

Program Review Self-Study Template

Revised 7/23/26

Department	
Dean & Assoc/Asst Deans	
Self-Study Team Members	
Submission Date	

This template is intended to be a guide for the team completing the program review self-study. When complete, you will have reviewed all aspects of your program including curriculum, faculty, and students. For each section, there is a central question in **bold** with follow up questions. It is not the expectation that you answer every individual question, although you may want to, but rather that you provide a thorough, evidence-based response to each central question. Please note that the Office of Institutional Research (IR) can provide assistance with *data* for all sections below upon request.

A department's self-study should be completed by a team of faculty, and all full-time faculty in the department should have an opportunity to read and comment on the final draft of the report before it is submitted. Within each section, please list the faculty who contributed to that section followed by their specific role, for example: “read the section”, “wrote the section”, “edited the section”, “contributed to the writing of the section”, etc. It is the responsibility of the Dean (or Assoc/Asst Dean) to ensure that multiple members of the department contribute to each section.

Here is an overview of the components that must be included in your self-study:

- Introduction and Context
- Department Faculty
- Department Service and General Education (GE) Courses
- Department Resources
- Program Level Analysis (one per program in the department)
- Goals and Recommendations for Program Improvement

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

I. Introduction and Context: This section describes central features of the programs in this department. Information in this section typically includes details for all categories below.

- A. **Overview: What academic program(s) are included in this self-study?** Include graduate and undergraduate, majors, minors, concentrations, and certificates.
- B. **History and Development: What do these reviewers need to know about the department's current programs to understand their context and how they function within the school/college and across the university?** How do your programs contribute to the university and discipline? How are they unique in responding to the needs of the community, region, and/or profession? This document will be read by the PLNU Program Review Committee, the Provost, and external reviewers.
- C. **Alignment with Mission: How do your programs align with PLNU's mission?** Review your department's mission, purpose, and practices, and discuss how the department's programs contribute to the University mission including the student's spiritual formation and character development. How do your programs align with PLNU's "University Promise" (brand platform) in helping students explore their calling? The response should provide examples, and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- D. **Belonging and Community: What efforts exist to foster a sense of belonging and community for faculty, staff, and students in your department?** How does the department promote a climate that embraces a variety of perspectives and cultures? In what ways have students been included in making decisions within the department? The response should provide examples, and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- E. **Overview of Special Issues: Are there unique issues or concerns that will be addressed in this self-study?** Is there anything unique about how the department addressed department level issues from the previous self-study?

DEPARTMENT FACULTY

II. Department Faculty: This section provides information and data about the faculty, faculty workloads, and student-faculty interactions. Responses for this section typically include details for categories below.

- A. **Overview: Who are the full-time and part-time faculty in the department.** Data should include rank, tenure status, degree, PLNU service years, the proportion of faculty with terminal degrees, list of faculty specialties within discipline (and how these align with the department programs' curriculum, and percent load in different divisions (TUG, GPS)).

Sample table

Name	FT or PT	Rank	Tenure status	Highest Degree	Years of Service	Specialty	% of load TUG	% of load GPS/AUG	% of load FE/GE	Comments or Unique factors (IE shared faculty member,

- B. **Faculty Scholarship & Creative Productivity: How is scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovations valued, supported, and disseminated in the department?**
Describe how the department promotes the connections between scholarship, teaching, student

learning, and service. The response should provide examples, and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.

- C. Faculty Workload: What insights does faculty workload data provide for the department's programs?** [IR will provide workload data upon request.] Do the SCH and SFTE to IFTE ratios compared to PLNU averages provide any insights? Compare the SCH load of each faculty member against the department average. Is the distribution of faculty workload equitable? Does the pattern of independent study units provide any insights that might be worth looking into? What role do part-time and adjunct faculty play in the quality and success of the department? What is the advising load for each faculty member? The response should provide evidence, and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- D. Faculty as a Resource: Do program faculty have the support they need to do their work?** Are there sufficient numbers of faculty to maintain program expectations? How has a variety of perspectives and cultures been fostered through faculty searches and recruitment, including developing a diverse candidate pool and the hiring process? If the department intends to request a faculty line, be sure to consider all of the questions and data in the "[New Full-Time Faculty Line Request Template](#)"
- E. Student-Faculty Interactions: What is the nature of the student-faculty interactions in the department?** What do the external surveys (e.g. SSI, NSSE, alumni survey) reveal about student-faculty interactions? Reflect on what the student perceptions data indicate about the quality of faculty-student interactions in your department, including caring, fairness, lack of bias, and timely feedback. The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.

DEPARTMENT SERVICE AND GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

III. General Education/Foundational Exploration/Service Courses. This section focuses on the department's responsibility for general education courses and service courses.

- A. GE courses: How has your academic program been impacted by the needs of GE courses?** List the GE courses offered and the associated GE PLOs. Include AUG GE courses. Review GE credit hours production data (see Data Depositories). What percentage of the FTEs and SCH is dedicated to GE courses? Are there changes that you could implement that would make your part of the GE more efficient and effective (e.g. reducing the number of low-enrollment sections, resequencing of classes, increase interdisciplinary efforts, etc...)? Discuss any new pedagogical practices that have been tried in GE classes by members of your department in the last few years. The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- B. GE course curriculum: What story does your GE assessment data tell?** What have you learned from your GE assessment data? Examine the assessment task(s) associated with the GE courses. Do these assessments align with the GE Learning Outcomes (GELOs)? What additional changes are you recommending based on your review of the GE assessment data? The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- C. Service Courses: How has your academic program been impacted by service courses?** What service courses (non-GE courses that primarily support a program in another department) does

your department teach? What percentage of your FTE and SCH is dedicated to service courses? Are there changes that you could make that would make your service courses more efficient and effective?

DEPARTMENT RESOURCES

IV. Allocation of Resources. This section focuses on the department's resources and their sustainability.

- A. Student Support: How is the department measuring the success and effectiveness of advising, student support, mentoring, etc.?** Are there sufficient mechanisms in place to assist students with achieving their academic goals and learning development? How do you know? [see Student surveys and alumni surveys for data.] What efforts have been instituted to promote equitable advising and mentoring practices, retention, and departmental climate and community for students? How is the department measuring the success and effectiveness of advising, student support, mentoring, etc.? The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- B. Technology and Information Literacy Resources: How are technology and information literacy (IT) resources used?** What technology and information literacy resources does the program currently use? Are there adequate Library and IT resources for sustaining the program?
- C. Facilities, Equipment, and Placements/Internships: What facilities and unique space or equipment (e.g., labs) does the program use?** Are the facilities adequate for sustaining the quality of the program? What evidence indicates that required or optional placements/internships are effectively managed?

Data in this section might include classroom space, instructional laboratories, research laboratories, office space, student study spaces, access to classrooms suited for IT purposes, access to classrooms designed for alternative learning styles/universal design, and evaluation processes for these.

- D. Staff and Other Resources: What clerical and technical staff support program operations?** What other resources support the mission of the program? Speak to supporting a variety of perspectives and cultures among staff.

PROGRAM (MAJOR) LEVEL ANALYSES

In this section, you will profile each program or major within the department individually. Review the program's students, curriculum, evidence of learning, curriculum alignment, and program sustainability, and then propose changes. Then repeat these sections for the next program in the department. Profiles for each program typically include information for categories V, VI, and VII below. In each individual section, include strengths as well as opportunities for improvement. The program profile should include data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (IR).

V. Evidence of Program Success

- A. Previous Program Review: What progress have you made on the recommendations from the previous program review?** What is the evidence that the findings from the previous program

review have been addressed? Have any additional significant changes have been made since the last program review?

- B. Student Learning: What evidence indicates that students in this program are learning?** Review the last three years of assessment reports for this program. What evidence shows that the students are (or are not) achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program? How are the expected levels of learning determined? How do you know the expected level is rigorous? Describe the mechanisms in place to ensure fairness and consistency in grading and assessment across shared courses? What mechanisms are in place to identify areas where students may be struggling as they proceed through the program? How does the program address any identified gaps in student learning? If your department is part of an external accreditation process, what is the success rate of boards or licensure exams, etc.? What issues of inequity or barriers to achievement have you identified? How have you used assessment results to remove or minimize those barriers and improve student learning? What does the Annual Program Metric (APM) data show about underrepresented students in your department (DFW rates & attrition)? Are there any disparities in student outcomes such as time-to-degree or degree completion? The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- C. Student Experience: What are students' perceptions of their experience in this program?** What does the program's Net Promoter Score tell you about the program? [IR can provide this score for you.] Review the alumni survey results and reflect on students' perceptions of their preparedness for careers. What does the student survey feedback from SSI and the NSSE tell you about the program? What are student perceptions of the clarity and reasonableness of major requirements? Are students being retained and graduating in a timely fashion? Additional information about students' assessment of their PLNU experience, post-graduation plans, and post baccalaureate educational and employment endeavors may be available through IR. The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- D. Curriculum Quality: What evidence demonstrates the quality of the curriculum?** A program curriculum is a series of courses designed to help a student reach the level of formal education that they are pursuing. How does the program's curriculum incorporate interdisciplinary and experiential learning opportunities? How does the program's curriculum align with industry trends? Where in the program's curriculum is career readiness embedded? Where appropriate, have external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, reviewed the program? How does your program content and pedagogy respect the diversity of PLNU's student body and integrate diversity of thought? How does the program adapt to changing educational trends, industry demands, and student needs? What evidence shows that students are prepared to apply their advanced study to the world of work? What mechanisms are in place for students to offer feedback on the relevance and effectiveness of the curriculum? The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.
- E. Aspirational Programs: How does the program compare to three external benchmark and/or aspirational programs?** [Consult with the Dean to identify benchmark and/or aspirational programs.] What are current trends or movements in the discipline? What facilities and faculty resources are in alignment with our programs and student numbers? Provide a comparative analysis that includes evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement.

VI. Curriculum Alignment and Proposed Changes

- A. Learning outcomes: What evidence indicates that the Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's) are relevant and rigorous?** How do the PLOs compare to the PLOs of the three aspirant programs?

Do your PLOs reflect the knowledge and skills that your team believes are most important for students to achieve upon completion of this academic program? If no, list the revised PLOs. What evidence shows that the PLO assessments are rigorous? In the design of the assessment tasks, what considerations were made to ensure the assessment tasks are equitable?

- B. Curriculum Map: How are the PLOs aligned with specific courses?** A curriculum map shows how the learning outcomes map to specific courses within the curriculum at the level of “introduced”, “developed”, and “mastered”. Examine your program’s curriculum map. Review the course learning outcomes to see how they align with what is stated in the curriculum map. What changes need to be made to ensure alignment between the revised PLOs and what is taught in the program curriculum? What mechanisms are in place to identify students’ input on the curriculum? Provide a revised Curriculum Map as needed.
- C. Assessment Map: How do you know the quality of the PLO assessments?** Examine the program’s assessment map. An assessment map shows in which courses the PLOs are measured. (This information may already be included in the curriculum map.) PLO Assessment data should be collected from Junior and Senior level courses where the PLOs are being mastered by students. Review the assessment tasks for each learning outcome. What changes need to be made to ensure alignment between the PLOs and the assessment tasks? What mechanisms are in place to identify students’ input on the assessment process? Provide a revised Assessment Map as needed.
- D. Curriculum Improvements: How is the assessment data informing program curriculum improvements?**¹ Review the last few years of assessment reports for this program. How is student feedback being used to drive improvements in the program? What innovative or creative curricular features might be useful in enhancing the quality of the program? Does your program have a culminating experience (capstone course)?² What changes will you make to the capstone curriculum based on student survey feedback and the revised PLOs? What mechanisms are in place to support continuous improvement in curriculum and assessment processes?

VII. Program Sustainability: This section provides an opportunity to focus on two or three annual program metrics (APMs).

- A. Annual Program Metric (APM) “Deep Dive”: What insights have the APMs provided for each program?** The APM reports focus on 10 to 12 metrics. Choose two of the APMs that the program can improve on. What has the department learned from these APMs? Examine the longitudinal trends for those metrics. What changes have been made during that time? The response should provide evidence and discuss strengths as well as areas for improvement. What narrative related to your programs and department is not explained well by the APM data? Please present data to help explain this narrative.

¹ If the data are “perfect” meaning that all students are always meeting all criteria every year, then the bar may have been set too low. Actionable assessment data is critical for continuous program improvements.

² A culminating experience (e.g. cumulative portfolio, signature assignments, senior project, or capstone course) is a senior-level activity wherein students demonstrate mastery of the program’s student learning outcomes.

GOALS & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

VIII. Goals for Improvement: Create a brief reflection summary to serve as a foundation for developing the program's long-term plan. The Chair of the Program Assessment and Review Committee would be happy to meet with you to help guide you through this section if desired. The intent is to provide an overview of the program's strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. Several guiding questions include:

- A. What are the program's primary goals for the next five to seven years?
- B. How will the program use assessment data for creating and measuring program improvement goals?
- C. To achieve these goals, how will the program address any weaknesses and build on existing strengths?
- D. How will the program make improvements with existing resources (through reallocation) and with new resources or innovative collaborations?
- E. If the program is currently using an already developed and executed long-term plan, please indicate how the current plan will integrate with the existing plan.

IX. Recommendations for Improvement

Please create a combined list of program recommendations and rank order that list according to the department's priorities. Please provide a very brief rationale for the ranking.

X. Faculty Contributions: List the faculty who acknowledge reviewing the final report. Also, as stated in the introduction, be sure that within each section above there is a list of the faculty who contributed to that section followed by their specific role, for example: "read the section", "wrote the section", "edited the section", "contributed to the writing of the section", etc.

Program Assessment & Review Committee and External Review

The steps of the program review process are below:

1. The Self-Study is completed by the department in communication with the Office of Institutional Research and Educational Effectiveness.
2. The complete self-study is sent to the chair of the Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC) and the Dean.
3. The Dean and PARC chair identify an external reviewer and ensure that an external review is completed. (For programs with external accreditation, sometimes an external review is not required.) The only person who will communicate with the external reviewer is the PARC chair.
4. The external reviewer report is sent to the department for their consideration and a response if desired.
5. PARC reviews the self-study and then incorporates the external reviewer feedback into a combined report that goes back to the Dean and department leader.
6. The Dean and Provost finalize an MOU with an action plan.

The self-study report, the PARC letter, and the MOU will comprise a completed program review.

Abbreviations

IU = Instructional Units: Generated faculty workload units excluding release time

IFTE = Instructional Full-Time Equivalent: Total Instructional workload units divided by 24

SCH = Student Credit Hours: Generated student credit hours associated with the faculty member

SFTE = Student Full-Time Equivalent: Total Student Credit hours divided by 32 for undergraduates/24 for graduate students

GELO = Gen Ed Learning Outcome

PLO = Program Learning Outcome

IR = Institutional Research Office

APM = Annual Program Metric report