

Department Manual

Guidelines:

Five-Year Program Review for Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs 1997-98

Contains:

- [OVERVIEW](#)
 - [OUTLINE FOR SELF STUDY ASSESSMENT:](#)
 - [A. Self Study](#)
 - [B. Implementation Plan](#)
 - [C. External Review Process](#)
 - [D. University Review](#)
 - [E. Abstract/Paragraph Summary](#)
 - [SUBMISSION OF REVIEW REPORT](#)
-

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.

This program review provides information, analyses, and evaluation that help tie the progress of the department and program to the strategic plans of the university:

1. To create and enhance innovative, high quality, and student-centered learning environments.
2. To invest in faculty and staff development and renewal.
3. To enhance academic programs by building a state-of-the-art technological learning environment.
4. To reaffirm the role of CSU, Chico as the anchor institution of the region and develop positive links to our community and region.
5. To diversify our sources of revenue and strategically manage the resources entrusted to us by the State and the people of California.

Each department will relate its activities and programs to the strategic plan for the university and to the performance indicators provided by the Provost and the Dean of the College. Before beginning the review, the department needs to have a clear idea of those objectives set forth for the College and any that might have been identified for the

department. Since the report will be linked to performance based budgeting - by the Provost to the colleges, and by the College Dean to the departments and programs - it is important that the report include evidence to support its self-evaluation. For example, FTES is an indicator of the department's interest in and ability to attract and retain students; assessment activity is one indicator of how serious a department is about student learning.

Using the Strategic Plan as the focus, the department will outline whether and where there is need for change, the strategies to be used to implement change, the establishment of time lines by which change will occur, and other decisions important to the program.

University, College, and Department priorities provide the basis for the review.

The program review is one means of measuring the program's success in fostering student learning, that assessments should depend upon the ongoing assessment of the programs. (What are students learning? Is it what we want them to learn? How are they learning?) and modifications resulting from it. (How can we do what we're doing well, better? How will we change what we are not doing well?)

OVERVIEW

- [Checklist](#)

The checklist (with time line) for program reviews is linked to these guidelines. Questions about the review process for undergraduate programs should be referred to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (x6101) and, for graduate programs, to the Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs (x6880).

- Systemwide Review Cycle

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

- Self-Study

The self-study should focus on the current program and on methods of improving the program to better meet the five strategic goals (see p.1) as well as college, department, and individual program goals. The self study should be based on input from faculty and students in the program.

1) The self study or assessment should consider changes since the previous review (e.g., What have you done to improve the curriculum?).

What curricular changes have been introduced to respond to student need or changes in the discipline?

2) The report should provide a candid and realistic assessment of the program (e.g., How well are you doing now? How does your program support, enhance, and contribute to student learning?).

3) The report should identify potential ways to improve the program, (e.g., How are you going to make the relationship of your program to student learning stronger?).

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 reviewed separately and the assessment reported in separate sections of the review report.

- Institutional Research (IR) 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.

OUTLINE FOR SELF STUDY ASSESSMENT

A. SelfStudy

1.0 Recent Accomplishments

What have you accomplished from your implementation plan five years ago? How has this affected student learning, faculty development, good management of resources, service contributions of faculty and students, communication and critical thinking (information literacy) skills of students? How have these accomplishments related to college and department goals?

2.0 Curriculum and Instruction

2.1 Program/Educational Goals- List learning goals and priorities you have set for the next five years and explain their relationship to department, college and university strategic goals.

What do you expect your students to be able to do academically when they graduate? What do you want your better students to be able to do academically when they graduate?

How are your learning goals made clear to students, and to faculty, staff, and others?

2.2 Curricular Focus - What are the major intellectual trends in your discipline? These may include such things as theory, research, social issues, ethical issues, pedagogy among others. Evidence could include your review of papers presented at professional meetings, a survey of articles in leading journals in your field, job specifications in national search advertisements for tenure track positions, and a review of course offerings and trends at the top graduate programs in your discipline. Include evidence regarding the most current issues in content-based pedagogy in your discipline. Place your program into the context of these trends. Where does your program stand with regard to these trends? What are you doing or planning to do to make certain your program reflects these disciplinary foci? Or, why have you chosen to move in a different direction if that is your goal?

What services do you provide to interdisciplinary programs?

What services do you provide to enhance diversity experiences?

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

2.3 Relationship to GE requirements (undergraduate programs) - Identify student learning outcomes listed in EM 92-18 for general education that are important knowledge and skills for new majors coming into your program(s), and b) that are consistent with the goals of your program(s) and

will be integrated into your students' progress through the program.

2.4 Writing Standards - How have your writing standards and goals influenced students' writing skills? What are you doing to train instructors in WP courses to help students develop their writing skills?

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 and expand student learning.

3.0 Monitoring Student Learning

3.1 How well are students learning? What is the relationship between current teaching practices and learning effectiveness? How do you measure student learning (e.g., paper assignments, examination types, portfolios, presentations?).

3.2 What experiences do your students have in speaking, writing, analyzing, explaining, integrating, creating?

3.3 What are the differences between your entering and completing students in speaking, writing, analyzing, explaining, integrating, creating?

3.4 How are your evaluations coordinated throughout the program to assess attainment of learning, build quality programs, communicate your high expectations for student performance?

3.5 What do you know about how much time students spend studying for the classes in your program? The time they spend in the library? In study groups? How is this affecting your plans to enhance the learning environment, to help students meet the academic standards and goals of your program?

4.0 Academic Environment

4.1 Trends in the major - Number of majors each year for the last five years.

the differences. How might you foster student progress in four years?

What factors govern course scheduling decisions in your program? If scheduling is less than optimal for student progress, how serious is the problem, and why is this the case? Are courses offered that typically have low enrollments? If so, why is keeping them a wise use of resources?

Look at waivers and course substitutions, missed prerequisites, repeated courses. Do you see an unusually large number? Are there any patterns? Do you need to make some changes?

4.3 Advising - How do you go about advising (i.e., what activities constitute your advising program? How frequently does advising occur? How proactive is it? Who is responsible?)?

What is your typical attrition rate? Have you done anything to reduce it?

When was your last department meeting that dealt substantially with advising? What was considered?

How have you assessed your advising effectiveness?

How do you help your majors complete the Upper Division Theme requirements for General Education?

How do you help your majors complete the breadth requirements in General Education and the graduation requirements of the University?

4.4 Social Opportunities - What opportunities are there for students, staff, faculty to interact through clubs, activity groups, study groups, field trips, etc.? Who participates? What kinds of efforts does the department make to promote these types of activities? Who are the leaders?

4.5 Academic Events - To what extent do your students, faculty, and staff participate in sponsored events, visiting professorships, research presentations, and other department, college, and university programs?

4.6 Facilities- How are you currently using offices, lecture rooms, conferencerooms, labs, and other facilities, and how might you use availablespace better?

4.7 Governance- What is your administrative organization? How are curricular andother decisions made?

5.0Information Literacy

5.1 Now and in the foreseeable future, it is critical thatour students become information literate (i.e., learn how to access,evaluate, interpret, and apply information effectively).

What are you doing to prepare yourstudents?

What opportunities do they have to learn to usethe various means of acquiring information, electronically andotherwise, such as on the WWW, journals in your discipline,etc.?

What kinds of experiences are you providingthat increase student skills in evaluating and interpretinginformation?

How are you helping them improve their skillsin using this information to communicate persuasively and to thinkcritically?

5.2 Curricularenhancement through technology - One of the strategic priorities ofthe University is incorporating the various forms of technology intoour educational programs where they will aid in strengthening thelearning environment. What are you doing to use tools such as theWEB, interactive video, the net to enhance your curriculum or studentlearning?

Instructional Technology - Review of facultyuse of instructional technology in instruction. Do you use currentlearning technologies in instruction (e.g., computers, CD-ROM basedtools, electronic networking, interactive learning package)?

Distance Learning - How are you involved withsatellite, ITFS, external degree programs, and other forms ofdistance learning?

6.0 Faculty Development and Scholarly Activities

6.1 Faculty Activity/Achievements - An assessment of the overall performance of your faculty 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 and contracts submitted and funded. Faculty who have had achievements should be profiled.

6.2 Support for Faculty/Staff Development - How does the department assist faculty in their scholarly endeavors, in developing methods to increase learning performance, and in advising effectiveness? How do you encourage and support 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, participation in CELT and TLP, and analyzing how the program's personnel process rewards scholarly activity)? How and to what extent does your faculty respond to department, college, and university opportunities such as the Master Teacher program?

6.3 Opportunities for Students - An analysis of the department's ability to provide students with appropriate opportunities for research, scholarship, and creative activity with faculty.

7.0 Service Learning

7.1 Community Outreach - What kind of links do you have with employers, relevant institutions, agencies, and community organizations. To what extent are any of these involved in your curricular plans? Events open to the community (e.g., cultural, informative, entertaining, etc.) should also be identified.

7.2 Instructional Programs Serving Regional and Community Clients - Describe 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.

8.0 Other -Any other items that will help to provide an accurate assessment of the program.

B.Implementation Plan (You should expect to reexamine your implementation plan at least twice during the review process.)

1.0 A draft implementation plan is included with the self-study sent to the outside reviewer. What are your plans for the next five years? These plans should be concrete, should result from the self-study, and be linked to department program goals, college and university goals and strategic plans.

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.

Faculty will again revise the implementation plan as needed following the University Review Team's report or, for the Graduate School, the Graduate Council review.

The 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.

The final implementation plan will result from discussion and consultation among the Provost, Dean of the College, Department Chair, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and/or Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs, and others when appropriate. This plan will link the department plans and goals to those of the college and university and will guide the activities of the department for the subsequent five years.

C.External Review Process

1.0 In February, upon completion of the program assessment report and implementation plan, one or more outside reviewers are brought to campus.

The external professional person is selected by the program faculty and College Dean and approved by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs or, in the case of Graduate Studies, by the Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs. Program faculty may submit names of external campus reviewers with vitae and justification to the Dean of the College, request names from the Dean of the College, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and/or Dean of the School of Graduate,

International, and Sponsored Programs. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs, or College Dean may recommend names to program faculty.

2.0 Funding for this individual is arranged through the College Dean. Contracting for an external reviewer is handled through the Contracting Office (x4525).

The reviewer is expected to read the materials sent to her/him before coming to campus and may request any additional documents to help her/him in the review.

2.1 The outside reviewer meets with the Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and, where appropriate, Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs at the beginning and, again, at the end of the campus visit. The reviewer meets with faculty, students, the Dean of the College, and other relevant personnel, reviews the curriculum, inspects facilities, and prepares a written report assessing the program's strengths and weaknesses with respect to its goals and other areas.

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:

- Vice Provost for Academic Affairs designee (when undergraduate program involved)
- Graduate Coordinators Committee member designated by the Dean of the School of Graduate, International and Sponsored Programs (when graduate program involved)
- Faculty Senate designee, selected by Educational Policies and Procedures Committee

- Two representatives from the college (but not from the department responsible for the degree program), selected by Dean of the College
- Senior student majoring in the program, selected by the Dean of the College (for undergraduate program)
- Graduate student majoring in the program, selected by the Dean of the College (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 and request additional material if wanted. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs designee and/or Graduate Coordinators Committee member will prepare the 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 department chair will submit the full document to the Dean of the College, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and/or the Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs (as appropriate) who will review the document.

1.3 In the case of graduate programs, the Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs will submit the review to the Graduate Coordinators Committee who will review the committee's report and discuss it at a Committee meeting. After the Graduate Coordinators Committee considers the report, it will make recommendations and forward the summary to the Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs.

1.4 The Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs, and College Dean will meet to discuss the report and the implementation plan. Any or all of these people will meet with program faculty and the Department Chair to discuss the results of the review. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will annually summarize the programs reviewed for the Chancellor's Office Trustee Report and as an information item for the Educational Policies and Procedures Committee.

E. Abstract/Paragraph Summary

1.0 For undergraduate programs, the faculty of the program will prepare a one-paragraph abstract or 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 Forgraduate programs, the Dean of the School of Graduate, International, and Sponsored Programs 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
- Final Implementation Plan
- Appendix A: Program Description - as in catalog
- Appendix B: 4 year plan (for undergraduate programs)
- Appendix C: Writing Standards
- Appendix D: Mission, Goals, and Strategic Learning
- Appendix E: Standard packet of IR data

[Top](#)
[5 Year Review Checklist](#)
[Dept. Manual Table of Contents](#)

[HOME](#) | [SEARCH](#) | [E-MAIL](#) | [CATALOG](#) | [SCHEDULE](#) | [LIBRARY](#) | [HELP](#)

This document is the property of VPAA and maintained by bitsv_easley@macgate.csuchico.edu

Last Updated: Sept 29, 1997