Responsible Office	Office of Academic Affairs	**Effective Date**	February 21, 2020
Responsible Official	Associate Provost	**Last Revision**	September 10, 2025

Academic Program Review Policy
Fairleigh Dickinson University Vancouver (FDUV)

Purpose:
The purpose of the academic program review is:
- To facilitate continuous improvement of the program(s)
- To provide an opportunity for each program to evaluate its quality, success, and role in the fulfillment of its own and the University's mission and strategic goals
- To encourage academic planning and innovation in units and programs
- To critically evaluate and, if necessary, revise current curricular and assessment practices
- To take advantage of fresh perspectives from colleagues outside Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Policy Statement:
Fairleigh Dickinson University (FDU) is committed to conducting regular, comprehensive, and systematic reviews of its academic programs as part of its dedication to the continuous improvement of academic quality and excellence.

Scope of Policy:
This policy applies to
a) Academic departments and professional colleges, and the academic degree programs within those units
b) College or University requirements, such as the General Education program, Writing Program, and Honours Program
c) Selected co-curricular programs designed to affect student learning outcomes.

Academic departments, programs, and colleges as well as selected co-curricular programs are required to conduct assessment and document both the assessment work and their reflection on the data collected in accordance with this policy.

FDUV programs reviewed by well-established accrediting bodies may provide their accrediting reviews in place of the one described in this policy.

Standing Expectations of Academic Programs
- Academic Programs should be familiar with and comply with all specifications of FDU's guidelines for learning outcomes assessment.
- All full-time faculty members in a program are eligible to be involved in the program review and in the assessment process in some capacity. Review and assessment should not be the responsibility of just one individual or a small committee.
- All full-time faculty members are eligible to participate in discussions concerning curricular changes made as a result of the academic program review and assessments. When feasible, part-time faculty should also be included in these discussions.

Specific Guidelines:
1. The academic program review will occur at least every five for degree programs, and at least every seven years for all non-degree programs.
2. Academic programs, working with the Deans and the Provost's Office, will establish a staggered schedule for program review.
3. The review process will consist of four stages:
   a. A program self-study;
   b. An evaluation by external reviewers, including at least three external experts and a site visit
   c. A response to the external review, including plans for program revisions.
   d. Adoption and implementation of the revisions by the college or department.
4. The members of the department/college will propose several external evaluators to the Provost for consideration, and the Provost will make the final determination of the external reviewer or site review team in consultation with the department and/or college leadership, as appropriate or required. Analysis of the program and resulting revisions should ensure that the program remains consistent with current FDU mission, goals and long-range plans as articulated in the Strategic Plan.
5. The external review will include a site visit, culminating in a final report assessing program quality.
6. The final report from the reviewer(s) and a formal response to that report from the program will be sent to the University Provost. A summary of the conclusions of the review will be made available to the University community and external agencies when required.

7. After the Dean and University Provost have accepted the report, the Provost or Dean may require revision or reaffirmation of the program mission, vision, and strategic plan, all of which would then be submitted for approval by the Dean and University Provost.
8. Self-study reviews of academic programs delivered on the Vancouver campus will include all the elements and processes required by the BC Degree Quality Assurance Board
9. A summary of the conclusions of the review will be made available to the University community and external agencies when required.

Elements of the Program Self-Study

Student learning outcome data should cover at least three years of data. Departments/colleges are encouraged to provide a comprehensive description and analysis of the program under review. Suggested elements of the report are as follows:

1. Introduction
   a. Brief description of the program
   b. Emerging trends/issues in the discipline
2. Program Overview
   a. Brief description of the program including curriculum
   b. Admission requirements
   c. Degree(s), concentrations, tracks, specializations, certifications and requirements/credit hours for each
   d. Courses: method(s) of delivery, length, location
   e. Available and needed resources (physical, technological, financial, human)
   f. Course coverage taught by Continuing Faculty
   g. A set of quantitative metrics including enrollment yield, profile of enrolled students over 5-7 years
   h. Faculty profiles
   i. Adequacy of the curriculum and staffing
3. Program Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes
   a. Each Student Learning Outcome must be assessed, and data collected at least 3 times during a 5-year cycle.
4. Assessment
   a. Overview
   b. Presentation of at least 3 years of Student Learning Outcomes data and analysis of data
   c. Comparison of the program's curriculum at comparable institutions
   d. A critical analysis of the current state of the program, focusing on program objectives, student learning outcomes data, teaching quality as reflected in departmental summaries of student assessments and peer reviews, progress on the program's outcomes, and other relevant data such as retention, graduation rates, employment outcomes, and employer ratings of graduates

e. Analysis of the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, admissions requirements, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and standards; the adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human); faculty performance including the quality of teaching and demonstrable currency in the field of specialization; the continuing adequacy of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement to ensure that the degree level standards have been achieved

f. Consideration of whether the learning outcomes achieved by students/graduates meet the program's stated goals, the degree level standard, and where appropriate, the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association

g. A summary reporting of program performance, including strengths and weaknesses, desired improvements, and future directions, aligned with the college or department mission, goals and plans.

h. A comprehensive review of the program's relationship and connections, including internal and external articulation, accreditation, Program Advisory Committee (PAC) involvement, credential recognition and nomenclature.

5. Other Student Data (as needed and appropriate)
   a. Retention rates (for all years since the last Self-Study)
   b. Graduation rates (for all years since the last Self-Study)
   c. Program's average GPA for admitted students (for all years since the last Self-Study)
   d. Employment outcomes
   e. Work integrated learning employer feedback
   f. Student comments/qualitative data
   g. Alumni profiles

6. Program strengths and areas for improvement
7. Future plans considering current and emerging trends in the discipline
8. Summary
9. Appendix A: Representative Syllabi of Selected Courses

Suggested Timeline for Program Review:
The following timeline is suggested as a guide and is to be adjusted to adapt to specific circumstances or academic unit structures. The position titles listed below apply where they exist but should be adapted where necessary to suit specific roles and responsibilities.

Time	Activity
12-14 months prior	Meet with the College Dean and FDUV Associate Provost and/or designee to discuss the objectives for program review, the appropriate timelines and strategies, and to discuss questions regarding the process

8-12 months prior	Work with the Office of Institutional Research and the Finance Office to begin compiling program specific data, including but not limited to retention and graduation data, budgetary spending data, student and alumni metrics regarding performance, any relevant assessment data (including performance on exit exams, benchmark assessments, capstones, student portfolios) and other relevant program artifacts
8-12 months prior	Start writing the self-study report
8 months prior	Submit a list of at least three names for potential program reviewers; program reviewers should have no FDU University affiliation, should have a background in the discipline area and committed for a virtual / in person visit to the school during the site-visit time window
6 months prior	Meet with the College Dean and FDUV Associate Provost and/or designee to finalize the site review team based upon the submitted candidate list and other potential reviewers identified by the FDUV Associate Provost
4 months prior	Make scheduling and travel arrangements for the site review team, including selection of dates that align with the calendar availability of all relevant university officials (including, but not limited to FDUV Associate Provost, College Dean, Department faculty and staff, representatives from Offices of Finance, Enrollment Management and Institutional Research)
3-4 months prior	Submit a draft self-study for review by the College Dean and FDUV Associate Provost
2-3 months prior	Conduct a meeting between the College Dean, FDUV Associate Provost and all program stakeholders to discuss the submission documents, address the review process and finalize any changes to the documents
6-8 weeks prior	Submit the self-study to the program review team and finalize the agenda for the site visit
2-4 weeks prior	Confirm all logistics of the event, including accommodations for the site review team, necessary paperwork for payment to reviewers, and other visit details
Site Visit	• Initial meetings with FDUV Associate Provost and College Dean • Initial meeting with Department Chair or Program Coordinator • Meetings with Faculty (as a group) • Meetings with Students and Alumni • Assessment of Facilities, Physical Footprint and Resources • Program Advisory Board or External Partners/Stakeholders

2-4 weeks post	Final Report delivered to the department chair or program director and to University Provost, Dean, and FDUV Associate Provost Report edited for any omissions or errors of fact
4-8 weeks post	Dean and/or FDUV Associate Provost meet with the Program to discuss relevant findings, answer any questions, gather any final information and address next steps
8-12 weeks post	Final report is generated by the FDUV Associate Provost or designee, which includes the program assessment report, a response from the dean, a response from the FDUV Associate Provost and overall conclusions and path forward
12-14 weeks post	Faculty in the given unit, having considered both the Self-Study and the External Review, write a response to the report for the Dean, FDUV Associate Provost, and University Provost. The Dean, FDUV Associate Provost, and University Provost review that report and then each signals acceptance of the report.
By the end of the primary semester after the semester in which the report was received	After the Dean, FDUV Associate Provost, and University Provost have accepted the report, the program or department revises its mission and vision statement and creates a strategic plan for the next five years. The mission and vision statement and strategic plan must be approved by the Dean, FDUV Associate Provost, and University Provost.