

East Stroudsburg University

Academic Program Review

PASSHE 5-Year Reviews

Purpose: This template is designed to fulfill the requirements of both the PASSHE 5-Year Program Review policy and the procedures of the University Assessment Committee.

Who: Academic programs leading to a degree, including concentrations and tracks

When: Every 5 years. The University Assessment Committee and the Director of Assessment and Accreditation will notify programs of the deadline to submit the program review at the start of the fall semester in the year the review is due. All program reviews will occur in the confines of the academic year/during regular contract windows; however, programs can use summer/winter months to complete data collection and analysis as staffing and contracts allow.

Why: To ensure that programs are regularly and appropriately assessing outcomes and programmatic success indicators as required by [PASSHE Procedure/Standard 2024-58](#). To engage in regular self-study as part of a community of assessment. To identify areas of success as well as opportunities for improvement.

How: The UAC process ensures regular assessment that leads to measurable change initiatives through regular data collection against program created outcomes. These outcomes are different from student PLOs and CLOs and are meant to show programmatic success. The UAC process will inform the conclusions drawn in this report and the potential budgetary requests the program may make. New outcomes can and should be created as part of this process for the next 5-year cycle.

Instructions: Program directors—or their designee—should complete the template and submit it to the Director of Assessment and Accreditation for submission to PASSHE. The program director is the final person responsible for the veracity of the document—the DAA is the liaison between the programmatic review team at PASSHE and ESU. The Director of Assessment and Accreditation will support programs in the completion of the 5-year review when requested by the program/department.

1. The UAC will notify programs at the beginning of the academic year of the need to complete a program review. The template for program review will also be shared.
2. Data regarding enrollment, retention, credit hour production, and faculty/staff will be requested by the UAC for the programs undergoing 5-year review. The data will then be shared with the program director at the same time the template

and narrative prompts are shared. Data will be requested in August by the Director of Assessment and Accreditation (DAA) and shared no later than September 30 for programs undergoing review.

3. Program chairs, along with any other program faculty and staff, should review the data and complete the narrative prompts that coordinate. The 5-year program review draft must be submitted by December 1 of each year a review is required.
4. A team of 3 reviewers from the UAC will complete a review of the data and narratives submitted to the UAC in the 5-Year review along with any UAC reviews completed during the past 4 years (if available). The review team will look at thresholds compared to submitted data, program defined outcomes, and student learning outcome data to assist the programs in identifying areas of success and opportunities for improvement.
 - a. The UAC Review Teams will use reviews completed within the collection cycle, the data spreadsheet, and the narrative responses as the basis for rating. No other data or anecdotal evidence should be considered. The UAC Review Team is not expected—nor should they—engage in any other data collection prior to completing the individual or group feedback rubric.
 - b. The UAC Program Review Rating Sheet should be used for individual ratings along with using the Adjudication Sheet to come to a group consensus.
5. UAC Review Teams will submit final Adjudication Sheets to the UAC Chairs, Director of Assessment and Accreditation, and program/department chairs by February 1.
 - a. UAC Reviews are formative in nature; feedback from the UAC can be used to strengthen the document before final submission.
 - b. A re-review of the final document can be requested from the UAC. These reviews will be completed by the Director of Assessment.
6. A final draft of the program review spreadsheet and narratives should be submitted to the DAA and college Dean by February 15 of the spring semester. Feedback will be provided by March 1.
 - a. Again, this is an opportunity to strengthen the final program review before submission to Academic Affairs and PASSHE.
7. Final program reviews are due by April 15 of each academic year.
 - a. The signed Executive Summary sheet (included in this handbook) must be included when sending the final document to the Dean of the college, Provost, and Director of Accreditation and Assessment.

8. The Provost will sign the program review but may also request edits or additions to the document.
9. The DAA will submit the final, fully signed report to PASSHE and document the next program review date.

Tips for a successful program review:

1. Include faculty, staff, and students in the process. Surveys and focus groups are great ways to obtain stakeholder feedback. Be sure to share findings with these groups as well.
2. Many programs in professional fields (nursing, education, business, etc.) utilize regular feedback from employers in the area. Sometimes this feedback is obtained ad hoc (when needed) but most often, programs create advisory boards comprised of individuals outside of the university who have a vested interest in the success of our programs. These advisory boards meet once or twice an academic year and help to support student learning and workforce development.
3. Consider the use of an external reviewer. This individual should work or educate in the field, not be a current member of ESU faculty, staff, or administration, and ideally have some knowledge of programmatic/curricular development and outcomes.
4. Use PASSHE system data. PASSHE data includes enrollment, graduation, and general workforce information. Consider its use when other sources are not available: [PASSHE System Data](#)
5. Be forthcoming. All programs are required to submit improvements for the next 5-year cycle—these improvements are meant to improve outcomes or conditions within the program. Ideally these improvements, 1. Help students succeed 2. Create program efficiencies and 3. Work mostly within the budgetary allocations of the program (with requests as needed). An example is below:

Within the next 5-year cycle, the program will work to reduce attrition by creating an orientation handbook for incoming students and an advising handbook for faculty to ensure students are able to progress through the curriculum and are aware of the requirements of the program.

Program Review Timeline:

September: Programs and IR notified by the UAC that a 5-year review is required. UAC Review Team assigned.

September: 5-Year Program Review Training – Required for all programs in review that year.

October-November: Program meets with Director of Assessment, program leadership, and school dean to discuss timeline, data needs, and any other needs. These are check-in meetings and can be group or individual program meetings.

December 1: Program review draft (data spreadsheet and narrative) submitted by the program to the UAC for review.

February 1: UAC Review Teams submit final Adjudication Sheets to the UAC Chairs, Director of Assessment and Accreditation, and program/department chairs.

February 15: Final draft report due to department and college leadership and the Director of Assessment, incorporating UAC Adjudication Sheet feedback

March 1: Feedback and suggested edits provided to program from Dean and leadership

April 15: Final 5-Year Program Review due. All approvals/signatures must be obtained before submission of the final review.

Narrative Elements for Program Review:

See spreadsheet template for the required data which will be provided by the UAC and Institutional Research. Please complete the narrative elements in a Word document that will supplement the spreadsheet. The narrative elements of the 5-year review should be no more than 15 pages with double spacing, headers, and any other formatting.

Instructions: In addition to the data collected in the Five-Year Review spreadsheet, the prompts in this document require programs to analyze, explain, and reflect on the program's key performance measures. Please answer all prompts and base analysis on the trends revealed by data. An example appears below:

AY	Students Admitted	Students Attended
2025-2026	200	90
2024-2025	200	75
2023-2024	200	90

Unsupported Analysis: The number of students admitted each year has remained steady at 200 students per academic year. The number of students who chose to attend the program is also relatively consistent at 90 students per year. In 2024-2025, fewer students chose to attend the program due to financial aid constraints. *(What evidence suggests financial aid constraints for why students did not attend?)*

Appropriate Analysis: The number of students admitted each year has remained steady at 200 students per academic year. In years 2023-2024 and 2025-2026, 45% of admitted students ultimately attended the program. However, in year 2024-2025, only 37.5% of admitted students attended the program. Causes of the decrease are not certain. Starting with the next admissions cycle, a survey will be sent to all admitted students to try and determine the factors that lead to matriculation. *(More data needs to be collected before a reason can be determined).*

Narrative Prompts:

1. Who prepared this report? Include names, titles, and ESU email addresses.
2. How does this program align to the university mission, goals, and The Way of the Warrior?
3. How does the program contribute to or help achieve the goals of the current strategic plan, [*ESU: Creating Opportunities Through Community, Engagement, and Belonging?*](#)
4. How has enrollment changed or not during the last 5 years? Consider:
 - a. Applications vs. admits
 - b. Admits vs. enrollment
 - c. Comparison of enrollment by track/concentration
5. Achievement: How does the program support student achievement beyond the classroom (i.e. conference attendance and presentation, awards, publications, etc.)? Are there areas where the program can better support student achievements in the field?
6. Graduation: Current Graduation rates can be found in the [PASSHE System Data, Graduation Rate dashboard](#). For the cohort entering in fall 2019, the 4-year graduation rate is 34.5% and the 6-year graduation rate is 51.7%. Is the 4-year graduation rate for the program above or below the ESU rate? Is the 6-year graduation rate for the program above or below the ESU rate? How has the program worked to support students to complete within 4 years? What can the program do in the future to support the 4-year graduation rate?
7. How has the program worked to collect employment data from students who are about to graduate? Alumni? How can the program improve collection around employment after graduation?
8. Please provide the current program learning objectives (PLOs). When were the PLOs last reviewed?
 - a. What major, direct assessments are students required to complete during the program? Include external assessments, like board certification exams.
 - b. What indirect assessments does the program use to determine programmatic quality and gain student, faculty, and staff feedback?
 - c. Discuss relevant data from direct and indirect assessments. This can include but is not limited to:
 - i. Trend data for completion of major assessments
 - ii. Trend data for outcomes of major assessments –did students achieve the objectives of the major assessments?
 - iii. Areas of success discovered through major assessments
 - iv. Areas of opportunity discovered through major assessments
 - v. Needs/requests because of data/feedback from major assessments

- vi. Student completion trends
 - vii. Student, faculty, and staff perceptions
9. Please provide the current 4-year degree plan including directed General Education courses with identifier. How do the directed General Education courses assist students with the curricular elements of the program?
10. Curricular Map: When was the curriculum map last updated? Are there opportunities for improvement to the map based on student academic achievement? For example, is more coverage of a particular PLO needed because students are not able to retain the content/skills?
- a. Please list any curricular changes made to the program in the past 4-5 years. Why were these changes made?
 - b. What, if any, curricular changes are planned for the next 5 years? This includes changes to major courses, pre- and co-requisites, and program changes.
11. Credit hour production. Please provide analysis of the total credit hours produced in each academic year. Can the program support additional students or courses with the current FTE?
- a. Do you anticipate increases or decreases in credit hour production? Why should these increases or decreases be anticipated?
 - b. If there are expected increases or decreases, how will these affect the current FTE?
12. Do you anticipate the need for additional full or part-time faculty to support the program in the next 3-4 academic years?
- d. Full-time, tenure-track faculty needed:
 - e. Part-time faculty needed:
 - f. Justification for faculty need (full- and part-time):
13. Faculty development: Please list any development sessions, conferences, and other professional development completed by program faculty. Please include any internal and external training courses attended. How do the attended sessions support the goals of the program and the university (Strategic Plan)? What support is needed to increase faculty professional development?
14. For program faculty, please provide a list of the following by each faculty member over the past 5 years: awards, honors, grants, research contributions, publications, citations, service endeavors, and student achievements. (See Faculty Development tab). Have any of the accolades been shared university-wide or with the public?
15. Do you anticipate additional staffing needs within the next 5 years? Full-time or part-time? Please provide a justification for how the program would utilize the new staff member(s) to achieve the goals of the program.

16. Resources: Please list and describe any program-specific software, technology, and specialized staff that the program currently uses.
- g. What additional resources does the program need to deliver content to students?
 - h. What additional resources does the program need to support students?
 - i. What additional resources does the program need to support faculty and staff?
 - j. Justification and approximate budget:
17. External comparison: In accredited programs—evidence of good standing and peer benchmarking. In non-accredited programs, how do we compare to other programs like ours? Evidence of this can be national rankings, a review by an external reviewer, or comparison to a group of peers (enrollment trends, degrees conferred).
- k. External reviewer: For non-accredited programs, engaging an external reviewer can help to identify opportunities and areas of excellence. It is highly recommended that the external reviewer come from a similar type of institution and program. It is also recommended that the reviewer examine the data and narrative provided here in order to ensure that his/her/their analysis is built on the same evidence.
 - l. National rankings: US News and World Report or similar
 - m. Comparison to peers: Identify 3-5 peer institutions that are similar in size, program, and/or type (public vs private) and compare the outcomes of your program (4- and 6-year graduation rates, job placement, board pass, etc.) and the other programs. Where can we improve based on our peers? Where do we outpace peers?
 - n. PASSHE comparison—using system data, how do we compare to other PASSHE schools?
 - o. Accredited programs: Work with the Director of Assessment and Accreditation to determine which comparison data will be used/submitted. Accredited programs often have more requirements for peer benchmarking than non-accredited programs.
18. If internal program data is kept, does the data from university sources (IR, Admissions, etc.) match internal data sources?
- p. How is internal program data collected and maintained? How does this differ from university data collection?
 - q. In what ways does the internal program data differ from the university data?
 - r. What ongoing or regular data needs does your program have? (Annual required reports, internal retreats, internal improvement initiatives, etc.).
19. Describe the process for collecting data from faculty and staff regarding perceptions of job performance, program success, and support. How can this process be

strengthened? If not currently collecting this data, how can the program start to gather this information from existing or new sources?

- a. What strengths or areas of improvement have resulted from the past 4-5 years of data collection/review?

20. Discuss relevant data from faculty and staff in the aggregate, including:

- s. Evaluations of the program
- t. Any areas of strength noted
- u. Any areas of weakness noted
- v. Comments from open-ended questions (not course evals)

Program Strengths and Recommendations

21. Based on the data trends from enrollment (applications, admits, and graduation rate), direct and indirect assessments of students, and data collected from faculty and staff, identify 3-5 recommendations for the program to improve outcomes for students, faculty, and staff. At least 1 of these recommendations must be student focused.

22. Based on the data analysis described above, identify 3-5 program strengths. At least 1 of these strengths must be student focused.

Appendix A: Program Review Executive Summary

University:	Submission Date:
Program Name:	
Three to Five Program Strengths Documented in the Review:	
Three to Five Program Opportunities Documented in the Review:	
If an external evaluator was utilized, summarize the key takeaways of the evaluator's report.	
What, if any, actions did or will the university take in relation to the program in response to the review?	
Department Chair/Director Name and Title: Department Name:	Signature of the Department Chair:
College Dean Name:	Signature of the College Dean:
Vice President/Provost Name and Title:	Signature of Vice President/Provost:

Appendix B: Rating Scale and Rubric-to-Standard Crosswalk

East Stroudsburg University — Academic Program Review

The table below maps each of the 16 rating criteria used in the UAC Program Review Rating Sheet and Adjudication Sheet (Table 1) to the three Standards used in the “Final Global Feedback from UAC” tab of the Data Collection workbook (Design and Delivery, Effectiveness, and Demand).

Note: The four compliance criteria in Table 2 (curriculum compliance with Board Policy 1990-06-A, annual UAC data updates, use of UAC review feedback, and the CPP enrollment/completion benchmark) are rated Met/Not Met and are evaluated separately from the three Standards above.

Rating Scale: For rating criteria, the following scale will be used:

- Exceeds Expectations: Program has documented and reflected upon all areas of the criteria or program review. Conclusions are drawn from data and are reasonable in discussion of findings. The program has identified ways to improve learning or program objectives and has a clear, actionable plan to address these potential improvements with an identified timeline and resources.
- Meets Expectations: Program has documented and reflected upon all areas of the criteria or program review. Conclusions are drawn from data and are reasonable in discussion of findings. The program has identified ways to improve learning or program objectives and has a plan to address these potential improvements.
- Partially Meets Expectations: Program has documented and reflected on most areas of the criteria or program review, although there is missing information. A plan for improving areas of weakness is not present or is insufficiently described.
- Progressing/Appropriate for Development: The program is new or is in a state of significant re-development. Data is not at a point that broad conclusions or improvements can be identified.
- Insufficient Evidence to Rate: Data or documentation of process is missing for the criteria. Data may be provided but is not from official sources or lacks analysis.

Crosswalk Between Rubric and Evaluation Criterion

Global Evaluation Standard	Rubric Criterion (Rating Sheet / Adjudication Sheet — Table 1)
Standard I: Design and Delivery of the Academic Program	Faculty and staff numbers are adequate to support the program and its students
	The program regularly invests in professional and scholarly development
	Faculty regularly publish and are recognized as experts in their discipline
	The curriculum is mapped and includes appropriate redundancy
	The curriculum is current with industry/disciplinary standards

Global Evaluation Standard	Rubric Criterion (Rating Sheet / Adjudication Sheet — Table 1)
	The curriculum is integrated with the university's general education program, if applicable
	The program has a structure in place for advising students that results in on-time graduation
Standard II: Effectiveness	Systematic assessment and use of data for continuous improvement is evident
	Direct assessments of student learning show achievement of PLOs
	Indirect assessments of students are used and considered
	The program regularly evaluates student performance
	Students are productive in scholarship, awards, grants, and presentations
	Student Learning Outcomes demonstrate program effectiveness
Standard III: Demand	The program is highly regarded compared to peer institutions
	Credit hour production is sufficient to support the program
	Students are able to find employment in the field