



**Academic Program Continuous Improvement Plan  
Updated June 30, 2024**

The Rutgers University Camden mission and vision each provide an essential foundation for our Continuous Improvement Plan.

**Our Mission**

*Rutgers University–Camden provides access to world-class education, innovative research, and transformative opportunities to multiple constituencies. Our mission is to prepare the next generations of leaders by delivering rigorous academic programs that are bolstered by excellence in teaching and scholarship, experiential learning, and community engagement. As one of the nation’s top comprehensive public research universities, Rutgers University–Camden is committed to creating an environment that fosters critical thinking, creativity, entrepreneurship, and societal responsibility. Building on our core strengths, we create distinct areas of academic excellence, strengthen interdisciplinary programs, expand our global reach, and transform the lives of students through personalized experiences.*

**Our Vision**

*As a top national research university dedicated to serving a 21st-century demographic, Rutgers University–Camden is committed to elevating its position as a leader among urban public research universities in research, teaching, experiential learning, and civic engagement. On a local and global scale, our students will be the visionary leaders and global citizens that will shape a society that is equitable, just, and sustainable. We endeavor to retain our intimate and collaborative campus culture, nurturing the aspirations of students, faculty, staff, alumni, and other aligned constituencies.*

**Our Continuous Improvement Plan also supports each of the five pillars in our campus strategic plan.**

1. Innovation in Academic Excellence, Striving Toward Preeminence
2. Transformative Student Success: Preparing the Next Generation of Compassionate Leaders
3. Holistic Student Experience: Serving the Needs of the 21st-Century Student
4. Beloved Camden Community: Advancing the Common Good on Campus and Beyond
5. Internationalization: Bridging Rutgers University in Camden and the World

In order to fulfill our mission and implement our strategic plan, Rutgers University Camden (RU-C) has a continuous improvement plan for our academic programs. This document provides guidelines for conducting reviews of academic units and programs.

The continuous improvement of academic units is essential to meeting our campus mission and goals. It is also important to the overall university. The Office of the Executive Vice-President of Academic Affairs (EVPAA) also provides following guidelines for conducting such reviews. The Institutional Framework provided by the Office of the EVPAA are presented below. The RU-C plan is aligned with this Framework.

### **EVPAA Institutional Framework for Continuous Improvement in Academic Affairs.**

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey is committed to continuous improvement in academic affairs to link periodic assessment to the broader strategic goals of the academic unit, campus, and/or university and to evaluate the budgetary resources necessary to achieve such goals. The university engages in multiple assessment efforts to promote continuous improvement.

To build upon these efforts, each chancellor-led unit (CLU) shall develop a procedure or policy that articulates the manner in which a regularized assessment process, with the goal of continuous improvement, is instituted within the CLU. Such procedures or policies are subject to approval by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs to ensure they are consistent with the guidelines outlined below. The intent of CLU-specific procedures or policies is to ensure that each CLU has sufficient latitude to define a continuous improvement process appropriate to its mission and to document evidence of assessment and continuous improvement to the Middle State Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE).

Following are guidelines that should be adhered to in developing a continuous improvement plan.

- Reviews or assessments should be focused on academic units (schools/departments) or academic programs (degrees/certificates), as determined by each CLU. Reviews may also be thematic in scope (i.e., cluster reviews) to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of cross-cutting areas (e.g., climate science, etc.).
  - Reviews by professional/specialized accreditors may serve as an acceptable form of review, if deemed appropriate by the chancellor. However, best practice is for such reviews to occur in advance of an accreditation review.
- Reviews should be periodic (i.e., on a regularized cycle) and supplemented, as appropriate.
  - Prior to the beginning of each academic year, CLUs will submit a list of scheduled reviews to the executive vice president for academic affairs. At the conclusion of each academic year, CLUs will submit a list of completed reviews and provide access to the resulting reports.
  - However, reviews may be initiated at any time by the president, executive vice president for academic affairs, chancellor/provost, or deans. Examples of when an ad-hoc review may be initiated include:
    - Demonstrated cause for concern with respect to performance indicators, such as declines in enrollment, graduation rates, or reputational standing. A pending change in decanal leadership, which would subsequently inform the search process.
    - When academic leadership believes a particular area represents a strategic strength, weakness, opportunity, or threat requiring an ad-hoc review.

- Reviews should:
  - Incorporate an internal assessment (i.e., self-study) of the academic unit or academic program that documents linkages with unit, CLU, and institutional priorities.
  - At the discretion of the chancellor, provost, or dean, incorporate an external assessment (i.e., peer reviewers) of the academic unit or academic program.
  - Incorporate a suite of metrics of relevance to academic leadership to inform both the internal and external assessment.
  - Be forward-looking and evaluative, not just descriptive, to ensure a focus on continuous improvement.
  - Incorporate recommendations and an implementation plan to enact such recommendations.
  - Incorporate a status report, at a pre-defined interval, that documents progress on recommendations resulting from the review.
    - Be shared first at the campus level with the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost. The EVC/Provost will review the results with the academic units and the Chancellor. After approval from the EVC/Provost and Chancellor, the results will be shared with the office of the EVPAA. The results will include implemented changes. The results will be in a format designed to be useful in constructing a repository of reviews for use during the reaffirmation of accreditation with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE).

There are four primary academic units at RU-C. Three of the units, School of Business, Law School and the School of Nursing are reviewed by external accreditation bodies. These external reviews meet the continuous review requirements for these Schools. The fourth unit, Camden College of Arts and Sciences, has a new program review model that will be implemented in Fall 2024. Specific details on the cycle and academic plan reviews for each of academic units is described below.

### **Camden College of Arts and Sciences**

The Camen College of Arts and Science (CCAS) does not have any requirements for external accreditation. CCAS goals for academic program review are to:

- Ensure that a department/program contributes to the campus mission, vision and strategy and provides high-quality academic programs;
- Link programmatic planning, budgeting, outputs, and assessment with our campus mission, vision, as well as the strategic goals;
- Link programmatic planning, budgeting, outputs, and assessment with college-specific goals;
- Enable a collaborative process for input from faculty, staff, students, and alumni, as appropriate;
- Contribute to a positive and collegial environment that fosters cooperation, innovation, and continuous improvement in academic programs.

### **CCAS Program Review Outcomes:**

Regular review of CCAS academic programs (including 17 departments) affords the opportunity for a comprehensive evaluation of a program's goals, objectives, and learning outcomes, building upon the information shared in annual outcomes assessment reports and annual reports. After the program review is complete, departments and/or programs should have a more comprehensive understanding of programmatic components, assessment of outcomes, and the ability to develop a strategy for moving the program forward. See the following Appendices:

- Appendix 1.0 – CCAS Program Review – Sample Timeline
- Appendix 2.0 – CCAS Five-Year Schedule for Academic Program Review
- Appendix 2.1 – CCAS Academic Program Review Report
- Appendix 2.2 – CCAS External Review Standards
- Appendix 2.3 – CCAS External Review Report Template
- Appendix 2.4 – CCAS Program Data Set Template

### **Primary Elements in CCAS Academic Program Review:**

- **Description:** Obtain and provide information about the current status of the program.
- **Analysis:** Identify program strengths and weaknesses, including those external and internal to the University.
- **Interdisciplinary and integrative:** Provide information about how the program is linked to other programs and services within the institution.
- **Efficiencies:** Understand how resources are utilized in each program, including deployment, faculty loads, class sizes, and use of facilities.
- **Outcomes:** Provide data and analysis demonstrating program outcomes and achievement of learning goals as defined by each department or academic program.
- **Campus alignment:** Describe and analyze how a program is responding to the campus strategic plan.

### **CCAS Program Review Timeline and Responsibilities:**

- The CCAS dean will maintain a timeline for academic program reviews and assist departments and programs with the steps involved in the process. The timeline will be established to allow for similar timelines for programs that are similar or aligned in an interdisciplinary manner. Templates for use in the
- Academic Programs will be reviewed every five years. Every effort will be made to link the review of a department's academic programs with any associated cross-disciplinary programs or synergistic programs.

- The department associated with a program review will be notified of the summer prior to the academic year the review is scheduled to take place.
- A timeline for the review will be developed in collaboration with departments or academic program leaders and will not exceed an academic year. The expected duration of the review will be six months or less.
- External reviewers may be selected in collaboration with the department or academic program leaders. The Dean's office will provide appointment letters and cover any expenses related to an external review.
- Specific goals or circumstances associated with a program the review will be identified in advance and agreed upon with the department and/or academic program leaders.
- Relevant program metrics for a five-year span (e.g., enrollment trends, degrees awarded, etc.) will be distributed from the Dean's office. The Dean's office will assist in working with Institutional Research to gather specialized reports. The department or academic program will receive this information no less than three months prior to the beginning of the review.

A sample timeline for the CCAS program review is included in Appendix 1. The schedule for CCAS Academic Program Review is provided in Appendix 2.0.

## **School of Business - Camden**

The School of Business is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The last on-site Continuous Improvement Review for the School occurred in April 2024. Before 2023, the AACSB visits were on a five-year cycle. The new cycle is six years. The next Continuous Improvement Review will be during the academic year 2029-2030. Between 2024 and 2028, a mid-cycle application for Continuous Improvement Review will be submitted. This mid-cycle application informs the scope of the 2029-2030 visit.

## **Rutgers Law – Camden**

The Law School is under one American Bar Association (ABA) accreditation umbrella. The ABA accreditation entails a cycle of site visits every seven years. The last site visit was in March 2022. For the six months preceding the site visit, the Law school collects relevant data and prepares a report for the ABA. The supportive information and site visit covers all aspects of compliance regarding accreditation. The Law School must also submit an annual questionnaire to the ABA each fall semester.

## **School of Nursing - Camden**

The School of Nursing is evaluated by four different accrediting bodies:

1. Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
2. Wound, Ostomy, Continence Society
3. Society for Simulation in Healthcare
4. National League for Nursing- Center of Excellence

The schedule for each external accreditation review is listed in Appendix 3.

## Appendix 1

### CCAS Program Review - Sample Timeline

Prior Summer:	Dean's office collects and develops a data set related to each academic program in consultation with program leaders.
August / Sept.:	Initial meeting with the Department Chair / Program Director of each academic program to review the plan, agree on a timeline, discuss concerns, and (if applicable) review a list of potential external reviewers.
Sept. – Nov.:	Departments / Programs develop each program's report (Academic Program Review Report)  Dean's office contacts potential external reviewers and develops a plan for the external review visit (Spring semester)
December:	Academic Program Review Reports are reviewed by the Dean's Office and then sent to External Reviewers
January:	Dean's office meets virtually with the External Reviewers to answer questions and make clear expectations for their campus visit
Feb./March:	External Review Teams visit campus and conduct their on-site review.
April:	External Review Reports are received by the Dean's Office, reviewed and distributed to Departments and Programs for their comments.
May:	Final Review Meeting
June:	Final Reports are provided to the Provost, Chancellor, and the Office of the EVPAA.

## **Appendix 2.0**

### **CCAS Five Year Schedule for Academic Program Review 2024-2029**

Note: This schedule is aligned to allow for programs with similar goal to conduct their reviews during the same year.

#### **Academic Year 2024-2025:**

Economics (B.A.)  
Psychology (B.A., M.A., Joint M.A. in Applied Psychology)  
Health Sciences (B.A.)  
Prevention Science (M.A., Ph.D.)

#### **Academic Year 2025-2026:**

CCIB (B.S., M.S., Ph.D.)  
Biology (B.S., M.S.)  
Chemistry (B.S., M.S.)  
    Forensics (M.S.)  
Physics (B.S., B.A.)  
Computer Science (B.S., M.S.)

#### **Academic Year 2026-2027:**

Mathematics (B.A., B.S., M.S.)  
English & Communications (B.A., M.A., MFA)  
World Languages and Cultures (B.A., M.A.)  
VMPA (B.A., BFA)

#### **Academic Year 2027-2028:**

SACJ (B.A., M.A.)  
    Africana Studies (B.A.)  
    Gender Studies (B.A.)  
Philosophy & Religion (B.A., MALS)  
Childhood Studies (B.A., M.A., Ph.D.)

#### **Academic Year 2028-2029:**

Public Policy & Administration (MPA, Exec. MPA, M.S., Ph.D.)  
    Urban Studies (B.A.)  
Political Science (M.S.)  
Education (M.S.)



## Appendix 2.1

### CCAS Academic Program Review Report

The Academic Program Review document should contain a cover page, the six parts described below, and exhibits as appropriate.

**Cover page:** Name of the Program  
Chairperson / Program Director  
Names of those participating in the program review process

#### Part I: Introduction

The purpose of the introduction is to describe the program to unfamiliar individuals. The introduction also describes the process used to conduct the review and the internal and external context within which the program operates.

#### Questions to be Answered:

- What does the program do (description)? This may include a history of the program, program objectives, characteristics of the students, and other information that informs internal and external reviewers.
- What process was used in doing the program review? The University encourages broad-based participation in the program review process, including the involvement of full-time and part-time faculty, staff, administrators, advisory committees, and professional organization representatives if appropriate. Each program will have its individuals or groups who might participate in the program review process.
- What major changes over the past several years, both external and internal to the College and the University, have impacted the program?

#### Examples of external changes include:

- Changes in the labor market
- Changes in or new licensure or accreditation requirements
- Receptivity of transfer institutions
- Pool of students and potential students
- State transfer initiatives

#### Examples of internal changes include:

- Retention of students
- Enrollment changes
- Revisions, additions, and deletions of curricula and courses
- Technology as it impacts teaching, learning, and course delivery
- Changes in faculty and staff

- Facilities
- Budget additions and/or deletions

### **Part II: Need for the Program**

The purpose of this section is to explain why the program is needed at Rutgers University-Camden and how it supports Rutgers University-Camden's mission. Academic programs often use evidence such as enrollments by majors and non-majors, curricula or courses fundamental to the University's mission, and labor market needs.

### **Part III: Quality**

Provide a narrative and indicators of quality for the program from both an internal and an external review. The program should present a "pattern of evidence" regarding quality.

Reviews should include the following data, if relevant, as well as additional data and information germane to the specific program:

- Student enrollment data over five years
- Degrees/Certificates awarded over five years
- Satisfaction of students, graduates, and employers
- Advisory committee members and activities (if applicable)
- Number and credentials of full and part-time faculty and their achievements
- Quality of equipment and facilities
- Support from external agencies such as accrediting bodies or advisory committees
- Innovative activities or services
- Course and overall curriculum development and revision
- Summary of assessment findings
- Linkages with external organizations
- External grants or other awards
- Results of course syllabi review are conducted by the Department/Program to ensure that the syllabi are current and include the required information.

### **Notes:**

- Quality assertions need to be supported by documented evidence, such as survey results, lists of faculty presentations/publications, etc.
- Data sources should also be noted. Multiple measures of quality, whether quantitative, qualitative, or a combination, should be used.
- There are no uniform criteria, formulas, or indicators of quality that apply to all programs.
- The final report should also summarize the external reviewers' findings and Department / Program responses to external review recommendations.
- In a program review of this nature, discussions of program weaknesses and challenges are also appropriate. Recognizing areas for improvement is as much a part of the program review process as identifying areas of strength.

#### **Part IV: Program Outcomes Assessment**

- The purpose of this section is to summarize annual assessment report findings and the use of assessment results to improve learning within the program.
- The process for reviewing assessment findings should also be discussed here.
- This section builds upon the already defined program goals and objectives and has identified measures to be used to assess expected outcomes.
- Programs report annually on assessment of program-level student learning outcomes.
- The annual assessment reports should form the basis for the comprehensive review of assessment findings.

#### **Part V: Learning and Recommendations**

The purpose of this section is twofold:

- 1) To describe what faculty and staff of the program have learned through the program review process
- 2) To describe what is planned as a result of what was learned.

This section should clearly state recommendations and a timeline for specific actions to improve or sustain quality and address weaknesses over the next five years. Include a plan for a continuous improvement process, marketing strategies to increase enrollment, and how the program will address issues of retention and graduation rates as appropriate.

#### **Exhibits:**

Programs may add exhibits to amplify and enhance the report. Please note that each item presented in an exhibit should be referenced within the report's body; the reader should know why the exhibit is important and what it adds to understanding.

#### **Examples:**

- Enrollment
- Degrees and certificates awarded
- Cost/revenue data
- Results from student surveys
- Annual student learning assessment reports (including results)
- Labor market data
- Advisory committee rosters, meeting agendas and minutes
- Informational and marketing literature
- Descriptions of innovative projects or activities
- Other relevant materials

## **Appendix 2.2**

### **CCAS External Review Standards**

#### **A. Choosing External Reviewers**

When the program is notified that it will be conducting a program review, departmental or program leadership should develop a list of possible reviewers. Reviewers must be external to the University and distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field familiar with campuses similar to Rutgers University-Camden or the department or program undergoing review. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration.

The Department Chair or Program Director recommends five external reviewers to the Dean, who in conjunction with the EVC/Provost, will select three reviewers who will make up the external review team.

#### **B. Instructions and Materials for the External Review Team**

At least thirty days before the scheduled campus visit, the Academic Program Review Report(s) and other relevant materials are sent along with a charge by the Dean to the External Review Team. A pre-visit Zoom meeting with the Dean, the Department Chair and/or Program Director, and the External Review Team will be held to answer questions, clarify the charge, and review the plan for the campus visit. The External Review Team will develop a report that includes observations, strengths, weaknesses, and evidence-based recommendations.

#### **C. External Review Visit and Report**

- The review visit typically lasts one day, when the review team members meet with department and/or program faculty, academic advisors, students, and select administrators.
- The review team typically takes part in an exit interview before concluding its departmental visit. An exit interview template is included in this manual to guide this portion of the external review process. (See Appendix II.)
- The External Reviewer Team is expected to submit their written evaluation to the Dean within several weeks of the visit (see example timeline above).
- The written evaluation should include a review of strengths and challenges, resource allocation and program viability, and suggestions for improvement.

- Upon submission of the report, external reviewers receive a previously agreed upon stipend (to be determined by the dean's office) and travel expense reimbursement.
- After an initial review, the report from the External Review Team will be distributed to the Department or Program.
- The Department or Program is typically asked to review the report (within a brief time) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. To maximize the effectiveness of the review, the findings and resulting decisions will be shared with stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the program's and/or institution's goals and creates an opportunity for all stakeholders to review the program review results.

## Appendix 2.3 CCAS External Review Report Template

Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

		Exemplary	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unclear at this time
<b>1. Curriculum</b>					
1.1	The current curriculum <i>content</i> is appropriate to the level and purpose of the program.				
1.2	The <i>curriculum design</i> is adequate (required depth and breadth of study, flow of courses, frequency of course offerings, overall coherence, alignment with desired learning outcomes, etc.) to enable students to develop the skills and attain the outcomes needed for graduates of this program.				
1.3	The program clearly outlines program requirements to ensure timely completion of the program.				
	Do you recommend any changes to enhance the curriculum (content, design, course availability, etc.)? If so, please explain and advise.				
<b>2. Program Outcomes</b>					
2.1	The program student learning outcomes reflect the most important skills, knowledge, and values of the discipline/profession.				
2.2	The criteria and standards of achievement for the program student learning outcomes adequately match disciplinary and professional standards.				
2.3	Based on your review of student work samples and annual learning results reports, student achievement of the program student learning outcomes is adequate for the degree and discipline.				
2.4	The assessment plan is appropriate and the assessment practices are yielding the needed information to determine how well students are learning the program student learning outcomes.				
	Do you recommend any changes to enhance student achievement or program assessment of the program outcomes? If so, please explain and advise.				

		Exemplary	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unclear at this time
<b>3. Student Experiences and Learning Environment</b>					
3.1	Students are satisfied with the overall quality of their learning experience.				
3.2	Students are adequately supported through the curriculum and advising to ensure their learning success.				
3.3	Class size levels are appropriate to enable student learning.				
3.4	The program provides adequate opportunities for internships, field experiences, and undergraduate research, as appropriate.				
3.5	Student support services are adequate and supportive.				
3.6	Do you recommend any changes to improve student experiences and learning environment? If so, please explain and advise.				
<b>4. Faculty Quality</b>					
4.1	Faculty competencies/credentials are appropriate for the discipline and degree.				
4.2	Faculty specialties correspond to program needs and to the concentrations in which they teach.				
4.3	The system for evaluating teaching practices facilitates continuous improvement of teaching and learning throughout the program.				
4.3	Faculty are adequately supported and engaged in ongoing professional development necessary for staying current in their field and continuously updating their courses/curriculum.				
4.5	Do you recommend faculty changes (qualifications, expertise, teaching practices, professional development, etc.) to enhance program quality and student learning? If so, please explain and advise.				
<b>5. Diversity</b>					
5.1	The program demonstrates a commitment to diversity in its curriculum, and student and faculty composition.				
5.2	Do you recommend changes to the commitment to diversity? If so, please explain.				
<b>6. Program Administration and Support</b>					
6.1	The library and student support resources are current and adequate to meet student and faculty needs.				
6.2	The laboratory facilities and support are adequate to meet student and faculty needs.				
6.3	The program has accurately identified and prioritized the program's most pressing resource needs.				
6.4	The program's student recruitment and retention processes are adequate.				
6.5	Overall program administration is efficient and effective and meets professional standards.				

		Exemplary	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unclear at this time
6.6	Do you recommend any changes to strengthen the program’s current administration, support, and resources (including possible reallocations of resources from current program operations to fund new budgetary priorities)? If so, please explain.				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Response to Internal Review Recommendations</b>				
7.1	The proposed changes are responsive to the program’s most important needs.				
7.2	The program makes use of assessment results, institutional research data, and other information obtained from students/alumni/employers as the basis of its proposed improvements.				
7.3	Do you recommend changes to the internal review recommendations? If so please explain and advise.				
<b>8.</b>	<b>Overall Program Summary</b>				
8.1	What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the program? In your formal report, please identify and cite the evidence that supports your answer.				
8.2	What goals would you suggest the program set for the next five years (please list in order of priority, the most important goal first) and how do these comport with those identified in the self-study? In your formal report, please identify and cite the evidence that supports your answer.				
8.3	What are the most realistic and important strategies the program can use to achieve the highest priority goals?				
8.4	What goals would require additional resources? What level of resources would these goals require? How might the program secure these resources?				



## Appendix 2.4 CCAS Program Data Set Template

**A. Degree / Certificate Level – Indicate program under review**

Bachelor's: \_\_\_\_\_

(BA, BS, etc.)

Master's: \_\_\_\_\_

(MA, MS, MBA, MEd, MSN, etc.)

Combined Master's/Doctorate: \_\_\_\_\_

(MS/Ph.D., MEd/Ed.D., MSN/DNP, etc.)

Doctorate: \_\_\_\_\_

(Ph.D., DNP., etc.)

Certificate: \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Academic Department / Program:** \_\_\_\_\_

**C. Academic College / School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Enrollments & Degrees Awarded:**

Undergraduate Enrollment				
2020	2021	2022	2023	2024

Graduate Enrollment				
2020	2021	2022	2023	2024

Undergraduate	Degrees Awarded				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Bachelor's					
Master's					
Doctorate					
Certificates					

### Appendix 3

## Schedule for School of Nursing External Accreditation

<b>Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)</b> <b>Review Process- Self-Study report in preparation for Site Visit by Evaluator Team and Interim Report midway through accreditation period with no site visit.</b>			
	<i>Baccalaureate Program (BS)</i>	<i>Master's Program (MSN)</i>	<i>Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)</i>
<b>Last Visit</b>	February 2016	Fall 2021	February 2021
<b>Next Visit</b>	Spring 2026	Fall 2026	Spring 2031*
<b>Status</b>	Full 10 Year Accreditation	Initial 5 Year Accreditation	Full 10 Year Accreditation
<b>Cycle</b>	Every 10 Years	Every 10 Years after initial accreditation	Every 10 Years

\*The School will go up for early 10-year accreditation to have all programs on the same calendar for review.

All Degree-granting programs are simultaneously accredited by the New Jersey State Board of Nursing in concert with CCNE, but do not require a visit. Self-Study report and results of on-site evaluation are submitted to the State Board.

<b>Wound, Ostomy, Continenence Society (WOC)</b> <b>Review Process- Self-Study Report in preparation for Site Visit by Evaluation Team</b>	
	<i>Wound, Ostomy, Continenence Certificate Program</i>
<b>Last Visit</b>	Fall 2021
<b>Next Visit</b>	Fall 2028
<b>Status</b>	Full 7 Year Accreditation
<b>Cycle</b>	Every 7 Years
<b>Society for Simulation in Healthcare (SSH)</b> <b>Review Process- Self-Study report in preparation for Site Visit by Evaluation Team</b>	
	<i>Center for Excellence in Interprofessional Practice, Education and Innovation</i>
<b>Last Visit</b>	November 2019
<b>Next Visit</b>	Fall 2024
<b>Cycle</b>	Full 5 Year Accreditation
	Every 5 Years
<b>National League for Nursing- Center of Excellence</b> <b>Review Process- Self-Study report and Site Visit by Evaluation Team (this is a voluntary recognition not impacting accreditation status)</b>	
	<i>All Academic Programs</i>
<b>Last Visit</b>	March 2021
<b>Next Visit</b>	Spring 2025
<b>Cycle</b>	Every 5 Years

**Appendix 4**  
**Schedule of Center and Institute Review**  
**Schedule updated as of June 2024**

Note: Centers that do not have a research mission are highlighted. A new Centers and Institutes Policy is expected to be in place after 6/20/24. The schedule will be updated at that time.

Name	Affiliation School/Campus/Other	Review Year
Center for Computational and Integrative Biology	CCAS	Spring 2021
Center for Government Compliance and Ethics	School of Law	Spring 2021
Center for State Constitutional Studies	FASC and School of Law	Spring 2021
Center for Urban Research and Education	FASC	Spring 2021
Community Leadership Center	FASC	Fall 2020
Daniel J. Ragone Center for Excellence in Accounting (not a research center)	RSBC	Sept. 2024
Institute for Executive Education (not a research center_	RSBC	Sept. 2024
Institute for Information Policy & Law	School of Law	Spring 2021
Institute for Law and Philosophy	FASC (Humanities) and School of Law	Spring 2021
Mid-Atlantic Research Center for the Humanities	FASC	Fall 2020

Rutgers Center for Risk and Responsibility	School of Law	Spring 2021
--	---------------	-------------

Rutgers-Camden Center for the Arts	FASC	Spring 2021
------------------------------------	------	-------------

Small Business Development Center – Camden (not a research center)	RSBC	Sept. 2024
---	------	------------

The Senator Walter Rand Institute for Public Affairs	RU-C	Spring 2022
---	------	-------------

Center for Corporate Law and Governance – both Newark and Camden campus	School of Law	Spring 2015
--	---------------	-------------