

# Portland State University



# Academic Program Review

## Program Review

*The program review process at Portland State University is designed to enhance planning within and among academic units to effectively use campus resources and advance university priorities.*

### **Review process articulates and measures objectives**

Program review combines assessment, enrollment management, external and professional accreditation review, and strategic budget decision making and planning. The following principles guide the process.

- Articulate goals and objectives in academic units in relation to university's priorities.
- Institute a regular process of internal and external review of qualitative and quantitative information about program activities.
- Demonstrate achievements.
- Measure outcomes for program improvement.

Common criteria for program review are derived from existing documents related to university priorities and performance.

### **Accreditation requirements set review schedule**

Most academic units already engage in regular program review in conjunction with professional accreditation. The PSU review process builds on existing accreditation requirements as much as possible, with particular attention to the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. Offices of the deans and the provost use the accreditation schedule as a major marker in a summative self-study and review process.

Coordinating self-study and program review with accreditation requirements makes sense if only for the reduced workload for an accreditation visit. Annual reviews allow academic units to track progress as it happens. Most of the necessary information is readily available to satisfy accreditation requirements.

## **Common Criteria for Program Review**

These criteria are provided to programs and departments to assist them in preparing unit profiles. Required information is provided in tables prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning from a central data base of official institutional data. Units may provide additional information, as appropriate, to create a fuller portrait of their missions, goals, and activities. Profiles are updated every two years, and may be used to support academic program review.

### **Centrality to the PSU mission**

How well does the program/department meet the University's expectations and priorities?

Narrative statement that addresses program/departmental goals and objectives in relation to the overall university vision, mission, and priorities. This document should be created by the program/department and reviewed and approved by the Dean's office.

### **Effectiveness of Instruction and Curriculum**

How well does the curriculum serve students, University, community?

Common data elements:

- Assessment of student learning outcomes
- Number of Community Based Learning, Capstone or other community-based courses offered
- Degree programs offered

Suggested data:

- Course schedules
- Continuing education courses offered
- Proportion of graduates who go on to graduate school
- Student performance on professional tests (where appropriate)
- Employer satisfaction
- Percentage of graduates with jobs after graduation
- Student awards and recognition
- Student satisfaction surveys
- Alumni satisfaction surveys

## **Effectiveness of Program**

How well does the program serve and respond to the University priorities?

Common data elements:

- Number of faculty
- FTE faculty
- Faculty by full-time/part-time status
- Number of faculty by tenure status
- Number/proportion of diverse faculty
- Number/proportion diverse students
- Number and type of graduate assistants
- SCH production: lower, upper, graduate
- SCH/faculty FTE
- Average class size: lower, upper, graduate
- Contribution to general education
- Number of course sections
- Number of degrees awarded

Suggested data:

- Cross-listed or joint offerings
- Courses required outside the major
- Offerings with international focus
- Types of community or other partnerships

## **Effectiveness of Faculty**

How well do the faculty support the University's expectations?

Common data elements:

- Number of faculty with terminal degrees
- Number of proposals and expenditures for sponsored research grants and contracts
- Publications and citations, presentations

Suggested data:

- National rankings of schools, colleges, department (where appropriate)
- Offices held in national organizations
- Journal editorships, editorial boards
- Prizes, awards, and recognition
- Community leadership in campus, local, regional, national, international communities

## **Cost Effectiveness and Level of Institutional Support**

Common data elements:

- Proportion of budget from grants and contracts
- Proportion of expenditures from E&G
- Average salary by rank

Suggested data:

- Cost per SCH
- Cost per degree granted
- Cost per faculty FTE
- Faculty development awards

### **Summary Narrative**

Programs and departments should include a summary narrative that addresses issues that have emerged from the analysis of data included in under the five common categories.

# Departmental Profiles

Each year, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) prepares profiles of instructional programs and departments that include data on students, faculty, curriculum, and budget and finance. Programs and departments have access to these data through the Departmental Profiles Web site, and may include narratives in addition to these data that describe goals, objectives, and initiatives as they relate to the overall university mission, vision, and priorities. The profiles provide a starting point for planning and management dialogs between deans and department chairs or program directors toward the achievement of unit goals and objectives, program planning, and resource allocation.

Data included in the Departmental Profiles correspond to those required in the University's program review process and may be used for this purpose when units come up for review. Programs and departments also may use information included in the profiles to respond to specialized accreditation requirements, the preparation of grant proposals, or program monitoring and planning. In addition, the Profiles allow deans to review their units using common criteria. OIRP updates these data on a regular basis and works with individual units to ensure accuracy.

A database of departmental work in the area of assessment is a common element of the Departmental Profiles. Academic units include assessment plans, measurement, findings, and reflections and update these on a regular basis, according to their plans. The Center for Academic Excellence supports programs and departments in the preparation and interpretation of their assessment materials and works closely with OIRP to ensure that materials are complete and up to date.

## ***Program Review***

### **Enhancing Planning and Use of Campus Resources**

The program review process at Portland State University (PSU) is designed to enhance planning within and among academic units. Better planning promotes effective use of campus resources and advances University priorities. Program review integrates strategic budget planning and decision-making with other campus efforts such as assessment, enrollment management, and external and professional accreditation review.

### **The overall goal of program review is to assist academic units in**

- articulating their goals and objectives in relation to the University's priorities,
- instituting a regular process of internal and external review of qualitative and quantitative information about program activities,
- demonstrating progress toward achievement of their goals, and
- using outcomes for program improvement.

## ***Review Schedule***

Deans are responsible for setting review schedules for their units on a five to seven year cycle. For those units who are subject to specialized accreditation, the Dean and department chair may decide to coordinate internal program reviews with the accreditation cycles.

## ***Procedures***

Program review procedures are outlined below. In consultation with the Provost and Vice Provost/Dean of Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies and Research, as appropriate, Deans and department chairs may modify these procedures to accommodate particular circumstances.

### **Preparation**

1. The Dean develops a schedule for reviews for his or her departments or programs: those programs or departments with specialized accreditation may follow that schedule, while those without may follow a schedule determined by the Dean.
2. At the beginning of each academic year, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning sends a reminder to the Dean listing the programs

- or departments he or she has indicated will be subject to review during the academic year.
3. The Dean meets with the programs or departments to develop a process for the reviews and finalize agreements on the information that will be required.
  4. The Dean meets with the Provost and either the Vice Provost for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies or the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research to propose a timeline for review of the programs or departments, and proposals for the appointment of external reviewers.
  5. The program or department prepares program review materials according to the Program Review Criteria outlined on the Departmental Profiles/Program Review Web site using the template provided in the Web site (to the extent possible), and any additional materials as required by the Dean. (Those departments subject to specialized accreditation should also use the Web site, but may prepare other materials as required by their accrediting agencies.)

### ***Review Process***

1. The Dean conducts a review of the program or department, including external reviews. The external reviewers prepare a report and present it to the Dean.
2. The Dean prepares a final report for the program or department.
3. The program or department prepares a response to the reports of the external committee and Dean.
4. The Dean's report and departmental response are reviewed the Vice Provost for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies or the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research.
5. The Vice Provosts meet with the Dean to recommend any additional steps and send a final report to the Provost.
6. The Provost signs off on the report or recommends additional steps, in consultation with the Dean and Vice Provost.
7. Cycle begins again with the new academic year.

## ***Program Review Criteria for Graduate Programs***

Graduate programs may use these criteria in addition to the common criteria for program reviews.

### **1. In Relation to Educational Objectives:**

Student application and process through a program:

- Number of applications
- Number of admissions
- Number of students matriculating
- Number of students continuing from previous year
- Number of graduates (Masters and Doctoral level separate)

Curriculum design and delivery:

- Percentage of total credit hours required for a program that must be from courses that are graduate only (e.g. not 400/500 level)
- Typical ratio of graduate versus undergraduate enrollment in mixed U/G courses
- What percentage of core courses and regularly offered electives are taught by tenure track faculty?
- For programs with both a thesis and non-thesis option, what proportion of graduates utilize each option, what proportion switch from thesis to non-thesis?
- What proportion of student credits are taught in approved versus experimental courses (510, 610, etc)?
- Does the program have formally documented processes and associated criteria for admission and graduation, aside from the general University standards?

Information that would provide perspective on mentoring and the ability of the faculty to foster immersion into the field

- Ratio of SCH generated to the number of faculty (FTE)
- # of students actively preparing theses or dissertations, compared to total number of students and to faculty FTE
- Class size information – largest, smallest, average

**2. In relation to Research**

Comment on the availability of potential national and/or local research funding sources. What trends or emphases are evident and to what extent does the program align with those trends?

**3. In relation to scale**

What number of tenured slots and fixed term FTE are dedicated / utilized in the delivery of the graduate program?

What number of ‘strands’ or areas of emphasis are offered in the program?  
How many faculty are associated with each?

**4. Availability of resources**

Does the program have necessary amounts and quality of space? (labs, offices for GA’s, studio space, student meeting areas, etc?)

Does the program have (or have access to ) the necessary equipment and related materials (e.g. computer hardware and software, scientific equipment).

## Department of Art

### 1. Centrality to the PSU Mission

#### Opening statement

#### Mission

The **Department of Art at Portland State University** is an urban success story. At PSU art making involves engagement with one's surroundings. Here faculty and students observe, imagine, and create art within an urban context. The Department of Art is located on the South Park Blocks in downtown Portland, is within walking distance to the Portland Art Museum, the Portland Center for the Performing Arts, and various art galleries and design firms. Students can participate in exhibitions in this community as well as in internships and service projects. The historical, cultural, and aesthetic influences of the city overlap on our campus and provide stimulus for both artistic reflection and action.

We have over eight hundred undergraduate majors in studio, graphic design, and art history. Within our department student can select from a wide variety of artistic pursuits. We offer a Bachelors of Arts (B.A.) or a Bachelors of Science (B.S.) in Drawing/Painting/Printmaking, Graphic Design or sculpture as well as a Bachelors of Arts in Art History. Our MFA program includes ten to twelve students, each with a spacious studio. The distinguished faculty, who come from across the United States, Korea, Japan, and Romania are strongly committed to teaching, and speak about the inspiration they receive from the unique and diverse group of students at PSU.

The Department of Art at Portland State University consists of artists and designers, educators and art historians actively engaged in their respective fields and with the extended community. As part of an urban university, the Department of Art is dedicated to helping students understand and experience ways that artists and their works are involved in a larger social context, both in the contemporary world and in the course of world history.

Within this urban academic environment the Department of Art strives to meet the following mission for its students:

The foundation of the Department of Art is the development of a visual, verbal, and critical language of the arts for future artists and scholars, as well as for members of the community. Since visual arts are a form of communication related to all other forms, understanding the theoretical bases and critical interpretations of this communication is a crucial component of our curriculum. At the same time, because the visual arts are a unique form of communication, students are trained in the necessary technical skills, the terminology and processes specific to the production of the visual arts.

Because learning "to see" is the most crucial component of any art program, the department requires all students to study both the history of art and to have studio experience. The Department of Art supports the full integration of art/design studio practice with art history and theory. Whether in the studio, computer lab, lecture hall, or seminar room, students have the opportunity to forge connections between traditions of visual art and their own developing imagination and expression.

## **Goals and Objectives**

Therefore by the end of their academic career at PSU the Departments main goals and objectives are to have students acquired the following skills and knowledge:

1. Knowledge and experience of creative problem solving processes
2. Knowledge of discipline specific skills and vocabulary
3. Knowledge of art history and design
4. Knowledge of the critical theories of art
5. Knowledge and experience to formulate a cumulative body of work in their discipline

## **Summary**

- Narrative analyzing and assessing performance on quantitative measures. Do this last.

## 2. *Effectiveness of Instruction and Curriculum*

### **Introduction**

The program curriculum covers a wide variety of issues within the art field. The first year foundation courses teach students the basics of design and drawing while augmenting this knowledge with the historical and cultural influence surrounding the various disciplines.

During the second year students choose a field of art on which to focus. During this year students explore the media by learning about application through structured studio instruction. Each media explores its own unique processes and techniques developing the student's confidence in their skill while instilling them with the language and theories pertinent to their major field of interest. This is also a time for students to explore other areas of interest within the other concentration areas often leading to a minor within another art field.

By the third year students are introduced to more advanced challenges taking to task the problem solving skills they have begun to develop in the second year. During this stage students bring more of their own ideas, images and voice into their work. Critical theories that were introduced in the second year become more fully explored and expanded on. Also, during this time students explore in depth the history of their discipline or area of investigation in order to understand their own work within a cultural context.

In the final fourth year art student's concentrate specifically on his or her own body of work. The focus of this year is somewhat preparatory in nature; faculty member's work with students focusing on challenges that their work presents and/or career planning. Students are encouraged to develop a cohesive cumulative body of work that may then be used in a variety of ways. By the end of this year students should be prepared to pursue further education, enter into the job market, present work to a gallery or apply to a residency program. For a detailed list of courses and program requirements we suggest that students visit our website <http://www.art.pdx.edu/>.

Throughout the four years students are continually encouraged to stretch their perception of what it means to be an artist. From inside the classroom we hope students gain advice, new ideas and perceptions from one another. Further, we encourage them to explore issues relevant to the community in which they live. As an urban university we readily draw on the resources from around us. We work closely with the local museums, galleries and

businesses, using the community as a sounding board and a teaching tool. In addition we often partner with other departments in order to create new interdisciplinary programs. Our department continually draws from a variety of sources in order to sculpt and provide the tools necessary for the student's growth as an artist.

After graduation majority of students go on to work in the private sector or pursue further education leading to an MFA, MA or Ph.D.

## Institutional indicators

Some indicators

Table 1. Community-Based-Learning section

	2002	2001	2000
UG (Lower division)	0	0	0
UG (Upper division)	5	7	3
Graduate	0	0	0
Total	5	7	3

- Fall term

## Common indicators

- Student satisfaction
- Graduate satisfaction
- Assessment of student learning outcomes
  - Program Description
  - Student Profile
  - Art Assessment Plans

The Art Department is accredited by NASAD, the National Association of Schools of Art and Design, on a five year cycle. The 2002-2003 academic year is our NASAD reaccreditation cycle year with on campus review May 27, 2003. A major component of this review is curriculum assessment and student performance evaluation.

(For more on NASAD - <http://www.arts-accredit.org/nasad/default.htm>)

The Art department is comprised of three programs, Studio Arts, including, painting, drawing, printmaking and sculpture, Art History and Graphic Design. Each of these program areas has its own assessment plan. These plans are being implemented and we expect review and revision to follow as a natural result.

- Graphic Art Assessment Plan **OPEN**
- Art History Assessment Plan **OPEN**
- Studio Art Assessment Plan **OPEN**
  
- Mid Program Performance Assessment
- End Program Performance Assessment
- Assessment Analysis and Recommendations

#### Program specific indicators

- Data on UG graduate admissions to graduate schools
- Performance on professional tests/licensing exams
- Employer satisfaction
- Percentage of jobs after graduation in the field-salary
- Student awards

#### Summary

- Narrative statement summarizing above indicators

### 3. Effectiveness of Program

#### Introduction

As mention previously the Department works closely with resources in our community, bringing together members of the community as advisory boards to discuss program issues and forging connections with local business to provide internships and other opportunities for students. We have a strong alliance with the Portland Art Museum and continually use the resources of local galleries such as the Laura Russo Gallery, Blackfish Gallery, Mark Woolley Gallery and many other NW and downtown galleries. In addition we work closely with PICA (Portland Institution for Contemporary Art) and RACC (Regional Arts And Culture Council) on issues concerning the Portland art community.

Diversity is also a key aim of our program. Within the arts major influences in learning come through the experience of our students. We encourage and promote the exchange of views and ideas as seen and drawn through a mix of ethnicities, age groups and gender experiences.

Our faculty actively seek partnerships within the community lending their expertise in the field as art jurors, lecturers or council members. In addition many become partnered with the local branch of national organizations such as American Institute for Graphic Arts (AIGA), or Oregon Art Education Association (OAEA). Finally, many of our studio faculty exhibit their work in local galleries such as Laura Russo Gallery, Mark Woolley, Froelick, Alysia Duckler and Pulliam Deffenbaugh Galleries.

Each full time and the majority of part time instructors hold Ph.D's or MFA's in their respective fields; each with a strong educational and professional background of their own.

#### Institutional indicators

Some indicators

Table 1. Student Ethnicity

	2002				2001				2000			
	UG		GR		UG		GR		UG		GR	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
<b>American Indian</b>	5	9	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	7	0	0
<b>Asian/PI</b>	30	43	0	0	27	32	0	0	19	20	0	0
<b>Black</b>	4	8	0	0	3	7	0	0	3	4	1	0
<b>Declined/Unknown</b>	33	50	1	1	27	51	1	1	22	43	1	0
<b>Hispanic</b>	16	16	0	1	16	16	0	0	9	9	0	0
<b>International</b>	5	16	0	0	7	19	0	1	7	21	0	1

<b>Multi-ethnic</b>	5	4	0	0	3	6	0	1	2	5	0	0
<b>White</b>	187	333	7	11	165	340	6	6	140	253	3	9
<b>Total</b>	285	479	8	13	250	483	7	9	202	362	5	10

- Fall term - 4th week

Table 2. Student Credit Hours - Fall term 4th week

	2002	2001	2000
<b>Undergraduate</b>	6,980	6,118	5,473
<b>Graduate(Master)</b>	480	410	366
<b>Graduate(Ph.D)</b>	0	0	3
<b>Total</b>	7,460	6,528	5,842

- Redistributed
- Main campus

Table 3. Degree Awarded

	2002	2001	2000
<b>Bachelor</b>	68	69	70
<b>Master</b>	4	9	9
<b>Ph.D</b>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	72	78	79

- Total degrees granted from 7/1 to 6/30

Table 4. Average Class Size

	2002	2001	2000
<b>UG</b>	23	26	28
<b>GR</b>	4	3	4

<b>Total</b>	28	29	32
--------------	----	----	----

- Fall term
- Excludes by-arrangement courses

Table 5. Instructional Faculty Fall Term

	2002				2001				2000			
	FT		PT		FT		PT		FT		PT	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
<b>Fixed Term</b>	4	8	11	15	2	0	11	18	2	0	12	13
<b>Indefinite</b>	3	6	0	0	2	7	0	0	3	2	0	0
<b>Annual</b>	3	3	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	6	0	0
<b>Total</b>	10	17	11	15	8	8	11	18	6	8	12	13

- Full time equals .50 FTE or Above
- Includes department chairs

### Common indicators

- Program assessment initiatives and outcomes.

### Program specific indicators

- Data on types of community, govt. and business partnerships
- Quality of faculty

#### 4. *Effectiveness of faculty*

##### **Introduction**

One of the main strengths of our department is our hard working faculty. The majority of both full-time and part-time faculty hold terminal degrees in their respective fields. The university mandates that all full time faculty pursue scholarly or creative endeavors, pursue community activities, and provide service to university committees and advisory boards.

Art Historians actively pursue research in their perspective fields of study publish books and articles and present papers at national and local conferences. In addition, they have created strong ties with the Portland Art Museum lending their expertise to provide lectures on varying topics related to exhibitions presented there. Further they strive to make contention within other university department such as History, English and University Studies to name a few. Working together they bring in guest lecturers that reach a broad range of students as well as people from the local community.

The studio faculty are represented at both local and national galleries; participating in solo exhibitions as well as group shows. In addition, they are often called upon to jury or curate local artist exhibitions both at a professional level and for secondary school. Each faculty member has an impressive list of collections to which their work belongs. Also, in serving the community they often provide lecture and workshops in their area of expertise. There work is also published in a variety of publications usually presented as part of theme in contemporary art. Finally the studio faculty enjoy the collaborative environment within the artist community. Most belong to the local professional organization as well as national.

The graphic design faculty actively design for local and national companies and organizations and write articles for various publications. In this field research is also a must to keep a plus on the ever changing field of graphic design. In addition many work with local community groups. Also the majority of the faculty belong to local and national memberships in organizations with in their perspective fields.

The part-time faculty are also committed to their work as a designer, historian or studio artist. Each pursues scholarly or creative endeavors and each artist is active in their field.

Refer to the following, for a list of recent professional affiliations, publications, presentations, awards and grants.

## Institutional indicators

- # of sponsored research grants and contracts

Table 1. Sponsored Research Expenditures

	Sponsored Exp.	Head Count	Average
2002	\$0	0	\$0
2001	\$1,000	0	\$0
2000	\$0	0	\$0
Total	\$1,000	0	\$0

- Head count of principal investigators on funded research contracts.

## Common indicators

- Publications, citations and presentations
- Prizes, awards and recognitions
- Community leadership in campus, local, regional, national, and international areas

## Program specific indicators

- National rankings
- Offices held in national organizations
- Journal editorships, editorial boards,
- Quality of scholarship, grants, etc. as judged by peers

## 5. Cost effectiveness and level of institutional support

### Introduction

- How well do the faculty support the University's expectations?

### Institutional indicators

Some indicators

Table 1. Budget

	2002	2001	2000
<b>E&amp;G</b>	\$1,696,952	\$1,437,820	\$1,314,104
<b>Self-Support</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Auxiliary</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Spon. Rsrch.</b>	\$0	\$1,000	\$0
<b>Total</b>	\$1,696,952	\$1,438,820	\$1,314,104

- Expenditures

Table 2. Instructional Faculty Average Salary

	2002	2001	2000
<b>Professor</b>	\$59,470	\$58,593	\$0
<b>Assoc. Professor</b>	\$46,209	\$45,155	\$43,765
<b>Assist. Professor</b>	\$40,502	\$39,578	\$38,664
<b>Senior Instructor</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Instructor</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	\$146,181	\$143,326	\$82,429

- Fall Term - 9 month contracts / FTE=1
- Average salary shown for those ranges populated with 3 or more faculty

Table 3. Graduate Assistants

	2002	2001	2000
Admin	0	0	0
RA	0	0	0
TA	6	4	5
Total	6	4	5

- Fall term
- FTE greater than or equal to .15

#### Common indicators

- Funds devoted to faculty development
- Cost per SCH

#### Program specific indicators

Some indicators