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INTRODUCTION

The periodic review of programs at Morgan State University is a natural and inevitable consequence of two facts. The first fact is the expansion in recent years of the number of undergraduate and graduate (including doctoral) programs, many of which have never been evaluated. The second fact is the increasing national trend towards the assessment of program quality at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and across many institutions and fields, as a result of demands from legislatures, the public, and consumers for proof that dollars spent on higher education are well-spent and that the public is receiving something valuable, in return for its investment.

This fact aside, the review process in and of itself proves beneficial to programs, by affording the opportunity to document the need for additional resources, either to maintain current quality, to correct perceived weaknesses, or to enable a program to advance by realizing projected goals; and by documenting those things which the program is doing well and which enhance its reputation. Even more importantly, self-initiated review of programs is evidence of a degree of institutional maturity, in reflecting upon, and making changes to, its processes, to demonstrate institutional discipline, to safeguard institutional integrity, and to ensure that its offering constitutes the best possible program an institution is capable of producing.

This report\(^1\) represents an effort to implement periodic review of programs by establishing a conceptual framework based upon, both recommendations of national academic bodies,\(^2\) and practices evident at a number of American higher education institutions.\(^3\) Specifically, this periodic review will cover program inventory of academic units/departments, as well as other curricular offerings such as certificates. Thus, program review seeks to: (a) evaluate the relationship between programs and the University, School, and Departmental

\(^1\)History of Committee Work: In February, 2006, the Ad Hoc Task Force on the Review of Graduate Programs was appointed by Dr. Maurice Taylor, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, and this Task Force functioned as a subcommittee of the Policies and Procedures Committee of the Graduate Council, chaired by Dr. Howard Simmons of the School of Education and Urban Affairs. The Task Force activity unfolded in four phases. The first phase, APrinciples and Best Practices,\(^@\) completed in April, 2006, represents an effort to establish the conceptual framework for a review, based upon, both recommendations of national academic bodies, and practices evident at a number of American higher education institutions. The second phase of Task Force activity, AStandards, Procedures, and Time Tables,\(^@\) was completed in October, 2006. In this phase, the Task Force detailed parts of the review process -- suggesting a specific review schedule; concrete standards against which a program is to be evaluated; and definite procedures for collecting and organizing data, for assessing strengths and weaknesses, for converting recommendations into feasible action plans, and for follow-up activities, where needed. The third phase, ending in April, 2007, compiles all elements into a single, coordinated, implementation scheme. The fourth phase, commencing in October, 2007, involved, not only a redrafting of the graduate plan, to fit the needs and realities of the undergraduate program, but also the combining of both graduate and undergraduate schemes into a single, university-wide instrument, capable of being applied to any one of the several schools.

\(^2\)These guidelines are based in part upon Marilyn J. Baker, Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs: A Policy Statement (Council of Graduate Schools: Washington, D.C., 2005).

\(^3\)Part I, Part II, and Appendix B are based upon templates from Arizona State University.
missions; (b) document program strengths and weaknesses; (c) nurture program improvement, based upon data, rather than anecdote; (d) articulate strategies for improvement, especially with regard to student competencies and in light of both institutional goals and national standards; (e) demonstrate institutional accountability; and (f) identify programs which may need to be placed on probation, reduced, suspended from operation for a specified time, merged, or discontinued (Sources: Indiana University Southeast and Peter Hernon, *Outcomes Assessment*). In the end, it is understood that no implementation plan can be devoid of flaws and that, therefore, the above guiding principles should be open to continuing revision and/or reconsideration, in light of the wisdom and experience of the University and its many departments.

The sections that follow are divided into two parts. Part I includes instructions to units preparing for the Program Review process and the preparation of the Self-Study Document. Part II provides instructions for site visitors. Those directly responsible for the Program Review should familiarize themselves with both parts of the process, including the related appendices.

**PART I: PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES**

The Periodic Review of Programs consists of four phases: the preparatory phase, the development of the Self-Study Report, the site visit, and the wrap-up phase.

**Phase I. Preparatory Phase**

**A. Provide Financial Support for the Review Process**

Though the institution should seek external services and resources (including consultants) which may be free of charge or which may present a merely nominal cost, there must be an institutional commitment to expending the funds necessary for an effective program review. To support the review process, the Graduate School should consider the services of a Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) consultant, as well as purchase Educational Testing Service (ETS) questionnaires for the review of master’s and doctoral programs.

---

4 Any institutional decisions must be guided by pre-approved guidelines outlining rationales and procedures implemented in stages which allow lead-time for corrections or adjustments in the program, and mechanisms of appeal.

5 Possible support resources are The American Association for Higher Education and The American Association of Colleges and Universities. For instance, the SAGE Group (Strategies for Achieving Greater Expectations), a consulting service formed by the latter association, consists of experienced senior administrators and educators who collectively offer a wide range of expertise and who provide individual and group consultation to institutions engaged in assessment.
B. Establish a School-Wide Review Committee

To implement the above review, there is a need for a permanent, oversight body, in the form of a School Review Committee. This should be a standing committee, composed of 7 faculty and elected from 7 different programs. The initial terms shall be staggered, as determined by the drawing of lots: 3 members will hold 3-year terms; 2 members, 2-year terms; and 2 members, 1-year terms.\(^6\) Thereafter, all terms will be 3 years, and all members shall be eligible for reelection. The chair of the committee should be appointed by the Dean, from the elected members. The Review Committee will oversee all aspects of the review process.

C. Prepare the "Rolling Review" Plan

The Review Committee will draft a "rolling review" plan, based upon the approved system (Appendices A1 - A4). The School should create a database, to assist in the management of these rolling reviews.

D. Distinguish Between Periodic Reviews and Accreditation Reviews

Although formal accreditation reviews remain critical, administrators often regard such reviews as inadequate in assessing program quality,\(^7\) from an institutional viewpoint. Thus, program review differs from an accreditation review in the former's concern for the extent to which quality programs support or enhance the mission of the department, school, and university, rather than adhering to some externally-established standard. This distinction notwithstanding, a program review should be complementary to, but not duplicative of, accreditation reviews. This notion that program reviews should be "complementary" or "supplemental," generally would mean that the program review would consider only those institutional concerns not addressed by previous, accrediting/licensing evaluations.

E. Notify Units

One year in advance of the review, the School Review Committee will notify the head of the academic unit/department that a review has been scheduled.

---

\(^6\) Individual schools may decide to choose a smaller committee of 3 or 5 faculty, as appropriate. In the case of a committee of 3, one member will hold a 3-year initial term; 1 member, a 2-year term; and 1 member, a 1-year term. In the case of a committee of 5, 2 members will hold a 3-year initial term; 2 members will hold a 2-year term; and 1 member, a 1-year term.

F. Appoint the Self-Study Committee

Self-study is a critical aspect of program review, in that this process allows the unit to reflect upon its own mission, to consider the relationship of this mission to its on-going activities, and to judge whether any adjustments need to be made in order to prepare the unit for the future.

Eight months prior to the self-study submission date, the head of the unit/department shall forward to the Review Committee the names of the self-study committee members, including that of the committee chair. The committee should consist of either three or five faculty members. In general, this committee should be a representative group of faculty from the unit/department. The self-study committee will be responsible for organizing and conducting the review process within the unit and for preparing the Self-Study Report.

G. Meet with the Local Dean

Once a committee is appointed, the unit/department chair and the self-study committee are encouraged to meet with their Local Dean to discuss any requests for specific information or to identify issues that the Dean would like included in the self-study.

H. Meet with the School Review Committee

At least six months prior to the self-study submission deadline, each unit/department should schedule a meeting with the School Review Committee, which may advise the unit/department on concerns touching the self-study or the review in general.

I. Nominate Site Visitors

(Please refer to Appendices B2 & B3)

There will be a need for external reviews of programs. External reviews, in supplementing the self-study review, seek:

(a) To confirm the results of the program self-study;
(b) To place the self-study into a broader context, vis-a-vis related programs in the institution and to comparable programs nationally;
(c) To determine if the self-study employed appropriate methods of assessing quality;
(d) To highlight differences in judgments between the self-study and the external review; and
(e) To evaluate the efficacy of the unit's goals or targets for the coming 6-year review cycle (Source: University of Connecticut). The chair of the unit/department, in consultation with the appropriate departmental committee and faculty (and with the Local Dean's approval), should submit a list of names and qualifications of twelve potential external site visitors, including eight names of prominent discipline-based faculty and four local community members who are also preferably recent graduates. It is essential that unit/departments describe in adequate detail the nominees' areas of expertise, credentials, and prior professional relationship to the unit/department. The site visit is always scheduled for two full days (Appendix B2).

J. Select Site Visitors

Three site visitors are to be selected by university officials (two faculty members and one community member who preferably is also a recent graduate). For accredited programs, it is advisable that at least one of the consultants be knowledgeable in, and experienced with, the procedures of the accrediting agency. All communication with site visitors should come from the School Review Committee and/or the Office of the Local Dean.

Phase II. Self-Study Report: Development and Preparation

A. Prepare Documents

The Self-Study Report is an interpretive document that uses data to assess current program status and future directions (please refer to "Appendix B1: Academic Program Review Self-Study Report Template" for a detailed description of the Self-Study Document). Data should be analyzed in relation to a unit/department's mission and goals. Although the report is written by the self-study committee, the unit/department head is responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the work and should actively oversee the report preparation.

One element of this Self-Study Report should be the unit/department's use of the approved evaluative instrument ("Appendix A5: Instrument for the Assessment of Program Quality").

Multi- and interdisciplinary programs which offer degrees or certificates should be reviewed as independent programs and, hence, would undergo periodic review.

Reviews should include either faculty/student questionnaires or direct meetings or interviews with these constituencies; and there should be definite student participation in a variety of ways, not excluding full, voting membership on the self-study committee.
The School Review Committee may perform the dual function of (a) coordinating the process and receiving the evaluation reports and (b) conducting the actual review, or these two functions may be distributed between two committees, one coordinating the review process and one conducting the actual review.

There should be a standard report format with a single set of categories or areas of assessment; and this format should be settled prior to the first review, so that data can be compared impartially, across programs. Since these data likely will include information collected from disparate offices, the Local School might consider creating a database strictly for program review purposes.

B. Distribute Documents

The Local Dean should be given the opportunity to review the Self-Study Document and executive summary, before it is forwarded. When necessary, suggested changes/improvements will be returned to the self-study committee for revision. The document will be distributed to site visitors only when the unit/department, and the Local Dean agree that the document is of adequate quality. The latter will sign an endorsement sheet ("Appendix B4: Academic Program Review Self-Study Document Signature Sheet").

C. Provide Sufficient Copies

The academic unit/department should provide a sufficient number of copies of the final self-study document, including the completed evaluative instrument and any appendices, to distribute to site visitors and appropriate university administrators.

Phase III. The Site Visit and Site Visit Report

A. Conduct a Two-Day Site Visit

During a two-day site visit (see "Appendix B5: Information Regarding Site Visit Arrangements" and "Appendix B6: Sample Site Visit Activities and Interviews"), the external site visit team will analyze the self-study document; collect additional relevant information; meet with appropriate faculty, administrators, students, and community groups; and prepare a report identifying program strengths, concerns, and recommendations. The site visit team is also asked to provide an assessment of the future direction and strategic initiatives of the unit/department as these elements relate to the unit/department's mission and vision for its programs.

One element of this site visit should be the visitors' use of the approved evaluative instrument (Appendix A5), so that the site visit team's assessment may be compared to that of the unit/department.
B. Prepare the Site Visit Report

Once the site visit is complete, the site visitors will be asked to submit a Site Visit Report, within three to four weeks of their visit. This report is sent to the Dean for appropriate distribution.

Phase IV. Unit's Response Report and Wrap-up Phase (Appendix B9)

A. Respond to the Site Visit Report

Once the Site Visit Report is received, the Local Dean will review it and share it with the unit/department chair. The unit/department head should review the report with the faculty and prepare a Unit/Department Response Report that addresses the program concerns and recommendations (e.g., program strengths and deficiencies, faculty and student quality, resource needs, future plans, strategic initiatives, etc.).

This Unit/Department Response Report should be submitted to the Local Dean within 6 weeks of receiving the Site Visitor's report.

B. Conduct Wrap-Up

The wrap-up phase will include an assessment of the findings of the site visit team and the unit/department's response. A wrap-up letter, drafted by the Local Dean, is forwarded to the unit/department head, to summarize this final assessment. This phase may also include a meeting of the unit/department head with the Local Dean, and the Review Committee, if there are concerns or if further clarification is deemed necessary before the final wrap-up letter is sent to the unit/department head.

In the wrap-up letter, the Local Dean, in consultation with the Provost, should identify which recommendations cannot be accepted and why.

C. Assemble the Permanent Record

The Self-Study Document, the Site Visit Report, the Unit/Department Response, and the Wrap-Up Letter will be considered the permanent record of the review, and these documents will be forwarded to the Provost for final review and approval.
PART II: INSTRUCTIONS TO SITE VISITORS

Academic Program Reviews serve many purposes, the most important of which is to provide information to academic units/departments and the university on ways to improve existing programs and to identify avenues of future development. The site visit team plays an important evaluative role in the process by providing a presumably more objective, third-party view and by helping the unit/department and university to determine where the program fits in the discipline at regional, national, and international levels. One of the disciplinary specialists will take the lead in drafting the report, but all site visitors are full participants and contributors. Site visitors should familiarize themselves with Part I of this document as well as the template in Appendix B1 that provides Program Review guidelines. The following information describes specific site visitor functions and responsibilities, as well as suggestions for maximizing the effectiveness of the site visit.

Travel Arrangements

# Travel arrangements are to be completed by the individual site visitor. Every effort should be made to minimize travel costs such as for airfare.

# The School Review Committee will oversee housing arrangements for out-of-town site visitors. The office of the Provost will pay travel, lodging, meal expenses, and an honorarium.

# It is anticipated that site visitors from the local community will incur few or no expenses beyond parking and the noon meals, since they will live in the metropolitan Baltimore/Washington area. They will also receive an honorarium.

Site Visit Overview

# Prior to the site visit, the Local School will send copies of the Self-Study Document, university catalogs, and a visitation schedule to the site visit team.

# During the two-day site visit, the site visitors meet with faculty, students, alumni, community representatives, and administrators. The site visit begins and ends with interviews with the Provost or his/her designee, with the Local Dean, and with the School Review Committee.

# Within three to four weeks after the site visit, the site visitors submit to the Local Dean a Site Visit Report that summarizes program evaluations and recommendations (see below). The Dean will distribute copies to the head of the academic unit/department, the graduate coordinator (in the case of graduate review), the Review Committee, and the Provost.
Guidelines for Preparing the Site Visit Report

There should be a specific format requirement for the Site Visit Report, although the contents and length may vary, depending on the nature and size of the program being reviewed. While the report should address each of the substantive areas described below, other program dimensions important to program quality and development may be included.

1. Mission and Goals

   # Are the mission and goals adequately addressed; do they seem appropriate, given the university mission; and are there on-going mechanisms within the unit/department to evaluate the currency and relevance of those goals?

   # What is the contribution of the unit/department in advancing the state of the discipline/profession, and what are the program’s reputation and quality, relative to peer institutions?

2. Strategic Initiatives and Future Direction

   What strategic initiatives have been identified by the unit/department, and what is the future direction of the program, as identified in the Self-Study Report? (The state of the discipline, emerging areas on the national scene, peer institutions and aspirational peers as identified by the unit/department should be taken into account).

3. Learning Objectives and Curricular Effectiveness

   # Does the unit/department have a clear understanding of curricular content and sequence? Does it employ appropriate learning objectives and outcome measures?

   # Is the curriculum current, and does it provide adequate training/education for graduates of the program?

   # Are areas of program emphases (e.g., concentrations, certificates, tracks) appropriate, in view of available resources (human and physical), and do these emphases address community, regional, or national needs? If not, what would the site visit team recommend?

---

8 A supplement to the April 17, 2003 meeting agenda of the Idaho State Board of Education offers one of the most analytical systems for determining both actual and aspirational peer institutions. The report to the Board offers the following distinction: A.A >peer= is a college or university that is >most like= another college or university based on similarities on a group of variables like mission, size, organization, control, location, mix of programs, and student body characteristics. However, A[as]pirational peers are those that the institution aspires to be like on some criterion, such as faculty salary or compensation levels, or academic reputation.
# Does the unit/department employ adequate processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its programs (i.e., outcome measures)?

4. **Student Recruitment, Retention, and Placement**

# What unit/department processes insure quality recruitment and retention practices?

# Is the diversity of the student population appropriate, or should efforts be made to diversify the program, further?

# What are the depth and quality of efforts to retain students and foster graduation rates, reduce the time to degree, and increase faculty involvement with students in both teaching and research?

# Is adequate attention given to career advisement, development, and placement?

5. **Faculty/Staff Quality**

# How does the level of faculty research/scholarly activity compare with that of peer institutions? Are external funding levels appropriate? Are there examples of exceptional faculty contributions to the mission of the unit/department and university?

# Is the faculty research/scholarly agenda appropriately integrated into student learning? Are there missed opportunities that should be considered?

# What are the level and appropriateness of faculty diversity?

6. **Use of Resources**

Does the unit/department make appropriate use, not only of existing resources, including physical (e.g., lab or office space), educational (e.g., university instruction, library, advisement), and fiscal resources?

7. **Community Engagement**

What is the level of engagement and impact with community professionals/constituents? If improvement is necessary, what steps might the unit/department take to foster stronger relationships?

8. **Other Considerations**

# New Curricular Initiatives. If the unit/department has proposed, or plans to propose, a new program (e.g., degrees, certificates), what is the potential for quality, success, faculty workload responsibility, resource adequacy, and quality student recruitment and placement?
Accredited Programs. If the unit/department houses an accredited program, does the program currently meet accreditation standards? If not, what is needed to bring the program into conformity with accreditation standards?

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

What does the site visit team consider to be the major strengths of the program?

What areas need greatest improvement? What does the team consider to be the major limiting factors for future growth and development of the unit/department? What opportunities exist for future development? (Recommendations for future growth might be couched within a 3-5% funding increase model).

Once all members of the site visit team have certified the contents of the report, it should be sent directly to: the appropriate Dean, Morgan State University, Baltimore, Maryland 21251.

Each site visit team member should also sign, and forward, the Signature Page for Site Visitors (see Appendix B7).
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APPENDICES
A1: "Rolling Review" Principles

The following review plan seeks to create a system of "rolling reviews," in which different programs will commence the review cycle at different, appropriate times. Such a plan would entail a cycle of staggered reviews, in which programs will undergo different phases of the review cycle at different times. This process will naturally require much coordination and will necessitate that assessment become an on-going function of each School and that there be appointed in each School a standing committee (Review Committee), to oversee and manage this process.

1. Program-Review-Sequence Principles

Program review sequence should be based upon objective principles, such as alphabetical or random selection, although exceptions to this sequence may be made for credible reasons, such as volunteering, upcoming external accreditation, or a compelling problem that does not otherwise diminish objectivity or impartiality. In most cases, older programs and programs which do not routinely undergo external or licensing reviews, should be assessed first. However, no new program should be reviewed until it has graduated at least 3 students.

2. Sequencing Questionnaire

The review process is initiated when the Review Committee sends out, and receives back from the unit/department, the questionnaire which seeks information relevant to the scheduling of a specific review ("Appendix A2: Sequencing Questionnaire").

3. Resultant Sequencing Plan

After all "Sequencing Questionnaires" have been received and logged ("Appendix A3: Professional Accreditation Log"), the Review Committee studies them and prepares a first draft of a Sequencing Plan. This plan identifies the year in which a particular program review cycle will commence. This draft should be sent to all units/departments affected, for comment and recommendations for revision. The Committee should make every effort to accommodate a particular program's scheduling request. When this accommodation is not possible, the Review Committee must explain in writing the basis for its decision.

4. Yearly Review Targets

After the Sequencing Plan is completed, the Review Committee will publish the name of the program and the target year in which the individual review cycle will commence ("Appendix A4: SAMPLE Review Roster, By Year"). The Committee will consider additional requests for adjustments. When these additional adjustments are not possible, the Review Committee must explain in writing the basis for its decision. At the end of the selection process, the Review Committee will inform the unit/department that a review has been scheduled, in accordance with the one year time frame indicated in "I-E. Notify Units," above.
5. Individual Review Timetable

The assessment of individual programs will follow the established six-year review cycle. (See AYear 1: Assessment Year@; AYears 2 - 5: Implementation of Recommendations, If Any@; and AYear 6: Projections,@ below.)

6. Six-Year Review Cycle

The six-year review cycle commences for individual programs during the year indicated in the "Review Roster, By Year" (Appendix A4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable</th>
<th>Programs Without External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (FULL REVIEW)</th>
<th>Programs With External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW, WITH NO SITE VISIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Self-study activities are under way.</td>
<td>If an external accreditation or licensing review was conducted, criteria and standards in the accreditation review have been compared with those specified by the Review Committee, and a plan has been prepared to review (as a Supplemental activity) any substantive Program Review elements not covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Self-assessment (&quot;Self-Study&quot;) is completed, following criteria stipulated in the Process.</td>
<td>The unit/department has addressed in writing the issues and/or questions submitted by the Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>External reviewers' visit has concluded; the Dean has received their report and circulated it to the unit/department; and the unit/department has submitted to the Dean the Unit/Department Response Report.</td>
<td>The unit/department has submitted to the Dean its final responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>The Wrap-Up has been completed.</td>
<td>A modified Wrap-Up has been completed, involving all of the designated parties, except the site visitors, whose report would be omitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 In the case of Supplemental Reviews, the Review Committee will determine program-by-program which (if any) questions or issues of concern in the periodic review have not been addressed by the external, accreditation process. Decision will be based upon a close examination of the unit/department's most recent accreditation report.
### Years 2 - 5: Implementation of Recommendations, If Any

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable</th>
<th>Programs Without External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews</th>
<th>Programs With External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 1 - November 1 of Each Year</strong></td>
<td>Units/Departments should make every attempt to implement the review recommendations and/or to document problems with implementation.</td>
<td>Units/Departments should make every attempt to implement the review recommendations and/or to document problems with implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 1 of Each Year</strong></td>
<td>Units/Departments should report to the Dean the recommendations that have been implemented and the ones that have not, and why.</td>
<td>Units/Departments should report to the Dean the recommendations that have been implemented and the ones that have not, and why.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 6: Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable</th>
<th>Programs Without External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews</th>
<th>Programs With External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 1</strong></td>
<td>Unit/departments should assess their resources; review departmental goals and objectives, in light of thoughtful projections of discipline needs and trends; and communicate these projections by letter or report to the Dean. These projections, along with the previous reviews, should form the basis of self-study in the upcoming 6-year Review Cycle.</td>
<td>Unit/departments should assess their resources; review departmental goals and objectives, in light of thoughtful projections of discipline needs and trends; and communicate these projections by letter or report to the Dean. These projections, along with the previous reviews, should form the basis of self-study in the upcoming 6-year Review Cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 Should a unit/department complete its task of implementing the recommendations, the unit will proceed to the *Year 6: Projections*, and the periodic review process will be considered closed, until the next 6-year cycle.

11 This year concerns follow-up and review of this cycle=s assessment reports, in preparation for the next review cycle. An aim of the next review cycle is to gauge the success of the cycle proceeding it, to build on prior progress, and to project new goals, according to the successes of the past and the needs of the future.
A2: Sequencing Questionnaire

The School of _________________________ is engaged in establishing a plan for the periodic review of all programs. This review will become a permanent process.

This questionnaire solicits information primarily concerning the participation of your program in external licensing/accreditation reviews (other than that of Middle States). In general, those programs which undergo such reviews will be included in the periodic program review process, only in a manner that supplements (rather than duplicates) the external review experience. Further, such programs are exempt from site visitations but will be asked to respond to those issues not addressed by their own accreditation/licensing process.

Please give accurate information below, and submit a separate sheet for each program in your unit which offers a degree or certificate. This information will be preserved in the AProfessional Accreditation Log® (Appendix A3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Offered</td>
<td>________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
<td>________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School/Unit</td>
<td>________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting/Licensing Agency (External)</td>
<td>___________________________ (Or Write A None=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Last Accreditation Visit</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Next Accreditation Visit</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Dean/Chair/Director/or Other

Return this form to ________________, Morgan State, or email a facsimile to ________.

For questions, please phone X____ or X ____.
### A3-I: Undergraduate Professional Accreditation Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>College/School/Institute</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Date of Last Accreditation Visit</th>
<th>Accreditation Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*12Based upon catalog entries for Morgan State University (2006 - 2009) and upon Academic Program Review, Office of the Provost, George Mason University (May 2005).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>College/School/Institute</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Date of Last Accreditation Visit</th>
<th>Accreditation Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Science and Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (Pre-Professional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>College/School/Institute</td>
<td>Accrediting Agency</td>
<td>Date of Last Accreditation Visit</td>
<td>Accreditation Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Environmental Design</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**A3-2: Graduate Professional Accreditation Log\textsuperscript{13}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>College/School/Institute</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Date of Last Accreditation Visit</th>
<th>Accreditation Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioenvironmental Sciences</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Leadership</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>D.Eng.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Dr.PH.</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master’s Degree Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>M.Arch.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13}Based upon A[Doctorate and Masters Degree Programs],@ School of Graduate Studies, Morgan State University ([2007]) and upon AAcademic Program Review, @ Office of the Provost, George Mason University (May 2005).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>College/School/Institute</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Date of Last Accreditation Visit</th>
<th>Accreditation Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bioinformatics</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>M.B.A.</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>M.C.R.P.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary &amp; Middle School Education</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (Civil/Electrical/Industrial)</td>
<td>M.E.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>M.L.A./M.S.L.A.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching</td>
<td>M.A.T.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>M.P.H.</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education (Biology)</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education (Chemistry)</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education (Physics)</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>College/School/Institute</td>
<td>Accrediting Agency</td>
<td>Date of Last Accreditation Visit</td>
<td>Accreditation Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td>EUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>M.A./M.S.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Studies</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(NOTE WELL: The information below is presented only for illustration purposes and cannot be regarded as either accurate or predictive of any actual Review Roster.)

### Year-1 (Assessment) Commencing in February, 2008 (Cycle Ending 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs Without External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (FULL REVIEW)</th>
<th>Programs With External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year-1 (Assessment) Commencing in February, 2009 (Cycle Ending 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs Without External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (FULL REVIEW)</th>
<th>Programs With External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Engineering (Electrical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A4-2: SAMPLE Graduate Review Roster, By Year

(NOTE WELL: The information below is presented only for illustration purposes and cannot be regarded as either accurate or predictive of any actual Review Roster.)

Year-1 (Assessment) Commencing in February, 2008 (Cycle Ending 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs Without External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (FULL REVIEW)</th>
<th>Programs With External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics M.A.</td>
<td>Architecture M.Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English M.A.</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture M.L.A./M.S.L.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History M.A.</td>
<td>Business Administration M.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Educational Leadership Ed.D.</td>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning M.C.R.P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year-1 (Assessment) Commencing in February, 2009 (Cycle Ending 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs Without External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (FULL REVIEW)</th>
<th>Programs With External Licensing/Accreditation Reviews (SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bioenvironmental Sciences Ph.D.</td>
<td>Music M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Ph.D.</td>
<td>City and Regional Planning M.C.R.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Ph.D.</td>
<td>Business Administration Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education Ed.D.</td>
<td>Public Health Dr.PH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (Civil/Electrical/Industrial) M.Eng.</td>
<td>Social Work Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A5: Instrument for the Assessment of Program Quality

Assessment of the Degree Program in: ____________________________________________
Degree Level (B.A., B.S.): ______________________________________________________
Date: ________________________________________________________________________
Evaluators: __________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

The assessment involves two (2) types of recommendations: quantitative and qualitative.

**QUANTITATIVE:**
The Assessment Committee is to 1) indicate whether each of the following Objective Standards has been fully met, minimally met, partially met, or not met, and 2) supply adequate rationales and/or evidence for these assessments.

1. A standard is **fully met** when irrefutable evidence supports it.
2. A standard is **minimally met** when it is supported by a preponderance of evidence.
3. A standard is **partially met** when there is supportive or suggestive evidence, but the evidence is incomplete or inconsistent.
4. A standard is **not met** when there is clearly no evidence to support it, thereby revealing a significant program deficit.

**QUALITATIVE:**
In addition to the above quantitative assessment, the Committee will provide a companion qualitative assessment, in which it takes into account, not only concerns not covered in the quantitative assessment, but also any intangibles which cannot easily be isolated by quantitative methods.

**RECONCILIATION OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Should there be a significant discrepancy between the qualitative and quantitative assessments, then the Committee should attempt to reconcile the two and embody this reconciliation in a single set of reasonable recommendations.
## PROGRAM
## RATING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET Fully (+3)</th>
<th>Met Minimally (+2)</th>
<th>Met Partially (+1)</th>
<th>Not Met (+0)</th>
<th>STANDARD CATEGORY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. A teaching faculty with the doctorate (or other appropriate terminal degree) and relevant professional experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teaching loads consonant with quality instruction, including adequate compensation for supervision, for advising and mentoring, and for culminating experiences such as senior theses or graduate theses and dissertations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Appropriate resources for research, opportunities to maintain professional and pedagogical currency, and opportunities for retooling of faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Faculty actively engaged in advancing the base of knowledge upon which the discipline is founded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Student Admissions, Guidance, Supervision, Retention, and Mentoring</td>
<td>(Total Points)/12 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Rigorous entrance requirements, based upon typical criteria such as: a. Standardized Tests; b. GPA and Course Work; c. Transcripts; d. Essays; e. Letters of Recommendation, Resumes, Extracurricular Activities, and Experience; and f. Interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Orientation for New Students and Departmental student handbook that supplements any published by the School or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET Fully</td>
<td>Met Minimally</td>
<td>Met Partially</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>STANDARD CATEGORY</td>
<td>SPECIFIC STANDARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+3)</td>
<td>(+2)</td>
<td>(+1)</td>
<td>(+0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Availability of financial support for students. In the case of graduate students, the availability of teaching opportunities and the informing of each graduate student about the extent of assistance, including support for completing theses and dissertations.

8. Formal process or mechanism for advisement and regular, formal checks of student progress, including departmental monitoring of time limits.

9. Opportunities for student research, scholarship, and/or creative activity and evidence of student research output.\(^{14}\)

10. Involvement of students in the program evaluation process.

11. Placement and career success of graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Score</th>
<th>C. Availability, Sophistication, and Quality of Academic Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Critical mass(^{15}) of students and faculty and sufficient number, frequency, and regularity of course offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Required core of courses or adequate individual plan to ensure breadth and depth, and a formal method of distinguishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) It should be noted that the ability of graduate students to conduct independent research outside of the classroom is a central outcome and provides an important index for assessing graduate programs.

\(^{15}\) A critical mass\(^{15}\) involves, not only the question of whether enough students are enrolled in a given program to provide substantial intellectual cross-fertilization, but also whether there are enough students to ensure the stability, variety, and depth of course offerings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET Fully</th>
<th>Met Minimally</th>
<th>Met Partially</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>STANDARD CATEGORY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+3)</td>
<td>(+2)</td>
<td>(+1)</td>
<td>(+0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. A personalized learning format that permits substantial student-professor contact (instruction, advising, and guidance) and that encourages the mastery of research through research papers, literature reviews, reports, or case studies.

15. Adequate facilities and resources (including library and information technologies) to conduct research and other academic work at an appropriate level.

16. Depth of knowledge, including knowledge of the discipline's history and development and ability to think critically and holistically about the discipline.

17. Understanding of the expectations for success as a professional in the discipline and the ability to communicate with the public and other scholars regarding knowledge, methods, outcomes, standards, products, ethics, and behaviors.

18. An appreciation of the diversity of intellectual and/or professional contributions, including those of women and minorities; and the ability to synthesize and integrate within and across disciplines, without increasing the total number of hours required for the degree.

19. A written or oral comprehensive examination demonstrating the breadth of knowledge in the discipline, depth in specific areas, and the ability to integrate what has been learned.

20. Demonstration of communication skills and the ability to apply knowledge independently, including: a. senior thesis or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET Fully (3)</th>
<th>Met Minimally (2)</th>
<th>Met Partially (1)</th>
<th>Not Met (0)</th>
<th>STANDARD CATEGORY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comparable expository paper(s) or a graduate thesis or dissertation, b. narrative analyses of case studies or problem sets, c. recitals or exhibits, and/or d. written reports on a major practicum or internship experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Score (Total Points)/6 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of the data is presented in the table below. The scores are calculated as follows:

\[
\frac{(A+B+C)}{60} = \text{Total Score (Add Columns)}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET Fully</td>
<td>MET Minimally</td>
<td>Met Partially</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RAW SCORE and PERCENTAGE SCORE**: The RAW SCORE represents the total number of points which a program acquired via this rating instrument, divided by the total number of points (i.e., 60) which it could acquire. Thus, the PERCENTAGE SCORE indicates the final rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAW SCORE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 60</td>
<td>Insufficient Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>Sufficient Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>Good Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 100</td>
<td>Excellent Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[16\]
Raters should elaborate below on specific standards not met and make recommendations for change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NOTES CONCERNING STANDARDS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>NOTES CONCERNING STANDARDS</td>
<td>APARTIALLY MET@ or ANOT MET@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS:
B1: Academic Program Review Self-Study Report Template

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Academic Program Review Self-Study Report

Academic Year: ______________________________________

UNIT/DEPARTMENT NAME: ________________________________

Unit/Department Chair or Director: _________________________

Unit/Department's School: ________________________________

Local Dean: ___________________________________________

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary (max. three pages)
   (Strengths of the unit's program offerings and any challenges that might exist. Summary of faculty's contributions to the program's mission and vision. Long-term plans, strategic directions, etc.)

II. Mission and Scope
   # Unit's Mission Statement
   # Unit Goals
   # Major Strengths of the Unit
   # Areas of Regional/National and International Prominence

III. Peer Comparisons
   # List of peer institutions and related data (can be in table format)
   # List of aspirational peers and related data (can be in table format)
   # Discussion/analysis of the unit's ranking, relative to peers (e.g., the size of the faculty and student body, funding, areas of specialty, uniqueness of the programs, etc).

IV. Findings from Last Review (including any possible accreditation issues)

V. The Specific Program
1. Program Inventory, Curriculum

(Please list the titles of all degrees, concentrations, etc., offered by the unit, and provide a brief description for each within a table format.)

Assess the direction and currency of curricular offerings, relative to the state of the discipline. (Please describe any new curricular initiatives.)

2. Student Profile

(Student enrollment, recruitment, retention and placement.)

Provide:

$ High School GPA or Average (in the case of masters programs, all baccalaureate GPA=s; and in the case of doctoral programs, all masters GPA=s, as appropriate)

$ Headcount by degree/concentration.

$ Diversity of student population data (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, domestic, international)

$ Student/faculty ratio

$ Entrance exams (SAT, GRE, etc.) scores

$ Job Placement data

$ Assess the patterns of enrollment in degrees/concentrations and their level of appropriateness, size, student/faculty ratios, etc.

$ Assess degree completion and graduation rates for each program and strategies for improvement.

$ Placement of students. (Discuss intended placement of students relative to actual placement, e.g., in advanced programs or employment in the field.)
3. Student Satisfaction, Advising, Services

$ Provide data illustrating what students feel about:
$ Overall academic experience in the unit/department;
$ Availability of required courses;
$ Strength of their education;
$ Practice in public speaking, presentation, and other skills;
$ Advising on career options within the field (including advanced academic work); and
$ Concern of faculty for individual students

$ Identify areas where improvement is necessary and discuss strategic steps to enhance student satisfaction.

VI. Other Curricular Offerings

$ List all curricular offerings (certificates, distance-delivered programs, etc.), and describe in tabular format, the name of the offering, focus/target group, and need/justification.

$ List service courses and indicate the FTE which these courses provide for the university.

$ Provide a brief description of the contribution of each program to the university.

VIII. Faculty Activity Reports (Provided by Individual Faculty)

All tenure/tenure track faculty must submit the following information for the Program Review process: (1) a five page (maximum) Activity Report listing his/her contributions to the success of the unit/department for the last six years. The Activity Reports submitted may be similar to those used for the annual report but must include, at a minimum:

$ Teaching: Courses taught, titles, year and semester; individualized instruction/mentor activities (i.e., dissertations, theses, honors projects, chair and committee responsibilities). In the case of theses/dissertations, faculty should specify student name, degree, thesis/dissertation title, and date of completion.

$ Research/Creative Activity: Publications, presentations, grants/funding.

$ Service: University, professional, and community.
VII. Faculty Teaching and Research/Scholarly Work, Staff Quality

- Provide data concerning:
  - Faculty FTE
  - Staff FTE
  - Faculty profile
  - Faculty FTE/Staff FTE
  - Student FTE/Faculty FTE
  - Research funding/faculty expenditures

- Provide an overview of faculty (e.g., tenure, tenure track, research, etc.) in table format. (Include faculty name, title, degree, FTE, and area of specialization as columns in the table.)

- Provide an overview of staff in table format.

- Describe and evaluate the quality, effectiveness, currency, and diversity of faculty and staff, including their research, teaching, and service contribution to the program mission and goals.

IX Resources of the Program

(Given current resource allocations, compare and discuss the sufficiency of resources related to technology, physical space, budgets, library, and human resources.)

Community Engagement

(List and describe major community engagement initiatives and their contributions to community enrichment.)

XI. Future Plans and Strategic Plan of the Program

(Based on the mission statement of the program, analyses in this report, and other pending initiatives, outline the unit’s major plans for the next three to five years.)
XII. Unit/Department Chair's Report

(This is an optional section that is completed by the unit/department chair, covering areas such as the vision for the program, strategic initiatives, any current concerns, faculty assignments, procedures for personnel, etc.)
B2: Guidelines for Recommending Site Visitors

1. Recommend from 4 - 8 disciplinary site visitors (faculty) and from 2 - 4 recent graduates of the institution who are members of the community. Please attempt to diversify your nominations (gender and race/ethnic representation). If the academic unit has special areas (e.g., professional/disciplinary, basic/clinical), please indicate which site visitors are appropriate for various areas.

2. The list should be forwarded to the Local Dean for his/her input.

3. **It is absolutely essential that the Local Dean be given sufficient biographical information on the nominees, to inform the selection process (e.g., area of specialization, prominence in the field, member of national committees in the discipline).**

4. Faculty nominees should be active, respected members of their profession and/or the community, particularly in the areas of specialization that are important to the unit under review.

5. Recent graduate/community nominees should have strong familiarity with the program, should not have financial association with Morgan State University, and should reside in the Baltimore/Washington metropolitan area.

6. If a visit is being conducted in anticipation of an accreditation review, several of the recommended individuals (specify which ones) should also have a thorough knowledge of the specific accreditation procedures that will be used.

7. In order to avoid conflict of interest, units are urged not to forward names of individuals such as former/current faculty, mentors/friends, previous Morgan State University teaching faculty/staff, former/current job applicants, donors, contractors, or administrators.

8. The Dean will extend invitations to the site visitors. (Please do not make contact with potential site visitors before the site visit has been set up.)

9. Copies of the self-study will be sent to the site visitors by the Dean in advance of their visit.

**Dates for the Site Visit**

10. The Review Committee will collaborate with the academic units to establish possible date options for potential site visits.

11. Preferable date options are always Monday/Tuesday or Thursday/Friday combinations.

12. The site visit is for two full days.
B3: Nomination Form for Potential Site Visitors
(Complete one form for each nominee)

Academic unit/department being reviewed: ____________________________

I   I Disciplinary (Faculty) Specialist    I I Community Member    I I Recent Graduate

Name: ______________________________________________________________

Title or Rank: _________________________________________________________

Background, including current position:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/Major</th>
<th>University/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic unit (if applicable): ______________________________________

Current address:

____________________________________________________________________

Work phone: (___ ) ______ - ______ (please verify phone number)

Email: _____________________ Fax number: (___ ) ______ - ______

Relationship to MSU or unit/department faculty? ____________________

It is essential to describe in detail the qualifications that make this person an appropriate site visitor for your unit. Indicate any relevant academic and professional experience qualifying this person as a reviewer. This biographical information is critical to help the Local Dean select site visitors and to provide a biographical overview to administrators who will interact with the site visitors. Please suggest reviewers who can offer a balance in representing appropriate areas of emphasis in your program.

Attach vita/resume of nominee, if available, or a copy of biographical information from a published source (e.g., Who's Who, American Men and Women of Science). Duplicate copies of this form should be sent to the Local Dean for approval. Please remember not to nominate current or past faculty or administrators, former or present applicants for jobs, donors, or contractors.
B4: Academic Program Review Self-Study Document Signature Sheet

Academic Unit/Department Name: ________________________________________________

School Name: _____________________________________________________________

The signatures below indicate that the Dean has had the opportunity to review (and endorse) the contents of the unit/department's Self-Study document.

_____________________________Signature ______________________________Date

Printed Name of Dean (here)
B5: Information Regarding Site Visit Arrangements

Coordination and Site Visit Arrangements

$ The Review Committee oversees the travel and lodging arrangements for the two-day site visits. Out-of-town site visitors typically arrive the evening before the site visit begins and leave the evening of the second day.

$ Travel arrangements must be completed by the individual site visitors, but these visitors should make every effort to minimize travel costs.

$ The Review Committee will oversee the housing arrangements for the academic consultants, who will spend at least two days on campus. The School, with funds from the Office of the Provost, will pay travel, lodging, meal expenses, and an honorarium. The unit/department must cover costs for all refreshments served to site visitors or unit/department participants during the review meetings, e.g., meals or coffee with faculty and/or student groups.

$ Since the community member/recent graduate of the site visit team will come from the metropolitan Baltimore/Washington area, it is not expected that he or she will incur expenses beyond parking and the noon meals. Should the unit/department choose to nominate a recent graduate who does not reside locally, the department itself will reimburse the travel and lodging.

$ The Review Committee will arrange the meetings with university administrators (i.e., the Local Dean and others, for the entrance and exit interviews). It is the unit/department's responsibility to arrange a tour of its facilities; a tour of the library; time for reviewing senior and honors projects and theses; and time for the appropriate meetings, as described below.

Hospitality

$ **The department is the local host for the site visitors.** Please ask a faculty member to arrange airport pick up and return transportation, transportation to and from the hotel, escort of visitors to their first meetings each day, and general assistance over the two days.

$ On the second day, please arrange for out-of-town visitors to check out of the hotel before noon so that Morgan State University is not charged for an extra day. Most local hotels will provide shuttle service to the airport, but scheduling conflicts may require that the unit/department provide transportation.

$ Lavish entertaining of the site visitors is not expected or encouraged. They will have a busy two days on campus and will need time to rest and discuss findings. Please leave dinner and evening hours free.

$ No funds are available for entertainment. If faculty members wish to go out to dinner or lunch with the visitors, they or their unit/department will be responsible for those expenses.

$ The site visitors will be reimbursed for reasonable costs such as for breakfast and dinner, but they need to save original receipts.

$ Please leave at least an hour and a half free immediately preceding the final interview, so that site visitors may organize the major themes of their report.
Visits with Students

§ It is essential that careful planning be used in arranging meetings with a site visitor and any sizable group of students. A faculty member and student representatives should be given responsibility for organizing these meetings. (These meetings, if left to last minute planning or if poorly attended, can leave a lasting impression on the site visit team).

§ Brown-bag lunches, coffee hours, and class meetings have worked well. Because students often raise questions for which the site visitors will want to seek answers, these meetings should be set up fairly early in the schedule.

§ After the visitors are introduced and their purpose explained, the unit/department meeting coordinator should leave so that students feel free to have a candid discussion with site visitors.

§ Some time (30 minutes) should be set aside for the site visit team to review senior and honors projects and theses.

Visits with Faculty Members

§ Depending on the size of the faculty, two or three small group meetings might be desirable. Meetings with individual faculty members are discouraged. The head of the academic unit should not attend the meetings with faculty.

§ Where appropriate, there should be meetings with other relevant faculty groups (e.g., advisory committees or curriculum committees whose work relates to the program review).

§ It is strongly recommended that site visitors meet with faculty from other related disciplinary areas with whom the unit interacts.

Visits with Unit/Department Administrators

At least one hour should be scheduled for the site visitors to meet with the head of the academic unit/department. Because site visitors will have developed a better understanding of the unit, this meeting should occur on the afternoon of the second day.

Visits with University Administrators

Because the Program Review is important to school and university planning, meetings will be scheduled with the Provost and the Dean of the local school.

Locations or Groups Suggested by the Site Visitors

Whenever feasible, site visitors should receive assistance in visiting locations and in meeting groups of the reviewers own choosing.
B6: Sample Site Visit Activities and Interviews

First Day

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.  (Building, room number)
( Prior to entry meeting )

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.  (Building, room number)

9:00 - noon  
(Buildings, room numbers)

1:30 - 2:30 p.m.  (Building, room number)

5:00 - 6:00 p.m.

Early morning c 7:45 a.m.
(Prior to entry meeting)

**Have Designated faculty pick up out-of-town site visitors**

**Breakfast with (names listed).**

**Travel to Campus.**

**Conduct Entry Meeting.**

**Meet with the Provost and the Local Dean.**

**Meet with Faculty.**

Meet with program-related faculty groups.

**Have Lunch with students, faculty, community constituents, and/or alumni.**

**Provide for Site Visitor Preparation Meeting.**

Required time for site visitors to discuss major issues and begin preparing site report.

Tour library and laboratory facilities.

**Meet with students.**

Meet with community members and employers of students, where possible.
Second Day

7:45 – 8:45 a.m.
(Prior to entry meeting)

9:00 - noon
(Building, room number)

12:00-1:30 p.m.
(Building, room number)

1:30 – 2:30 p.m.
(Building, room number)

2:30 – 4:00 p.m.
(Building, room number)

4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Have Breakfast with (names listed).
Travel to Campus.

Meet with Key Administrators.
Meet with the Provost and the Local Dean

Have Lunch with students, faculty,
community constituents, and/or alumni.

Meet with Unit/Department Chair.

Provide for Site Visitor Preparation Meeting.
Required time for site visitors to discuss major issues
and to begin preparing site report and exit meeting
discussion points. The unit/department should have
available a quiet room with computer access.

Conduct Exit Meeting
Meet with the Provost, the Local Dean,, and the
Review Committee.

Note: Travel to and from campus will be arranged by the academic unit, and return flights should be scheduled not earlier than 7:00 p.m.
B7: Signature Page for Site Visitors/Reviewers

Each member of the site visit team should complete the form below, attach it to a copy of the Program Review Report, and return it to:

Dean, School of ______________________
Morgan State University
Baltimore, Maryland 21251

This report was prepared by:

Name:  

Institution:  

Address:  

I have read the Site Visit Report for the _________________________________ program and

I  I  concur

I  I  concur with the following reservations:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

I  I  disagree and have attached a statement

Printed Name  

Signature  

Date  

Note: Please do not include confidential information in the above statement.
B8: Checklist for Program Reviews

Unit/Department
__Attend preliminary meetings with the Local Dean and the Review Committee.
__Recommend the unit/department self-study committee.
__Nominate site visitors.
__Collaborate with the Review Committee, to establish possible date options and to arrange the site visitation schedule.
__Complete and submit the Self-Study Report, after it is reviewed by the Local Dean.
__Assist site visitors during the visit.
__Distribute Site Visitors’ Report to faculty (when received).
__Schedule faculty meeting to discuss the site visit review.
__Forward the Unit Response Report, after consultation with the Local Dean.
__Participate in the Wrap-up phase.
__Review final recommendations and the actions to be taken, with the Local Dean.

Local Dean
__Review and approve the list of proposed site visitors.
__Approve the Self-Study Report.
__Interview site visitors.
__Read Site Visit Report.
__Participate in Wrap-up phase.
__Approve recommendations for action.

Review Committee
__Notify unit/department about review timetable.
__Conduct an orientation session with the unit/department, if needed.
__Finalize site visitors’ schedule.
__Participate in entrance interview.
__Participate in exit interview.
__Participate in the wrap-up process.
__Help to coordinate final record of program review.
B9: The Unit Response Report and Wrap-Up Phase

The unit/department chair should review the findings of the Site Visit Report with faculty and prepare an outline and written response. The unit/department chair should consult her/his Local Dean to obtain agreement on major issues prior to report preparation. The final Unit Response Report should be submitted to the Dean within six weeks of receiving the Site Visitor's Report.

Outline of the Unit Response Report

I. Introduction
   Briefly review and respond to major strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities discussed in the Site Visit Report.

II. Strategic Plans To Address Concerns
   A. Issue 1 (identify issue)
      1. Proposed action, expected outcome
      2. Cost/Resource implications
      3. Source of funds/resources
      4. Benchmark and timeline for solution
   B. Issue 2 (identify issue)
      1. Proposed action, expected outcome
      2. Cost/Resource implications
      3. Source of funds/resources
      4. Benchmark and timeline for solution
   C. Etc.

III. Additional Information
   Discuss any other program changes and developments related to the Program Review generally, and the Site Visitor Report specifically.

Wrap-Up Phase

$ The wrap-up phase will include an assessment of the site visit team's findings and the unit/department's response.

$ A wrap-up letter, drafted by the Dean, will be forwarded to the unit/department head, to summarize this final assessment and to endorse all necessary recommendations for change.

$ This phase may also include a meeting among the relevant parties if there are concerns that need to be addressed before the wrap-up letter is sent.

$ The Dean=s wrap-up letter and recommendations will be forwarded to the Provost for approval.