

**Lehman College, City University of New York**  
**Office of Academic Programs and Educational Effectiveness**  
**Guidelines for Academic Program Review (Revised 2023 Fall)**

All academic programs, centers and institutes shall conduct formal periodic program reviews. An academic program review consists of:

1. a self-study;
2. an external peer review, site visit, and report;
3. a discussion of the review between the program and the administration; 4. development of an action plan to utilize results for continuous improvement.

These guidelines do not supersede or replace reviews of academic programs that are subject to an accreditation process by external agencies. Those programs are addressed later in this document.

**Self-Study**

The self-study encourages faculty and staff to analyze the overall effectiveness and quality of the program. Specifically, the self-study should look back over the past 5 years (or since the most recent program review) and, utilizing qualitative and quantitative data, address:

1. The relation of the program to the College's mission, vision, and goals: addressing such questions as how the program *educates, empowers, and engages* students and contributes to achieving the College's *Institutional Learning Goals*; how the program advances 90x30; and, how the program integrates the College's *Strategic Plan*.
2. The program's curriculum in relation to desired outcomes: addressing such questions as how the program compares to comparable programs and/or norms established by relevant professional organizations; how the program ensures students can achieve program learning goals; how the program assesses student learning; how the program collaborates with/supports other programs within the College; how the program considers and addresses student perceptions and expectations.
3. The faculty's activities in scholarship, teaching and professional service, including faculty development and pedagogical innovations.
4. The program's use of assessment for continuous improvement.
5. Future directions for the program, based on an analysis of the program's current strengths and weaknesses, external opportunities and obstacles, forecasts for the program's field, and changes implemented since the last program review. A plan and timeline for the next 5-year period should be developed.

**External Peer Review**

Normally, there will be two reviewers. They should be selected from different appropriate institutions and professional organizations. The department will nominate reviewers to the Dean and Associate Dean, along with pertinent biographical information such as current position, area of specialization, relevant professional experience, where and when the Ph.D. was granted, and other distinguishing academic credentials. Reviewers must be from outside of the CUNY system and any connections that a proposed reviewer may have with the department or any of its members need to be disclosed. The Dean and Associate Dean may seek additional names and will then select reviewers with the approval of the Associate Provost. The Dean or Associate Dean will send the departmental self-study to the reviewers at least two weeks in advance of the visit. The Department Chair will establish a schedule

for, and oversee, the visit. The site visit will consist of interviews with faculty, students, administrators and alumni (to the extent possible). The final report should be submitted to the Dean and the Department Chair within four weeks of the site visit.

**Action Plan**

After the department has had an opportunity to examine the report for accuracy and consider its recommendations, the Associate Provost’s Office will schedule a meeting of the department P&B or the entire department, the Associate Provost, the Dean, and Associate Dean for a discussion of the report and the department’s reaction to it. Following this meeting, the department will develop an action plan for the next five years. The goals and timeline articulated by the department should be as explicit as possible. Two months after the meeting to discuss the report, the department's draft action plan should be submitted to the Associate Provost and Dean. The Associate Provost and Dean may recommend revisions of the draft plan or additional meetings. Once the plan is finalized, the Associate Provost will send the department and Dean a formal written acceptance.

**Programs with External Accreditation**

Generally, external accreditors request the same information as in a self-study and often conduct a site visit. In such cases, the external accreditation will take the place of the self-study and site visit components of the academic program review process. However, the program must complete a statement addressing the following issues: (i) the relationship between the program and the College’s mission, vision, and goals; (ii) assessment of student learning outcome that demonstrates how the program produces students who are *educated, empowered, and engaged*; (iii) contributes to achieving the College’s *Institutional Learning Goals*; (iv) how the program advances 90x30; and (v) how the program integrates the College’s *Strategic Plan*. This statement is attached to the final accreditation report submitted to the Dean and Associate Provost prior to their meeting with the department to consider the accreditation recommendations.

**Program Review Timeline**

	<b>Activity</b>
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of programs to be reviewed the following academic year</li> <li>• Department Chair considers potential external reviewer.</li> </ul>
Fall	Program writes self-study.
October 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department Chair recommends external reviewer(s) to the Dean and Associate Dean by mid-October</li> <li>• The Dean selects external reviewer(s) and secures the approval of the Associate Provost by end of October</li> <li>• Chair then initiates contacts to coordinate site visit dates</li> </ul>
October 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair collects signed scope of work document and signed/notarized Independent Contractor Agreement from reviewer(s)</li> <li>• Chair submits documents to Associate Provost and SPAIR Director</li> </ul>
November 30	Self-study due to Associate Provost, Dean, and Associate Dean.

January 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department Chair, Associate Dean and Dean coordinates the itinerary for the site visit.</li> <li>• Draft schedule due to the Associate Provost a month prior to the site visit.</li> </ul>
February 1	Dean's Office sends final self-study to the external reviewer(s)
By April 30	Site visit
3 weeks post site-visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External reviewer(s) report is due.</li> <li>• External reviewer invoices are due.</li> </ul>
3 weeks post external reviewer's report	Dean, Associate Dean, and Department Chair meets with Associate Provost to discuss the external reviewer's report and issues to be addressed in the Action Plan
2 months post external reviewer's report	Department Chair, Associate Dean, and Dean submit Action Plan to the Associate Provost
2 months post external reviewer's report	Associate Provost submits summary report to Provost
2 years after the program review	Dean/Associate Dean report on Action Plan implementation and outcomes

### Proposed Budget

#### *Travel (Northeast area)*

	1 Reviewer	2 Reviewers
Honorarium for external reviewers	\$500	\$1,000
Travel (transportation and hotel for 2 nights)	\$600	\$1,200
Roundtable discussions and lunch	\$200	\$200
Coffee meeting and discussion	\$100	\$100
Total	\$1,400	\$2,100

#### *Travel (immediate area)*

	1 Reviewer	2 Reviewers
Honorarium for external reviewers	\$500	\$1,000
Travel (transportation)	\$100	\$200
Roundtable discussions and lunch	\$200	\$200
Coffee meeting and discussion	\$100	\$100
Total	\$900	\$1,500

**Note:** For roundtable discussions and lunch and coffee meetings and discussion, programs should pay. Receipts should be provided to the SPAIR Office and then the funds would be transferred to the program.