



**Guidelines:
Undergraduate Degrees Programs
Five-Year Program Review**

- PREAMBLE
- OUTLINE OF SELF-STUDY

Articulating a Collective Vision

- Mission and Educational Objectives

Main **headings** for self-study are from WASC Handbook of Accreditation, pp. 6 and 7.

Vision subheading from CSUC Strategic Plan, WASC Standard 1, Cornerstones, CSU Accountability Areas 1,10

Organizing for Learning

- Teaching and Learning
- Scholarship and Creative Activity
- Participants in Learning
- Learning Enabling Resources

Organizing for Learning subheadings from CSUC Strategic Plan, WASC Standards 2 and 3, *Cornerstones*, and CSU Accountability Areas 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11.

Becoming a Learning Organization

- Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement

Learning Organization subheading from CSUC Strategic Plan, WASC Standard 4, *Cornerstones*, and CSU Accountability Process Principles.

- SELF-STUDY REVIEW PROCESS
 - Check List for Five-Year Program Review
 - Self-Study Report
 - External Reviewer Report
 - Final Review and Approval of Continuous Improvement Plan

- APPENDICES
 - Program Summary Data Profile
 - Sample Evidence Templates

Phase I

PREAMBLE

The New Framework for Five-Year Review

In response to the changing context of higher education and to reflect the vision, mission and strategic priorities of the CSU and CSU, Chico, the American Studies Program, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, and the Department of Sociology are pilot-testing a new framework for Five-Year Program Review. The elements of this new framework align under the strategic priorities of the university, the ten principles of *Cornerstones*, the principles of the CSU Accountability Process, and the “core commitments” to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness that are embodied in the new WASC accreditation standards.

In accordance with the vision/mission orientation of the Five-Year program review process, the self-study report should describe the program’s mission, objectives, and the processes established to achieve such objectives, and should provide evidence of the progress toward accomplishing the objectives and the outcomes of these processes. Documentation of effectiveness of processes should relate to the time period since the previous program review.

In accordance with the continuous improvement orientation of the Five-Year Review, the self-study report should describe objectives for the future as well as the processes in place to achieve those objectives. Such descriptions will aid in evaluating the effectiveness of the current processes and provide a basis for assessing continuous improvement in future program reviews. Accordingly, plans for the next five years should be described.

In accordance with the “culture of evidence” orientation of the Five-Year Review, the new review process moves program review from previous reliance on assertion and description toward a reliance on demonstration and performance. The new five-year program review process is designed to make program review more than a periodic event. It is intended to encourage significant levels of on-going engagement by internal and external stakeholders in issues of program capacity and program effectiveness.

WASC’s core commitments highlight mission/goals orientation; Standard 4.2

See Principle 2 of the CSU Accountability Process

The new review process is based on the belief in the fundamental value of evidence and the willingness to be disciplined by it. It is based on the conviction that any form of inquiry must be informed and its result must be verifiable. Evidence in this respect is the substance of what is advanced to support a claim that something is true. Its characteristics include:

- Evidence is intentional and purposeful
- Evidence entails interpretation and reflection
- Evidence is integrated and holistic
- Evidence can be both quantitative and qualitative
- Evidence can be either direct or indirect.¹

This section is modeled after materials in WASC, *Evidence Guide*, January 2002.

Because evidence is advanced in support of specific review criteria, it is important to consider the properties of evidence that are compelling in the review process. For purposes of the five-year review process, evidence should be:

- Relevant. It must be demonstrably related to the review criterion being addressed.
- Verifiable. The validity of any evidence advanced must be demonstrable.
- Representative. Any evidence advanced must be typical of an underlying condition or situation, not an isolated case. It is helpful to present data in a time series.
- Cumulative. Evidence gains credibility as additional sources or methods for generating it are employed.
- Actionable. Evidence within the context of a five-year review should provide specific guidance for future action and improvement.

Traditionally in program reviews, the self-study author used data to describe the program rather than explain what the program *does* and illustrate *how well it does* relative to its goals and standards of performance. The new five-year review process refocuses programs toward becoming more systematic and intentional about gathering data about the *right things*—performance and effectiveness—and on *using* the resulting information to continuously improve what the program does.

¹ For more details see: http://www.wascweb.org/senior/Evidence_Guide.pdf

Review Criteria

Each element of the Five-Year Review is constructed with the following three interrelated elements:

Content Area

While specific content areas are distinguished within the Five-Year Program Review, each is intended to be an integrated topic, framed to emphasize overall program effectiveness and accountability. Each content area is expressed as the characteristic of a quality education program in positive, descriptive, and general terms. The stated conditions and attributes are intended to serve as guides and indicators to encourage thoughtful approaches to analyzing and presenting program effectiveness and program accountability, and to develop action plans where warranted.

Criteria for Review

Within each content area are “criteria for review” which are intended to identify key areas for review. These criteria for review are meant to support basic decisions about five-year reviews and thus enable the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the department faculty, and the college dean to render an effective judgment of the performance of a program and to form an appropriate perspective for its future direction.

Guidelines for Documentation

Where appropriate, expected forms or methods of demonstrating performance related to content areas have been identified to assist programs with further interpretations of the content area and/or criteria for review and suggest ways in which programs can demonstrate they have addressed them. If a program chooses not to employ the suggested form or method, the program is responsible for demonstrating that it has addressed the intent of the content area/criterion in an equally effective way. In addition, each program must complete the Program Summary Data Profile. (See Appendix)

This section is modeled after
WASC Handbook of
Accreditation, pp. 15-16

OUTLINE OF SELF-STUDY

Articulating a Collective Vision

This content area centers on the degree to which the program sets goals and obtains results in student learning at both the program and course levels that are: a) clearly stated and widely understood by students, faculty, and other stakeholders; b) appropriate for the type and level of program offered; and c) adequately assessed.

WASC: Articulating a Collective Vision, p. 6

1. Mission and Educational Objectives

The program articulates its mission and its objectives as a guide to its future, planned evolution, infrastructure and use of resources. The program has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the campus community, and its relationship to society at large. Each program faces choices as a result of a wide range of opportunities and resource limitations. The development of the mission/purpose of the program requires decisions regarding these alternatives and the mission embodies these choices.

Introduction to WASC Standard 1; Cornerstones 1 and 4; CSU Accountability Area # 1

Criteria for Review

- 1.1. The program has a clear and published mission statement that is subjected to periodic review and revised as necessary.
- 1.2. The program's mission statement is appropriate for higher education and consonant with the mission and strategic priorities of the university.
- 1.3. The program has specified its educational objectives and expected learning outcomes for the program as a whole and has established processes for assessing student-learning outcomes and for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for completion of program.

WASC Standard 1.1

CSU Accountability Performance Area # 1

- 1.4. The program's curriculum and co-curricular activities are consistent with the mission and the program has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its mission and objectives.

Guidelines for Documentation

The general objective of this section of the self-study report is to describe the mission and educational objectives of the program. The description should provide information concerning the translation of the mission statement into educational goals, student-learning outcomes, and priorities for program activities.

- Provide the mission-purpose statement and statement of distinctiveness.
- Describe (or refer to documents that describe) the process by which the mission statement and the educational objectives of the program were developed are reviewed and revised.
- Describe how and to whom the mission-purpose statement is disseminated and demonstrate that constituents understand and use it to guide decisions and direct efforts towards realizing the goals of the mission-purpose statement.
- Describe how the mission-purpose statement influences decision making in the program, connects faculty and students' action, and provides a common basis for learning.
- Describe the educational objectives for the program and discuss how they connect to the mission-purpose of the program.
- List the student learning outcomes for the program and analyze how the required courses in the program address these outcomes.
- Discuss how the objectives for significant categories of program activity connect to the mission-purpose statement.

OUTLINE OF SELF-STUDY (Continued)

Organizing for Learning

This content area centers on the alignment of program assets and characteristics with the goal of producing high levels of student learning and includes review of curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, faculty recruitment and development, scholarship in support of improved teaching and learning, information resources, student services and co-curricular activities, and resources and facilities.

WASC: Organizing for Learning, p. 6

2. Teaching and Learning

The program achieves its mission and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning and demonstrates that these functions are performed effectively.

WASC: Standards 2.1 – 2.7

Criteria for Review

- 2.1. The program's expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members, including faculty, students, staff, and – where appropriate – external stakeholders.
- 2.2. The program's curriculum and extra-curricular activity are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature.
- 2.3. The program maintains a faculty sufficient to provide stability and integrity of the curriculum and on-going quality improvement for program offerings.
- 2.4. The deployment of faculty resources reflects the program mission and objectives. Students in the program and/or its subunits have the opportunity to receive instruction from appropriately qualified faculty.

WASC: Standards 3.2 – 3.3.

- 2.5. The faculty, individually and collectively, has and maintains the intellectual qualifications and current expertise to accomplish the core functions of teaching and learning.
- 2.6. The program actively involves students in learning, challenging them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.
- 2.7. The program demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.

Guidelines for Documentation

The general objective of this section of the Self-Study Report is to demonstrate the existence and sustainability of a high quality program-learning environment that is operationalized by an effective execution of teaching and learning by all its participants employing appropriate resources.

- Describe the process whereby program constituents are informed of program expectations and demonstrate its effectiveness.
- Describe the content and structure of the program and demonstrate its appropriateness as perceived by internal and external stakeholders.
- Describe how teaching and learning in the program exemplifies *The Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*.
- Describe how teaching and learning in the program exemplifies the statement on Academic Rigor in the *University Catalog*.
- FTES generated by the program and its subunits for the previous five-year period.
- Number of majors in the program for the previous five-year period.
- Demonstrate the adequacy of the faculty complement to fulfill the program's mission and educational efforts.

- Demonstrate that full-time faculty teach at least 60 percent of the student credit hours required in the program.
- Demonstrate that at least 70 percent of the program faculty are either academically or professionally qualified (or both) for the courses they teach in the program. Academic qualification requires a combination of original academic preparation and subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for teaching responsibilities. Professional qualification requires both academic preparation and relevant professional experience.
- Demonstrate that qualified faculty are distributed across program tracks and disciplines consistent with the program mission and students' needs.
- Present information on student-faculty ratios based on FTEF and FTEF in the classroom.
- Present data on student engagement in the program. (NSSE)
- Present data on student evaluations of teaching.
- Present data on faculty interaction with students. (*Sample: Table 17 CSU Faculty Workload Study or Faculty Inventory for 7 Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education, p.4*)
- Present information on levels of satisfaction with the program on the part of students (current and alumni) and external stakeholders.

3. Scholarship and Creative Activity

The program achieves its mission and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of scholarship and creativity learning and demonstrates that these functions are performed effectively. Faculty scholarship, research and creative activity are essential components of the CSU mission.

Criteria for Review

- 3.1. The program actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the program's mission-purpose and

WASC: Standards 2.8 – 2.9; Cornerstones # 4; CSU Accountability # 11.

WASC: Standards 2.8 – 2.9

characteristic.

- 3.2. Faculty members make scholarly and creative contributions on a continuing basis appropriate to the program's mission-purpose.
- 3.3. The program engages students directly in scholarship and creative activity, consonant with program purpose and character.
- 3.4. The program recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.

Guidelines for Documentation

The general objective of this section of the Self-Study Report is to demonstrate the existence and efficacy of program policies and practices to encourage and support scholarship and creative activity and highlight the extent to which they are linked to improvements in teaching and learning.

- Demonstrate that a broad cross-section of the program faculty, normally 80 percent, engages in continuing intellectual development, as indicated by professional accomplishments and activities.
- Present data on the assignment of AWTUs for purposes of scholarship and creative activity for the previous five-year period. (Include number and percent of tenure-track faculty who received AWTU; average number of units of AWTU; total AWTU by category; and internally versus externally funded AWTU; for each year of the review period.)
- Present data on the program's awarding of sabbatical, difference-in-pay, and absence-without-pay leaves.
- Present data for faculty participation in campus-, college- and program faculty development programs for the previous five-year period.
- Present a summary of the program faculty's scholarly, creative and professional activities for the previous five-year period. (*Sample format: Table 10 in CSU Faculty Workload Report, February 2002*)

- Present data on the total dollar amount of awards received from grants and contracts proposals by program faculty and describe the funded activities.
- Discuss the effectiveness of the program faculty's scholarly and creative activities in accomplishing the program mission and in achieving quality and continuous improvement.

4. Participants in Learning

Students are the focus of the program enterprise. Students are expected to be active partners with faculty in the learning process and the program provides opportunities for active learning throughout the curriculum.

Cornerstones # 2 and 3.

Criteria for Review

- 4.1. The program recruits and systematically selects its students consistent with its mission-purpose. The program regularly identifies the characteristics of its students, and assesses their needs, experiences, and levels of satisfaction.
- 4.2. Students meet the entry requirements of the program. Students understand the requirements of the program and receive timely, useful and regular information and advising about program requirements
- 4.3. Retention policies for the students are consistent with the objective of producing high quality graduates.
- 4.4. Students engage the learning materials with appropriate attention and dedication and perform to standards set by the faculty.
- 4.5. The program's faculty takes collective responsibility for the creation and delivery of effective instruction, the evaluation of instructional effectiveness and student achievement, the continued improvement of instructional efforts, and innovation

WASC Standards 2.10,
2.11

WASC Standard 2.4 and
2.5.

in instructional processes.

- 4.6. The program's faculty takes individual responsibility for currency in their instructional field, delivery of effective instruction, frequent and prompt feedback on student performance.

Guidelines for Documentation

The general objective of this section of the Self-Study Report is to demonstrate that the program maintains a mix of both students and faculty participants that achieves high quality in the activities that support the mission of the program.

- Describe the processes the program has articulated to evaluate student progress towards degree completion, provide early identification of retention issues, intervene with support (where appropriate), and separate students from the program, if necessary.
- Demonstrate that students currently enrolled in the program have met all admission/entry requirements.
- Present data on the percent of program students who graduate in four years and six years over the previous five years.
- Present information on the persistence rates for program students by status for the past five years.
- Present data on student engagement in the program. (*Sample data: NSSE results*)
- Describe (or refer to documents that describe) processes that demonstrate individual and collective faculty instructional responsibility, including monitoring of curriculum delivery and assessment of teaching effectiveness. (*Sample format: Faculty Inventory for 7 Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*)

- Demonstrate how faculty fulfill the functions of curriculum development, course development, course delivery, academic assistance, academic advising, career advising, and other activities that support the program's mission.
- Provide examples through course syllabi, course project descriptions, learning products and other descriptive materials that demonstrate active student involvement, collaborative learning experiences and frequent, prompt feedback. (*Sample format: Faculty Inventory for 7 Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*)

5. Learning Enabling Resources

The program sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal and information resources. These key resources create and maintain a high quality environment for learning.

Strategic Priority # 5;
WASC Standard 3.

Criteria for Review

- 5.1. The program employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its mission and educational objectives.
- 5.2. Faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentives and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional and program mission and educational objectives.
- 5.3. The program maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with educational objectives and program mission-purposes.

WASC Standard 3.1 – 3.4.

Strategic Priority # 2;
WASC: Standards 3.5 –
3.7

- 5.4. The program has adequate processes in place to manage and support faculty over the progression of their careers.
- 5.5. Fiscal resources are effectively aligned with program mission and objectives, are appropriately diversified, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kind of program offerings both now and in the foreseeable future.
- 5.6. The program holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to supports its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members.
- 5.7. The program's academic technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and provide key academic and administrative functions.
- 5.8. The program's space and facilities are sufficient to support its academic offerings.
- 5.9. The program's organizational structure and decision-making processes are consistent with its mission and purposes and provide for effective academic leadership to ensure academic quality and sustainability of mission and character.

Strategic Priority # 5.

Strategic Priority # 3.

Guidelines for Documentation

The general objective of this section of the Self-Study is to describe how program resources are sufficient to achieve program mission and objectives and provide evidence that the resources are effectively employed.

- Describe (or refer to documents that describe) processes for faculty recruitment, selection, orientation, development, promotion, and retention.
- Describe (or refer to documents that describe) processes for staff recruitment, selection, orientation, development, promotion, and retention.

- Describe how hiring practices address diversity goals.
- Submit previous five-year data on the following indicators:
 - FTEF (TT and PT) per FTES
 - FTE Staff per FTES
 - Average number of 3-hour (equivalent) courses taught by tenure-track faculty.
 - Average number of Student Credit Units taught by tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty
 - Faculty activity workloads
 - Investment in faculty and staff development activities
 - General fund allocations to the program; faculty, non-faculty and operating expenditures
 - Non-general fund resources available to the program from internal and external sources
 - Lottery and work-study funding to the program
- Relative to the program's mission, describe the resource adequacy for:
 - Learning materials
 - Academic technology support
 - Student advising and career placement
 - Basic infrastructure space and equipment
- Describe the program leadership and assess its effectiveness
- Describe the effectiveness of the above described resources and processes in accomplishing the program's mission and in achieving quality and continuous improvement.

OUTLINE OF SELF-STUDY (Continued)

Becoming a Learning Organization

This content area centers on the degree to which the program has developed systems—to assess its own performance and to use the information to improve student learning over time—that reflect the input of stakeholders, identify key dimensions of performance, and are based on standards of evidence that prominently feature educational results.

WASC: Becoming a Learning Organizing, p. 6

6. Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement

The program conducts sustained, evidence-based and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its mission-purposes and achieving its educational objectives. These activities inform both program planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of program inquiry, research, and data collection are used to set program priorities and revise program purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning and scholarly/creative work.

WASC: Standard 4

Criteria for Review

- 6.1. The program periodically engages its multiple constituencies in reflection and planning processes that assess its strategic position; articulate its priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources; and define the future direction of its efforts.
- 6.2. The program monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.
- 6.3. Planning processes align personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological resources with the mission, objectives and priorities of the program.
- 6.4. The program employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes.

Guidelines for Documentation

The general objective of this section of the Self-Study Report is to demonstrate that the program has clear, well-established policies and practices for gathering and analyzing information that leads to a culture of evidence and improvement.

- Report how the results of the previous five-year review have been used to improve the program quality and outcomes.
- Describe the process by which the mission statement and the educational objectives were developed and are reviewed and revised. Demonstrate that the mission statement is the outcome of a process in which the viewpoints of various constituencies have been considered.
- Provide a copy of the program's approved assessment plan for the achievement of mission and attainment of educational objectives.
- Submit data on program performance indicators/outcome measures for the prior five years; include sources of evidence.
- Describe the distribution and use of program performance data to program constituents.
- Describe the program's continuous improvement plan for the next five years and highlight the strategies and courses of action that will be pursued to implement the elements of the plan.

CSU Accountability
Process, Indicator 1.2

SELF-STUDY REVIEW PROCESS

1. Checklist for Five-Year Program Review

Revise/update the current checklist (Bitsy may have some specific suggestions for improvement): <http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/manual/Undergrad5YrRevCklist.htm>

2. Self-Study Report

The Self-Study Report provides an opportunity for a program to describe its mission and progress towards accomplishing its mission, as well as the processes for the delivery and continuous improvement of its educational efforts. Thus, the Self-Study Report summarizes a program's evaluation of itself in accordance with its defined mission and the criteria of review specified in the Guidelines for the Undergraduate Degree Five-Year Program Review. The Five-Year Review process is to confirm achievement of program mission as well as the effectiveness of continuous improvement processes consistent with the criteria of review.

No single format for presentation of results of the self-study is prescribed. Because the Self-Study Report serves as the basis for the entire review process, however, the needs of the different reviewers (External Reviewer and members of the Review Team) should be considered in the preparation of the document.

The contents of the Self-Study Report should be as follows:

1. Cover Page
2. Certification Page
3. Checklist - Completed

Most of these components are in the current *Submission of Review Report*.

4. Executive Summary
5. Table of Contents
6. List of Exhibits
7. Self-Study – Criterion by Criterion Reports
8. External Reviewer’s Report
9. Final Continuous Improvement Plan
10. Appendices

3. External Reviewer Report

The Five-Year Review process is implemented through a review of the program’s self-study, a visit by an external reviewer, and a final recommendation by the Review Team.

The external reviewer is to carry out the following responsibilities:

1. To understand thoroughly the mission and educational objectives of the program under review;
2. To determine the facts on which the program review is based;
3. To analyze the program’s achievement of each criterion for review based on his/her determination of facts;
4. To ascertain that the current structure and processes of the program assure continuous development and improvement;

These responsibilities are adopted from the AACSB Peer Review Process Manual.

5. To determine how the program's fulfillment of its mission and educational objectives affects achievement of overall high quality;
6. To make an overall recommendation to the Review Team;
7. To provide consultation to the program when requested.

4. Final Review and Approval of Continuous Improvement Plan

The Review Team -- consisting of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, College Dean, Department Chair, Program Director, and an undergraduate student – will make a recommendation to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for or against continuation of the program. This recommendation should follow from the Team's review of the program's overall quality and processes for ensuring continuous improvement and the program's achievement of its mission and educational goals. The recommendation should be based on the facts at the time of the five-year review, not on future plans.

The recommendation can take on one of the following four options:

1. ***Recommend Continuation.*** This recommendation implies that the program is fulfilling its mission, is maintaining overall high quality, and has processes in place that assure continuous improvement. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the Team should identify issues appropriate for further improvement prior to the next five-year review.
2. ***Recommend Continuation, but cite specific concerns for transmittal to the program.*** The concerns cited may not be sufficient to preclude a favorable recommendation, but the letter of transmittal should reinforce the Team's recommendation that the program attend to these concerns in its Continuous

These recommendations are adopted from the AACSB Peer Review Process Manual.

Improvement Plan.

3. ***Recommend the program remain under continuing review.*** The recommendation cites concerns the program must rectify before a recommendation for continuation can be contemplated. The Team Report of Debriefing should provide specific information on a) actions or outcomes required to address deficiencies, b) seriousness of the deficiencies identified and the length of time anticipated to address them, and c) nature and frequency of reports and reviews that will be required.
4. ***Recommend suspension.*** The Team's recommendation cites deficiencies that so seriously impair overall quality that the program is asked to show cause why it should not be terminated. This recommendation is reached only when the Team has concluded that the program cannot or will not rectify the cited deficiencies.

APPENDICES

Program Summary Data Profile



Sample Evidence Templates



Phase I