UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND

INNOVATION FOR A HEALTHIER PLANET

Office of Assessment

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDEBOOK: For Programs without Programmatic Accreditation

CONTENTS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TIMELINE 1

PART I: PROGRAM REVIEW PURPOSE 2

A. Program Improvement 2
B. NECHE Accreditation Standards 2
C. Preparing for the Program Review 3

PART II: SELF-STUDY 3

A. Introduction, Context, and Goals 3
B. Evaluation of Program Quality, Viability, and Sustainability 4
   1. Evaluation of Program Quality 4
   2. Evaluation of Program Viability and Sustainability 6
C. Appendices 8

PART III: EXTERNAL REVIEW 8

A. Choosing a Reviewer 8
B. External Reviewer's Preparation, Site Visit, and Report 9

PART IV: STRATEGIC PLAN 10

PART V: WRAP-UP MEETING 12

PART VI: REGULAR CHECK-INS FOLLOWING THE REVIEW 12

REFERENCES 13

APPENDICES 14

A. Strategic Plan Template 14
B. Program Review Checklist 16

Original: September 2009
Last updated: August 2026

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TIMELINE

TIME recommended*	**ACTIVITY**
January	• Provost's office notifies deans of their programs that are scheduled to undertake a review in the upcoming academic year. The email includes the guidebook and an offer of a workshop from the Office of Assessment for completing a self-study and strategic plan. • Deans forward the message to their chairs/academic directors (AD)/program directors (PD).
By Aug 31	• Assessment office reminds deans of schedule and guidelines, which the deans then forward to their chairs/ADs/PDs. • Office of Institutional Research and Data Analytics (OIRDA) provides programs with five-year trends of relevant institutional data. • Assessment office provides a market analysis, as needed, on current and potential future new program offerings. • Chair/AD/PD and/or dean select and schedule external reviewer. • Chair/AD/PD or dean notifies provost and Assessment office of external reviewer.
Sept-Jan	• Programs under review collaborate with all pertinent stakeholders to gather and analyze data and complete a self-study. • Assessment office and OIRDA assist, as needed, programs undergoing a review.
Jan-Feb	• Programs submit self-study to the dean, who reviews and approves it. • Chair/AD/PD and/or dean then send self-study to external reviewer.
Jan-Apr	• External reviewer reviews program.
By May	• External reviewer submits report to chair/AD/PD and dean. • Program has opportunity to write a response to external reviewer's report. • Chair/AD/PD meets with dean to discuss external review and self-study findings.
Sept-Oct	• Chair/AD/PD, program faculty, and, if applicable, professional staff collaborate, consult with the dean, and draft a strategic plan that is based on the self-study, external review, and other pertinent documents. • Assessment office and OIRDA assist as needed.
By Nov 15	• Chair/AD/PD submits draft of strategic plan to the dean, who then approves it.
Nov 15-Dec 15	• Chair/AD/PD/dean sends self-study and strategic plan to the associate director of assessment. • Assessment office schedules meeting with chair/AD/PD, provost, associate provost, dean, associate dean, associate director of assessment, and other pertinent stakeholders.
By mid-Jan	• Chair/AD/PD, provost, associate provost, dean, associate dean, associate director of assessment, and other pertinent stakeholders meet to discuss and finalize the self-study and strategic plan that derived from the review.
From January	• Chair/AD/PD/dean implements strategic plan together with the program faculty and pertinent stakeholders.
Follow-up Progress Report	
Annually, Aug/Sept, after the program review	• Assessment office checks in with dean's offices to see if the deans need updates on their programs' strategic plans. • Dean meets with chairs/ADs/PDs, as needed, to discuss progress on their strategic plan.

*While the entire program review should be completed over an 18-month period, colleges may adjust the timing of the steps within the process to better suit their specific needs. A timeline will be established following a discussion.

PART I: PROGRAM REVIEW PURPOSE

Program review serves as one of the instruments the University of New England (UNE) uses to regularly evaluate its educational effectiveness and make plans for improvement. UNE's program review process involves a comprehensive analysis to evaluate and enhance the quality and currency of each program.

Programs without programmatic accreditation generally undergo a program review and self-study once every seven years, depending on the program and its college procedures, through a combination of internal self-evaluation and external peer-evaluation.

Various levels of the institution—program, department/school, college/division, and university—use the program review's results to inform planning and improvement, budgeting and resource allocation, and overall quality assurance. The review process typically is completed over an 18-month period.

According to Wolff (2006), "If done appropriately, program review provides a singularly effective way of addressing both the need for internal improvement and external accountability" (xii).

A. Program Improvement

Program review provides an internal structure and process to foster continuous program improvements that may include:

- Aligning program strategic plan with the college mission and university strategic plan
- Aligning program strategic plan to program learning outcomes
- Refining program learning outcomes for assessing student learning
- Making curricular and instructional changes to improve student learning and retention
- Refining, reorganizing, or refocusing curricula to reflect changes in the discipline or profession
- Refining curriculum map and measures for assessing student learning
- Reorganizing or improving student support systems, including advising, library services, and career readiness, to improve students' academic success in the program
- Designing needed professional development programs, including those that help faculty learn how to assess learning outcomes, increase pedagogical effectiveness, and improve curricular cohesion
- Reorganizing or refocusing resources to advance student learning and the curriculum
- Reassigning faculty/professional staff or requesting new lines
- Illuminating potential intra-institutional collaborations
- Informing decision-making, planning, and budgeting, including resource allocation
- Linking and aggregating program review results to the institution's broader quality assurance and improvement efforts

B. NECHE Accreditation Standards

While not the primary reason for conducting a program review, the increased scrutiny on the quality, cost, and value of higher education has led to heightened regulatory oversight to ensure that there is regular and ongoing institutional oversight of its programs. In this context, the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE), UNE's institutional accreditor recognized by the U.S. Department of Education, specifies:

The institution reviews its academic programs on a regular cycle, incorporates external perspectives when applicable, and uses the results for program improvement (2026, Standard 2.10).

The institution regularly and systematically collects and analyzes data aligned with its mission and uses the findings to identify and address areas for improvement (2026, Standard 4.3).

C. Preparing for the Program Review

As programs begin working on their self-study and strategic plan, it is important to continue to refer to the academic program review timeline (p. 1), which lays out the key steps in the process. Typically, the program review's steps extend over three semesters.

- **Fall semester**: Program works with its dean's office to identify and schedule an external reviewer and collaborates with its faculty and other pertinent stakeholders to complete a self-study, while assembling the main components of its strategic plan.
- **Spring semester**: The dean's office reviews and approves the self-study. Then, at least 30 days before the external review, the program and/or dean's office sends the self-study to the external reviewer, who then reviews the program at the scheduled date.
- **Following fall semester**: Program completes the strategic plan. Once the dean's office approves the materials, the key stakeholders (e.g., the chair/AD/PD, dean, associate dean, provost, associate provost, and associate director of assessment) meet to discuss and wrap up the review.

PART II: SELF-STUDY

The self-study should consist of a maximum of 15 pages (excluding appendices). It is a **comprehensive, evidence-based, and candid inquiry and analysis** of the program since its prior review. Prepare the self-study in a collaborative effort by having all program faculty contribute to it and review it.

The self-study: (a) begins with a brief introduction of the program; (b) centers on evaluating the program quality, viability, and sustainability; and then, following an external review; (c) establishes a strategic plan for program improvement. Ultimately, the self-study and external review should serve as the foundation for the program's strategic plan.

A. Introduction, Context, and Goals

The self-study begins with a brief section that provides the context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study, this portion is primarily descriptive and may include:

- The internal context: What substantive changes have been made in the program since the last review? What value does the program bring to the institution? How does the program support, enhance, and/or interface with other programs at the institution? How does the program support the university mission and strategic plan?
- The external context: How is the program responsive to the needs of the field, discipline, community, and/or region in which it serves? What contributions, if any, has the program provided to the larger community?

Include the program mission, vision, core values, and program learning outcomes, updating them as needed. If the program does not yet have a mission, a vision, or core values, develop them for this section.

They should serve as key points of analysis that make up the core of the program review's next section and the foundation of the program's strategic plan (Part IV).

- The **program mission** should describe, in honest, authentic, and concise prose, the program's present-based purpose, i.e. the reasons it exists, within the context of the UNE mission.
- The **program vision** should describe, in a concrete and concise manner, the program's future-based, long-term ambitions and aspirations by articulating the direction and path it plans to take, the goals it seeks to carry out, the identity it wants to assume, and the impact it wishes to make on the students, the university, and the community. Situate the program vision statement within the context of the UNE vision; compose it in future tense; and organize it, if desired, into areas within the department/school, such as student majors and minors, and faculty research, scholarship, and service.
- The **program core values** should highlight, either in paragraph form or numbered/bullet points, the program's set of qualitative attributes that characterize and guide its ethos, principles, and standards. The core values convey the behaviors and qualities that the program values, expects, and exemplifies, within the context of the UNE core values, and serve as the basis for decision-making. A program can value, for instance, student-centeredness, collegiality, academic excellence, health and wellness, and lifelong learning.
- **Program learning outcomes** are more specific statements that articulate what successful student majors will possess when they complete the program. They should begin with a measurable verb; state the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and/or values students will develop when they graduate; and be accompanied with direct and/or indirect measures that assess student learning.

Program mission, vision, core values, and program learning outcomes should align with each other and with the college mission, the institution mission, and the institution strategic plan.



"As appropriate to its mission, the institution provides clear public statements about what students are expected to gain from their education (e.g., civic engagement, information literacy, employability, critical thinking, religious formation, global awareness)" (NECHE, 2026, Standard 1.2).

B. Evaluation of Program Quality, Viability, and Sustainability

The bulk of the self-study entails an evidence-based analysis and evaluation of the program's quality, viability, and sustainability. Departments/schools that are reviewing more than one program for their self-study should evaluate **all** of their majors, minors, and concentrations. This portion of the report uses evidence to evaluate the extent to which the program mission, vision, core values, and program learning outcomes are being met. Again, this is an **evidence-based, reflective, and candid inquiry and analysis.**

Program evaluation can be divided into two categories:

- Program quality
- Program viability and sustainability

1. Evaluation of Program Quality typically addresses questions about:

a. **Students**: In what ways do the program mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes relate to and enhance the profile of students in the program?

   - Data might include:
     - Students' gender, ethnicity, age, GPA, standardized test scores, previous institution, and employment status. (OIRDA will provide five-year trends of relevant institutional data on the program.)

b. **The Curriculum and Learning Environment**: How current is the program's curriculum? Does it offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for the degree? How well does it align with the program mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes? Are the courses well sequenced and reliably available in the sequence? How does the program compare to external stakeholders' feedback and/or similar programs?

   - Evidence might include:
     - A curriculum map and description of the ways in which the curriculum addresses the program learning outcomes
     - A comparison of the program's curriculum with curricula at other institutions and with disciplinary/professional standards
     - Measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course teaching observations and evaluations, faculty scholarship on teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty)
     - Other learning experiences that are relevant to program learning outcomes (e.g., internships, research experiences, study abroad, community-based learning), and the number of students who participate in those experiences
     - A narrative on the ways in which the faculty's pedagogy responds to various learning modalities and student learning preferences

c. **Student Learning and Success:** To what degree are students achieving the program learning outcomes at the expected level of learning? How are the outcomes measured and evaluated? What changes have been made in response to the assessment results? Are students being retained and graduating in a timely fashion? To what degree are they being prepared for advanced study or the profession?

   While the annual assessment reports address a few selected program learning outcomes each year, the self-study should consider **all** of the program learning outcomes and provide a summary and analysis of assessment results and the substantive changes the program has put in place since its last self-study.

   - Evidence might include:
     - Annual results of direct and indirect student learning measures in the program
     - Departmental/school ongoing efforts to "close the loop" by responding to assessment results
     - Student retention and graduation rate trends
     - Graduate school and/or job placement rates
     - Graduating student and/or alumni satisfaction surveys
     - Employer evaluations of student performance or employer survey satisfaction results
     - Disciplinary ratings of the program
     - Student/alumni achievements (e.g., community service, research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments)

"Because student learning is a fundamental goal of any academic program, student learning assessment should be a primary component of the program review process" (Suskie, 2009, p. 14).

"A meaningful program review process…should include information about student learning as a basis for review and planning" (Walvoord, 2010, p. 40).

"The institution uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods, and direct and indirect measures, to assess its mission-appropriate goals for student learning and success and to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of its academic programs, student services, and co-curricular programs in achieving its mission and facilitating student success" (NECHE, 2026, Standard 4.2).

d. **Faculty**: What are the highlights of the faculty's qualifications and achievements that relate to the program mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes? How do faculty members' background, expertise, research, and pedagogical methods contribute to the quality of the program?

    - Evidence might include:
        - List of faculty specialties within the discipline and how those specialties align with the program curriculum
        - Teaching quality (e.g., peer evaluations, faculty self-review)
        - Faculty participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment
        - Record of scholarship, funding, awards, service, and/or professional practice
        - Proportion of faculty with terminal degrees
        - Distribution of faculty across ranks or years at institution
        - Diversity of faculty

2. Evaluation of Program Viability and Sustainability

Evaluation of program viability typically addresses: the level of student demand for the program; the reasons students choose the program; the uniqueness of the program; the available faculty to support the program; and the overall relevance of the program.

Evaluation of program sustainability typically addresses: the program's strategic vision and plan; the program's internal management; the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately and are sufficient to maintain program quality and support the program in achieving its mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes; and the extent to which the program has and will continue to have the support it needs.

a. **Demand for the Program/Market Analysis:** What makes the program unique? Why do students choose to major/minor in the program? How does the program distinguish itself in the market? How does it compare to similar programs at other institutions? How does it compare to professional standards?

    1. Evidence might include:
        - Trends in student applications, admits, and enrollments over a five-year period
        - Trends within the profession, local community, region, and/or nation on the anticipated need for this program in the future
        - The program's effort to recruit new students
        - Internal demand for the program or the support it offers to other programs

- Credit-hour production for the program (which includes majors and non-majors)

"Many academic programs are necessary simply because they are required to support other programs. A high degree of interdependence exists among academic disciplines, especially because programs are designed to develop well-rounded graduates" (Dickeson, 2010, p. 74).

b. **Allocation of Resources**: Does the program have the support it needs? Has the program met and/or set its goals for resources? Are there a sufficient number of faculty, student support services, information and technology resources, facilities, professional staff, and/or financial resources to maintain program quality?

Evidence might include:

1. **Student support**
   - Academic and career advising programs, practices, and resources
   - Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and T.A. training
   - Basic skill remediation
   - Support for connecting program learning outcomes to general education outcomes
   - Orientation and transition programs
   - Financial support (scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.)
   - Support for engagement in the campus community
   - Support for non-cognitive variables of success, including emotional and psychological needs
   - Support for research or engagement in the community beyond campus, such as fieldwork or internships

2. **Faculty support**
   - FTE faculty to credits taught
   - Student-faculty ratio
   - Faculty workload
   - Faculty review and evaluation processes
   - Mentoring processes/program
   - Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds)
   - Sufficient time for course development and teaching, and professional development (e.g., research, writing, and conference presentations)

3. **Information and technology resources**
   - Library print and electronic holdings in the program's teaching and research areas
   - Resources to support information literacy outcomes
   - Technology resources to support the pedagogy and research in the program
   - Technology resources to support students' needs

4. **Facilities**
   - Classroom space
   - Instructional and/or research laboratories
   - Office space
   - Student study spaces
   - Access to classrooms suited for instructional technology

- Access to classrooms designed for alternative learning styles

5. **Professional Staff**
   - Administrative and technical FTE professional staff supporting program, departmental, and/or school operations

6. **Financial resources**
   - Operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a five-year period

C. Appendices

Include all relevant documentation in the Appendix. Add, for example: data from institutional research, survey results of faculty and students in the program, course syllabi, course evaluations, examples of student work, annual assessment reports of student learning outcomes, curricular flow charts, faculty CVs, and examples of faculty research.

As the academic program review timeline indicates (see p. 1), once the chair/AD/PD completes the self-study and the dean reviews and approves it, the chair/AD/PD and dean then send the external reviewer the self-study, and the external reviewer appraises the program.

PART III: EXTERNAL REVIEW

Each program review includes an external review that typically occurs after the program completes its self-study. The external review process aims to encourage programs to compare their offerings with similar programs at other institutions, provide faculty and administrators with a wider perspective, and ensure that the program under review is current and is not isolated from the larger community.

A. Choosing a Reviewer

The external reviewer should be an active and distinguished scholar/teacher/practitioner in the field and be chosen from a similar program to UNE's program under review. It is also helpful for the external reviewer to have experience with program administration, the ability to review and analyze student learning outcomes assessment and the program's assessment processes and findings, and be able to carry out an impartial review.

When possible, the reviewer should reside within a reasonable distance from the UNE campus (i.e., the Northeast) to minimize expenses.

Candidates with the following potential conflicts of interest should be avoided.

- Individuals with a prior UNE faculty appointment, or who have applied for a position in the UNE program under review during the past 10 years
- Individuals with a strong connection to the program faculty (e.g., collaborated on publications, presentations, research projects, and/or grants)

To begin the process, the chair/AD/PD, in consultation with the dean, should determine the best candidate as the external reviewer. The chair/AD/PD and/or dean then confirms and schedules the external reviewer and sends the external reviewer the self-study.

B. External Reviewer's Preparation, Site Visit, and Report

Around thirty days before the scheduled review, the chair/AD/PD and/or dean should send the self-study to the external reviewer.

The reviewer's visit typically lasts 1-2 days, during which time the reviewer meets with program/department/school faculty, professional staff, students, and the dean. The reviewer is expected to submit a report to the chair/AD/PD within three weeks of the visit.

The reviewer should comment on all aspects of the program under review.

The external reviewer might consider the following questions for her/his/their report:

Self-Study:
- What is the overall quality of the program's self-study? Does it effectively evaluate the program, and reflect on its successes and areas needing special attention?

Program:
- What are the program's strengths and accomplishments?
- What are the program's greatest opportunities and how can it best capitalize on them?
- What are the program's areas that need special attention? What strategies might the program take to address those areas?

Courses and Curriculum:
- How current are the program's courses and curriculum?
- Do the courses and curriculum offer sufficient breadth and depth of the topic(s) for the degree?
- Are the courses well sequenced and reliably available in sequence?
- How often are the courses updated?
- Who develops the courses and curriculum?
- Who reviews and approves the courses and curriculum?

Program Assessment:
- How well does the curriculum align with the program mission, vision, core values, and program learning outcomes?
- Are the program learning outcomes appropriate to the level of the program?
- Do the learning outcomes align with the assessment measures?
- Are the measures appropriate for assessing the learning outcomes?
- Who collects, analyzes, and reports on the assessment data? Does the program have a designated person or committee in place for programmatic assessment?
- Is the program meeting its benchmarks of those outcomes? To what extent are students achieving the desired outcomes at the expected level?

Students:
- What are the general characteristics of the student population?
- Do most of the students that the program serves take one or multiple courses in the program?
- Are students getting the support they need from the faculty, the college, and the university to succeed in the program?
- Are students getting the skills they need to meet their educational and professional goals?

- Based on the evidence, does the program adequately prepare its students for the profession and/or graduate study?
- Is the program meeting student expectations?

Faculty:
- How well do faculty meet the needs of the program (e.g., in terms of teaching experience, areas of expertise, academic qualifications, committee and advising work)?
- Are the faculty's pedagogical practices engaging and effective for the students?
- Are faculty getting the support they need for course development, teaching, and professional development?
- What resources might faculty need to get further support?
- How often are faculty reviewed? What are the elements of the review process?
- Are faculty involved in shared governance?

Program Administration:
- What is the administrative structure of the program?
- How well are the department, school, college, and university supporting the program?
- What resources might the college and/or university provide to strengthen the program (e.g., more classroom space, advising support, library print and electronic sources)?

Program's Viability and Sustainability:
- What is the program viability and sustainability?
- What is the program's position on expanding or reducing courses?
- What are the growth opportunities for the program (e.g., forming collaborations with other programs, colleges, or external organizations)?

Upon submission of the external reviewer's report to the chair/AD/PD and dean, the external reviewer receives a $1000 honorarium and up to $1000 reimbursement for reasonable travel expenses, including mileage, meals, and hotel stay. The college/school/department will incur the costs associated with the external review but can make special requests for support to the Office of Provost as necessary. Deans should include these expenses in their annual budget requests based on the number of program reviews that will be conducted in their college in the upcoming fiscal year.

After receiving the external reviewer's report, the chair/AD/PD reads the report for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions, and, if needed, prepares a departmental response.

PART IV: STRATEGIC PLAN

The self-study will conclude with an evidence-based strategic plan for the program. The strategic plan should be based on and reflect on the findings derived from the self-study, the external review, programmatic and institutional data, market analysis, and discussions with and feedback from other pertinent stakeholders. The strategic plan should also align with the college mission and university strategic plan.

At minimum, the program's strategic plan should follow the structure and level of detail of the university strategic plan, including: (a) Mission, (b) Vision, (c) Core Values, (d) Strategic Priorities, (e) Prioritized Goals, (f) Initiatives/Strategies, and (g) Action Items.

Departments or schools with more than one program may decide to create a strategic plan for each of their programs or that encompasses the entire department or school, or, for example, establish a common

mission, vision, and core values, and separate strategic priorities, prioritized goals, initiatives/strategies, and action items.

The strategic plan should ultimately facilitate departments/schools to agree on the future direction of their program and the values and goals they want to fulfill. It should go beyond the components of the self-study and external review and envision future collaborations, innovations, and actions to further benefit the students, the program, the college, and the university.

(a) Mission: The mission statement should describe, in honest, authentic, and concise prose, the program's present-based purpose, i.e. the reasons it exists, within the context of the UNE mission.

(b) Vision: The vision statement should describe, in a concrete and concise manner, the program's future-based, long-term ambitions and aspirations by articulating the direction and path it plans to take, the goals it seeks to carry out, the identity it wants to assume, and the impact it wishes to make on the students, the university, and the community. Situate the program vision statement within the context of the UNE vision; compose it in future tense; and organize it, if desired, into areas within the department or school, such as student majors and minors, and faculty research, scholarship, and service.

(c) Core Values: The core values should highlight, either in paragraph form or numbered/bullet points, the program's set of qualitative attributes that characterize and guide its ethos, principles, and standards. The core values convey the behaviors and qualities that the program values, expects, and exemplifies, within the context of the UNE core values, serve as the basis for decision-making, and underpin the program mission, vision, strategic priorities, prioritized goals, initiatives/strategies, and action items. A program can value, for instance, student-centeredness, collegiality, academic excellence, health and wellness, and lifelong learning.

(d) Strategic Priorities: The program's strategic priorities are a collection of overarching areas of focus that should include a brief description and vision statement, like the UNE strategic priorities, and align with and be mapped to the UNE strategic priorities where possible. Reference the number of each of UNE's strategic priorities that aligns with the program's strategic priorities (see Appendix A for template). The program can also include other priorities that do not directly map to UNE's strategic priorities, if needed.

(e) Prioritized Goals: Under each strategic priority, the program should list measurable short-term (1-2 years) and long-term (3-5 years) prioritized goals.

(f) Initiatives/Strategies: Under each goal, the program should list various initiatives and/or strategies it will implement to achieve the related goal.

(g) Action Items: Then, under each initiative/strategy, the program should list concrete, achievable, and measurable action items that it will carry out to fulfill (d), (e), and (f).

Sections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of the strategic plan should address all concerns identified in the self-study, including program quality, viability, and sustainability, and by the external reviewer.

The chair/AD/PD then submits the self-study, external reviewer's report, program's response (if any), strategic plan, and any other pertinent documents to the provost, dean, and associate director of assessment.

PART V: WRAP-UP MEETING

Once the program completes its self-study, external review, and strategic plan, and receives approval from its dean's office, the chair/AD/PD sends the materials to the associate director of assessment who then schedules a wrap-up meeting. The wrap-up meeting brings together the provost, dean, associate provost, associate dean, chair/AD/PD, associate director of assessment, and any other stakeholders.

Before the meeting, the associate director of assessment will ask the invitees (1) if other stakeholders need to attend (e.g., representatives from Admissions or the Registrar), and (2) the topics that the chair/AD/PD should prepare to address. To ensure a meaningful and productive meeting, the associate director of assessment will also ask the chair/AD/PD to open with a ten-minute high-level summary of the review that includes the program's key findings, successes, challenges, and opportunities that are connected to enrollment, retention, and/or learning outcome trends. The meeting will then move into a discussion on the review.

PART VI: REGULAR CHECK-INS FOLLOWING THE REVIEW

Program reviews for programs without programmatic accreditation generally run on a seven-year cycle. Thus, in the years between a program's review, its dean's office, in collaboration with the Office of Assessment, will regularly check in to get updates on its strategic plan.

Throughout their seven-year review cycle, programs should regularly evaluate their strategic plan. For various unforeseen reasons, they might need to add, revise, or remove a component of their strategic plan. For instance, after a year or more of implementing its strategic plan, a program might need to change direction, remove one of its strategic priorities, and/or add a different one. That process thus might involve revising the prioritized goals, initiatives/strategies, and action items that fall under each strategic priority. Or a program might keep its strategic priorities but revise its action items.

The Assessment office will check in with the dean's offices annually, early in the fall semester, to see if they need to remind programs of the action items they are working on that year. Each dean's office will then decide if/when it needs to check in with programs. Because each program differs, for instance, the deans should decide which school/department/program needs an annual check-in, and which needs a biennial check-in. The check-in provides an opportunity for deans to regularly discuss with their chairs/ADs/PDs their strategic plans. Since programs tend to undergo changes and leadership transitions over the years, the check-in ensures that they continue working toward their goals.

The Assessment office recommends that each dean's office encourages its programs to regularly record the progress and modifications they have made toward their strategic plans. Each program can either create its own file, or the Assessment office will provide a standard spreadsheet for each program to record the updates.

The Assessment office recommends that each dean's office meets regularly with its programs to discuss:

- the scope of their work on their strategic plans;
- the length of time that programs need to complete each action item;
- the resources programs need to complete each action item;
- the progress they have made on each action item; and
- the modifications programs need to make on their strategic plan.

The Assessment office also encourages chairs/ADs/PDs to engage in regularly scheduled meetings with their faculty/department/school to discuss the work needed toward achieving their goals. The Assessment

office will keep track of the program review schedule and contact the deans as each program reaches its seven-year cycle and will need to undergo its next comprehensive program review.

REFERENCES

Dickeson, R. C. (2010). *Prioritizing academic programs and services, revised and updated: Reallocating resources to achieve strategic balance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

New England Commission of Higher Education. (2026). *Standards for accreditation*. Retrieved from https://www.neche.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/2026-NECHE-Standards-for-Accreditation-2-26-2026.pdf

Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

U.S. Department of Education. (2016-17). *Federal student aid handbook with active index* (Vol. 2, Ch. 1).

Walvoord, B. E. (2010). *Assessment clear and simple: A practical guide for institutions, departments and general education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (2016). *Resource guide for 'good practices' in academic program review: 2013 handbook of accreditation update*.

Wolff, R. A. (2006). Foreword. In M. J. Bresciani, *Outcomes-based academic and co-curricular program review: A compilation of institutional good practices* (pp. ix - xiv). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

APPENDIX A:
STRATEGIC PLAN TEMPLATE

[Program/Department/School] Strategic Plan, YYYY-YYYY

Completed MMMM YYYY

**Format the program strategic plan the same way as the UNE strategic plan. The program/departmental/school strategic plan does not need to mimic the language of the UNE strategic plan. It should be program-/department-/school-specific but aligned to UNE's strategic plan.*

Mission:

Vision:

Core Values:

I. Strategic Priority (Aligned with UNE Strategic Priorities # & #)

Brief description, vision statement, or statement of significance

Toward these ends, we will:

1. **Prioritized Goal**
    - Initiative/Strategy
        - Action Item
        - Action Item
    - Initiative/Strategy
        - Action Item
        - Action Item
    - Initiative/Strategy
        - Action Item
        - Action Item
2. **Prioritized Goal**
    - Initiative/Strategy
        - Action Item
        - Action Item
    - Initiative/Strategy
        - Action Item
        - Action Item
    - Initiative/Strategy
        - Action Item
        - Action Item
3. **Prioritized Goal**
    - Initiative/Strategy

    - Action Item
    - Action Item
- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item

II. Strategic Priority (Aligned with UNE Strategic Priorities # & #)

Brief description, vision statement, or statement of significance

Toward these ends, we will:

1. Prioritized Goal

- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item
- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item
- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item

2. Prioritized Goal

- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item
- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item
- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item

III. Strategic Priority (Aligned with UNE Strategic Priorities # & #)

Brief description, vision statement, or statement of significance

Toward these ends, we will:

1. Prioritized Goal

- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item
- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item
- Initiative/Strategy
    - Action Item
    - Action Item

APPENDIX B:
PROGRAM REVIEW CHECKLIST

This program review checklist includes **recommendations** of key items to address in a self-study and strategic plan for programs without programmatic accreditation. See Parts II, III, and IV (above) for a detailed description of the following items. **This checklist is neither comprehensive nor compulsory**. Rather, it aims to help programs put together an evaluative and reflective self-study and purposeful strategic plan.

Criteria	Yes	No	Comments
Part II: Self-Study, A: Introduction, Context, and Goals			
Self-study includes a clear overview of the program's internal and/or external context since the program's last review			
Self-study includes the program mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes			
Program mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes align with each other			
Program mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes align with the college mission			
Program mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes align with the university mission and strategic plan			
Part II: Self-Study, B: Evaluation of Program Quality, Viability, and Sustainability			
Self-study amply evaluates program quality by using evidence from, for example, the profile of students, the curriculum and learning environment, student learning and success, and/or faculty contributions			
Self-study evaluates **all** of the departmental/school majors, minors, and concentrations			
Self-study evaluates assessment of **all** of the program learning outcomes			
Program uses robust direct, indirect, quantitative, and/or qualitative tools to measure and assess student learning			
Program has established benchmarks/target goals for each learning outcome			
Program identifies and evaluates its strengths using sound evidence from student learning measures			
Program identifies and evaluates its areas for improvement using sound evidence from student learning measures			
Program "closes the loop" on assessment by incorporating findings from its assessment process for ongoing improvement			

Self-study evaluates program viability and sustainability by using evidence from, for example, demand for the program and/or allocation of resources			
Program uses evidence to ultimately evaluate the extent to which it meets its mission, vision, core values, and learning outcomes			
Part III: External Review			
Program review includes an external review			
Part IV: Strategic Plan			
The strategic plan is based on and reflects on the findings derived from the self-study, the external review, programmatic and institutional data, relevant market analysis, and discussions with and feedback from other pertinent stakeholders.			
Strategic plan states the program's mission, which aligns with the UNE mission			
Strategic plan states the program's vision, which aligns with the UNE vision			
Strategic plan articulates the program's core values, which align with the UNE core values			
Strategic plan states the program's strategic priorities, which align with the UNE strategic priorities			
Strategic plan maps the program's strategic priorities with the UNE strategic priorities, where applicable			
Strategic plan lists measurable, short- and long-term prioritized goals the program will take to fulfill each related strategic priority			
Strategic plan lists the initiatives/strategies the program will take to fulfill each related strategic priority and prioritized goal			
Strategic plan includes concrete, achievable, and measurable action items the program will carry out to fulfill each related strategic priority, prioritized goal, and initiative/strategy			
Strategic plan addresses all concerns identified in the self-study, and/or by the external reviewer			