

Program Review Procedural Guidelines

For Non-NCATE Institutions

Report review process:

- The state/national team will review the program under the guidance of the team leader.
- When consensus is reached, the team leader will write the final composite report; if consensus cannot be reached, the team leader should consult with the designated Program Review Advisory Board (PRAB) member. For non-affiliate areas, please consult with the chair of the PRAB for guidance.
- The team leader will write the report and clear it through all reviewers prior to its submission to OCTP. *This will be the only report accepted by OCTP.* The team leader should make a copy of it (along with the original reviews from all team members) for his/her own records.
- OCTP will forward the final report to the PRAB member for final approval.
- The PRAB member will return the report to OCTP who will notify the institution of the review findings.
- Each member of the review team will sign and submit the “Confidentiality Policy” and “Conflict of Interest Policy” pages to the team leader who will submit them with the final draft.
- Reviewers should keep a copy of each review with the folio. Do not throw these materials away for at least one year in case questions arise about certain points. You may be asked to review your notes for clarification at a later time, or a rejoinder may be filed by the institution.

Important considerations for the review sheet:

- Use the exact name of the program as it appears on the folio.
- Date your review by month and year.
- Designate the degree level.
- It is important that there be uniformity and consistency in comments and recommendations. Reports must be unbiased and be guided solely by the standards. The reviewer’s personal or institutional experiences should not influence the review decision.
- Clearly identify guidelines not met by using both the guideline number (i.e., 2.1.3) and the nature of the guideline.
Note: you can identify the reasons for citing non-compliance after each guideline or use “The Perceived Program Weaknesses” section for that purpose. You may also provide a brief reason with the guideline and then expand upon it under “Weaknesses.” A short narrative in this section is permissible. The information in this section and under the “Other Comments” section will help shape the rejoinder if one is needed.
- Cite program strengths as appropriate, but avoid citing numerous strengths that seem to suggest a strong program when a number of guidelines are unmet.

- Use the “Other Comments” section if needed to continue commentary on weaknesses or to cite positives such as “extremely well organized folio.”
- If pertinent information is lacking, it is permissible to request additional documentation from the institution. This is the team leader’s responsibility.

Note: If several guidelines are not in compliance and/or information is missing or explanations are unclear, the reviewer can opt for “not in compliance” and indicate what information would be helpful in determining if the program is in compliance. (Fill in “additional information needed to determine compliance.”)

Consider carefully whether you believe the program is or is not in compliance. It is possible, on occasion, for a program to be in compliance but still to have program weaknesses identified. However, if a program has several guidelines in the knowledge base or pedagogical areas not met, then it may well be a candidate for non-compliance.

Rejoinders

Institutions whose programs have been found in non-compliance may file a rejoinder that focuses on only the guidelines and weaknesses cited. Reviewers should examine the new information provided by the institution and determine if the areas of non-compliance have been sufficiently addressed to change the findings of the original review. Reviewers working with rejoinders should be careful to address those areas found to be in non-compliance or a weakness; no new weaknesses or additional guidelines should be cited unless this is clearly warranted by the rejoinder information.

After determining whether the program is now in compliance or remains in non-compliance, the reviewer completes another individual review form, following the same process as used in the original review. The rejoinder review is forwarded to the team leader who follows the same procedures as with initial reviews.