Program Review:  
Review Committee Report

The program review helps in long-range planning and in setting both university and program priorities. It informs administrators about the size and stability of a program, its future faculty resources and student market, its equipment and space needs, its strengths and weaknesses and its contribution to the mission of the institution.

The review committee is comprised of two to three experts in the discipline undergoing review, as well as one to two KSU faculty representatives. External reviewers play an essential role in the program review process because of their expertise in the discipline, objectivity and ability to place the program in a larger disciplinary context both nationally and internationally. The KSU faculty representatives contribute knowledge of the university’s mission, policies and practices.

The final report should cover program strengths, challenges/weaknesses, opportunities and recommendations for change. It should be evaluative rather than descriptive, and should be forward-looking, not simply an assessment of the program’s current status. The external reviewers are responsible for writing the final report, although the internal KSU faculty representatives may be asked to provide information and/or clarification. Typically, reports are 8-10 pages in length, and are due within four weeks following the campus visit.

The sections below mirror those of the unit’s self-study report, and may be used to guide the review process.

Section 1 – Mission, Goals and Context

1. Are the mission and scope of the department/school suitable given the current number of faculty and undergraduate and graduate students and the resources available to the program? For example, are there too many or too few areas of specialty/emphasis within the graduate program(s) given the size of the faculty and number of students?

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding the identified concentrations/emphases within the undergraduate program(s). For example, are there too many or too few areas of emphasis? Are the areas consistent with current professional and/or disciplinary trends?
3. Provide evaluative comments regarding the identified concentrations/emphases within the graduate program(s). For example, are there too many or two few areas of emphasis? Are the areas consistent with current professional and/or disciplinary trends?

4. Provide evaluative comments regarding how the undergraduate and graduate programs may have an impact locally, in the State of Ohio, nationally and internationally.

**Section 2 – Resources and Infrastructure**

1. Are the department/school’s office and laboratory spaces, specialized facilities and equipment and any other resources (e.g., computers, computer software, journal subscriptions) adequate?

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding how the department/school’s funding and resources are used to support undergraduate and graduate education.

3. Is the department/school’s revenue generation, including revenue generated through tuition, external funding and endowments, suitable given the size and scope of the program? Comment on the opportunities for revenue generation that are available to the program.

**Section 3 – Administration**

1. Is the administrative structure adequate in meeting the needs of the undergraduate and graduate programs and the students?

2. Please evaluate the student handbook(s), which should be provided in an Appendix to the unit’s self-study report. For example, are there areas that should be covered but are missing? Are there inconsistencies between the material covered in the handbook(s) and other university policies or procedures?

**Section 4 – Faculty Composition, Credentials, Workload and Scholarship**

1. Evaluate the diversity of department/school’s faculty.

2. Evaluate the overall scholarship and creative activity of the faculty with respect to both the quantity and quality of their work since the last review. Is this level of productivity what you would expect for a unit of this size and scope? Evaluate the outlets in which faculty are publishing and presenting their work.
3. Provide evaluative comments on the overall faculty workload, including research, undergraduate and graduate teaching, advising and service. Is this what you would expect for a unit of this size and scope?

4. Provide evaluative comments on the use of non-tenure track faculty, adjuncts and graduate students in teaching. Is this what you would expect for a unit of this size and scope?

Section 5 – External Grants and Sponsorship

1. Evaluate the overall sponsorship of the faculty. Is this the level you would expect for a unit of this size and scope?

2. What is your evaluation of the level of graduate student support from external awards given the goals and scope of the program?

3. Provide general comments and impressions of the unit’s funding history and prospects for future funding in light of the funding opportunities in the discipline.

Section 6 – Graduate Recruitment and Admissions

1. Provide evaluative comments about the quality and quantity of the graduate program(s) applicants, as well as those offered and accepting admission.

2. Evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment efforts of the program(s).

3. Evaluate the admissions criteria, including program selectivity and the effectiveness of the criteria.

Section 7 – Students Admitted and Graduated

Undergraduate Program(s)

1. Evaluate the quantity and quality of undergraduate student publications, presentations, performances, exhibits, showings, honors and awards.

2. Evaluative trends in enrollment, degrees awarded, student retention and the number of service courses offered.

Graduate Program(s)
1. Provide evaluative comments about program size, demographics and efforts to sustain diversity among the graduate student body.

2. Evaluate the quantity and quality of student publications, presentations, performances, exhibits, showings, honors and awards.

3. Evaluative trends in enrollment, time to degree, retention, degrees awarded and tuition/stipend support.

4. A list of graduate student theses and dissertations should be provided in an appendix to the unit’s self-study report. Please select several theses and/or dissertations from the list, and assess the quality of the students’ work. The complete documents are available on-line through the OhioLink Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Center. The preceding link will direct you to Kent State University’s Electronic Thesis and Dissertation page. From this page, select “Departments” from the navigation menu on the left-hand side of the screen. Each department or school is listed separately, with the college name appearing first in the list. Please note that departments/schools are listed twice—one link will take you to a list of theses and dissertations for that department, while the other will take you to undergraduate honors theses. There is no way to distinguish between the two links, so if one takes you to undergraduate honors theses, you will need to go back to the list and find the other link. Alternatively, you may use the search feature at the top of the page to search by department/school, thesis/dissertation title or author name.

Section 8 – Curriculum and Learning Environment

Undergraduate Program(s)

1. Provide evaluative comments regarding the ability of the undergraduate and graduate programs to prepare students for a career path.

1. Provide evaluative comments regarding the program requirements and course offerings. For example, is the curriculum up-to-date? Are course offerings meeting the needs of the students?

2. Are student learning outcomes assessed and is this information used to improve the student learning experience?

Graduate Program(s)

1. Provide evaluative comments regarding the program requirements and course offerings. For example, is the curriculum up-to-date? Are course offerings meeting the needs of the students?
2. Are student learning outcomes assessed and is this information used to improve the student learning experience?

Section 9 – Student Duties, Career Development and Quality of Life

Undergraduate Program(s)

1. Provide evaluative comments regarding the preparation of students for a career path.

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding faculty mentoring. For example, is faculty mentoring regularly assessed, and is the program making appropriate changes based on these assessments? Are faculty identifying and supporting students who are not making adequate progress to their degree? Is the program providing adequate support to students who have special challenges, such as those coming from an underrepresented group or different culture or those with disabilities?

3. Provide evaluative comments regarding the program-arranged internships/placements. For example, does the internship/placement enhance the pedagogical experience for the student? Are internships/placements regularly assessed, and is the program making appropriate changes based on these assessments?

Graduate Program(s)

1. Provide evaluative comments regarding the preparation of students for a career path.

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding faculty mentoring. For example, is faculty mentoring regularly assessed, and is the program making appropriate changes based on these assessments? Are faculty identifying and supporting students who are not making adequate progress to their degree? Is the program providing adequate support to students who have special challenges, such as those coming from an underrepresented group or different culture or those with disabilities?

3. Provide evaluative comments regarding the program-arranged internships/placements. For example, does the internship/placement enhance the pedagogical experience for the student? Are internships/placements regularly assessed, and is the program making appropriate changes based on these assessments?
4. Comment on the proportion of graduate students that receive full (20 hours/week) and half (10 hours/week) assistantships. Are the average stipend amounts above average, average or below average?

5. Are the duties of teaching assistants, research assistants and administrative assistants consistent with what you would expect? Are the students adequately prepared for and mentored in their duties?

6. Evaluate the program’s efforts to assess the quality of graduate assistantship positions and the performance of teaching, research and administrative assistants. Has adequate action been taken to improve the quality of assistantship positions?

Section 10 – Alumni

**Undergraduate Program(s)**

1. Is the program using an adequate process to gauge student satisfaction? Is feedback being used to improve program quality in an appropriate way?

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding the employment obtained by program graduates and the career paths that the program is designed to support.

**Graduate Program(s)**

1. Is the program using an adequate process to gauge student satisfaction? Is feedback being used to improve program quality in an appropriate way?

2. Provide evaluative comments regarding the employment obtained by program graduates and the career paths that the program is designed to support.

Section 11 – Distance Education

**Undergraduate Program(s)**

1. Evaluate the program’s use of distance education. For example, is the program taking advantage of current opportunities for distance education? Is there an appropriate balance between distance education and face-to-face offerings? Do distance education offerings have the same academic standards as face-to-face offerings?
2. Evaluate the program’s efforts to assess their distance education offerings. Has adequate action been taken to improve the quality of their offerings?

**Graduate Program(s)**

1. Evaluate the program’s use of distance education. For example, is the program taking advantage of current opportunities for distance education? Is there an appropriate balance between distance education and face-to-face offerings? Do distance education offerings have the same academic standards as face-to-face offerings?

2. Evaluate the program’s efforts to assess their distance education offerings. Has adequate action been taken to improve the quality of their offerings?

**Section 12 – Outcome of Last Program Review**

Evaluate the progress the program has made in addressing the recommendations identified in the previous program review.