

PILOT GUIDELINES 1995-96

Guidelines for Five-Year Program Review for Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs

The purpose of academic program review is to assess the program in order to improve its quality (e.g., better meet student needs, increase student learning). The review provides information, analyses, and evaluation that help outline whether and where there is need for change, the strategies to be used to implement change, the establishment of timelines by which change will occur, and other decisions important to the program. Systemwide policy (CSU Board of Trustees Policy, 1971) requires that each undergraduate and graduate academic degree program conduct a full review at least once every five-six years. Results from these reviews are submitted to the Chancellor's Office for summary presentation at the Board of Trustees' January meeting. Reviews must address four goals (per AA 80-4):

1. Educational Quality
2. Academic Environment
3. Creative, Scholarly, and Scientific Endeavors
4. Community Service and Regional Outreach

While requests for resources are an integral part of the campuswide strategic planning process, program reviews are an internal examination of both the curriculum and the faculty's role in providing a vigorous academic environment. (The appropriate place for resource requests is the strategic plan and its updates.)

Overview

Reports to outside accrediting agencies (if appropriate) and the strategic plans/updates are used as the foundation for the program reviews.

- Checklist

The checklist and timetable for program reviews is attached to these guidelines. Questions about the review process for undergraduate programs should be referred to the Vice Provost (x6101) and, for graduate programs, to the Associate Dean of the Graduate School (x5391).

- Systemwide Review Cycle

Every degree program has been placed on a systemwide list that identifies the specific review cycle. When possible, program reviews may be scheduled to coincide with any outside accreditation reviews. If a department has more than one degree, the reviews for each degree may be conducted during the same year to avoid duplication.

- Institutional Research Data

The Office of Institutional Research maintains a set of reports for each program conducting a program review including: student demographic information, degrees granted, major enrollments, surveys of recent graduates, course FTES, and grades. These data are used in conducting the program review. In addition to these regular data, programs may wish to contact the Director of Institutional Research (x5624) to arrange for special reports; These requests must be made well in advance.

Contents of Five-Year Review Report

General Comments

Self-Study. The self-study should focus on the current degree program and on methods of improving the program to better meet the four CSU system goals (see p.1) and individual program goals. The self study should be based on the input from all faculty in the program.

Results and conclusions should be preceded by a brief description of the program goals, the methods used to assess the program, their relationship to program goals, and how the results of assessment during the review period have been used to strengthen the program.

- 1) The assessment should consider changes since the previous review;
- 2) The report should provide a candid and realistic assessment of the program; and
- 3) The report should identify potential ways to improve any noted deficiencies.

The department has the option of providing separate review reports for each degree program. If the department chooses to submit one review report, each degree program must be assessed separately and the assessment reported in separate sections of the review report.

A. Format for self study/assessment

1.0 What have you accomplished that you planned in your implementation plan five years ago? This will include a status report and any changes that have occurred in the implementation plan itself. If detailed discussion of items will be included in following sections of the self study, indicate where and do not go into detail here.

2.0 Goal One: Educational Quality—Curriculum and Instruction

2.1 Program/Educational Goals - Clearly state program/educational goals and priorities for the past five years. Discuss progress in meeting the goals. Also list goals and the priorities you have set for the next five years and explain modifications. (These could be a part of the goals and strategic priorities listed in your Five-Year Strategic Plan and its updates, and may well be the result of assessment efforts.) These goals and priorities will direct your implementation plan.

2.2 Curriculum -

Assessment of Curriculum - A thorough evaluation of the current academic curriculum is necessary. Assessment may include: currency; comparison to curriculum offerings by other universities; relationship of curriculum to program goals; relationship to GE requirements (undergraduate programs); comparison with other department degree programs; service obligations to interdisciplinary programs; effectiveness of writing requirements; ability to prepare students adequately for doctoral programs, for teaching at the community college level, and/or for careers; examination of national and global perspectives provided by the program; faculty, student, and alumni evaluation of the curriculum and its currency.

Strengths and Deficiencies - Curricular strengths and deficiencies should be clearly identified and evidence presented to support the conclusions.

- 2.3 Writing Standards - Describe how writing is included in required courses in the program and how it is evaluated. Provide an evaluation of the department writing standards. (Include a copy of the department writing standards as Appendix C.)
- 2.4 Distance Learning (where appropriate) - A review of involvement with satellite, ITFS, and external degree programs. The review should identify potential opportunities for greater involvement in distance learning.
- 2.5 Experiential Learning (where appropriate) - An evaluation of the program's use of experiential learning opportunities (e.g., internships and/or cooperative education) to enhance the curriculum.
- 3.0 Assessment of Student Outcomes
- 3.1 Statement of Desired Student Outcomes - What do you want your students to acquire. Desired outcomes should be stated in such a way that they can be measured or assessed. Should be closely connected to or same as some of goals in 2.1.
- 3.2 Student Learning - How well are students learning? What is the relationship between current teaching practices and learning effectiveness?
- Plans for faculty development and/or methods to increase student learning performance and advising effectiveness should be identified.
- Faculty and student involvement in the teaching-learning process should be included.
- List outcomes that have been measured; describe procedures and measures used to evaluate student outcomes. (NOTE: Outcomes assessment may include measures of alumni employment, acceptance into terminal degree programs, capstone courses, student and/or alumni self evaluations of learning, focus groups of students, student portfolios, performance on program-oriented professional licensing examinations, etc.)
- 3.3 Assessment Results - Describe the results of previous and ongoing means of assessment.
- 3.4 Use of Results - Explain how the results of outcomes assessment have been used to improve program planning.
- 3.5 There should be an examination of how the program's personnel processes (including post-tenure review) reward teaching and learning activities.
- 4.0 Goal Two: Academic Environment
- 4.1 Enrollment - A report summarizing current program enrollment and enrollment trends for the past five years.
- 4.2 Advising - Effectiveness of advising (undergraduate - general education requirement, graduation requirement).
- 4.3 Instructional Technology - A review of the program's use of instructional technology in instruction. Does the program use current learning technologies in

its instruction (e.g., computers, CD-ROM based tools, electronic networking, interactive learning packages)?

- 4.4 Student Involvement - A description of student involvement in the discipline/academic program including student organizations and other formal and informal means of enhancing student participation in the academic environment.
 - 4.5 Academic Events - An analysis of sponsored events, visiting professorships, student participation in research, and involvement with college and university programs.
 - (Optional) 4.6 Facilities - A review of the current use of offices, lecture rooms, conference rooms, labs, and other facilities, and a discussion of methods to use available space better.
- 5.0 Goal Three: Creative, Scholarly, and Scientific Endeavors
- 5.1 Faculty Activity/Achievements - An assessment of the overall performance of the program faculty's involvement in scholarly activities and improving instructional quality. The assessment should report faculty contributions to the academic discipline since the last review. This would include creative and scholarly activities, research including research designed to study and improve student learning and enhance the curriculum, and grants submitted and funded. Faculty who have had achievements should be profiled.
 - 5.2 Support for Faculty Development - A review of how the department assists faculty in scholarly endeavors. Emphasis should be placed on methods for encouraging and supporting instructional and scholarly activities (e.g., scheduling and/or adjusting teaching loads to allow for flexible time, awarding college/department dollars to pursue scholarly activity, and analyzing how the program's personnel process rewards scholarly activity). This review should include an analysis of how faculty use department, college, and university opportunities.
 - 5.3 Opportunities for Students - An analysis of the department's ability to provide students with appropriate opportunities for research, scholarship, and creative activity.

- 6.0 Goal Four: Community Service and Regional Outreach
 - 6.1 Community Outreach - An analysis of the program's current link with relevant employers, institutions, agencies, and community organizations. Events open to the community (e.g., cultural, informative, entertaining, etc.) should also be identified.
 - 6.2 Instructional Programs Serving Regional and Community Clients - Description and review of the program's short courses and workshops designed to meet needs of off-campus clients in the community and region. The courses may be for credit or non-credit and may be offered in conjunction with Regional and Continuing Education.
- 7.0 Other - Any other items deemed necessary to provide an accurate assessment of the program.

B. Implementation Plan

- 1.0 A draft implementation plan is included with the self-study sent to the outside reviewer. What are the plans for the next five years? These plans should result from the self-study, be linked to program goals, and be concrete.
- 2.0 Following receipt of the outside reviewer's report and its consideration by the program faculty, the faculty will revise the implementation plan if and where appropriate. This revised form will be included in materials sent to the University Review Team.
- 3.0 Faculty will again revise the implementation plan as needed following the University Review Team's review or, for the Graduate School, the Graduate Council review.

The final implementation plan should reflect the views of the department faculty, consideration of the suggestions of the outside reviewer, and reaction to the responses of the University Committee. The department does not have to accept suggestions, but it must indicate bases for rejecting reviewer responses.

C. External Review Process

- 1.0 In February, upon completion of the program assessment report and implementation plan, one or more outside reviewers will be brought to the campus. (For programs with accreditation agencies, the report from the on-site accrediting team is used.)

The external professional person is selected by the program faculty and college dean and approved by the Vice Provost and, in the case of Graduate Studies, by the Associate Dean of the Graduate School. (Program faculty may submit names of external campus reviewers with vitae and justification to Dean, request names from Dean, Vice Provost and/or Assoc. Dean of the Graduate School, and Vice Provost and/or Grad School Assoc. Dean may recommend names to program faculty)

- 2.0 Funding for this individual will be arranged in advance through the college dean. The reviewer is expected to read the material sent to her/him before coming to campus. S/he may request any additional documents that will aid her/him in the review.
 - 2.1 The outside reviewer will meet with the Provost, Vice Provost and Assoc. Dean of the Graduate School at the beginning of her/his campus visit. The reviewer will meet with faculty, students, the dean, and other relevant personnel, review the curriculum, inspect the facilities, and prepare a written report assessing the

program's strengths and weaknesses with respect to its goals and any other areas the program faculty, dean, Vice Provost, and reviewer deem relevant.

- 2.2 For graduate programs the external reviewer will also review at least three theses and/or projects, completed within the three years prior to the review, in order that she or he is able to comment on the standard of the work presented. The Graduate School will randomly select the theses/projects to be reviewed. If a single reviewer is charged with evaluating both the bachelor's and master's programs, the reviewer must address both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

D. University Review

The program's self-study (including the self-study, external reviewer's report, and implementation plan) will be reviewed by a University Review Team.

- 1.0 The University Review Team will be composed of:

- Dean of the college - who arranges and conducts the meetings
- Vice Provost designee (when undergraduate program involved)
- Graduate Council member designated by Assoc. Dean of Graduate School (when graduate program involved)
- Faculty Senate designee, selected by Educational Policies Committee
- Representative from the college (but not from the department responsible for the degree program), selected by dean
- Senior student majoring in the program, selected by the dean (for undergraduate program)
- Graduate student majoring in the program, selected by the dean (for graduate program)

- 1.1 This team will review the documents, interview the department chair, coordinators of the review, faculty and/or others they feel appropriate. The Vice Provost designee and/or Graduate Council member will prepare a written report. All members of the University Review Team will review the written report(s) and indicate by signature agreement with the content or prepare a minority report.
- 1.2 The Graduate Council will review the committee's report and discuss it at a council meeting with the college dean, the department chair, and the graduate coordinator. After the Graduate Council considers the committee's report, it will make recommendations and forward the summary to the Dean of the Graduate School.
- 1.3 Following the completion of all aspects of the review, the Provost, Vice Provost, and/or Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Dean, and Department Chair will meet to discuss the report and the implementation plan. Finally, when possible or needed, the Vice Provost, and/or Associate Dean of the Graduate School and Dean will meet with program faculty and the department chair to discuss the results of the review. The Vice Provost will annually summarize the programs reviewed as an information item for the Educational Policies Committee.

E. Abstract/Paragraph Summary

- 1.0 For undergraduate programs, the faculty of the program will prepare a one-paragraph summary of the program review. This should include a brief statement of program goals, a sentence or two summarizing strengths, problems, and planned objectives for the next five years.

- 2.0 For graduate programs, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School will prepare a one-paragraph summary.

Submission of Review Report

The full review report must be submitted to the Provost's Office before the end of the spring academic semester. The order for the report, due in May, is:

- Cover Page
- Checklist (optional)
- Abstract for Each Degree Program
- Program Assessment for Each Degree Program (Self-Study)
- External Reviewer's Report
- University Review Team Report
- Implementation Plan
- Appendix A: Accreditation Report (optional), Strategic Plan
- Appendix B: Program Description - as in catalog
- Appendix C: Writing Standards

10/11/95