California State University, Chico
Academic Program Review Guidelines:
Undergraduate Degree Programs

Academic Program Review Guidelines:
Undergraduate Degree Programs

INTRODUCTION

SELF-STUDY REVIEW PROCESS

- Self-Study Report
- External Reviewer Report
- Final Review and Approval of Program Five-Year Improvement Action Plan

CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

1. *Articulating a Collective Vision*

   - Mission and Program Goals

2. *Organizing for Learning*

   - Curriculum, Pedagogy and Learning Outcomes
   - Faculty Resources
   - Students as Partners in Learning
   - Other Learning-Enabling Resources

3. *Becoming a Learning Organization*

   - Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement

SELF-STUDY REPORT

- Self-Study Report Format
- Required Program Data Elements

INTRODUCTION

The New Framework for Academic Program Review

Traditionally in program reviews, the self-study author(s) used data to describe the degree program rather than explain   what the program *does* and illustrate *how well it does* relative to its goals and standards of performance. The new academic program 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 degree program does.

The specific elements of this new framework align under the vision, mission and strategic priorities of the CSU and CSU, Chico and the core commitments to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness that are embodied   in the current WASC accreditation standards. The new Academic 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 effectiveness.

Accordingly, the self-study should:

- ▪ Provide the degree program's mission, goals and outcomes, including the processes used to establish these.

- ▪ Provide evidence of progress toward accomplishing the mission, goals and outcomes defined for the program.

- ▪ Demonstrate that indicators of performance are regularly developed and data collected to inform program   decision making, planning and improvement.

Overall, the new review process embraces an organizational learning approach in which the program regularly and   systematically assesses its own performance and uses the assessment information to foster collective learning and   thereby increase the program's capacity for educational effectiveness.

SELF-STUDY REVIEW PROCESS

Self-Study Report

The Self-Study Report provides an opportunity for a degree program to describe its mission, goals and desired outcomes and progress towards accomplishing these, 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 for review specified in the Guidelines for the Undergraduate Degree Academic 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 for 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 organized as follows:

1. Cover Page

2. Certification Page

3. Quick Facts

4. Executive Summary

5. Table of Contents

6. List of Exhibits

7. Self-Study: Criterion-by-Criterion Reports

8. Appendices

   - Required Data Elements
   - Other (s)

CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

Format of the Academic Program Review Guidelines

The Academic Program Review is framed around issues of program capacity and effectiveness. It emphasizes   our commitment to quality and integrity of the degree offered, a commitment that the review process reviews and validates.

Each element of the Academic Program Review is constructed with the following three interrelated elements elements:

Content Area
The Academic Program Review includes three main content areas: ― *"Articulating a Collective Vision," "Organizing for   Learning"* and *"Becoming a Learning Organization."* Each of these content areas, while addressed individually, 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 Provost, the College Dean and the department faculty to render an effective judgment of the performance of a program   and to form an appropriate perspective for its future direction.

Guidelines for Documentation

Suggested methods of demonstrating performance related to content areas are provided to assist with further interpretations of the content area and/or criteria for review.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

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; c) adequately assessed; and, d) continuously improved based on assessment results.

1. Mission and Program Goals

The program articulates its mission and its goals 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. The program uses effectiveness and performance indicators beyond inputs and resources as the organizing basis for defining, evaluating, and reflecting on program quality and program effectiveness.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines for Documentation and Reflection
1.1 The program has a clear and published mission statement.	- Provide your program's mission statement - Describe the process whereby the mission statement was developed and disseminated. (See Academic Program Portfolios) - Provide a brief discussion of the mission statement as it relates to the University and College mission, student success, and the current state of the discipline.
1.2 The program has developed and widely disseminated its program goals.	- Provide your program's goals and indicate any revisions since the last review. - Describe the process whereby the program goals were developed and disseminated. Include: - Knowledge, skills, and values that faculty expect graduating students to achieve; - Type of students and other constituents served by the program.
1.3 Consistent with its purpose and character, the program demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity of society and the student body in its support of student success in its mission and goals.	- Present evidence of how diversity is represented in curriculum and hiring. - Discuss how the program's mission and goals have responded to the increasing diversity of society and the student body.
1.4 The program has developed and begun to use key indicators and sources of evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its mission, goals, and success of its students.	- Present an evidentiary set of exhibits that demonstrates overall achievement of program mission and goals (for example, present date on graduation rates, placement in graduate programs, students' willingness to recommend the program and/or employer satisfaction with graduates). - Discuss the means and measures by which the program assesses its achievement of its mission, goals, and success of its students.

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. This requires a 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.

2. **Organizing for Learning: Student Success**

The program achieves its mission and attains its goals through the active management of teaching and learning and demonstrates that these functions are performed effectively.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines for Documentation and Reflection
2.1 The program has specified its expected learning outcomes, which are widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and—where appropriate—external stakeholders.	• Provide an exhibit of the student learning outcome statements of the program; describe and/or illustrate how learning outcomes were developed; and illustrate how and where they are published. • Note and justify any changes in SLOs since the last review.
2.2 The program's curriculum content and standards align with the program mission, goals, and learning outcomes.	• Provide your program's Curriculum Alignment Matrix. Describe how the objectives for significant categories of curriculum activity connect to the program's goals and learning outcomes. • Note and explain any substantive curricular changes since the last review.
2.3 The program has established processes for assessing SLOs, has established benchmarks for student performance, documented levels of student learning and provides examples of the use of assessment results for program improvement.	• Present the learning outcomes **assessment plan**, **assessment results** including **levels of student performance** on specific outcomes, and program changes enacted as a result of assessment findings. • Provide data on any notable achievement gaps among student populations and how these are addressed.
2.4 The program actively involves students in learning and provides ample curricular and co-curricular opportunities to enhance and explore applications of their learning.	• Present data on student evaluations of teaching; on student engagement; service learning and on other High Impact Practices within the program such as student clubs and competitions, faculty-mentored research, study abroad, internships, and/or other projects. Include data on scale and scope of student participation and efforts to make participation inclusive of diverse students.
2.5 The program actively supports student successes at all stages of their experience in the major. The program directs resources in support of the success of diverse students, tracking students by ethnicity, gender, income, and first generation status in support of retention, learning, and graduation.	• Discuss the number and characteristics of program students (ethnicity, gender, first-generation status, low-income status [Pell eligibility]), disaggregated retention and graduation rates, and recent or ongoing efforts to support student success. • Discuss changes in curriculum pedagogy, co-curriculum or hiring aimed at addressing the success of an increasingly diverse student body.

3. Organizing for Learning: Faculty Resources

CSU, Chico recognizes that the quality of educational program efforts is inextricably linked to the quality of faculty and support staff. Faculty, collectively and individually, are responsible for the creation and delivery of effective instruction, the evaluation of instructional effectiveness and student achievement, and continued improvement and innovation in program offerings and instructional processes. Faculty scholarship, research and creative activity are essential components of the CSU, Chico mission. The program has policies and practices that encourage and support scholarship and creative activity linked to the mission and improvements in teaching and learning.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines for Documentation and Reflection
3.1 The program maintains faculty sufficient to provide stability and integrity of the curriculum and on-going quality improvement for the program offerings. Faculty workload is aligned with program mission, goals, and outcomes.	• Provide data on the number, quality, and status (tenure-track, tenured, non-tenured) of program faculty. • Discuss how the program deploys faculty to assure quality of instruction and achieve other program mission and goals. • Present information based on total program FTES, total FTEF and teaching FTEF, and translated into appropriate student-faculty ratios.
3.2 The program encourages participation in appropriate faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with program mission, goals, and outcomes including student success.	• Provide data on faculty activities aimed at improving teaching and learning in support of student success. • Provide copy of faculty development policy. • Present data on the assignment of AWTUs for purpose of scholarship and creative activity for the previous five-year period. • Present data on the awarding of sabbatical, difference-in-pay, and absence-without-pay leaves.
3.3 Faculty members make scholarly/creative contributions and/or provide service to the community on a continuing basis appropriate to the program's mission, goals, and outcomes.	• Provide data on faculty scholarly/creative activity and service related to program mission, goals and student success. • Present data on faculty involvement in community service. • Present data on the total dollar amount of awards received from external grants and contract proposals by faculty and describe the funded activities.

4. Organizing for Learning: Students as Partners in Learning

Students are the focus of the academic enterprise.‖ Students are expected to be active partners with faculty in the learning process and the program is to provide opportunities for active learning throughout its offerings.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines for Documentation and Reflection
4.1 Students understand the requirements of the program and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about program requirements and post-graduation opportunities.	• Describe program policies toward student advising and efforts to ensure that *all* students receive timely information and advice on efficient pathways to program completion. Students receive effective advice about career and post-graduate educational opportunities. • Reflect on the effectiveness of the program's Major Academic Plan (MAP) or Student Success MAP. • Present data on students' evaluation of program and career advising.
4.2 Actions oriented toward student success are consistent with the objective of serving a diverse student body and producing high quality graduates.	• Describe efforts inside and outside the classroom to enhance student academic engagement and create a welcoming environment for diverse students. Refer, as necessary, to CFR 2.5 on the socio-demographics of your student population.
4.3 The program engages students directly in scholarship/creative activity and/or service to the community, consonant with program purpose and character.	• Provide data on student engagement in faculty-sponsored scholarship/ creative activity and/or community service. • Describe efforts to ensure that these activities are *inclusive*: that students from varied backgrounds have the opportunity to participate. • Reflect on how the objectives for extra-curricular activities connect to mission and goal statements.

5. **Organizing for Learning: Other Learning-Enabling Resources**

The program sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its mission and goals through its investment in fiscal, human, information and physical resources. These key resources enable the creation and maintenance of a high quality learning environment.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines for Documentation and Reflection

5.1 Fiscal resources are effectively aligned with the 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.	• Provide data on trends in budget allocations and uses since the last review.
	• Relative to the mission, describe the resource adequacy in terms of:
	   ○ General fund allocation; faculty, non-faculty, and operating expenses
	   ○ Lottery and work-study funding to the program
	   ○ Non-general fund resources including grants, contracts, and advancement

5.2 The program employs staff personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its mission and program goals.	• Refer to the number and quality of staff who support the department's mission and goals. • Describe how staff hiring practices address diversity goals, and present data on diversity goal accomplishment. • Describe staff career management activities.
5.3 The program's student support resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its mission and educational purposes.	• Present data on the current resources and reflect on the future needs regarding student success, program outcomes, advising and career placement relative to the program's mission and goals.
5.4 The program holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members.	• Present data on the current resources and reflect on the future needs regarding learning materials and information resources relative to the program's mission and goals.
5.5 The program's academic technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and provide key academic and administrative functions.	• Present data on the current resources and reflect on the future needs regarding academic technology support/learning management resources relative to the program's mission and goals.
5.6 The program's space and facilities are sufficient to support its academic offerings.	• Present data on the current resources and reflect on the future needs regarding basic infrastructure space and equipment relative to the program's mission and goals.

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, These systems should reflect the input of stakeholders, identify key   dimensions of performance, and are based on standards of evidence that prominently feature educational results. 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.

6. **Commitment to Learning and Strategic Improvement**

The program conducts sustained, evidence-based and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing   its mission and goals. 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.

In this section, reflect on the results of student learning outcome assessment, and other measures of program performance in the self-study, to project anticipated changes in mission, goals, student learning outcomes, pedagogy and curriculum aimed at enhancing program performance

Criteria for Review	**Guidelines for Documentation and Reflection**
6.1 The mission statement, program goals, and student learning outcomes are subject to periodic review and revised as needed. The review process involves appropriate stakeholders.	• Note processes in place to periodically review mission, goals, and outcomes and recent actions in this regard. If changes are anticipated in mission, goals, and outcomes in the immediate future, please discuss.
6.2 The program employs a deliberate set of processes—including consultation with relevant stakeholders—to assess program effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula and pedagogy.	• Highlight areas of program strength and weakness, how these have been determined, and changes implemented since the last review. • Discuss anticipated changes in curriculum, pedagogy, or resource allocation to improve program effectiveness.
6.3 The program leadership is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of assessment, inquiry, and evaluation.	• Summarize processes and actions aimed at program improvement since the last review. • Illustrate the effectiveness of the program's leadership in promoting organizational learning through evidence-based planning, evaluation, and decision-making.

External Reviewer Report

The Academic Review process is implemented through a review of the program's self-study, a visit by an external reviewer, the development of an improvement action plan and a final recommendation by the Review Team.

The external reviewer has the following responsibilities:

1. Understand thoroughly the mission and goals of the program under review;

2. Determine the facts on which the program review is based;

3. Analyze the program's achievement of each criterion for review based on his/her determination of facts;

4. Ascertain that the current structure and processes of the program to assure continuous development and improvement;

5. Determine how the program's fulfillment of its mission and goals affects achievement of overall high quality;

6. Make an overall recommendation to the Review Team;

7. Provide consultation to the program when requested.

Concluding Reflective Essay: Program Five-Year Improvement Action Plan

Following the completion of the self-study and an analysis of the external reviewer's insights and suggestions for improvement, the program, in consultation with the dean of the college and chair of the department, develops a five-year improvement plan that provides:

1. A summary of results of Student Learning Outcomes assessment, includes strengths and weaknesses identified in student learning;
2. A description of how information on student learning will shape efforts to improve program performance including curricular revisions and pedagogical innovations;
3. A discussion of changes in numbers and diversity of students served by the program during the review period and how this influences program planning moving forward, and;
4. A projection of faculty resources in light of the above and anticipated changes in the make-up of faculty in the next five years.
5. Any additional data or analyses that help shape the course of the program in the coming 5 years.

The information contained in the self-study, the external reviewer report and the dean-approved improvement action plan form the basis for the Review Team's recommendation to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Final Review and Approval of Improvement Action Plan

The Review Team -- consisting of an Office of the Provost Representative, College Dean and Department Chair and Program Director (where appropriate) – will make one of four recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This recommendation will follow from the Team's review of the degree 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 Academic review, not on future plans.

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

- **Recommend Affirmation**: 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 External Reviewer should identify issues appropriate for further improvement prior to the next five-year review.

- **Recommend Reaffirmation, but with specific concerns for transmittal to the program**: The concerns cited may not be sufficient to preclude a favorable recommendation, but the report should reinforce the External Reviewer's recommendation that the program attend to these concerns in its Continuous Improvement Plan.

- **Recommend the program remain under Continuing Review:** The recommendation cites concerns the program must rectify before a recommendation for continuation can be contemplated. The External Reviewer's Report 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.

- **Recommend Suspension**: The External Reviewer'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 External Reviewer has concluded that the program cannot or will not rectify the cited deficiencies.