TOURO UNIVERSITY
CALIFORNIA

Academic Program Review

Academic Program Review Process

Section 1: Introduction

All academic programs at Touro University California are subject to systematic program review. The program review process is designed to evaluate and enhance the quality of academic programs through a focus on student learning outcomes, evidence-based decisions, and integration with institutional planning. This reflection on assessment results allows for programs to make evidence-based conclusions regarding their performance and evidence-based decisions in proposing major programmatic changes or in requesting resources. These evidence-based decisions and requests are then shared with the Provost and integrated with the planning and budgeting processes

Integration with Student Learning Outcome Assessment

While programs document their assessment efforts and student learning outcomes in annual updates, the program review process incorporates student learning outcomes information gathered during multiple years and the findings are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The complete program review, occurring no more frequently than every five years, cast in a broader frame by also taking into account the resources that support student learning, the program's relationship to internal and external stakeholders, changes in its discipline and in societal trends, and the evaluation of external reviewers.

Integration with Professional Accreditation

All TUC degree programs hold specialized accreditations as required in their fields. These accreditations impose regular evaluations by external reviewers. To avoid duplication of effort, the program review process is designed to integrate seamlessly with programs' existing professional accreditation activities. TUC's program review is scheduled to occur in concert with the accreditation visit. Programs with specialized accreditation cycles longer than seven years will be scheduled to prepare an interim report for the university at the halfway mark of their accreditation cycle. When possible, these reports are integrated into required interim accreditation reports.

Section 2: Components of Program Review

The Touro University California program review process consists of 3 key components: a self-study, an external review and an MOU. These components align with

fundamental institutional concerns regarding program accreditation, the assessment of Touro University ISLOs, program improvements, and strategic planning.

Self-Study Report

Prior to the formal Program Review, programs will be required to submit a Self-Study Report to the Program Review Committee. The Self-Study Report consists of an analysis of the following information collected since the last program review. Programs substituting professional accreditation self-study for the program review self-study will need to crosswalk the accreditation report with TUC standards below and submit additional data if applicable.

1. Introduction
   a. Program mission and how it relates to the institutional mission
   b. Major changes since the last program review
   c. Program goals and student learning outcomes
2. Program Effectiveness
   a. Student profile summary
      i. Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee to understand the profile of students and its relationship to the program mission or goals. Examples of student profile information may but is not restricted to include enrollment trends, distributions of student gender/ethnicity/age, GPA from previous institution, admissions interview/test scores, and student employment status.
   b. Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness
      i. Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee to demonstrate the quality of the curriculum offered by the program. Evidence of curriculum quality may but is not restricted to include a curriculum flowchart (description of how the curriculum addresses programmatic student learning outcomes), a comparison of the program's curriculum with curricula at other institutions, a comparison of the program's curriculum with professional standards, reports from curriculum retreats, examples of course syllabi (with student learning outcomes), or results from student/faculty surveys.
      ii. Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee to demonstrate the quality of instruction. Evidence of instructional quality may but is not restricted to include course evaluation results, peer evaluations of teaching, faculty self-evaluations, faculty

scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, reports from programmatic discussions of instruction.

    iii. Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee to demonstrate the quality of other learning experiences provided by the program. Evidence of this may but is not restricted to include participation rates or evaluations of clinical experiences, internships, or research experiences.

  c. Student Learning & Success

    i. Programs will submit all annual student learning outcomes assessment updates completed since the last program review. This will provide the Program Review Committee with a list of measures used by the program to assess Touro University SLOs, results from those measures, the degree to which students achieve these SLOs, and uses of these assessment results.

    ii. Programs will submit annual student retention and completion rates (disaggregated by demographic categories)

    iii. Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee to demonstrate the achievement of programmatic student learning outcomes. Evidence of this may but is not restricted to include licensure/certification exam scores, grade distributions by course, trends in program GPAs, job placements, placement of graduates into continuing education programs, employer evaluations of graduates' preparation, graduating senior survey results, alumni survey results, or alumni achievements.

  d. Faculty Accomplishments

    i. Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee to demonstrate the qualifications and achievements of the faculty in relation to program mission and goals. Evidence of this may but is not restricted to include records of scholarship activity, list of faculty specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program mission), teaching quality (peer- or self-evaluations), external funding awarded to faculty, record of professional practice, faculty service activities, distribution of faculty across ranks (or years experience at institution), diversity of faculty, or awards/recognition.

3. Evidence of program viability and sustainability

 a. Demand for the program

    i.   Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee to demonstrate an ongoing demand for the program. Evidence of this may but is not restricted to include trends in the number of student applications or admission rate, an analysis of what is happening within the profession, local community, or society generally that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future.

b. Allocation of resources

    i.   Faculty: Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee in demonstrating sufficient resources necessary to maintain program quality. Possible information may but is not restricted to include number of full-time faculty, ratio of full-time to part-time faculty, student-faculty ratios, faculty workload, faculty review/evaluation processes, mentoring processes, professional development opportunities, professional development resources (including travel funds), or release time for course development/research.

   ii.   Student Support: Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee in demonstrating sufficient resources necessary to maintain program quality. Possible information may but is not restricted to include academic advising programs/resources, tutoring/remediation programs, orientation/transition programs, financial support (scholarships, fellowships, etc), support for engagement in the campus community, support for emotional/psychological/physical interventions

  iii.   Information and technology resources: Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee in demonstrating sufficient resources necessary to maintain program quality. Possible information may but is not restricted to include library print/electronic holdings in the program areas; technology resources available to support programmatic instruction, research, and student needs.

  iv.   Facilities: Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee in demonstrating sufficient resources necessary to maintain program quality. Possible information may but is not restricted to include classroom space, instructional labs, research labs, office space, student study space, access to classrooms suited for instructional technology.

   v.   Financial resources: Any information deemed critical by the program or Program Review Committee in demonstrating sufficient resources

necessary to maintain program quality. Possible information may but is not restricted to include the program operational budget and trends since the last program review.

4. Summary Reflections

    a. An interpretation of the findings from the analysis of program evidence, including program strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. Examples of questions to be addressed may but is not restricted to include: (a) Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with program goals? (b) Are program goals aligned with the goals of the constituents the program serves? (c) Is the level of program quality aligned with the University's and students' acceptable levels of program quality? (d) Are program goals being achieved? (e) Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the expected level?

5. Future goals and proposals

    a. A list of the program's goals for the next few years. These goals should align with what was learned through the self-study. If possible, measures and criteria should be specified for each goal in order to track progress.

    b. An explanation of how the program intends to achieve these goals. Examples of questions to be addressed may but is not restricted to include: (a) How will the program specifically address any weaknesses identified in the self-study? (b) How will the program build on existing strengths? (c) What internal improvements are possible with existing resources (through reallocation)? (d) What improvements can only be addressed through additional resources? (e) Where can the formation of collaborations improve program quality?

    c. A list of any formal proposals the program would like to make in order to meet its goals. The proposals should be clearly supported by information reported in the external review and self-study.

External Review

The purpose of external review at Touro University California is to provide another outside perspective besides program professional accreditation agencies to ensure program quality and program effectiveness.   The responsibility of external reviewers is to provide a constructive, expert analysis of the program quality in delivering its curriculum and addressing its student learning outcomes, and to provide recommendations for future planning and improvements.

1. Selection and Contracting Process

In consultation with their faculty, program chair or college dean from the reviewed program submits a list of names including a summary of the expertise of proposed reviewers to PRC. PRC recommends one or two candidates to the provost /COO, who will make the final decision. Once external reviewers have been identified, a formal letter and contract is issued by the Office of Provost, with copies to the department chair and college dean. Office of Provost handles all paperwork for payment of the honorarium and reimbursement for transportation, lodging and visitation expenses.

When selecting external reviewer, programs take into account the following:
    a. _Discipline Expertise_
Candidates should have teaching and/or administration experiences in the reviewed program discipline.
    b. _Student Learning Outcomes Assessment & Program Review Experience_
At least one candidate has experience with program review, student learning outcomes assessment, institutional effectiveness, external review or accreditation and overall good fit for the reviewed program.
    c. _Conflicts of Interest_
Candidates are ineligible if they graduated from Touro, worked at Touro within the past five years, were a prospective candidate for employment at Touro, are related to a Touro employee, or other conflicts of interest.
    d. _Location Logistics_
Program should make every effort to nominate candidates who reside/work locally. If a candidate is not local, the program chair or dean has a preliminary discussion with the Program Review Committee Chair about resources to support participation for the site visit.

2. On-campus Visit

    a. PRC contacts the external reviewers to arrange their campus visit dates. The visit requires one or two days on campus. If two reviewers are hired, both reviewers will participate in all the campus visit activities and jointly contribute to the external reviews report.
    b. Once external reviewers and the site visit dates are confirmed, PRC informs the program chair and college dean. As the host, the program is responsible to:
        i. Schedule rooms for all external reviewer discussions with student, alumni, staff and faculty, etc. and inform involved people about the site visit and

  prepare them to participate in group discussions with the external reviewers.

  ii. Work with PRC to set up a Site Visit Schedule (Appendix A for a template).

  iii. Designate a private, secure office/workspace for the external reviewers.

  iv. Provide any documents the reviewers need to consult.

  v. Assign one person to escort the external reviewers between discussion groups the day(s) of the site visit.

 c. PRC sends to each external reviewer, at least 3 weeks prior to the visit, the following:

  i. Independent Contractor Agreement (Appendix B)

  ii. Program Self-study and other relevant documents

  iii. Schedule of the campus visit

  iv. External Reviewer Report Cover Points (Appendix C)

3. External Review Report

The external review report focuses on insights from the self-study report and the site visit. Following the points from the External Reviewer Report Cover Points, this report describes the existing strengths and weaknesses of the program, and provides recommendations from the perspective of experts in a given program's discipline. The report is expected 2-3 weeks after the reviewers' visit to TUC and should be sent directly to the chair of PRC.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
Members of the PRC review the *Self-Study* (including any additional information deemed necessary by the Program Review Committee), the *External Review* and a collection of the annual student learning outcomes updates submitted by the program since its last review and invite the College Dean, Program Director(s), and program faculty to present their materials at a program review meeting. During this meeting, program representatives will walk through and address questions about the program's mission, goals, self-study information, and future goals/proposals.

PRC develops a *Formal Findings & Recommendations Report*. This report summarizes the PRC's evaluation of the recently completed program review. In this report, the PRC may include but not limited to include:
- A holistic evaluation of the program review

- Suggestions for improving program goals, measures, criteria, or other self-study components
- Comments about the program's progress in meeting recommendations from its accrediting agency and other external reviewers
- Suggestions for improving the program's effectiveness, including potential collaborations with other programs
- Concerns about the impact of future proposals
- A list of steps to be taken (or additional information desired) in preparation for the next program review
- *Recommendations for Administration* section whereby the PRC may suggest ideas for budgeting and strategic planning.

The *Formal Findings & Recommendations Report* will be submitted to the College Dean, Program Chair(s), and Provost within 4 weeks following the completed program review. Program Chair (s), College Dean and Provost write and sign an MOU (memorandum of understanding), responding to PRC Formal *Findings & Recommendations Report*. The MOU may contain:
- Recommendations that the department is expected to fulfill by the next review, including a timeline with progress milestones.
- Recommendations for resource allocation.

The MOU will share with different stakeholder groups. To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, each year program review committee will meet with dean and program chairs of the reviewed programs to discuss the progress. Based on the progress to date, the action plan may be updated or modified, or the original MOU may be revised.

Copies of the unedited program review documents (self-study report, external review report, responses, and findings and recommendations report, MOU) will be sent to Provost, Dean/Program Chair and Faculty Senate.

Program Review Flowchart

Timeline		Action
The Academic Year Preceding the Scheduled Program Review	By May 30th	**PRC Chair Notifies Program Chair/College Dean of the Scheduled Program Review and Forwards** a. *TUC Program Review Guidelines* b. *Program Review Checklist*
	By November 30th	**Program Chair/College Dean Submits the Materials to PRC Chair** a. *Self Study Report* b. *Annual Assessment Reports* c. *External Review Candidates Contact Information*
	By December 15th	**PRC Provides the Program/College with:** a. *Self Study Feedback* b. *The Selected External Reviewer(s)*
	By December 30th	**PRC Chair Forwards Materials to the External Reviewer(s)**
The Academic Year Of the Scheduled Program Review	By March 5th	**External Reviewer(s) Campus Visit**
	By March 30th	**External Reviewer(s) Submit** *External Review Report* **to PRC Chair**
	By April 30th	**PRC Meet with Program Representatives**
	By June 30th	**PRC Submits** *Formal Findings & Recommendations* **to Program Chair/College Dean and the Provost**
The Academic Year Following the Scheduled Program Review	By August 30th	**Program Chair/College Dean and the Provost Share M*emorandum of Understanding* with Stakeholders;**

Program Review Schedule: Seven-Year Cycle

Programs	Colleges	Professional Accreditation Schedule	Program Review Schedule
Physician Assistant	College of Education & Health Sciences	2011- ARC-PA	2011-2012
MSMHS	College of Osteopathic Medicine		2012-2013
Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine	College of Osteopathic Medicine	2015-COCA	2013-2014
Public Health	College of Education & Health Sciences	2014-CEPH	2013-2014
Doctor of Pharmacy	College of Pharmacy	2015-ACPE	2014-2015
Nursing	College of Education & Health Sciences	2015-AACN	2015-2016
Graduate School of Education	College of Education & Health Sciences	2017-CCTC	2016-2017
MSMHS	College of Pharmacy		2017-2018

Note: New academic program proposals will be reviewed along with regularly scheduled program reviews

2018-WASC Onsite Visit

Appendix B

<div align="center">

Academic Program Review
External Review Final Report Cover Points

</div>

The External Reviewers write a brief report of roughly five to ten pages that responds to the following elements of the given program:

1. <u>Program Capacity</u>
   a. Has the program clearly articulated its program mission, program goals and student learning outcomes?
   b. Is it realistic in terms of faculty, facilities, financial support, institutional commitment, students and the employment market?
   c. Is the current curriculum content and design appropriate to enable students to develop the skills and attain the outcomes needed for graduates of this program?
   d. Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment, resources, staff, and support services?
   e. Provide recommendations and commendations on the program

2. <u>Students</u>
   a. Is there an adequate supply of qualified students?
   b. Has the program been successful in its student recruitment, retention and graduation goals?
   c. Are admissions criteria and performance standards clearly stated and consistently applied?
   d. Does the record of employment placement correspond to the institutional objectives and type of program?
   e. Provide recommendations and commendations regarding students

3. <u>Faculty</u>
   a. Are faculty competencies/credentials appropriate for the discipline and degree?
   b. Does the system for evaluating teaching practices facilitate continuous improvement of teaching and learning throughout the program?
   c. Is faculty adequately supported and engaged in ongoing professional development necessary for staying current in their field and continuously updating their courses/curriculum and/or research?
   d. Has the program been successful in its faculty recruitment and retention goals?
   e. Provide recommendations and commendations regarding faculty

4. <u>Assessment and strategic planning</u>

a. Does the program assessment plan clearly articulate student learning outcomes, assessment tools, procedures for gathering evidence of student learning?
b. How are assessment results used to improve the program and in strategic planning?
c. Provide recommendations and commendations regarding assessment and planning

5. Program improvement and development
    a. Given the existing strengths and weaknesses of the program, how can efficiency and effectiveness of the program be increased?
    b. How could the curriculum of this program be improved over the next five years?
    c. What actions would be required to accomplish the improvement given current level of resources (faculty, staff, facilities, equipment, etc.)?
    d. Provide recommendations and commendations regarding program improvement and development

6. Other comments and suggestions
    a. Overall health of the program
    b. Please comment on any program specific concerns (e.g. professional accreditation concerns)
    c. How is the program rated in comparison to other programs in the profession?
    d. Please make any comments regarding aspects of this program not covered in this review which you think should be described
    e. Provide general recommendations and commendations

Appendix C

Academic Program Review
External Review Onsite Visit Schedule Template

8:45am	(15 mins)	Meet with Program Review Committee
9:00am	(75 mins)	Meet with Program Self-Study Group
10:15am	(60 mins)	Meet with program faculty
11:15am	(60 mins)	External Reviewer time: recap meetings, review materials, & break time
12:15pm	(60 mins)	Lunch with students and/or alumni
1:15pm	(60 mins)	External Reviewer time: recap meetings, review materials, & break time
2:15pm	(45 mins)	Meet with the Dean
3:00pm	(45 mins)	Meet with the Provost
3:45pm	(60 mins)	External Reviewer time: complete notes on the external review team summary sheet & exit/debriefing meeting with Office for Education Effectiveness
4:45pm	(15 mins)	Exit meeting with the Program
5:00pm		Optional – continuation of External Review team discussions and drafting report

Appendix D

Independent Contractor Agreement

This Independent Contractor Agreement ("Agreement") is made this _____ (date) by and between Touro University-California ("Principal"), having its place of business at 1310 Club Drive, Mare Island, Vallejo CA 94592, and _____ (name), an Independent Contractor ("Contractor") at _____ (address), collectively "the Parties".

Article 1. Term of Contract

Section 1.01. This Agreement shall be effective on _____ (date) and will terminate on _____ (date).

Article 2. Services to be Performed by Contractor

Section 2.01. Contractor shall perform the following services pursuant to Principal's by-laws and adopted procedures.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

Section 2.02. Contractor shall perform all services in a manner satisfactory to Principal. Contractor shall not employ methods that jeopardize the standing or reputation of Principal in the community.

Article 3. Compensation

Section 3.01. Subject to satisfactory completion of all services, as determined solely by Principal, Contractor shall receive compensation for its services as follows:

_____

_____

_____

Contractor shall submit to Principal monthly invoices with detailed information regarding the billed charges, including number of hours worked per month. Invoices shall be sent to: Accounts Payable Department, Touro University, 1310 Club Drive, Mare Island, Vallejo, CA 94502. Payment for Contractor services shall be made within thirty (30) days of Principal's receipt of Contractor's invoice.

Article 4. Obligations of Contractor

Section 4.01. Independent Contractor Status. The Parties jointly agree that Contractor shall hold Independent Contractor status for services performed under this Agreement. Contractor shall report and pay all applicable taxes, state disability insurance and any other such applicable taxes upon all compensation earned in performance of this Agreement.

Section 4.02. Indemnification. Contractor shall indemnify and hold harmless Principal and Principal's related entities form the acts or omissions of Contractor, its employees, officers or related entities in the performance of this Agreement.

Section 4.03. Assignment. Neither this Agreement nor any duties or obligations under this Agreement may be assigned by Contractor without prior written consent of Principal.

Section 4.04. Adherence to Principal's Rules. At all times during the performance of this Agreement, Contractor shall adhere to the general rules, regulations and policies of Principal.

Article 5. Obligations of Principal

Section 5.01. Reasonable Requests. Principal agrees to comply with all reasonable requests of Contractor necessary to the performance of Contractor's duties under this Agreement.

Article 6. Termination of Agreement

Section 6.01. Termination. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, Principal may terminate this Agreement at any time without advance notice. Contractor may terminate this Agreement by giving five (5) days advance written notice to Principal.

Section 6.02. Termination on Occurrence of Stated Events. This Agreement shall terminate automatically on the occurrence of any of the following events: (1) Bankruptcy or insolvency of either Party or (2) Death of Contractor.

Article 7. Privacy Rights

Section 7.01. Principal's Ownership of Materials. All items provided by Principal to Contractor shall be and remain the sole property of Principal, including but not limited to proprietary information; records; financial, sales and other data; profile data; keys; supplies and other materials. Upon termination of this Agreement, Contractor shall return all such materials still in possession of Contractor to Principal immediately, including any copies or notes made there from. Principal shall have and retain rights and ownership to all work product developed by Contractor under this Agreement. Principal shall not be required to obtain approvals from Contractor, nor shall Principal be required to pay additional fees to Contractor in order to use or reproduce work product for any business purpose.

Section 7.02. Confidentiality. Contractor agrees and acknowledges that any and all information and materials provided by Principal to Contractor shall be treated as confidential information, unless such information is readily available to the public. Contractor further agrees that it shall not use said confidential information for any purpose or reason other than for the benefit of Principal. Contractor shall not disclose to any third party any confidential information gained through this Agreement, unless authorized in advance in writing by Principal.

Article 8. General Provisions

Section 8.01. Notices. All notices to be given hereunder by either Party to the other may be effected by personal delivery in writing or by mail. Mailed notices shall be addressed to Contractor at the address appearing in the introductory paragraph of this Agreement. Notices to Principal shall be addressed to the Chief Financial Officer, Touro University-California at the address appearing in the introductory paragraph of this Agreement.

Section 8.02. Entire Agreement of the Parties. This Agreement supersedes any and all agreements, either oral or written, between the Parties hereto with respect to the rendering of services by Contractor for Principal and contains all of the covenants and agreements between the Parties with respect to the rendering of such services in any manner whatsoever. Each party to this Agreement acknowledges that no representations, inducements, promises or agreements orally or otherwise, have been made by either Party, or any one acting on behalf of any party, which are not embodied herein, and that no other agreement, statement, or promise not contained in this Agreement shall be valid or binding. Any modification of this Agreement shall be effective only if made in writing and jointly executed by both Parties.

Section 8.03. Partial Invalidity. If any provision of this Agreement is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of this Agreement will continue in full force and effect without being impaired or invalided in any way.

Section 8.04. Attorney's Fees. If any action at law or in equity, including an action for declaratory relief, is brought to enforce or interpret the provisions of this Agreement, the prevailing party will be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, which may be set by the court in the same action, in addition to any other relief to which that Party may be entitled.

Section 8.05. Arbitration. Any controversy or any claim arising out of or relating to this Agreement or the breach thereof shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the rules of the American Arbitration Association and judgment on the award rendered may be entered in any court having jurisdiction.

Section 8.06. Governing Law. This Agreement will be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF and acknowledging acceptance and agreement of the foregoing, Principal and Contractor affix their signatures hereto.

Principal   **Contractor**

Touro University-California

_____   _____
Signature   Signature

Provost, Touro University_____   _____
Title   Name

_____   _____
Date   Date

References & Resources

California State University, Northridge Guidelines for External Reviewers' Campus Visit. Retrieved January 6, 2011, from http://blogs.csun.edu/ugs/program-review/

California State University, Northridge Guidelines for Program Review- Consultant's Evaluation Reports. Retrieved January 6, 2011, from http://blogs.csun.edu/ugs/program-review/

John F. Kennedy University Program Review Guide. (2009). Retrieved January 6, 2011, from https://www.westmont.edu/_offices/institutional_portfolio/program_review/documents/JFKUProgramReviewGuide2009.pdf

San Francisco State University Academic Program Review Sixth Cycle Handbook. Retrieved January 6, 2011, from http://academic.sfsu.edu/CMS_uploads/files/11apee-139.pdf

University of La Verne College of Arts and Sciences Program Review General Guidelines for External Peer Reviewers. (2009). Retrieved January 6, 2011, from http://sites.laverne.edu/institutional-research/files/2011/09/WASC-external-reviewer-guide-10-12-2009.pdf

University of San Diego Guidelines for Academic Program Review. (2011). Retrieved January 6, 2011, from http://www.sandiego.edu/cas/documents/assessment/USDAPRGuidelinesandAppendices07-18-2011.pdf

WASC Program Review Resource Guide. (2009). Retrieved December 8, 2011, from http://wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/Program_Review_Resource_Guide___Sept_2009.pdf

WASC Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews. (2008). Retrieved July 8, 2011, from http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/Rubrics___combined.pdf

Western University of Health Sciences Program Review Process Draft (Personal Communication, October 24, 2011)