site/Virtual Visit Date: _____

Response to External Findings Report Date: _____

Final Program Action Plan Submission Date: _____

Implementation of Final Action Plan Date: _____

First Annual Follow-up on Action Plan Date: _____

Signatures

Program Review Coordinator:

Name: _____ Date: _____

College Dean(s)/Associate Dean(s):

Name: _____ Date: _____

Name: _____ Date: _____

Graduate Dean ¹

Name: _____ Date: _____

Reviewed by Designee from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Name: _____ Date: _____

Provost

Name: _____ Date: _____

¹ Required if a graduate program is reviewed.

Appendix C: Data

OIE will provide most required data via hyperlinks directly embedded in the Self-Study Fillable Master Template. Programs will supplement where noted on the same document. The list below is provided to assist programs in determining **particular data elements** they may consider including on the Self-Study Fillable Master Template.

Enrollment

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions
Enrollment	Career	Undergrad
		Grad
	Status	FT/PT
	Characteristics	First-Time/Transfer
		Gender
		Traditional/Non-Traditional
	Type	Ethnicity
		In-State
		Out-Of-State
	Quality	International
		ACT
	Need	GRE
		% Pell Eligible

Scholarly Productivity

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions
Scholarly Productivity	Publications of FT Faculty	#, %
	Production of Creative Works	#, %
	Grants of FT Faculty	#, \$
	Faculty Awards	#
	R&D Expenditures	\$
	Patents	#, \$
	% of Undergraduate Students Involved in Research	%

Instructional Productivity

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions
Instructional Productivity	# Sections Taught per Faculty	# for different faculty category
	% Taught by FT/PT/GA	% for different faculty category
	Avg. Class Size	# for different faculty category
	Avg. Teaching Load	# for different faculty category
	Sections less than 30	% for different faculty category
	#SCH (per FTE)	# for FT Faculty
	Student/FT Faculty Ratio	Ratio
Cost per SCH	\$	

Resources/Budget

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions
Resources/Expenses	Operating Expenditures	% of total budget
	Expenditures for Admin (% of total)	% of total budget
	Expenditures for Advising (% of total)	% of total budget
	Misc. Revenue	% of total budget

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
Student Success	2-Year Grad Rate	#, %
	4-Year Grad Rate	#, %
	5-year Grad Rate	#, %
	6-year Grad Rate	#, %
	Time to Degree	#, %
	Fall/Fall Retention Rate	%
	Job Placement Rate	%
	# of Hours at Grad	Avg.

Additional Data:

- Faculty advising loads;
- Description of recruitment and retention efforts;
- 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;
 - Accomplishment and potential of program graduates to generate new knowledge or new initiatives in teaching, public service, and/or other practice.

Faculty Demographics

Metric Dashboard	Data Element	Data Dimensions
Faculty Demographic	Headcount	TTF/NTTF #

		FT/PT
		Gender
		Ethnicity
		International
	% w/terminal degree	% by rank

Additional Data:

- List of all faculty in the unit, including highest degree, field, and institution and their graduate faculty status;
- Faculty retention rate and trends;
- 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;
 - c. The faculty garners significant external funding, as defined by disciplinary norms, which enhance the 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
Program Quality	Curriculum	Scan Elements
	Review/Revision	UC/GC Docs
	Alignment with ULO	SAAC Assessment Plans
	LO Assessment	SAAC Assessment Reports
	Accreditation/Program Review Status	Doc

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.

Program Interaction

Academic programs do not exist in isolation but rather in relation 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;
- Centrality of the program to advanced study in the specific discipline(s) regionally or nationally.

**Appendix E: Checklist for Self-Study and Action Plan Evaluation by OIE/PRAC
(Internal Evaluation)**

	Done (check)	Comments
Background – Program Context		
Task 1: Official program description and outcomes that match the catalog		
Task 2: Status of the discipline, detail of emerging trends and issues, viability of program, changes in the environment		
Task 3: Update of action taken as a result of last five-year program review (as applicable), actions taken to increase enrollment and/or distinctiveness		
Task 4: Additional context/background as relevant and/or noteworthy		
Task 5: Program review process – demonstration of faculty and constituency involvement		
Review of the Current Program: Curriculum		
<p>Task 1: Map student learning outcomes</p> <p>Are all intended learning outcomes covered in courses?</p> <p>Does the sequencing of courses support and build upon concepts as needed for student learning?</p> <p>Is the program cohesive and intentional with clear progression of student learning and courses?</p> <p>Do the outcomes reflect what students should be learning to be prepared for professional and educational opportunities ahead of them?</p> <p>Does the program offer a curriculum that is comprehensive, relevant, and cohesive?</p> <p>Discuss any findings, especially inconsistencies. If there are inconsistencies, solutions are provided</p>		
<p>Task 2: Review student learning outcome assessment reports from the past five years.</p> <p>A holistic data-based examination of how well students are achieving program learning outcomes is provided.</p> <p>Changes made as a result of previous assessment findings are summarized and illustrate the impact of those changes.</p>		
<p>Task 3: Map courses to the core competencies (UG or GR) competencies.</p> <p>Describe the discipline’s contribution to the liberal arts core. (UG)</p> <p>Describe the program’s integration of core/graduate competencies into major/program requirements.</p> <p>Map of curriculum and program learning outcomes/competencies is clear and provided.</p>		

Review of the Current Program: Faculty, Resources, and Cooperation		
<p>Task 1: Faculty qualifications and activity</p> <p>Provide a list of all faculty (full- and part-time), by rank, including tenure status, highest degree earned, graduating institution, and one or two areas of expertise or research interest.</p> <p>Provide information on faculty achievements, including peer-reviewed scholarship since the last program review and describe any recent achievements, grants, awards, patents, performances, etc. For recently hired faculty, only discuss achievements since arriving at BGSU.</p> <p>Discuss the current workload of the full-time faculty. Is there equitable division of teaching responsibilities? What role do overloads and course releases play in the need for adjunct faculty?</p> <p>Identify any holes in the program's faculty area expertise.</p>		
<p>Task 2 -- Service and cooperation</p> <p>Discuss efforts to promote civic engagement and service among students, faculty, and staff. Describe service learning opportunities and other service promoted by the program. How do faculty and staff engage with the broader public?</p> <p>Describe any linkages, collaboration agreements with institutions outside the university, and courses or collaboration with other programs at BGSU.</p> <p>Demonstrate engagement and/or contribution to the public good.</p> <p>List external grants.</p>		
<p>Task 3 -- Physical resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe any relevant physical resources -- dedicated studios, labs, classrooms, etc. -- and evaluate their sufficiency. • Describe availability and sufficiency of budget/financial support. 		
Enrollment, Graduation, and Alumni Outcomes		
<p>In-depth analysis of data</p> <p>Does the program maintain sufficient enrollment to be a sustainable major at the university?</p> <p>Does the department have additional data and information on alumni employment and educational outcomes? What does that information say?</p> <p>Does the program adequately support and prepare its majors for employment and graduate school/continued growth and education?</p>		
Student Input and Advising		
<p>Task 1 -- Gather student input on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths of the program and areas where the program needs to make improvements • Extent to which program and university mission and values were explicit throughout the student's educational experience • Preparation for internship and careers; how does the program help students obtain internships, and student feedback on this process. 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special or unique features of the program • Extent to which the program outcomes were emphasized throughout the student’s educational experience • Extent to which sufficient advisement was given to program majors. Describe what kinds of orientation, advising, and mentoring efforts have been carried out. • Courses students would have wanted to take <p>Task 2 -- Task 2: Use student input and other findings from the program review process to identify major themes regarding program strengths and areas for improvement.</p>		
Benchmarking of Program		
<p>Task 1: Identify at least three institutions with the program offering.</p> <p>Task 2: Conduct a benchmarking analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do program requirements, course offerings, and content compare to other schools in quantity, scope, and depth? • Is the program in sync with current trends and best practices in the field? • What is unique about the BGSU program? • Based on the findings, what changes (additions or modifications) should the program consider? 		
Action Plan		
<p>Task 1: Assess the program’s engagement with and contribution to BGSU’s mission and strategic plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate how well the program reflects, supports and advances to BGSU’s mission and plan. • Identify changes and innovations that program will undertake over the next five years to promote the mission and plan. • Address how the program will improve or maintain its enrollment and program distinctiveness. <p>Task 2: Develop a measurable, metrics-based, feasible, five-year action plan, based on the findings of the program review. The following are considered/included:</p> <p>Goals – Specifically what does the program want to accomplish over the program review cycle?</p> <p>Rationale for goal based on Program Review – Why were these goals selected?</p> <p>Strategy to achieve goal – How will the program achieve the goals? Please give a timeline and milestones.</p> <p>Resources needed to achieve goal – What resources such as funding or needed to accomplish goals?</p> <p>Timeline – What is the schedule for obtaining this goal?</p> <p>Indicators of success – How will the program know that it is being successful on each of the established goals?</p>		

**Appendix F: Self-Study and Action Plan Evaluation Rubric by OIE/PRAC
(Internal Evaluation)**

		Beginning	Developing	Meets/Accomplished	Exceeds/Exemplary
1	Program's relationship to BGSU's mission, vision, and strategic plan	Program has only tentatively articulated one of the following: formal mission statement, vision, and strategic plan.	Program mission is articulated, but alignment to University mission is incomplete or in- process, or the mission is not integral to strategic planning. A strategic plan has been drafted but lacks alignment with that of the University.	The mission statement is articulated and aligned to the University mission. Mission and vision both guide strategic planning. Mission is clearly communicated and published at the University.	Mission and vision are articulated and aligned to institutional goals; both guide planning; both are published widely. Program has a scheduled process for reviewing mission and vision and their alignment to the University mission. Metrics exist to support continuous improvement of strategic plan.
2	Program's contribution to general education requirements and/or support offered for other programs, including curricular and co-curricular activities or broad-based learning experiences	Program does not contribute to the general education core and/or program does not support other programs related to co-curricular activities or learning experiences at the University. Limited potential for collaboration with other programs on campus.	Program contributes to the general education core. Some program courses are prerequisites for courses in other programs. Some potential planning for collaboration with other programs on campus, but no current collaborations with other programs; engagement with broad-based co-curricular and learning activities on campus is under discussion and/or being considered in a more intentional way as demonstrated through planning meetings.	Program contributes to the general education core. Program features courses that are prerequisites for courses in other programs. Courses in the program are required by other programs beyond the general education core contributions. Program provides courses needed by other programs for admission to professional or graduate programs. Program has some collaborations with other programs, specifically documented participation and/or contribution to co-curricular activities and broad-based learning experiences for students.	Program contributes to the general education core, other undergraduate programs, and other graduate or professional programs. Courses provided are required for accreditation for other programs on campus and there exist advanced options. Program provides courses necessary for admission into other professional or graduate programs on campus. Program has current and ongoing active collaborations with other programs on campus. Program facilitates, assesses, and innovates a wide range of successful co-curricular activities and broad-based learning experiences for students.

3	<p>Program's ability to recruit and retain high-quality professors and students</p>	<p>Program has challenges in filling job vacancies and has frequent turnover. Necessary credentials for faculty in program are missing. Heavy reliance on temporary or part-time faculty. Enrollment and retention student data are at levels that are insufficient or unstable. Program recruiting limited to regional area and/or only attracts academically unprepared students.</p>	<p>Strategies in place to address program shortfalls in faculty. Faculty actively engaged in ongoing efforts to improve credentials. Program requires use of temporary or part-time faculty to fill limited critical needs. Stable enrollment and retention at levels that justify continued support of program. Program recruits actively in regional area and has attracted motivated students.</p>	<p>Faculty is stable over a 5-year period and varied in rank and experience. Vacancies are filled promptly. Faculty has all necessary credentials, meets annual evaluation criteria, and is current in specialty area. Limited temporary or part-time faculty usage. Stable, long-term enrollment and retention for at least a 5-year period. Top 10% of majors represent academically outstanding students. Program actively recruits regionally and beyond.</p>	<p>Faculty is stable over a long-term period with variety of rank and experience. Vacancies are seen as competitive options for external candidates. All faculty have appropriate credentials and meet or exceed annual evaluation objectives. Some faculty are recognized experts. Sufficient faculty support to meet departmental needs with minimal use of temporary or part-time faculty. Stable and consistent enrollment and retention over a period of longer than 5 years with little fluctuation in numbers. Top 25% of majors represent academically outstanding students. Program actively and successfully recruits on a national scale.</p>
4	<p>Program's contribution to the public good, specifically, promotion and enhancement of the educational and cultural level of the surrounding region and stakeholders the University serves</p>	<p>The program has potential to connect with the external public and serve as a local and regional community resource within a program's expertise; however, this program is not well-known by, engaged with, or utilized by the public. The program is in its beginning stages and has yet to provide these benefits.</p>	<p>The program is in the process of becoming a resource for information, cultural events, health/wellness clinics and/or other services that enhance the educational and cultural level and the general health and well-being of the population in the surrounding region. The program is increasing its visibility as a result of this process. The program's events/services and other extramural activities begin to be covered in local and regional media.</p>	<p>The program has well-established events and services, but these are not yet fully utilized by the public. The program's events/services are covered in local and regional media. The program has developed means to publicize its services/events at recruiting events and through other venues. The program has developed processes and procedures to bring prospective students, their parents, and interested community members to campus to attend/utilize its events and services. The program begins to receive requests from external constituents for faculty to serve off-campus as clinicians, adjudicators, presenters, and for other external engagement roles and activities. Program graduates</p>	<p>The program has fully developed its potential to connect with the public and serve as a resource for information, cultural events, health/wellness clinics, and/or other services. Alumni support has become a significant asset to the program and the program's graduates have a visible presence in the region and who speak to the program's value and actively promote it. The program is regularly covered and is mentioned as an area of excellence in local and regional media. Program faculty are frequently requested by local and regional schools and other organizations as clinicians, adjudicators, presenters, and for other external engagement roles and activities. Community-focused services are fully utilized</p>

				play an increasingly important and visible role in promoting the services/events.	by the regional public, and sponsored events are consistently well attended.
5	Student placement into jobs and/or graduate and professional degree programs to meet critical workforce needs within the state and beyond	Little or no data reported on the placement of graduates into jobs and/or graduate and professional degree programs. Little or no evidence shown of the workforce demands for program graduates. Little or no evidence of analyzing student placement in meeting critical workforce needs.	Some data reported on the placement of graduates into jobs and/or graduate and professional degree programs. Some evidence shown of the workforce demands for program graduates. Some evidence of analyzing student placement in meeting critical workforce needs.	Data on the placement of a majority of graduates into jobs and/or graduate and professional degree programs clearly demonstrates demand for program graduates. Placements generally meet workforce needs. Evidence of analyzing student placement in meeting critical workforce needs is presented.	Data on the placement of all or nearly all graduates into jobs and/or graduate and professional degree programs clearly shows evidence of demand for program graduates. Placements are well aligned in meeting workforce demands. Evidence of analyzing student placement in meeting critical workforce needs is presented that clearly shows evident trends for maintained demand, long-term sustainability, and even growth.
6	Data and Data Analysis Capacity: Longitudinal data and trends, number of students in a major and number of graduates over at least a five-year period, number of full-time faculty equivalents, SCH production per FTE	Some data are reported but little analysis is evident. Not all required elements are present. Number of students: Number of graduates: Number of FTE: SCH Production/FTE:	Data are reported and some rudimentary analysis is evident. Most of the required elements are present. Number of students: Number of graduates: Number of FTE: SCH Production/FTE:	Data are displayed in tabular and graphical forms with adequate, correct, consistent narrative analysis of the evident trends. Most of the required elements are present. Number of students: Number of graduates: Number of FTE: SCH Production/FTE:	Data are displayed in tabular and graphical forms with in-depth, rigorous narrative analysis of the evident trends. All required elements are present. Number of students: Number of graduates: Number of FTE: SCH Production/FTE:

7	<p>Process followed that identifies needed curriculum improvements, including examples of improvements made; evidence provided that the program is actively participating in BGSU assessment and evaluation processes; proof shown of “closing the loop” for curriculum improvement</p>	<p>Little or no evidence of a systematic process of continuous improvement. Assessments are either not clearly identified or are not aligned to program outcomes. Collection of data and evaluation of results are nonexistent or informal. Little or no reference to systematic, data-driven improvement in the narrative.</p>	<p>A formal and systematic process of continuous improvement is being implemented and further developed; assessments are somewhat aligned to program outcomes; collection of data and reporting of results have taken place but are possibly inconsistent. These efforts (albeit developing) are intentionally mentioned in the narrative.</p>	<p>A formal, systematic, and on-going process of continuous improvement has been implemented; assessments are generally aligned to program outcomes; data is routinely collected; results are entered in the institutional system; there is evidence of curricular and/or program improvements based on assessment results. The narrative provides adequate examples of systematic, data-driven improvement efforts.</p>	<p>A formal, systematic, and on-going process of continuous improvement has been implemented; metrics are routinely re-assessed for accuracy, relevance, and meaningfulness; assessments are directly aligned to program outcomes; data is routinely collected; results are entered in the institutional system; there is a consistent record of curricular and/or program improvements based on assessment results. Regular outcome reviews include routine input from external stakeholders.</p>
8	<p>Excellence in scholarship activities, including but not limited to, externally-funded research, performance, exhibition, and publication, which brings recognition to BGSU and help “tell our story”</p>	<p>Program focuses exclusively on teaching and does not encourage scholarly or creative production. Faculty occasionally present work in-progress at conferences (or the equivalent), but this does not come into a finished form in a printed publication or a polished presentation or performance.</p>	<p>Some professors are independently developing scholarly or creative projects, but the program has few guidelines, nor support to guide faculty to better final products, such as publications, presentations, performances, extramural funding applications, or patent applications.</p>	<p>Program has clearly defined goals for scholarly research, including publications, presentations, extramural funding applications, performances, and/or other activities that are appropriate to the discipline and research expectations of the university. Faculty actively engage in professional development support to increase scholarly/creative output and this is well documented. Scholarship is included in strategic planning.</p>	<p>Faculty produces high level scholarly research, presentations, performances, and/or other activities that are consistent to the clearly defined goals and expectations established by the program. Undergraduate and graduate or professional students are intentionally included in the scholarly research focus of the program. Scholarship is included in strategic planning and has a demonstrated impact on the program’s long-term story-telling and growth.</p>

Appendix G: Selection of External Reviewers for Program Review

The selection of external reviewers for program review at BGSU is a collaborative process between the program faculty and leadership, College Dean/Associate Dean, OIE Provost Designee, and the Provost. The role of the external reviewers is to provide independent feedback and insights/suggestions on the program's Self-Study, Action Plan, and areas of potential growth.

Selection Process:

Step 1: The process starts with an initial selection of potential candidates (6-8 are recommended) generated by the program faculty and leadership of the program/unit. A list of the following information should be forwarded first to the College Dean(s) for approval:

- a. Name of the potential Reviewer
- b. Rank/Title
- c. Institution
- d. Link to Professional Website
- e. Contact information (email/phone)
- f. 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/peer programs.

Step 2: After review by the College Dean, the list of potential reviewers is then submitted to the Dean of the Graduate College (if graduate programs are included in the review), and the OIE Provost Designee for review and approval.

Step 3: The OIE Provost Designee confirms which four external reviewers have been formally approved – two primary and two secondary should *in extremis* circumstances require a replacement.

Step 4: The Program Review Coordinator contacts the external reviewers and facilitates the visit process. A visit schedule is due to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for review and approval **6 weeks prior** to the visit set dates.

NOTE: The Program Review Coordinator and faculty must review the qualifications and background of external reviewers to avoid any conflicts of interest prior to sending to OIE.

Appendix H: No-Conflict of Interest Form for External Reviewers

Attestation of External Review Status/No Conflict of Interest

In an effort by Bowling Green State University (BGSU) to ensure an objective and unbiased review of its self-study, BGSU has undertaken to identify external reviewers to provide formal feedback. In serving as an external reviewer for BGSU, reviewers should have no recent or current familial or professional engagement (paid or unpaid work), that creates or introduces bias or constitutes an actual or potential conflict of interest with the University.

If the University identifies a bias or conflict during the term of the review period, the University will replace the reviewer. To avoid such situations and ensure a diligent review process, please affirm to having none of the following relationships or partnerships with BGSU faculty or staff within seven (7) years prior to being approached as a possible external reviewer.

Initial each box:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I have not served as an employee or received compensation for services from BGSU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I have not applied to a position within this department at BGSU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I am not an immediate family member (spouse, sibling, parent or child) of a BGSU faculty or staff member |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I have not received royalties from any scholarly or academic involvement at BGSU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I have not co-authored a publication (book, article, etc.) with a BGSU faculty or staff member |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I have not served as a co-investigator on sponsored research with a BGSU faculty or staff member |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I have not served as a co-reviewer with a BGSU faculty or staff member during an accreditation visit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I have not served on a funded project with a BGSU faculty or staff member |

Please also affirm, by initialing each box:

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I am not an alumnus of Bowling Green State University |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | I am not currently pursuing a degree or enrolled in coursework within the program/department I am reviewing at Bowling Green State University |

In addition, I affirm that if such a relationship or status arises during the course of my role as an external reviewer for BGSU, I will immediately notify the Program Review and Institutional Accreditation Coordinator, Weena Gaulin at wgaulin@bgsu.edu.

Name (Printed)

Current University/College Affiliation

Signature

Date

Appendix I: Sample Email Inquiries

SAMPLE 1

Dear Prof. (XXXXX)

It was a pleasure to speak with you the other day, and to learn of your interest in serving as an external reviewer for the () program at Bowling Green State University. Attached please find the program's Self Study document, and a guidelines document that will help to frame your work.

Your visit will be coordinated by (XXXXXX), who I am copying on this note and who will be in touch with you soon about your visit. Your travel, hotel, and meal expenses associated with your visit will be covered by Bowling Green State University through reimbursement. While on campus you will need to complete and sign our payment form, so that your (not to exceed \$XXXX) stipend can be processed upon receipt of your report by the Provost's office.

We very much appreciate your interest in visiting us and we look forward to working with you. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if I may answer any questions you might have.

Best regards,

Dean, School of (XXXXXX)

SAMPLE 2

Dear Dr. [name],

On behalf of _____, I am writing to invite you to serve as an external reviewer of Bowling Green State University's _____ major, in the spring/fall of 20___. Bowling Green State University reviews each academic program on a six-year cycle and welcomes your contribution to that process.

As an external reviewer, you would agree to review a self-study of the program along with supporting documents, participate in a face-to-face or virtual interview with program faculty, and write a short evaluation. The college will pay you a stipend of \$XXX after receipt of the report.

I would appreciate it if you would respond to this invitation as soon as possible to indicate whether you will participate in the review. Thank you for your assistance in helping Bowling Green State University maintain the excellence of its academic programs. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at XXXXX.

SAMPLE 3

Invitation to External Reviewers

(DEPARTMENTAL LETTERHEAD)

(DATE)

Dear _____(NAME),

You have been recommended as a person highly qualified to review and evaluate _____. We believe external evaluations contribute substantially to the academic review process, and we would greatly appreciate your willingness to serve in this capacity. If you are willing to accept our invitation, we solicit your comments regarding the depth, originality, reliability, importance, significance, visibility, and productivity of the _____ (NAME of Program/Cluster). Your evaluative comments based upon your knowledge and appreciation of the field and its standards, will be a significant contribution to our review in light of continuous improvement.

In order to complete our review, I hope we might have your response by _____(DATE). Should you decide not to accept our invitation to serve as an external reviewer for _____ (PROGRAM NAME), we would appreciate learning of that decision at your earliest convenience. A telephone call to me at XXXX would facilitate our selection of another reviewer if you cannot accept our invitation. In either case, please be assured that we are very grateful for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely, _____ (DEPARTMENT CHAIR)

Appendix J: Sample Questions for Use by External Reviewers During the Visit

The following questions were developed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) to serve as a **resource for external reviewers**. They are offered as an **optional tool** to be utilized by external reviewers. OIE recognizes that external review teams may ask any questions as they see fit relative to content of the Self-Study and Action Plan. **In crafting their final report, external reviewers are welcomed to adopt the outline below or follow the critical questions of the MoU.**



Context

The purpose of the academic program review is to assess:

1. The program's contribution to the vision, mission and values of the University, specifically as outlined in BGSU's strategic plan;
2. The quality of the program curriculum, faculty, and students (inclusive of targeted and anticipated goals and outcomes);
3. The program's current resources, sustainability and its administration;
4. The department/program's action plan for the next six years.

Mission and Overview

1. Is the department/program's mission clearly aligned with the University's mission and strategic priorities? Does the program effectively educate leaders who will contribute to the common good? Leaders who are focused on the future and embrace a mindset anchored in a purposeful and meaningful life?
2. Are the department/program's mission, goals and student learning outcomes clearly articulated and communicated to faculty, students and staff as well as other campus constituencies?
3. What makes the department/program distinctive (in the field and/or on campus)? What is the department/program's reputation in the field?
4. Who does the department/program see as current peers/competitors? What trends are emerging within the department/program's discipline and do these trends warrant the need for a change in mission?
5. What leadership changes have recently occurred? How have these impacted the department/program's effectiveness?
6. How is the department/program organized in its operations and functions? Do faculty and staff (tenure, non-tenured, adjunct, etc.) and students participate in department/program administration/governance? What is the relationship of department/program leadership with other campus administrative units?

Goals

1. After reading the departmental/program self-study and conducting a site visit, how would you characterize the quality and performance of the department/program?
2. Overall, how does this program compare to other programs within the state and nationally, specifically their peers and competitors?

Curriculum and Instruction/ Teaching and Learning

1. How is educational quality defined and assessed?
2. What are the enrollment, retention and graduation rates and trends for the department/program's curriculum?
3. Does the department/program's curriculum provide breadth, depth, and challenge in the light of current scholarship and trends?

4. Does the department/program's curriculum educate students in the values, knowledge and skills appropriate to the discipline?
5. Has the curriculum kept pace with developments in the field? How does the curriculum compare with those of comparable institutions?
6. Does the department/program provide a stimulating, challenging learning environment for all students?
7. Does the department/program have adequate procedures in place to determine whether it is meeting its instructional goals/learning outcomes and objectives and to determine and refine curricular content?
8. Does the program appear to have adequate human and fiscal resources (support staff, space, laboratories, computer technology, equipment, income and expense budgets, etc.)? Is the program supported with sufficient leadership at the program, College, and University levels?
9. What are the department/program's efforts to ensure quality and viability (recruitment/retention)? What are the department/program's efforts to track student graduation and placement? What efforts does the department/program make to recruit and retain underrepresented students? What processes and/or procedures exist to ensure the "right fit" of students and program?
10. What are the department/program's efforts to ensure instructional effectiveness? What is the department/program's philosophy for who teaches which courses? How is faculty load determined? Has the department/program implemented new instructional strategies and to what effect? Are all instructors properly credentialed? Offered training opportunities?

Undergraduate Programs

1. What percentage of students complete their degrees and how long do these students typically take? How do these data points compare to students at other institutions?
2. Does the undergraduate program have a coherent design characterized by continuity, breadth, sequential progression, and a synthesis of learning? What are the findings of an analysis of the content and organization of the curriculum? Are the instructional goals of the program appropriate for the students?
3. Does the program have appropriate and measurable learning outcomes?
4. Do the courses offered in the various modes of instruction (lecture, seminar, laboratory, clinical practice, fieldwork, etc.) provide an appropriate balance for the instructional program?
5. Do courses effectively include use of instructional media, computers, and other modern technologies and employ innovative teaching strategies?
6. Does the advising of students seem appropriate and effective?
7. What is the overall quality of the undergraduate program?

Graduate Program

1. How does the structure of the graduate program (process of admission, course requirements, evaluation) compare to other graduate programs nationally? How does the quality of the graduate program compare with the high-ranking programs in other institutions?
2. Does the program have appropriate and measurable learning outcomes?
3. What percentage of students complete their degrees and how long do these students typically take to complete these degrees? How do these data points compare to students at other institutions? What are the strengths and weaknesses of this program?
4. Do the department's proposals for improving the graduate program seem effective?
5. What are the future demand for graduate students in the academic and professional areas covered by the program?
6. What is the overall quality of the graduate program?

Assessment

1. Is the department/program assessment plan comprehensive enough? Are there key program outcomes that the department has not evaluated and should be evaluated in the next assessment cycle?
2. Are there “best assessment practices or methods” that the program should consider using to measure its success in achieving its program learning objectives?
3. Does the department/program effectively use student learning outcome data and other data points to improve the overall quality of the program?

Faculty and Scholarly Contribution and Collaboration

1. What are the findings relative to faculty demographic data contained in the departmental/program self-study? What efforts does the program make to recruit and retain underrepresented faculty and staff? Have there been significant hires or losses recently (within the reporting cycle)?
2. What awards have faculty and staff received?
3. How does the faculty compare to faculty at other institutions in terms of their contributions to scholarship and creative work; teaching; and service to students, the profession, and community?
4. Is the faculty sufficiently active in research or creative work to support superior academic programs?
5. To what extent is the scholarly and/or creative work of the faculty integrated into the department’s graduate and undergraduate programs? What are the research strengths of the department/program? How well do they align with the department/program’s mission? How do research and creative activities compare to peers?
6. How appropriate is the balance of faculty with respect to senior and junior appointments, diversity, and full-time vs. part-time appointments?
7. How are junior faculty mentored?
8. What are the department/program’s efforts with regard to professional development and growth, particularly among junior faculty?
9. What are the findings relative to faculty workloads and the balance between teaching, research and service responsibilities?
10. What percentage of courses is taught by adjuncts and graduate assistants? How does the department/program assure the improvement and quality of instruction from adjuncts and GAs?

Students

1. Does the program provide a rich learning environment and distinctive education in the discipline? Does it prepare students to make a meaningful contribution to society? In what ways does this department/program provide the best possible educational experience for students? In what ways does this department/program promote student learning and success?
2. Does the performance of students, as evidenced by papers, course examinations, comprehensive examinations, theses or other projects indicate satisfactory preparation in the discipline? How does the department/program encourage students’ scholarly work and production? What are the findings relative to the effectiveness of student participation in the academic life of the program, including undergraduate research and other opportunities for student/faculty collaborative work?
3. What efforts are made to create an intellectual and social climate that fosters student development and learning (e.g. clubs, student chapters of professional organizations, etc.)?
4. What is the nature of the department/program’s academic and career advising efforts? Does the program effectively monitor student academic progress and assist underperforming majors?

5. How is student satisfaction assessed and how are results used to make department/programmatic decisions?
6. What opportunities are students given to learn about options after graduation in the department/program's discipline?
7. Have there been changes in the quality of the student body?
8. What significant awards have students received? How prepared are students upon program completion? What evidence is there of such? Have students had any major impact on the field (professionally or academically)?

Diversity

1. In what ways does the work of this department/program reflect and foster understanding of the diversity of our society and campus community? What are the findings relative to the department/program's diversity in terms of faculty, students and staff? How do these findings compare with departments at the very best institutions?
2. Does the program effectively promote diversity and build awareness of and sensitivity to multicultural issues?
3. How does the department/program foster and encourage intellectual diversity?
4. How does the department/program encourage a global perspective among its faculty and students? What partnerships exist at the national and international level? What impact have these collaborations had on department/program's effectiveness and reputation?

Facilities and Resources

1. How does the total amount of resources provided to the department/program compare with those at similar institutions?
2. What is the department/program's assessment of its most pressing equipment and resource needs? What kinds of space and/or facility issues does the department/program face? What are the projections for future needs?
3. Does the department/program have adequate support staff?
4. How well do the university's computer hardware and software policies and campus support for technology meet the department/program's current and future needs?
5. What additional resources and facilities, if any, are needed to improve the quality of the programs being offered? How does the department/program use various campus support services (and which) to enhance its effectiveness?
6. What is the department/program's funding mix (scholarships, tuition, grants, etc...)? How does the department/program assess how well it uses available funding and human resources?

Conclusions, Action Plans and Future Developments

1. What are the department/program's strengths? In what ways could the department/program be considered a leader in its field?
2. What are the department/program's challenges and opportunities? What are the department/program's weaknesses and where could it most improve? What further challenges do you foresee the department/program facing in the coming years? What changes will occur in your field over the next five to ten years that will impact the future direction of the department/program? What do you see as the major obstacles that impede the department/program's progress?
3. How would you describe the morale and atmosphere within the department/program? Does the department/program enjoy the kind of collegiality among its members and other university members that is conducive to sustaining and enhancing its excellence?
4. What are the findings relative to the department/program's integrated plan for improvement over the next five years?

5. Based on the findings of this self-study, what should be the core objectives and priorities for the department/program over the next five years?
6. What are the risks (health and safety, financial, reputation, etc.) this department/program assumes through its programs, services, and staffing? In what ways do staff from this department/program mitigate these risks?

Appendix K: External Reviewers' Executive Summary TEMPLATE

Office of Institutional Effectiveness – Program Review



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY TEMPLATE FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

Instructions:

This Executive Summary Template is to be completed by external reviewers and **attached as a cover to their full report.**

Both the executive summary cover and full report must be sent electronically to the Provost Designee in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Weena Isabelle Gaulin, Ed.D. at wgaulin@bgsu.edu

The Provost designee will forward both documents to Program/Cluster review coordinator, program/cluster chair/director(s), dean(s)/dean designee(s), and Provost.

This executive summary is **not to exceed 4-5 pages**. External reviewers are asked to write a report (narrative or bulleted format) that includes an executive summary of general findings, identifies features of the program that merit commendations and makes final recommendations for continuous improvement. This template is to be completed and submitted within **three (3) weeks** of the visit.

1. Institution Name:
 2. Name and Degree Level of Program(s):
 3. External Reviewer Information (**attach resume/CV**):
 4. Date of Review:
 5. Location of Review:
 6. Synopses of Commendations and Recommendations on:
 - a. Mission and Goals
 - b. Curriculum and Instruction/ Teaching and Learning
 - c. Undergraduate Programs
 - d. Graduate Programs
 - e. Assessment and Strategic Planning (Model and Use of Results towards Continuous Improvement)
 - f. Faculty and Scholarly Contribution and Collaboration
- Check if virtual:

Click or tap here to enter text.

g. Students

Click or tap here to enter text.

h. Diversity

Click or tap here to enter text.

i. Facilities and Resources

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Additional comments on Action Plan, including Timeline (The action plan should include measurable and specific action items that responds directly to the concerns outlined in the MOU)

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. Final Recommendations (Provide evaluative feedback that would improve any aspect of the program; The report may note recommendations that have been shown to be effective for continuous improvement at peer-like institutions)

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. Signatures

Prepared and submitted by (enter external reviewer's first and last names): Click or tap here to enter text.

External Reviewer's signature: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Appendix L: Response to External Findings TEMPLATE

Academic Program External Review Findings Response Template

Instructions:

This report should list the recommendations from the external reviewers and the department/cluster's response to those recommendations. Further, the department should work with its respective Dean/Associate Dean's office to indicate what actions will take place as a result of the review.

Deadline:

This report is due to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness by **(Date:)**.

Questions:

Any questions about the process can be directed to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at institutionaleff@bgsu.edu

I. Response to the External Reviewers' Recommendations

In this section of the report, please copy/paste the recommendations that the external reviewers provided in their report. Feel free to focus on the top 5 to 8 recommendations from the external reviewers' report that are more salient or timely to the department/cluster's needs. Then, provide a departmental/cluster response to each recommendation. This is an opportunity to agree with the recommendation or disagree with it (and in the latter case, to provide some context as to why). Copy/Paste from your existing Action Plan as needed for the third column (far right). Indicate which initiative(s) of the University's strategic plan would be addressed (See Appendix A for initiatives highlighted by the Provost as most pertinent to Program Review; For the full strategic plan, [click here](#)). Add lines to the table as necessary.

Recommendations from External Reviewers (copied from the external review report)	Response <i>Agree/Disagree (if so, context/rationale)</i>	Is this already addressed in the Department/Cluster Action Plan/Strategic Plan? Yes/No and How? What metrics will be used for evaluation of this Action Plan item? What is the timeline for accomplishment of this Action Plan item? Who will be the person(s) responsible?	Initiative(s) from the Strategic Plan, <i>Forward</i> (*), addressed by this specific Action Plan item <small>(*) See Appendix A for those initiatives highlighted by the Provost as most relevant to Program Review</small>

II. Self-Reflective Summary

In this section of the report, **reflect on the entire process of undergoing the review.** Prompt questions for consideration: Were there discoveries made during the Program Review about the department/cluster that are worth noting? Did the external reviewers' findings point to aspects of the department/cluster that were not originally mentioned in the self-study? Besides the listed actions, are there other aspects of the department/cluster that will change as a result of the study? Did the external reviewers confirm the activities that are well done in the department/cluster in ways that were expected? Unexpected? *This section may be in narrative or bullet format.*