GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

I. Charge to the Committee

The Committee for Department and Program Assessment at NJIT is charged with oversight of assessment of academic programs. The Committee establishes process and policies for the institutional review of: (1) professional accreditation self-studies and reports, and (2) all academic programs not included in professional accreditation review processes. The Committee establishes the program review process for academic programs that do not participate in prescribed professional accreditation reviews.

The Committee recommends actions to the provost and deans based on accreditation and program evaluation reports. Actions will be directed toward the improvement of the specific academic programs under review as well as the quality and efficacy of the overall academic program of the university. The review process should be used to enhance and inform strategic planning, program development, and the budget process.

II. The Program Review Process

The program review process is outlined in this document:

A. Procedures to establish committees to review each program
B. The outline and guidelines for the development of the review committee reports
C. Procedures relative to the presentation and evaluation of reports by the committee
D. Possible Committee actions on reports
E. The timeline for accomplishment of tasks in the process are established.

III. Criteria for Evaluation Excellence

Evaluation of programs is based on criteria associated with excellence in university academic programs and these criteria are consistent with standards of excellence established by Middle States, ABET, NAAB, AASCB and other educational accreditors. In general, program reports need to address these standards, and assessment by the Committee needs to focus on establishing program efficacy, strengths and weaknesses based on these criteria. General criteria include, but are not confined to:

1. The strength of the relationship of the program to the mission of the university and its centrality to the university’s academic offerings and academic strategic plan. This encompasses the contribution that the program makes to the university academic life and reputation.
2. The level of preparation of students for appropriate performance in their chosen fields, including subsequent course work and careers.
3. The strength of the relationship between enrollments, retention and graduation rates, demonstrating the viability of the program in attracting, retaining and
graduating students into the market place or to higher levels of academic preparation.
4. The extent to which students are meeting learning goals and objectives.
5. The quality of instruction.
6. The amount and quality of research conducted by faculty and opportunities for students to participate in research.

**IV. Process Guidelines**

The following describes the schedule of activities for the review of programs.

1. **Initiate Process (January)**
   The review process is initiated by the provost, who chairs the Review Committee for Department and Program Assessment, from the roster of programs scheduled for review in the coming academic year. The review committees are formed for designated programs. The chair of the program review committee is selected by the dean of the school in which the program resides. The dean and program review committee chair select internal program review committee members. Committee members may include:

   - Faculty representatives.
   - The Review Committee for Department and Program Assessment representatives.
   - Administration and staff as appropriate.

   The dean of the school and the program review committee chair are members on an ex-officio basis. The committee may want to consider including students and/or alumni. The NJIT’s Office of Institutional Research and Planning provides technical assistance to the program review committee.

2. **Form and Orient Review Committee (January/February)**
   Members of the Review Committee for Department and Program Assessment orient program review committees. The orientation consists of a review of guidelines, a review of procedures, and an overview of resources available to assist the program review committee. The orientation also includes review of the charge to the committee.

3. **Report and Recommendations Submitted to Dean (October)**
   All sections of the report need to be drafted 8-10 months after formation of the program review committee. The program reviews and recommendations are reported to the dean of the school in which the program resides. The dean's comments on the program review and recommendations to the internal program review committee are attached to the report.

4. The final draft of the self-study report needs to be submitted to all members of the Department and Program Review Committee at least two weeks prior to presentation and discussion of the program.
5. Dean Reports to the Review Committee for Department and Program Assessment
   (November/December)
   The dean presents the report, recommendations and comments to the Review Committee for
   Department and Program Assessment. The Committee analyzes the report for its sufficiency
   in addressing required report sections.

6. The summary of Committee comments, recommendations and recommended actions is
   added to the report and returned to the review committee. Copies of each completed report
   are filed in the Office of the Provost and (2) in the Office of Institutional Research and
   Planning.

V. Charge to the Review Committees

   A. Review all prior documents and reports relating to the development, status, and
      review of the program.
   B. Provide needed program descriptions.
   C. Identify data needed to document findings and retrieve or collect data from
      appropriate institutional sources.
   D. Analyze data: compare measurable program objectives defined by the program
      approval document to the outcomes.
   E. Interpret data: explain what the results mean in the context of the given program.
   F. Develop recommendations which are based on the analysis and interpretation of
      findings.
   G. Prepare a document, not to exceed 50 double-spaced pages. Appendixes may be
      added.
   H. Submit the document for the review process described above.

VI. Program Review Guidelines

   The following outlined sections must be addressed in the program review report. The table
   below also gives suggestions for data and information that may be useful in a full discussion
   of sections of the report:

Outline

A. Background
   1. Specify program title(s): all degrees awarded for the program under review,
      including options, as specified in the catalog
   2. Give a brief history of the program
   3. Program mode: (describe the proportion of courses given on/off campus, day,
      evening, distance education, etc.)

B. Previous Deficiencies and Actions to Correct (if any have identified during the previous
   reviews).
C. Students
   1. Enrollment trends (both majors and credit hours of instructional service to other programs at the university)
   2. Ethnic and gender diversity
   3. Full and part-time enrollment trends
   4. Student level of preparation identified by the course grades, instructor exams, standardized exams, capstone courses performance, senior theses, co-op experience, internships, and other relevant outcomes
   5. Retention and graduation rates
   6. Student advisement procedures
   7. Research opportunities
   8. Program student activities outside classroom activities and student/faculty contacts (other than classroom)

D. Program Outcomes Assessment Practices and Results
   1. Summarize program educational goals and outcomes
   2. Describe the processes used to assure that graduates have achieved the program outcomes and summarize findings
   3. Describe student success in terms of subsequent employment or further academic study
   4. Describe how the assessment results are implemented to improve the program

E. Faculty
   1. Describe the faculty with regard to size, tenure/non-tenure, full-time, part-time, rank and credentials of the faculty
   2. Analyze ethnic and gender diversity
   3. Describe the quality of instruction
   4. Describe faculty instructional development initiatives and faculty professional development

F. Facilities
   1. Describe classrooms, laboratories, equipment and infrastructure and their adequacy to the program goals
   2. Identify the opportunities students have to learn the use of modern technology tools
   3. Describe a plan and sufficiency of resources to acquire, maintain, and operate facilities and equipment

G. Institutional Support
   1. Describe the program’s budget, financial resources, and leadership necessary to achieve program’s objectives
   2. Describe the adequacy of faculty professional development
   3. Discuss the adequacy of support personnel and institutional services
H. Recommendations

Summarize the recommendations of the review committee. All recommendations must be based on analysis of the data and information collected for the study, and must be drawn from the implications of these analyses.

Editorial notes: The cover of the document should include the program name as well as the names of the members of the program review committee. The document must not exceed 50 pages of text, double spaced, although appendixes are permitted. The document should be prepared to allow for electronic distribution.

CURRENT SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMS FOR INTERNAL REVIEW

2004-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCE Program</th>
<th>Program Review Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S. &amp; PhD in Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Bill Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. &amp; PhD in Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>Basil Baltzis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in &amp; PhD Civil Engineering</td>
<td>John Schuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in &amp; PhD Environmental Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Atam Dhawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. &amp; PhD in Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Internet Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Engineering Management</td>
<td>Athanassios Bladikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in &amp; PhD Industrial Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. &amp; PhD in Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. &amp; PhD in Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Nadine Aubry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSLA Program</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Chemistry</td>
<td>Joseph W. Bozzelli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>