DREXEL UNIVERSITY
Office of the
Provost

Program Alignment and Review

PAR
Compendium

APRIL 25, 2018

Handbook for Program Review
At Drexel University

Creating a Culture of Assessment and Reflection for Continuous Quality Improvement

Overseen by the University Program Alignment and Review Committee

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

BACKGROUND

Program Review, part of the Program Alignment and Review (PAR) process, fulfills several purposes at Drexel University. Primarily, the process is designed to assess program quality, viability, and facilitate program improvement. PAR also assists in achieving the best use of institutional resources, both human and financial. The information and data gathered in the course of the review will assist in Drexel's planning efforts and guide its academic decisions. Drexel's PAR program is fully compliant with the expectations for institutional self-reflection as articulated by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, our regional accreditation body.

The primary purpose of academic program review then is to examine, assess, and strengthen programs. Programs will be examined to determine:

A. The quality of educational programs, including an assessment of student outcomes.
B. The quality of research, creative activity, or scholarly work.
C. The quality of outreach activities and service to the university, the profession, and the community.
D. The contribution or importance of the program to other campus programs.
E. The viability, potential, and future expectations for the program.

The review is intended to:

A. Enhance the quality of a program and to assist in determining a program's ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities
B. Evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and thus determine future priorities
C. Aid in shaping a strategic plan for the program going forward
D. Result in an action plan that will guide and shape the program over the course of the next 5 to 7 years.

ELEMENTS OF THE PAR PROCESS

There are three major components to the PAR process at Drexel: the **self-study**, the **external review**, and the **action plan**. Each creates a synergy with the other, and each overlaps with the other. The outcome of

reviews should inform planning for the future using analysis of recent data trends, with program/departments identifying through self-study and review, the necessary steps to maintain excellence correct deficiencies, and reflect on potential economies and efficiencies.

TAB 1 - PAR INITIATION AGREEMENTS

The self-study process commences with the receipt of a signed initiation agreement [See Tab 1]. This document is to be completed in the time specified, and is the first deliverable post orientation. Instructions appear on the template. Copies of the initiation agreement will also be available from the internal Share Point site [https://provost.moss.drexel.edu/par/steering/SitePages/Home.aspx] to which all of you will be given access. The site is a compendium of required forms, data repositories, resources, and work files dedicated to each of the self-study teams. Each team's work folder will only be available for viewing and action to members of that particular team, and *not* to other discipline's team members.

TAB 2 - PAR TIME LINE OF ACTIONS

Additionally, each of the action items or deliverables will reside on a time line of action [See Tab 2] that will similarly be posted on the Share Point site, and updated from time to time as circumstances dictate. Changes to the time line will be posted on the SharePoint site as they occur and sent as e-mails to PAR Chairs of Self-Study Teams

TABS 3 AND 4 - PAR CYCLES

The Standing Program Alignment and Review Committee or PAR appointed by the Provost has determined that Drexel will operate on a 7-year cycle of academic program review. For a complete schedule of the full university PAR cycle to 2025, [See Tab 3]. This year, 2018-2019, there are 18 programs undergoing review, and those can be reviewed in Tab 4. Taken together, Drexel will have engaged 102 programs in academic review from inception [AY 2012-2013] to June 2019.

In addition, to a listing of programs to be reviewed in Tab 4, you will find in Tab 5 all of the names of the team members for 2018-19 including their e-mail contact information.

TAB 6 – DATA

One of the cornerstones of the PAR process is data. A new initiative this year will be to provide direct access to departmental/program data through the Tableau software. The customized dashboards created by Institutional Research [IR] will provide data ranging from admissions and enrollment to retention and graduation data. This new level of access will allow you to gain immediate access to data rather than waiting for requested information. Institutional Research [IR] will offer a brief overview and training during the PAR orientation, and then will offer follow up trainings if needed and requested.

The available data in Tableau and the Office of the Provost does not preclude you from introducing data from another source which is vetted and validated, and which can effectively provide evidentiary material to your narrative. You might also request a customized report for your program, which we, in concert with IR, will endeavor to produce for you. In addition, in Tab 6 you will find a series of guidelines and suggestions for the review of data. As in past years, fiscal data will be provided by the Office of the Provost.

TAB 7 – EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Still another key element of PAR is the use of external reviewers to review the self-study as well as to engage in an on-site visit. Tab 7 provides all of the necessary background with which to assist the teams in procuring external reviewers as well as the procedures for arranging the site visits. In selecting the reviewers, please bear in mind that the PAR Standing Committee would like to have the participating external reviewer group consist of distinguished educators in their fields with knowledge and expertise regarding the work of their departments and the practical academic requirements of their discipline. You are encouraged to recommend evaluators of exceptional scholarship and significant professional reputation. Within Tab 7, you will also find suggestions for organizing the site visit as well as sample itineraries for a two day visit which is the recommended length. Finally, you will see in Tab 7 a memo, which carefully outlines the expectations the standing committee has for the oral exit summary given to the Provost, as well as the written report to be issued by the visiting teams two to three weeks after the preliminary oral summary and the site visit.

TAB 8 – SCDC

For the last two years, the reflective essays that students are required to submit as part of their CoOP experience were included in the material made available to the self-study teams through your college liasion. Several of the teams chose to incorporate some content gleaned from the sample student essays into their report, and they did so quite effectively, usually to personalize and underscore points and perspectives noted in the narrative. For a list of how the Steinbright Career Development Center could be helpful to your PAR self-study work this year, review the information in Tab 8.

TAB 9 – THE ACTION PLAN

The third major dimension in PAR, and in some ways the most critical, is the development of the follow-up action plan. The action plan presents an opportunity for the program/department to develop a series of action steps based upon the synthesis of the self-study team's recommendations and the external reviewers. While this is the culminating step in the process, it is also the roadmap that sustains the program from the first PAR review to the second in the cycle. Tab 9 illustrates the elements and their definitions that will be entered into a software called Compliance Assist to increase the ease of tracking and updating the action plan. Training will be offered on this topic during orientation and as we move further into the process. It is an extremely user-friendly and intuitive software, which requires a mere 30 minutes to explain.

TAB 10 – SAMPLE SELF STUDY

In Tab 10, you find a sample self-study format from the Physics Department. The Physics Self-Study report was selected as an exemplar of the pilot process in place during 2012-13. An additional exemplar report for the Physician Assistant program is also available to all of the teams. Please be advised that all of the self-

studies are posted on our internal SharePoint site for your review at any time you wish should you care see what programs in your college or school have submitted.

TAB 11 – RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVITY

Tab 11, shows you the research, scholarship and creativity tables that are active in the resource section of the PAR SharePoint site. You will use these tables in addition to answering the questions on pages 9 – 11 for Research, Scholarship and Creativity.

One of the many developments during the last three cycles was the addition of offering *__focus groups__* to the self-study teams for use in their reports. The focus groups are facilitated by the Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Effectiveness, and are available to all teams as an optional service. Many of the self-study teams initiated this request of us to which we were very happy to accommodate. The resultant feedback was extremely purposeful to the report, and so we are now offering to facilitate focus groups for any self-study team in 2018-2019 who would like to participate. At the conclusion of the focus groups each self-study team will receive, a written transcript summary with all identifying information [if any] redacted. **Additionally, we will meet with the teams personally to discuss the focus group reports**.

I.   THE SELF-STUDY

A self-study will be completed for *all* programs at the University. The self-study will be conducted by a team of faculty [typically 3 to 5 members] under the direction of a coordinator or chair with **all members of the team being selected by the Dean or his/her designee**. The self-study offers the opportunity to collect, document, and review all of the quantitative and qualitative information required for making reliable decisions about program quality, direction and viability.

The centerpiece of the review process is the program/department's self-study. The self-study will reflect the program/department's unique culture and provide an opportunity for critical self-reflection and assessment of the program/department's scholarly directions and academic programs, along with its strengths and weaknesses. The self-study should provide a helpful and detailed overview of the unit.

The Dean of each college is responsible for selecting and approving the Self-Study Committee for each program/department undergoing review. Committee members will include senior faculty and will reflect the diversity of the program or department. **Faculty committee members will represent tenured and tenure-track faculty _as well as_ full-time teaching faculty.** Adjunct faculty may be included as well if it is appropriate for the program. Self-study groups should have no more than five members and may include 1-2 members from outside the program/department if that is deemed relevant for the study. The self-study committee typically will be chaired by the Program Director or Department Head for the program/department under study, and he/she will manage the efforts of the group to ensure the report's completion by the time indicated in the self-study initiation agreement and published time line.

OUTLINE FOR THE SELF-STUDY

The questions provided here are meant to be ***guiding*** questions that can be used throughout the process and in framing your narrative. **There is no expectation that every question will be answered by each program undergoing review. Not all questions will apply to every program. Questions should be engaged honestly, openly and fully. Responses must contain specific examples, details, and metrics.** Do not simply list the question and the response. We encourage the team to use the information gathered as an opportunity for program reflection and review, and how what you discovered might impact your programmatic vision. Teams will address those questions that are both relevant and meaningful for the particular program under review.

A. Executive Summary of Review and Improvement Plan

The self-study should begin with an executive summary of one to two pages that introduces the self-study report and documents the program review process. This summary should identify highlights of the self-study as well as identify issues and challenges meriting future attention. The summary can also include unique areas of distinction or strength in the program.

B. Program Description

1. Describe the size, scope (e.g., degree programs), and mission of the program.
2. Describe the key majors and related curricular activities of the program.
3. Identify significant accomplishments of this program in recent years.
4. Briefly describe the culture and leadership of this unit.
5. Provide a discussion of how the program aligns with the mission of its College/School and of the University. Are goals and expectations clear and supported by faculty?
6. What are the significant obstacles to greater achievement in this program?
7. With what programs in peer or aspirant institutions would you like to be considered?

C. Background and History

1. When was the program initiated? What was the impetus for the program's creation?
2. Describe the evolution of the program and time points where significant mission elements were established.
3. Discuss any recent events that have particular significance to the status of the program.
4. Describe the history of the department's/program's working climate? Is there an environment of collegiality, collaboration, and cooperation?

D. Enrollment and Student Profile

1. How well are enrollment analytics used, if at all, to respond to the needs of entering students?
2. Provide information on the placement of graduates.
3. Discuss trends observed in the number and diversity of students entering your program over the last 10 years.
4. Describe admission requirements for the program.
5. Discuss initiatives to improve access and increase enrollment for selected populations.

E. Faculty Profile

1. Summarize the composition of the faculty associated with the program and attach, in an appendix, a curriculum vita for each faculty member in the program.
2. Identify any significant faculty achievements in scholarship, creativity, research productivity and teaching.

F.   Curriculum and Instruction

1. Describe with appropriate detail the structure and content of the curriculum.
2. Please provide syllabi for all courses being actively taught in the program. All syllabi should contain course level outcomes/objectives.
3. Describe instructional/pedagogical innovations within the program.
4. Provide an analysis of trends in the program regarding the rigor of the program. For example:
   a. What assessment methods does the program use to measure student learning outcomes, particularly the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLP's)?
   b. How were the outcome measures developed? Are there learning outcomes unique to your discipline?
   c. What have been the results of assessments done over the past 3 years?
   d. What student learning outcomes would you want to see improved? Altered?
   e. What assessment measures do you intend to continue, and what new assessment measures do you intend to implement in the next 3 years?
   f. Do curriculum and instruction support student research? How is undergraduate student research demonstrated (i.e. involvement in research day, research coops of students' enrolled, STAR scholars)?
   g. How is student achievement of program outcomes and the DSLP's used to improve instruction, curricula, and student supports?
   h. How does the program assess advising?
5. Are there changes in knowledge that support possible curricular innovations, connections, with other Drexel programs, formal or informal, or even radical re-design?
6. Is the program and the component courses integrating and infusing technology appropriately and providing access to materials in ways that aid learning?
7. Is the program incorporating new pedagogical approaches supporting collaboration, interaction, and experiential learning to improve the quality of the student experience?
8. Is the curriculum being updated and refreshed regularly to incorporate current information and practice in the field of study?
9. What trends have been documented for student satisfaction from end-of-term surveys, student interviews, reflective essays, the Senior and Graduate Exit Surveys, etc.?
10. Do the grade distributions for courses in your program reveal any distortion or inflation of evaluation?
11. In terms of online instruction, please respond to the following:
    a. Are online instructors available for e-mail and on-line discussion?
    b. How effective is the use of multimedia approaches? Consider amount and quality.
    c. What kind of technical support is available to online instructors?
    d. What kind of interactive opportunities exist in your online courses? [Include opportunities for student to student interaction]
    e. How might online instruction in your program be improved?

f. Do your plans for expanding online learning demonstrate the program's capacity to assure an appropriate level of quality?

g. How does your program ensure the rigor of the offerings and the quality of the instruction?

h. Is the program's online curriculum coherent in its content and sequencing of courses and is it effectively defined in easily available documents including course syllabi and program descriptions?

i. Does scheduling of online learning courses provide students with a dependable pathway to ensure timely completion of degrees where that is a goal?

j. Are your program's online learning faculties carefully selected, appropriately trained, frequently evaluated, and marked by an acceptable level of turnover?

F. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Please complete the research data tables in TAB11 of the SHAREPOINT site resource section. The quantitative data requested in these tables should be utilized to support the narrative responses to the questions below.

1. What is the program's vision for its contributions to the creation of knowledge?

2. How do the research activities in this program support the University and college's strategic plans?

3. Define the types of research, scholarship and creativity productivity that typically occur in your program? For example, activities might include, but would not be limited to, major shows, screenings, exhibitions, commissions grants and awards (for both the performing arts and more traditional artist), works in permanent collections, etc. Additional examples include publications (peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed), presentations, grants, awards, invention disclosures, and patents.

4. How does research, scholarship and creative productivity (reflected above) compare with competitors and/or professional standards in the discipline? If you program is ranked by a respected source, where does it stand?

5. Does the program have identified foci for its research, scholarship, and creative pursuits? If so what are they and reflect on their productivity.

6. Identify significant faculty and/or programmatic achievements in research, scholarship and/or creativity within the program.

7. Describe any unique research/scholarship/creativity foci that sets your program apart from its peers. Use data to support your assertion of unique foci.

8. Identify and describe the collaborative and/or interdisciplinary projects/initiatives within the program. Describe the role of collaborative projects/initiatives in the context of the overall research mission of the program.

9. Describe the program's involvement, if applicable, with university-wide interdisciplinary research themes and initiatives. If the research initiatives involved non-traditional research disciplines, describe if and how did these non-traditional research disciplines add value to multidisciplinary projects and their outcome.

10. What strategic hiring and recruiting practices have been implemented to strengthen the program's research mission?

11. What impediments inhibit the expansion and strengthening the productivity of research, scholarship, and creativity efforts? How can the impediments be addressed?

12. Is the University technology and information infrastructure and associated resources (e.g. IT, research institutes/centers/cores, Libraries) adequate to support the growth of research in this program?

13. Describe initiatives and resources available to encourage undergraduate involvement in faculty research. Please provide the number of students engaged in STAR research, Research Co-op or other research, also include metrics of undergraduate research productivity such as presentations, co-authorships, grants, shows, and exhibits.

14. Describe initiatives and resources to support graduate student involvement in faculty research. Please provide the number and type (Ph.D., Doctoral, M.S., etc.) of graduate students engaged in research/creativity, include metrics of graduate student research productivity such as presentations, co-authorships, grants/fellowships, shows, and exhibits.

15. Describe initiatives and resources to support post-doctoral fellows' involvement in research/creativity. Please provide the number of post-doc students engaged in research/creativity, include metrics of research productivity such as presentations, co-authorships, grants/fellowships, shows, and exhibits.

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS USING THE RESEARCH TABLE [SEE TAB 11] IN THE RESOURCE SECTION OF THE SHAREPOINT SITE TO PROVIDE THIS DATA.

1. What are the types of faculty scholarship and creativity that typically occur in your program? For example, creative activity might include, but would not be limited to, major shows, screenings, exhibitions, commissions and awards (for both the performing arts and more traditional artist), works in permanent collections, etc.

2. Identify significant faculty achievements in research and/or creativity within the program. Use the research table in the resource section of the SharePoint site as a guide to answer to this question Feel free to add new categories if needed. The quantitative data requested in this table may be accompanied by a narrative detailing the activities if you choose to do so.

3. Describe initiatives and resources available to encourage undergraduate involvement in faculty research. Please provide the number of students engaged in STAR research, Research Co-op or other research, also include metrics of undergraduate research productivity such as presentations, co-authorships, grants, shows, and exhibits.

4. Describe initiatives and resources to support graduate student involvement in faculty research. Please provide the number and type (Ph.D., Doctoral, M.S., etc.) of graduate students engaged in research/creativity, include metrics of graduate student research productivity such as presentations, co-authorships, grants/fellowships, shows, and exhibits.

5. Describe initiatives and resources to support post-doctoral fellows' involvement in research/creativity. Please provide the number of post-doc students engaged in research/creativity, include metrics of research productivity such as presentations, co-authorships, grants/fellowships, shows, and exhibits.

I.   Advising

1. What advising model are you using? For example, do you have professional advisers in the early years followed by a hand off to faculty advisors in the later years?
2. Do all students have a developmental plan of study?
3. How does the program determine advising responsibilities? What is the current advising to student ratio in the program?
4. What is the scope of advising offered to students in the program?
5. Is there coordination between advisors and faculty regarding student issues? Please explain.

J.   Finances

1. Is the program financially viable, sustainable, and potentially expandable?
2. Provide an analysis of resource allocation within the program. Also comment on the following where pertinent:
   a. Does the program plan for, and does the budget support, regular equipment (copiers, pc's, printers, etc.) replacement and upgrade, or is the cycle of replacement and upgrade sporadic, requiring occasional special allocations from administrative sources?
   b. Describe any efforts during the past 5 years to cut costs or operate more efficiently.
   c. Does the lab fee revenue [if applicable] received meet the needs for which it was designed?
   d. Without increasing resources, what changes would you propose that would strengthen the program?
   e. With a reasonable increase in your budget, what new initiatives could you pursue that would strengthen the program?
3. Are there economies of scale or efficiencies that can be applied to the organization or the delivery of the program to increase revenues or decrease expenses?
4. Are the external and internal demands for the program sufficient to maintain enrollment goals and grow the program?

K. Analysis of Resources

1. Staffing
   a. List the names, titles, and responsibilities of current staff in your program.
   b. Is the number and abilities of staff sufficient to meet the current educational and research goals of the program? For the next five years? Are there positions that could be consolidated or eliminated?
2. Library Resources
   a. Comment on the adequacy of available library resources available for program and future needs in this area.
3. Administrative Support
   a. Is your program receiving appropriate support from the administration to achieve your goals?
   b. What initiatives could the administration undertake to assist your program in furthering its goals?

c. Are there ways your program could share resources to support others?

L. Facilities and Space

1. Are facilities, equipment, and maintenance adequate for current programs? For the next five years?
2. How does the condition of the current facilities impact program delivery and research? Please explain.
3. What kind of short-term changes in facilities would contribute to the success of your program or research plans?
4. What kind of long-range changes in facilities would contribute to the success of your program and research plans?

M. Technology

1. Identify technology resources that are allocated or available to your programs, including shared resources.
2. Discuss how these resources are used most effectively to achieve learning outcomes. Are faculty and staff in your program adequately trained to use the technological resources available?
3. Identify needed additional technology resources to meet the program's five year plans

N. Strategic Alignment

1. Does the program support the mission and strategic plan of:
   a. the university,
   b. the college, and
   c. the department/program ?
2. What aspects of the plan(s) does it support primarily?
3. Are there related programs, which should be considered in concert with this one to identify and review potential options for consolidation/collaboration and which are they? Would alignment or affiliation serve teaching, learning, and research goals? Please describe.

O. Economies and Efficiencies

1. What enrollment trends does the data suggest to you? What insights might the data provide in terms of your program's analysis of enrollment trends in F2F instruction? On-line? Graduate enrollment? Is there interest in the program? Is there capacity in the program, which is not being maximized?
2. Are class sizes what they should be? Do you have additional capacity, which is not optimized? Are there changes in the field that may impact the costs of providing the program in the future? (such as equipment or experiential components) Are there too many classes being run for fewer than 9 students?
3. Are there changes to be made in how the courses in the program are delivered which may result in savings? (faculty workload, pedagogical approaches, lecture, seminar, etc.) Who is teaching the courses and what support do they have? (such as TA's)
4. Has the discipline and professional landscape changed in ways that would merit a redesign of the program including cross-disciplinary collaborations, consolidation with other programs, or other

organizational changes that would enhance the academic experience and increase the currency and relevance?

5. What trends do you see in terms of your program's research dollars over time? How do those awards affect the research and scholarship productivity of your faculty? What is the market for research awards in this program or field?

6. Is the cost of equipment, labs/facilities, increasing in such a way that makes delivering a quality program impractical?

7. Is the program contributing to the University's goals for improving retention, student quality, and professional placement?

P. Conclusion and Action Plan:

1. What are some of the "best practices" and future trends in the discipline that your program should implement?

2. Summarize the program's strengths and weaknesses.

3. Describe and outline a plan for strategic improvement. What actions do you recommend – and in what order and priority? **[Please reference Tab # 9 for the parameters of an action plan]**

THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The PAR Committee believes that the purpose for the external review is to assist faculty and academic leadership in improving program quality by providing a new, comparative and broader perspective on the program and student learning. The program/department under review may invite up to *two [2], or sometimes three [3]* external reviewers/scholars, depending on the size of the department and the range of its sub-disciplines, from outside the University to participate in the review process. Since it is reasonable to expect that not everyone who is identified will be able to participate, you may have to contact more than two or three people in order to find the two or three who are available. Mindful of potential reviewers' busy calendars, we ask that you please create a **prioritized** list of at least six to eight recommended external reviewers. As the team develops the list of recommended external reviewers, please bear in mind that the PAR Standing Committee would like to have the participating external reviewer group consist of distinguished educators in their fields with knowledge and expertise regarding the work of their departments and the practical academic requirements of their discipline You are encouraged to recommend evaluators of exceptional scholarship and significant professional reputation. The six to eight you identify will be submitted to Stephen DiPietro who in turn will prepare a compendium for the Provost to review and approve. Once the Provost approves the list, the teams should then contact their approved reviewers in the priority order that the teams chose to invite them to participate. By submitting 6 to 8 names, you can simply go down your approved list until you find the 2 to 3 reviewers who are willing to engage in the review. This way, you do not have to seek approval constantly for new evaluators if your top choices turn you down. Once the teams have their 2 to 3 reviewers, they have a ready supply of approved reviewers in the background in case one of their initial choices cannot make it. External reviewers **MUST** receive copies of the self-study **prior** to their campus review visit.

In making your suggestions, here are a few recommendations that the PAR Standing Committee asks you to consider:

- Recommend a mix of external reviewers from both benchmark and aspirational ***programs.***
- Consider gender and ethnic diversity in your recommendations.
- Recommend external reviewers who have experience in program review if possible.
- Recommend at least one individual who has the highest degree in the relevant discipline and who holds the rank of associate professor or professor.
- Recommend external reviewers who are able to offer advice, suggestion and constructive criticism from an objective, discipline perspective.
- Do not include in your recommendations external reviewers who have a personal or professional association with the faculty or staff (e.g., mentor relationship).
- Avoid any person(s) whose selection might be considered a conflict of interest.

The Office of the Provost, along with the PAR Standing Committee, prepares an annual budget to support the external reviewers pay, travel, and other expenses associated with the PAR process. The colleges do not incur any costs save for a breakfast or dinner the self-study may have with the external reviewers.

EXTERNAL REVIEW CONSULTANT'S REPORT

The questions provided here for the external review team report are meant to be ***guiding questions*** that can be used to frame the team's report. There is no expectation that each question will be addressed by each external review team. Teams will address those questions that are both relevant and meaningful for the particular program under review. The questions approximate the basic format of the Self Study Report Guidelines.

Prior to the site visit in the spring term, the external reviewers should be informed of the PAR Process at Drexel University and the expectations we have of them as reviewers. **Please see Tab 7**.

SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR THE WRITTEN EXTERNAL REVIEWER'S REPORT

A.   Executive Summary

1. Comment on the department's/program's strengths and weaknesses, plans, new directions, and pressing needs.

B.   Background and History

1. How effectively does the program state its purpose for being and its institutional history?

C.   The Academic Department/Program

1. How does the department/program compare with others of similar institutions, including those selected as aspirational targets by the department?
2. Does the department/program have appropriate goals and aspirations? Do they align with Drexel's mission?

3. What do you see as the department's/program's significant accomplishments, areas of challenge, and weaknesses?
4. What are some key areas of innovation and initiatives begun by the department/program?
5. Does the department/program have a culture supporting collegiality, quality, and innovation?
6. Is department/program leadership effective?
7. Is the department/program creating an intellectual culture for its faculty and students?

D. Students

1. Comment on the diversity of students (by gender and race/ethnicity).
2. Is the number and quality of undergraduates appropriate?
3. Is the number and quality of graduate students appropriate?
4. Are graduates obtaining appropriate positions?

E. Faculty

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current faculty members in terms of teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity?
2. How well are the department, college and university supporting faculty members? If more support were needed, what suggestions would you make?
3. How well are the department and College supporting its adjunct faculty members? If more support were needed, what suggestions would you make?
4. What do you see as impediments or opportunities to the strengthening and expansion of research or creative activities in this department?
5. Is the current system of faculty evaluation and the criteria for promotion and tenure appropriate, clear and rigorous?

F. Program Quality

1. Is the number of majors/programs offered reasonable for the size of the department and of Drexel?
2. Is the department's curriculum rigorous and up to date?
3. Does the department have an adequate system to assess its own programs? How well is it using multiple means of assessment to improve its core, major, and graduate programs?
4. Does the department have reasonable plans for improvement? Can they be achieved?
5. How well is the department doing in the areas of faculty-student interaction and advising?
6. How has the department integrated experiential learning [co-op, global experiences & other engagements] with the overall academic experience?

G. Departmental Support and Resources

1. Does the department have adequate support staff and support services?
2. Are facilities and equipment needs being met? If not, what improvements need to be made?
3. Does the condition of the current facilities and equipment support program delivery and/or

research productivity?

4. Does the department receive appropriate resources, both human and financial, from the university and college administrations?
5. Is the department financially viable, sustainable, and potentially expandable?

H.   Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusion

III.   THE ACTION PLAN

The third major dimension in PAR, and in some ways the most critical, is the development of the follow-up action plan. The action plan presents an opportunity for the program/department to develop a series of action steps based upon a synthesis of the self-study team's recommendations and those of the external reviewers. While this is the culminating step in the process, it is also the roadmap, which sustains the program from the first PAR review to the second. Tab 9 illustrates the action plan template, designed as a project management sheet, along with suggestions for its completion.

Samplings of elements included in the action plan are:

1. Overall status and trajectory of the Department
2. Issues and Opportunities Articulated from the Self-Study and External Review
3. Internal and External Challenges
4. Departmental Responses to External Recommendations
5. Specific Action Steps, Strategies and Ideas to Address and Move Forward

IV. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Program: In order to graduate from the university a student must complete a program, which is made up of a specific group of courses denoted as a major(s), which lead to a corresponding degree(s). Major and Program are often interchanged and can both be used to refer to the group of requirements that must be completed to earn a degree.

Major: A major is comprised of an approved list of requirements that must be completed in order for a student to reach the goal of a degree. All students working toward our definition of degree have a major.

Degree: Degree is a student's ultimate goal when attending the university. The degree can be specified (BSAE, MSAE, DPT, EDD), non-specified (BS, MS, PHD) and at Drexel we consider certificates (CERT, PBC, PMC) as degrees because it is a goal toward which the student is working, although it is not a traditional degree.

Concentration: A concentration is comprised of an approved list of requirements that are attached to a major and provide depth and breadth in a specific area of the major being studied.

Minor: A minor is an approved group of courses, usually 24 credits, developed to provide students with an opportunity to explore areas outside of the major. At Drexel, minors are only available to undergraduate students who have a major.

College: A division within the university comprised of departments or schools offering courses and majors leading to a degree in specific areas.

Department: A division within a college offering courses and majors leading to a degree in specific areas. What follows is a set of guidelines, which can serve as a framework for approaching a continuous quality improvement approach to academic programs. The two main components of the program review will be a self-study and a review by an external expert.

Tab 1
Initiation Agreement

PROGRAM REVIEW INITIATION AGREEMENT TO GUIDE THE

ACADEMIC REVIEW OF [Insert Program Name]

Academic program review consists of on-going, high quality peer reviews of all the university's academic program/departments. The purpose of program review is to foster academic excellence at all levels, to determine how to raise existing quality to a higher level, and to provide guidance for administrative decisions in support of continual future improvements.

Program reviews at Drexel University have the following characteristics:

1. Reviews provide a concise, honest appraisal of an academic program/department's strengths and weaknesses.

2. Reviews are forward looking. While evaluation of a program's current status is important, <u>priorities for continual future improvement are of greatest concern</u>.

3. Reviews are evaluative, not just descriptive. Plans for improvement require academic judgments about the quality of the faculty, academic program(s), students, curricula, resources and future directions.

4. Reviews incorporate expert assessment provided by reviewers from other high-quality institutions and programs.

Each program under review must include consideration of the issues described in the Guidelines for Program Review, in particular the outline for the program/department's self-study, which specifies that the Review Committee should thoroughly and candidly evaluate:

1. The mission and intellectual profile of the program, as well as its alignment with the mission and strategic plan of the department, college and the university.

2. The reputation of the program among peers in the discipline, including national rankings, and the extent to which the program is regarded as a leader in the field.

3. The quality of the program, its students, and its faculty

4. The financial well-being of the program

5. The extent to which the program/department under review contributes (or could contribute in the future) to interdisciplinary research and teaching, and whether there are interdisciplinary ties that currently are underdeveloped.

6. Improvements that are possible without the need for additional resources

7. Improvements that are possible only with additional resources.

8. Whether there are entrenched or irreconcilable issues within the program/department that constrain its effectiveness, and whether there might be more effective ways of working together.

PROGRAM(s) IDENTIFIED FOR EVALUATION

The program/department(s) to be evaluated are listed, or described, as follows:

TYPE NAME(S) HERE

SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE CHAIR

The follow person has been selected to chair of the self-study committee:

NAME	TITLE	DEPARTMENT	E-MAIL CONTACT

SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE

The members of the Self-Study Committee for the identified program/department(s) are listed as follows by name and position at the university:

NAME	TITLE	DEPARTMENT	E-MAIL CONTACT

COLLABORATING AND INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM/DEPARTMENTS [OPTIONAL]

The following collaborating or interdisciplinary program/departments, centers, or groups of faculty may be included in the evaluation of the program/department(s), participate in the development of the self-study, and/or participate in the site visit:

NAME	TITLE	DEPARTMENT	E-MAIL CONTACT

ADDITIONAL EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS

Please note that any additional evaluative questions do not supplant the specific areas for evaluation listed earlier. The school, college, or program/department should provide their analyses of these issues in the self-study and during the review process. We note that the review itself may raise additional issues during the process of assessing a program/department's strengths and weaknesses.

The additional questions identified as important to address during this review are the following:

1.

2.

3.

The evaluation of the identified program/department(s) will be completed in three academic terms unless given special consideration by the PAR Standing Committee to extend the review time. In particular, the following milestones will be completed no later than the identified date on the PAR time line:

MILESTONES	ACTION	COMPLETION DATE
1	Sign the Implementation and Assessment Plan Agreement	

2	Identify member(s) of the external review team	[INSERT DATE]
3	Submit completed self-study to Dean	[INSERT DATE]
4	Submit self-study to the Vice Provost	[INSERT DATE]
5	Finalize self-study	[INSERT DATE]
6	Conduct the site visit	[INSERT DATE]
7	Submit Action Plan to Dean	[INSERT DATE]
8	Submit Action Plan to the PAR Committee	[INSERT DATE]
9	Input Action Plan into Compliance Assist	[INSERT DATE]

During this process, the Provost's Office, through the Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Effectiveness will provide additional data, information, and assistance as requested by the Self-Study Committee.

If changes to this document and the plan included are required, the Dean and the Provost will discuss the proposed changes and determine mutually agreeable alterations to the plan.

TAB 2: Sample Time Line

ACTIONABLE ITEMS	DUE DATE	STATUS
Preparation and Communication		
Selection of Self-Study Committee Members & Chair	March 29, 2018	COMPLETED
Orientation of Self-Study Team	April 25, 2018	COMPLETED
Tableau Software Demonstration to Leads and self-study members	April 25, 2018	COMPLETED
Tableau assistance provided by OPIR [Dan Larson] to Leads, self-study members and department members	April 25 and On-Going	
Communicate with PROGRAM, distribute resource materials, and upload identified data into the self-study SharePoint site	April 25 and On-Going	
Identify Benchmark Programs	On-Going	
Initiation Agreement Signed (Provost and Dean) (Send to Steve sld343@drexel.edu)	**May 11, 2018**	
Identify External Review Committee Members	**October 15, 2018**	
Steve to meet with Self-Study Teams at their first meeting	Variable	
Steve to meet with Self-Study Teams to gather info for Interim Report	January-February 2019	
Finalize Next Programs for Review with Deans for 2019-2020	February, 2019	2020
Reminder Note to Deans for identification of 2019-2020 Self-Study Teams	February, 2019	2020
Deadline for Deans to submit names of 2019-2020 self study team names to Steve	March 29, 2019	2020
Orientation for New Self-Study Teams 2018-2019	April 24, 2019	2020
The Self-Study		
Collect and Analyze Data / Request Additional Data	January, 2019	
Complete self-study and submit to Dean	**February 25, 2019**	
Submit Self-Study Draft to Steve DiPietro **after** Dean Review [PAR Standing Committee Members will be assigned to read one of the submitted reviews by sub-group]	March 8, 2019	
PAR Standing Committee Members Provide face-to-face Feedback to Self-Study Teams on reports by	March 27, 2019	
Final Report Submitted to Steve DiPietro	April 5, 2019	
The External Site Visit		
Transmit Dates of External Site Visit to Steve	**February 8, 2019**	**NO LATER**
Team Chairs distribute the Self-Study to the External Review Team	**IN ADVANCE OF VISIT**	**TWO WKS PRIOR**
Set the Itinerary and Coordinate the Visit	April, May 2019	
Site Visit and Report	April, May 2019	
Provide Steve DiPietro with a copy of the External Review Report for distribution and posting	April, May, June 2019	
Response to the Report		
Review Self-Study & External Review Report to determine which action items the committee will accept, defer or reject	May/June, 2019	
Develop an Action Plan in Response to the Site Visit, Self-Study Report, and accepted items for action by way of the Action Plan Template & Compliance Assist	May/June, 2019	
Send Final Action Plan [Dean approval] to Steve DiPietro	July 8, 2019	
Progress Reports as Prescribed by Implementation Plan	Set by Individual Action Plan	
PAR Process Debrief and Improvements		
Internal Review of Full Implementations of PAR by Standing Committee	June 2019	
Make Final Adjustments to Materials and Processes for 2018-2019	June 2019	

TAB 3: Seven-Year Cycle

NEW 7 YR CYCLE BEGINS

COMPLETED CYCLES

ACADEMIC YEAR 2024-2025
- BEES & GEOSCIENCE [CoAS]
- PSYCHOLOGY [CoAS]
- HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT [Center]
- MS ACCOUNTING [LeBow]
- BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COUNSELING [CNHP]
- MA FAMILY THERAPY; PHD, COUPLE AND FAMILY THERAPY [CNHP]
- MHS HEALTH SCIENCES & POST-PROFESSIONAL - PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT [CNHP]
- BSN NURSING, ACE [CNHP]
- PHD ECONOMICS [LeBow]
- PHD PROGRAM IN BUSINESS [LeBow]
- TELEVISION PRODUCTION & MEDIA [CoMAD]
- TELEVISION MGMT [CoMAD]
- ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING [CoE]
- COMPUTER ENGINEERING [CoE]
- MSFS FORENSIC SCIENCE [DUCOM]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2023-2024
- BIOLOGY [CoAS]
- SOFTWARE ENGINEERING (BSSE)(MSSE) [CCI]
- SPORT MANAGEMENT [Center]
- DPT PHYSICAL THERAPY; PHD REHABILITATION SCIENCE; PHD HEALTH SCIENCES [CNHP]
- COMPUTER SCIENCE [CCI]
- MSN CLINICAL NURSE LEADER IN ADULT HEALTH, IN PEDIATRIC HEALTH AND IN WOMEN'S HEALTH [CNHP]
- MSN LEADERSHIP IN HEALTH SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT; INNOVATION AND INTRA/ENTREPRENEURSHIP; NURSE EDUCATION AND FACULTY ROLE; CLINICAL TRIALS RESEARCH[CNHP]
- MSN NURSE PRACTITIONER (ALL TRACKS) [CNHP]
- ANIMATION & VISUAL EFFECTS [CoMAD]
- GAME ART & PRODUCTION [CoMAD]
- FASHION DESIGN [BS/MS] [CoMAD]
- INTERACTIVE DIGITAL MEDIA - WEB DEVELOPMENT [CoMAD]
- MS/PHD DIGITAL MEDIA [CoMAD]
- MS ANIMAL LABORATORY MLAS [DUCOM]
- MD/PHD PROGRAM [DUCOM]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2022-2023
- CHEMISTRY [CoAS]
- HISTORY [CoAS]
- MA CREATIVE ARTS IN THERAPY (ALL 3 PROGRAMS) [CNHP]
- DNP DOCTOR OF NURSING PRACTICE [DRNP – TO BE CHANGED TO DNP] [CNHP]
- CIVIL ENGINEERING [CoE]
- ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING CAEE [CoE]
- ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING CAEE [CoE]
- BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION* [10 CONCENTRATIONS] [LeBow]
- MA ARTS ADMINISTRATION [Westphal]
- DANCE [Westphal]
- MS PUBLIC POLICY [CoAS]
- POLITICAL SCIENCE [CoAS]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2021-2022
- BS HEALTH SCIENCES [CNHP]
- ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT [CoE]
- MATERIALS SCIENCE [CoE]
- MS FINANCE [LeBow]
- ECONOMICS [LeBow]
- DESIGN & MERCHANDISING [Westphal]
- THEATER [Westphal]
- ART & ART HISTORY [Westphal]
- FILM & VIDEO [Westphal]
- SCREENWRITING & PLAYWRITING [Westphal]
- BS, BS/MS BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING (5 CONCENTRATIONS) [BIOMED]
- ANTHROPOLOGY [CoAS]
- COMMUNICATION [CoAS]
- CRIMINOLOGY AND JUSTICE STUDIES [CoAS]
- SOCIOLOGY [CoAS]
- FOREIGN LANGUAGE [CoAS]
- INTERNATIONAL AREA STUDIES [CoAS]
- ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTER [CoAS]
- MATHEMATICS [CoAS]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2020-2021 (NEW 7 YR CYCLE BEGINS)
- MS MUSEUM LEADERSHIP [Westphal]
- PhD EPIDEMIOLOGY [SPH]
- BUSINESS ANALYTICS [LeBow]
- BS PUBLIC HEALTH [SPH]
- CYBER SECURITY [CCI]
- EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT & TRANSFORMATION [SoE]
- CHEMICAL ENGINEERING [CoE]
- MECHANICAL ENGINEERING [CoE]
- PHYSICS [CoAS]
- ENGLISH & PHILOSOPHY [CoAS]
- BUSINESS & ENGINEERING [LeBow]
- MS SYSTEMS ENGINEERING [CoE]
- MS LEGAL STUDIES [Kline]
- MS MENTAL HEALTH & COMMUNITY COUNSELING [SOE]
- CRIMINOLOGY & JUSTICE STUDIES [CoAS]
- PHD NURSING [CNHP]
- LEARNING, CULTURE & TECHNOLOGY [UG] [SoE]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2019-2020
- DRPH, COMMUNITY HEALTH & PREVENTION [SPH]
- MS FOOD SCIENCE [CNHP]
- MS and PhD BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE [BIOMED]
- PHOTOGRAPHY [CoMAD]
- BS/MS COMBINATIONS [CCI]
- MSLIS LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE [CCI]
- DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL & OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH [SPH]
- MSIS INFORMATION SYSTEMS [CCI]
- PHD INFORMATION STUDIES [CCI]
- HEALTH INFORMATICS [CCI]
- PRODUCT DESIGN [CoMAD]
- ENTERTAINMENT & ARTS MANAGEMENT [CoMAD]
- MUSIC INDUSTRY [CoMAD]
- MUSIC [CoMAD]
- TEACHER EDUCATION [UG] [SoE]
- MS SPECIAL EDUCATION/ABA [SoE]
- MS MATH & SCIENCE LEARNING AND TEACHING [SoE]
- MS APPLIED BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS [SoE]
- TEACHER EDUCATION [G] [SoE]
- MS EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION [SoE]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2018-2019
- CULINARY ARTS & SCIENCE [CNHP]
- PROPERTY MANAGEMENT [COE]
- GENERAL STUDIES [Goodwin]
- ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY [COE]
- CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT [COE]
- CREATIVITY & INNOVATION [SoE]
- MS EDUCATION POLICY [SoE]
- MS HIGHER EDUCATION [SoE]
- MS LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES [SoE]
- MS ADULT EDUCATION AND ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT [SoE]
- MS GLOBAL AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION [SoE]
- DEPARTMENT OF EPIDEMIOLOGY & BIOSTATISTICS [SPH]
- ARCHITECTURE [Westphal]
- INTERIOR DESIGN [Westphal]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2017-2018
- MS PROJECT MANAGEMENT [COE]
- BS PUBLIC HEALTH [DSPH]
- MS HUMAN NUTRITION AND FOODS [CNHP]
- MS NURSING, NURSE ANESTHESIA [CNHP]
- MS MEDICAL SCIENCE [DUCOM]
- MS MOLECULAR MEDICINE, INFECTIOUS DISEASE & IMMUNOLOGY [DUCOM]
- EXECUTIVE MPH PROGRAM [SPH]
- COMPUTING AND SECURITY TECHNOLOGY [CCI]
- BS INFORMATION SYSTEMS [CCI]
- HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION [CNHP]
- PhD ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS
- TELEVISION MGMT [CoMAD]
- SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY [CoAS]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-2017
- BEES & GEOSCIENCE [CoAS]
- PSYCHOLOGY [CoAS]
- HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT [Center]
- MS ACCOUNTING [LeBow]
- BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COUNSELING [CNHP]
- MA FAMILY THERAPY; PHD, COUPLE AND FAMILY THERAPY [CNHP]
- MHS HEALTH SCIENCES & POST-PROFESSIONAL - PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT [CNHP]
- BSN NURSING, ACE [CNHP]
- PHD ECONOMICS [LeBow]
- PHD PROGRAM IN BUSINESS [LeBow]
- TELEVISION PRODUCTION & MEDIA [CoMAD]
- ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING [CoE]
- COMPUTER ENGINEERING [CoE]
- MSFS FORENSIC SCIENCE [DUCOM]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2015-2016
- BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES [CoAS]
- SOFTWARE ENGINEERING [CCI]
- SPORT MANAGEMENT [Center]
- DPT PHYSICAL THERAPY; PHD REHABILITATION SCIENCE; PHD HEALTH SCIENCES [CNHP]
- COMPUTER SCIENCE [CCI]
- MSN CLINICAL NURSE LEADER IN ADULT HEALTH, IN PEDIATRIC HEALTH AND IN WOMEN'S HEALTH [CNHP]
- MSN LEADERSHIP IN HEALTH SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT; INNOVATION AND INTRA/ENTREPRENEURSHIP; NURSE EDUCATION AND FACULTY ROLE; CLINICAL TRIALS RESEARCH[CNHP]
- MSN NURSE PRACTITIONER (ALL TRACKS) [CNHP]
- ANIMATION & VISUAL EFFECTS [Westphal]
- GAME ART & PRODUCTION [Westphal]
- FASHION DESIGN [Westphal]
- INTERACTIVE DIGITAL MEDIA - WEB DEVELOPMENT [Westphal]
- MS/PHD DIGITAL MEDIA [CoMAD]
- MLAS ANIMAL LABORATORY [DUCOM]
- MD/PHD PROGRAM [DUCOM]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2014-2015
- CHEMISTRY [CoAS]
- HISTORY [CoAS]
- MA CREATIVE ARTS IN THERAPY (ALL 3 PROGRAMS) [CNHP]
- DNP DOCTOR OF NURSING PRACTICE [DRNP – TO BE CHANGED TO DNP] [CNHP]
- CIVIL ENGINEERING [CoE]
- ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING CAEE [CoE]
- ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING CAEE [CoE]
- BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION* [10 CONCENTRATIONS] [LeBow]
- MA ARTS ADMINISTRATION [Westphal]
- DANCE [Westphal]
- MS PUBLIC POLICY [CoAS]
- POLITICAL SCIENCE [CoAS]

ACADEMIC YEAR 2013-2014
- BS HEALTH SCIENCES [CNHP]
- ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT [CoE]
- MATERIALS SCIENCE [CoE]
- MS FINANCE [LeBow]
- ECONOMICS [LeBow]
- DESIGN & MERCHANDISING [Westphal]
- THEATER [Westphal]
- ART & ART HISTORY [Westphal]
- FILM & VIDEO [Westphal]
- SCREENWRITING & PLAYWRITING [Westphal]
- BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING* BS and accelerated BS/MS (5 CONCENTRATIONS) [BIOMED]
- ANTHROPOLOGY [CoAS]
- COMMUNICATION [CoAS]
- CRIMINAL JUSTICE [CoAS]
- SOCIOLOGY [CoAS]
- FOREIGN LANGUAGE [CoAS]
- INTERNATIONAL AREA STUDIES [CoAS]
- ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTER [CoAS]
- MATHEMATICS [CoAS]

CULTURE & COMM

PILOT YEAR — ACADEMIC YEAR 2012-2013 PILOT
- CHEMICAL ENGINEERING [COE]
- MECHANICAL ENGINEERING [COE]
- PHYSICS [CoAS]
- BUSINESS & ENGINEERING [LeBow]
- ENGLISH & PHILOSOPHY [CoAS]

TAB 4: 2018-2019 PAR
Academic Year Cycle

ACADEMIC YEAR
2018-2019
ARCHITECTURE [Westphal]
INTERIOR DESIGN [Westphal]
CULINARY ARTS & SCIENCE [CNHP]
MS FOOD SCIENCE [CNHP]
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT [COE]
GENERAL STUDIES [Goodwin]
ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY [COE]
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT [COE]
TLC TECHNOLOGIES, CREATIVITY & INNOVATION [SoE]
MS EDUCATION POLICY [SoE]
MS HIGHER EDUCATION [SoE]
MS ADULT EDUCATION AND ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT [SoE]
MS GLOBAL AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION [SoE]
MS LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES [SoE]
DEPARTMENT OF EPIDEMIOLOGY & BIOSTATISTICS [SPH]

TAB 5: 2018-2019 Self-Study Teams

#	PROGRAMS AND COLLEGES	REC	CHAIR	TEAM	TEAM	TEAM	TEAM	TEAM
	PAR PROGRAMS AY 18-19							
1	ARCHITECTURE [Westphal]	X	Alan Greenberger	Ulrtike Altenmuller	Rachel Schade			
2	INTERIOR DESIGN [Westphal]	X	Alan Greenberger	Deb Ruben	Ada Tremonte			
3	CULINARY ARTS & SCIENCE [CNHP]	X	Rose Trout rek23@drexel.edu	Mike Traud mjt59@drexel.edu	Paul O'Neill pgo27@drexel.edu	Jim Burke jdb448@drexel.edu		
4	MS FOOD SCIENCE [CNHP]	X	RoseTrout rek23@drexel.edu	Michael Tunick mht39@drexel.edu	Jasreen Sekhon jks333@drexel.edu			
6	GENERAL STUDIES [Goodwin]	X	Tim Gilrain	Lamont Wilson				
7	ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY [COE]	X	Vlad Genis genisv@drexel.edu	TO BE NAMED	TO BE NAMED	TO BE NAMED		
8	CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT [COE]	X	Christine Fiori cmf356@drexel.edu	TO BE NAMED	TO BE NAMED	TO BE NAMED		
9	TLC TECHNOLOGIES, CREATIVITY & INNOVATION [SoE]	X	Bill Lynch	Freddie Reisman	Jennifer Katz-Bounincontro	John Gould		
10	MS EDUCATION POLICY [SoE]	X	Bruce Levine	Allen Grant	Joyce Pittman			
11	MS HIGHER EDUCATION [SoE]	X	John Gould	Jose Chavez	Kristen Betts	Alonzo Flowers		
12	MS ADULT EDUCATION AND ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT [SoE]	X	Sal Falletta	Rajashi Ghosh	Kathy Geller			
13	MS GLOBAL AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION [SoE]	X	Bruce Levine	Joy Phillips	Joyce Pittman	Samantha Mercanti-Anthony	Lou Cristillol	
14	MS LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES [SoE]	X	Bill Lynch	Mary Jo Grdina	Aroutis Foster	Brian Smith		
15	DEPARTMENT OF EPIDEMIOLOGY & BIOSTATISTICS [SPH]	X	Leslie McClure	Scarlett Bellamy	Brian Lee	Yvonne Michael	Lucy Robinson	

TAB 6: Data Elements

LIST OF DATA ELEMENTS – the following is a list of data elements that we ask you to include in your self-study report. All of the data will be culled from your own program/department and Tableau. There is one exception. The Provost Office will continue to supply you with the 10 year report of all employees by Type [Faculty and Staff], and the ten year report of year-to-date expenses.

A. Catalog Data

1. List of Required Courses
2. List of Elective Courses
3. List of Core Major Requirements

B. Student Activity Data

1. 10-Year Report for Enrollment (numbers of students, SAT, HS GPA and rank, sex, ethnicity, etc.)
2. 10-Year Report for Student Credit Hour Production
3. 10-Year Report for Graduation Rates
4. 10-Year Report for Retention and Persistence Rates
5. 10-Year Report for GPA
6. Student Learning Assessment Plan

C. Faculty Profile

1. 10-Year Report of All Employees by Type (Faculty and Staff)*
2. 1-Year Faculty Instructional Workload Report
3. 10-Year Report of External Funding Awards and Applications
4. CV's for each faculty member (2-3 page version)

D. Budget and Finances

1. 10-Year Report of Year-to-Date Expenses*

E. Other Resources

1. List of Library Resources – Journals and Electronic Databases
2. Report on Facilities and Space
3. College Strategic Plan
4. College Organizational Chart
5. Program Strategic Plan
6. Program Organizational Chart
7. Experiential Learning Opportunities
8. Senior Exit Survey

*Data provided by the Provost's Office
.

GUIDED QUESTIONS ON DATA FOR TEAM REFLECTION

The following questions are intended to serve as guides or triggers to your self-study team's deliberations. They are intended to provoke thought and provide perspective as to how discussion might take place within your team.

GUIDED QUESTIONS

1. What enrollment trends does the data suggest to you? What insights might the data provide in terms of your program's analysis of enrollment trends in F2F instruction? On-line? Graduate enrollment? What surprises you, if anything about the findings? How does your program's trend data compare with broader market demand for the program?

2. What trends do you see in terms of credit hour production? How does your program's credit hour data affect your financial resources? Staffing? Enrollment? Curriculum? Research opportunities? Are you addressing any of these impacts currently?

3. What conclusions can you draw about staffing [faculty & staff] levels in your program? Do you believe the trend data is on pace with enrollment or at variance? Why? To what extent do you believe current staffing levels/trends enhance or detract from current enrollment? Projected enrollment? Does your human capital inhibit or underpin faculty research productivity or creativity? What would you do to correct or capitalize on your findings?

4. How have the financial/budgetary resources allocated to your program kept pace with enrollment trends? With staffing levels? Does the program's financial health inhibit or enhance faculty research productivity or creativity? How does your program's credit hour production affect your financial resources?

5. What trends do you see in terms of your program's research dollars over time? How do those awards influence the research and scholarship productivity of your faculty? What is the market for research awards in this program or field?

6. What insights might the graduation data provide in terms of trends? Do the trends match the broader market demand for this program? How does the data on the number of graduates compare with other data on year-to-year retention and persistence? What surprises you, if anything about the findings?

Tab 7: External Reviewers

The PAR Standing Committee believes that the purpose for the external review is to assist faculty and academic leadership in improving program quality by providing a new, comparative and broader perspective on the program and student learning. The program/department under review may invite up to three external reviewers/scholars, depending on the size of the department and the range of its sub-disciplines, from outside the University to participate in the review process. Since it is reasonable to expect that not everyone who is identified will be able to participate, you may have to contact more than three people in order to find three who are available. Mindful of potential reviewers' busy calendars, we ask that you please create a prioritized list of at least six to eight recommended external reviewers. As the team develops the list of recommended external reviewers, please bear in mind that the PAR Committee would like to have the participating external reviewer group consist of someone well-grounded in outcomes and assessment, someone who holds faculty rank in the same or similar program(s) on his/her respective campus, and someone with administrative experience (e.g., Department Head, Center Director, Associate Dean, or Dean). You are encouraged to recommend evaluators of significant professional reputation.

In making your suggestions, here are a few recommendations that the PAR Committee asks you to consider:

- Recommend a mix of external reviewers from both comparable and **programs** that are targets of aspiration.

- Recommend a mix of external reviewers from both benchmark institutions and institutional aspiration.

- Consider gender and ethnic diversity in your recommendations

- Recommend external reviewers who have experience in program review.

- Recommend at least one individual who has the highest degree in the relevant discipline and who holds the rank of associate professor or professor.

- Recommend external reviewers who are able to offer advice, suggestion and constructive criticism from an objective, discipline perspective.

- Do not include in your recommendations external reviewers who have a personal or professional association with the faculty or staff (e.g., mentor relationship).

- Avoid any person(s) whose selection might be considered a conflict of interest.

PAR RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Last Name	First Name	Title	Institution	Phone	E-Mail	Reviewer Experience

SUBMITTED BY: DATE:

PLEASE ADD ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE QUALIFICATIONS OR RELEVANCE OF EACH RECOMMENDED EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Last Name	First Name	Comments

KINDLY ATTACHED A PICTURE AND A ONE-PARAGRAPH SUMMARY OF THE BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH OF THE REVIEWERS SELECTED.

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ORAL SUMMARY AND WRITTEN REPORT BY THE EXTERNAL TEAM

To maximize the time and efforts of the external reviewers and the process established, we wanted to summarize key considerations for your self-study team and for your reviewers as you guide them. There are two components to the external review: one is the **meeting with the Provost** and the other is **the written report** completed by the external reviewers after their visit is complete.

- External review schedules should have time for the team to meet and collect their thoughts and ideas **prior** to meeting with the Provost. The most successful meetings have been those at which the external reviewers have organized their thoughts, shared presenting them, and, while not required, prepared simple PowerPoint's of their findings, recommendations, and observations. The PowerPoint is then submitted along with the written report to the Provost. This is the preferred method of reporting.
- The report to the Provost should be a thoughtfully crafted oral summary of the site visit that the team has concluded. This visit is intended to both validate the findings of the self-study as well as to meet and engage with faculty and students on its conclusions.

- The external team is expected to comment on three broad areas:
    - Observations and strengths
    - Challenges
    - Recommendations

- The report to the Provost should be structured and well organized and provide frank and honest comments to the team, the Dean, the Provost, and representatives of his executive staff in attendance at the meeting.

- The report to the Provost should address major areas in the self-study particularly curriculum, and comments by faculty and student. Information gleaned from student interaction is particularly important.

- The external teams are expected to submit a written report approximately two weeks after their visit is concluded. The report should be an extension and expansion of the report to the Provost including recommendations and suggestions, which can be used to chart a course for the program's future and support the internally developed action plan.

SUGGESTIONS FOR DEVELOPING THE SITE VISIT

Mindful of the wide array of experiences in this area that members of all of the review teams have had, the ideas presented here have probably occurred to you already, but for those who may be new, here are some additional thoughts to consider:

- It would be nice, if possible, for a representative of the self-study group, or the group itself, to "meet and greet" the team members before they commence their work. Perhaps you might want to meet for dinner the evening of their arrival or informally for breakfast the first day after they arrive, or whatever venue and activity the team thinks is best.

- The team will probably contact you in advance about whom they would like to meet while they are here. If they do not, then you might consider arranging meetings with department/program chair, the dean, curriculum committee, etc. or whatever group/individual makes the most sense for your team.

- They will no doubt want to meet with some faculty while they are here and may choose those people randomly, or you might consider having a randomly chosen group of who might be available at the time the team indicates they want to meet.

- It is highly likely that they will ask to meet with your students. It is highly suggested, therefore, that you arrange your/their schedule to accommodate their need to meet with your students. Perhaps a group could be formed for a "pizza lunch" as an incentive. Once your dates are confirmed, you might want to see whom you can assemble among the student body in advance, just in case they make that request, as they will surely do. If you have more than one program in your department, consider gathering students from each area.

- Most of the times, the site teams do not ask to meet with support staff, but of course they could, so please be accommodating. This would be especially true if staffing surfaced as an issue in your report.

- Sometimes, teams will ask for a facilities tour as well. These should be kept brief and targeted to what they want or ask to see.

- As you build their schedules for their time here, please allow time for them to work during the day for an hour or two. They have very limited time so it is always appreciated when time is allowed during the day for work.

- Please be aware that you may be asked to provide access to both computers and a printer while they are here. Give that some thought in case you get that request, but be ready.

- The teams are asked to issue an oral report just prior to leaving campus. All exit summaries will be held in the Provost's Conference Room in the Main Building. You should invite the dean, the head of the program under review [in case the chair/head is not the chair of the self-study team] the full self-study team, Stephen DiPietro and M. Brian Blake from the Provost's Office.

SAMPLE TWO DAY EXTERNAL VISIT AGENDA

DREXEL UNIVERSITY
Department of
Physics
College of Arts and Sciences

PAR External Reviewers Program

Thursday October 10, 2015

Time	Event	Room	Comments
9:00 am	**Reviewers meet**	Disque Hall 614	Reviewers only
9:30 am	**Overview**	Disque Hall 919	Dept. Head & PAR Committee
10:00 am	**Space & Tour**	Disque Hall 919	Lane and PAR Committee
11:00 am	**Meeting with Dean**	MacAlister 4020	Dean Murasko
12:00 pm	**Lunch**	Faculty Club	Reviewers & Tenure faculty
1:30 pm	**Main Office Staff**	Disque Hall 816	Dept. Head & Main Office Staff
1:50 pm	**Lab Staff**	Disque Hall 816	Dept. Head & L. Ferrara & A. Aprelev
2:00 pm	**UG Non-majors**	Disque Hall 919	Tyagi & PAR Committee
2:30 pm	**UG program**	Disque Hall 919	Goldberg & PAR Committee
3:00 pm	**UG students**	Disque Hall 708	UG Majors
3:30 pm	**Graduate program**	Disque Hall 919	Vogeley & PAR Committee
4:00 pm	**Graduate students**	Disque Hall 705	GR Students

Time	Event	Room	Comments
4:30 pm	**Reviewers work period**	Disque Hall 614	Reviewers only
6:30 pm	**Dinner**	TBD	Reviewers & PAR Committee

Friday, October 11, 2015

Time	Event	Room	Comments
9:00 am	**Research overview**	Disque Hall 919	Ferrone and PAR Committee
9:30 am	*Astrophysics*	Disque Hall 614	Astrophysics Group
10:15 am	*Biophysics*	Disque Hall 919	Biophysics Group
11:00 am	*Condensed Matter*	Disque Hall 919	Condensed Matter Group
11:45 am	*Particle Physics*	Disque Hall 919	Particle Physics Group
12:30 pm	**Hiring**	Disque Hall 919	Richards, Reviewers & PAR Committee
12:45 pm	**Lunch**	Faculty Club	Reviewers & Tenure-track Faculty
1:30 pm	**Reviewers work period**	Disque Hall 614	Reviewers only
3:00 pm	**Debriefing meeting**	Disque Hall 919	Reviewers, Provost, Dean, Dept. Head & PAR Committee
4:15 pm	**Depart**		

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR PAYMENT
FOR EXTERNAL PAR REVIEWERS

The following is a step-by-step process to insure the timely payment of the $1,000.00 fee and travel expenses incurred by the external reviewers participating in the process. Where possible the easiest procedure would be for the individual reviewer to pay their own travel expenses and then submit their receipts to the person in your program or department charged with financial oversight. To accomplish that goal, please follow the instructions below:

1. Once your reviewers are identified and confirmed you should send them a Certification for Determination of Independent Contractor Status form, an Independent Contractor Agreement (ICA) form, and a W-9 form. The forms are available at the following URL's:

   a. FOR CERTIFICATION FOR DETERMINATION OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR STATUS FORM:
      http://drexel.edu/tax/independent-contractors/resources/

   b. FOR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR AGREEMENT (ICA) FORM:
      http://drexel.edu/~/media/Files/GeneralCounsel/IC-Agreement.ashx

   c. FOR W-9 FORM:
      http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/fw9.pdf?portlet=3

2. All completed forms go back to the department/program/team chair.

3. Once received the department/program chair must sign the Certification for Determination of Independent Contractor Status form in Section 4, and the Dean must sign in Section 5. Procurement will sign and execute the ICA form on behalf of the university.

4. The W-9 and Certification for Determination of Independent Contractor Status form should be scanned and e-mailed to the Office of Tax Compliance at taxdept@drexel.edu. Questions about the form may also be directed to this email address.

5. A Non-Catalog Order form will need to be complete to process the contract and payment of the fee (ensure the ICA is attached to requisition). A separate Non-Catalog Order form should be submitted for each external reviewer. If there are travel related expenses requiring reimbursement, please log into Smart Source to fill out a check request for travel reimbursement (attaching scans of original receipts) once you are in receipt of all original travel receipts from the external reviewer. Separate check requests should be submitted for each external reviewer. Travel reimbursements should be charged to 110001-3479 and the appropriate travel account code. A listing of travel account codes can be found at http://drexel.edu/procurement/travel/travel-expense-forms/. The fee should be charged to 110001-3479-3405. If the external reviewer is not an already existing supplier in Smart Source, you will enter the supplier manually on the Non-Catalog Order form and they will be sent an invitation to register as a supplier. Do not attach the external reviewer's W9 in Smart Source. The external reviewer will upload their W9 as part of the supplier registration process. For additional information on using Smart Source, please refer to the available job aids at http://drexel.edu/procurement/makingPurchases/smart-source/smart-source-training/.

6. Once the requisitions are complete, please assign them to Jason Gersh in the Provost's Office for approval.

   Jason Gersh, Director, Finance & Administration
   Drexel University, Office of the Provost
   3141 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104
   Phone: 215-895-0334   jag337@drexel.edu

Tab 8: SCDC Resources

The Steinbright Career Development Center collects a considerable amount of data related to co-op student employment, experience, and workplace performance. Much of this data is already available to you through assessment liaisons in your college or school. Steinbright's Program Assessment and Operations team works with these liaisons on a regular basis to provide data on a semi-annual basis. As you prepare for your Program Alignment and Review, it will be important to know where you can find data that is important to you. Please note that the described data is only available to programs that support the undergraduate co-op program (4- or 5-year).

What your assessment contact has:
1. **Student Employment Data** – *including employment rates, paid ratios, top employers, location, and salary information (from AY 2015 & 2016)*
2. **Employer Feedback on Student Performance*** (from the 2010-11 academic year on) – *including:*
   a. Quantitative performance data related to the Drexel Student Learning Priorities and College Learning Outcomes (if submitted)
   b. Qualitative responses to the questions:
      i. What are the student's strengths?
      ii. What are the student's weaknesses/areas of improvement?
      iii. What changes, if any, would you suggest for the academic preparation of this student?
3. **Student Feedback on Co-op Experiences*** (from the 2010-11 academic year on) – *including*:
   a. Quantitative data on the Drexel Student Learning Priorities and College Learning Outcomes (if submitted)
   b. Qualitative responses to the questions:
      i. Please submit a 400-word reflective analysis on how one aspect of this co-op experience relates to a personal, academic, or professional goal that you are pursuing at Drexel. Be specific about both your goal and how one aspect of the co-op relates to that goal. (AY 2016)
      ii. Reflecting upon your recent cooperative education experience, how well do you think your classroom activities prepared you? Was there anything missing that you felt would have better prepared you? Do you have any suggestions on how to improve you classroom activities to prepare you for your career? Please compose a 300-400 word reflective essay addressing these issues, including specific examples whenever possible.
      iii. What coursework did you apply most during your co-op?

* Please note that all evaluation data for a given co-op cycle is available one full term after that co-op cycle's completion. This means fall/winter co-op data is available July 15th, and spring/summer co-op data is available January 15th.

Steinbright maintains all student and employer evaluation feedback on co-op experiences prior to the 2010-11 academic year. To request additional data, please use the provided data request form to detail your request and then submit it to Steinbright Assessment team at SteinbrightData@drexel.edu.

While Steinbright will make every effort to complete requests in the preferred timeframe, Steinbright reserves the right to decline requests in order to maintain the integrity of its program and participants.

Please note that all graduating senior outcomes data (also known as senior survey data), including post-graduation outcomes and employment information, are maintained by Institutional Research, Assessment, and Effectiveness.

Below, you will find a list of Steinbright's liaisons by college/school for all of the 2018-2019 PAR programs:

Assessment Liaisons

Steinbright Career Development Center
Joanne Ott   jh882@drexel.edu
Rachel Callahan   rh69@drexel.edu

Westphal College of Media Arts and Design
Sandy Stewart   stewarts@drexel.edu

College of Nursing and Health Professions
Lora Furman   lrb36@drexel.edu
Deb Karlan   dck29@drexel.edu

Goodwin College of Professional Studies
Timothy Gilrain   Timothy.l.gilrain@drexel.edu
Regina Ruane   Regina.Ruane@drexel.edu

College of Engineering
Kristin Imhoff   Imhoffk@coe.drexel.edu
Kevin Ayers   ka38@drexel.edu

Tab 9: Action Plan

GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETION OF THE ACTION PLAN

1. **ISSUES ACCEPTED AS ACTIONABLE FROM THE SELF-STUDY AND EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORTS**

   These items are taken from both the self-study report as well as the external reviewers report. They are viewed as actionable by the dean, department/program head and the self-study team. Some programs have also used the reports as a framework for faculty retreats in which the items are discussed, debated and adopted.

2. **ORDER OF IMPORTANCE**

   Please indicate the level of importance that your program has assigned to each of the actionable items.

3. **SPECIFIC ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN**

   For example, if as a team in concert with your external report, decided that one of the issues you wish to address was the "marketing of program, accomplishments and news". One of the specific actions to be taken might be "Re-design and enhance current website". Another might be, "Develop a marketing, enrollment and retention plan".

4. **INTENDED OUTCOMES**

   What is anticipated as the end result or final product?   What is the end game of this action? Please indicate if action is intended to be accomplished over multiple academic years. For example, if the overarching issue is faculty hiring, might the objective be to hire two new faculty members per academic year?

5. **DATA TO BE COLLECTED TO SUPPORT THE ACTION ITEM**

   What evidentiary material/data would you need to collect, or have collected to support this action item? For example, number of faculty in the department or program? Anticipated enrollment? Faculty anticipated retirements? Teaching/Research Balance? Areas of specialty? Diversity? Budget?

6. **PROJECTED START DATE**

   When will the effort be initiated? In our hiring example, one might have to begin several months out from the projected start of the fall term for it to be accomplished.

7. **CURRENT STATUS**

   Has the project begun? Is it in process then? Is it complete? Has it been deferred?

8. **PROGRESS REVIEW DATE**

   Using the start date and the completion date as your continuum, when are you going to monitor progress? Four weeks into it? Mid-point? Annually? Do you have go or no-go benchmarks in your time line?

9. **TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION**

   When do you hope to have the item totally completed? In our hiring example, August 15th might make sense as a target date for a fall hire.

10. **INTERNAL & EXTERNAL CHALLENGES**

    What might get in the way of this action item being brought to completion? Budget? Competition? Facilities? Labs? Workloads? Ratios? Release time to execute hiring? Office space? Lab/facility expansion or improvement?

11. IMPLICATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IF ANY

What might the new employee/faculty member require? Professional development in instructional delivery? Technology integration? Assessment strategies?

12. TITLES OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

What are the titles of those charged to implement this item? Use titles in lieu of names to insure responsibility consistency in the event of personnel changes.

13. APPROVALS REQUIRED

What level of approval might be needed to implement this action item? Please list appropriate title(s). Example, Provost, Dean, Department Head, etc.

14. COST OF IMPLEMENTATION

If the action item is a new hire, what is the cost to the program in terms of salary? Fringe [33% of base salary], start-up fees if applicable? Impact on program/college budget? Impact on ability to enhance opportunities for research findings? If not a hiring item, is there any cost associated with the action other than effort? NOTE: Your entries should be listed fiscal year [FY] by fiscal year over a five-year period.

15. ACTUAL OUTCOMES & FINDINGS

What actually happened with this item? Is it complete? What will come of this action being completed? Did it cost less/more than projected? Have a greater impact on resources than anticipated? Result in concrete change? Altered business practices? New protocols? Opportunity to pursue additional research funding? Will the new employee bring a unique strength in curriculum design and revision?

Tab 10: Sample Physics Self-Study Template

Self-Study Committee

Table of Contents

Faculty Publications
Measures of Faculty Stature
Funding
Submissions
Interdisciplinarity
International Collaborations
Peer & Aspirant Comparisons
National Trends

Finances
Overview
Teaching Mission
Research Mission
Saving Resources

Analysis of Resources
Staffing

Facilities and Space
Overview
Space
Facilities

Technology
Faculty Involvement and Training

Strategic Alignment

Conclusion and Action Plan
Strengths
Weaknesses
Opportunities
Threats
Conclusion

Appendices

PLEASE NOTE:
We strongly encourage you to review the Physician Assistant Self-Study, which resides on the Share Point site. It is an exemplar report and one worthy of your time to review.

Tab 11: Research Grid for Questions

Part I

The tables below include information about grant activity, funding amounts as well as different types of presentation and publications

Grant Information	Grant Proposals Submitted	Grant Proposals Accepted	Sponsor list	Currently active grants
2012-13				
2013-14				
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				

Table 1: Information surround grant submission and approved projects

Research Funding	Internal Funding	External Funding	Total
2012-13			
2013-14			
2014-15			
2015-16			
2016-17			

Table 2: Informaton about internal and external funding

Presentations/ Talks	Conferences	Invited Talks	Conferences Organized	Chaired Conference Sessions	Workshops	Author Meets Critic Sessions
2012-13						
2013-14						
2014-15						
2015-16						
2016-17						

Table 3: Information about presentations, workshops, invited talks, etc.

Publications	Journal Articles	Refereed Papers	Books/Book Chapters	Awards
2012-13				
2013-14				

2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				

Table 4: Information about publications including journals, papers and books

Part II

The tables below correspond to the number of students involved with research or scholarship and also the deliverables that were produced

UG Student Involvment	STAR Research	Research Co-op	Other Research Projects	Presentations	Co-authors	Grants	Awards
2012-13							
2013-14							
2014-15							
2015-16							
2016-17							

Table 5: The amount of UG students involved with research and scholarship and their contributions

GR Student Involvment	Presentations	Co-authors	Grants/ Fellowships	Awards	# of Masters Students	# of Doctoral Students
2012-13						
2013-14						
2014-15						
2015-16						
2016-17						

Table 6: The amount of GR students involved with research and scholarship and their contributions

Post-doc Involvment	Presentations	Co-authors	Grants	Awards
2012-13				
2013-14				
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				

Table 7: The amount Post-doc students and deliverables

Part III

The tables below detail the amount of creative contribution during the five year period including patents, exhibits and screenplays

Intellectual Property	# of invention disclosures	% of faculty submitting invention disclosures	Licensing Fees
2012-13			
2013-14			
2014-15			
2015-16			
2016-17			

Table 8: Information about inventions and licensing fees

Patents	Submitted	Approved
2012-13		
2013-14		
2014-15		
2015-16		
2016-17		

Table 9: Information about patents

Performances	Major Shows	Awards
2012-13		
2013-14		
2014-15		
2015-16		
2016-17		

Table 10: Information about performances and awards pertaining to performance

Exhibits	Temporary Exhibits	Permanent Collections	Awards	Commisoned Work
2012-13				
2013-14				
2014-15				
2015-16				
2016-17				

Table 11: Information about exhibits, collections and awards pertaining to exhibits

Written Work	Screenplays	Screenings
2012-13		
2013-14		

2014-15		
2015-16		
2016-17		

Table 12: Information about screenplays and scripts created as well as screenings and plays

Libraries Resources for Self-Study

- Liaison librarians
- University Archives
- Literature databases
- Bibliometric and analysis tools

Drexel University Libraries

1

Self-Study Specifics

- Describe background & history of program
- Identify peer and aspirational programs
- Benchmark faculty research & scholarly outputs against selected peer programs
- Complete research tables

Drexel University Libraries

4

Self-Study Specifics, continued

- Identify significant faculty achievements: publications, collaborations, creative works
- Comment on adequacy of Libraries' resources, current & future:
  - degree programs
  - research efforts

Self-Study Specifics, continued

- Identify significant faculty achievements: publications, collaborations, creative works
- Comment on adequacy of Libraries' resources, current & future:
  - degree programs
  - research efforts

Drexel

UNIVERSITY