

SECTION SIX

PROGRAM REVIEW

The University provides for evaluation of its academic programs on a continuing basis to insure that the academic standards of the campus, and of the profession generally, are met and that each program achieves excellence both in fact and reputation. Program Review is both a collegial and administrative process which culminates in the development of planning documents which are integrated into the overall University management plan and budget review process.

Program Review is conducted on a cyclic basis to afford optimum use of available resources and to provide for analysis and implementation of responses to evaluations. Reviews occur on a seven-year cycle or concurrently with accreditation review. Accredited programs have the option of scheduling internal review concurrent with accreditation review or during the year following accreditation. Questions regarding the program review calendar should be directed to the Office of Academic Affairs.

Program Review is conducted in four distinct stages: self-study, external review by either accreditation agencies or special consultants, internal review by faculty councils, and administrative review.

The program should plan for program review costs, especially the cost of administering the Alumni Survey, as part of its budget. Only the fees of accreditation agencies for the visitation teams and the honoraria and travel costs of external consultants are paid centrally.

Responsibilities For Program Review

I. DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM

The department or program begins the program review process by preparing a self-study. Departments and programs receive notification of pending review approximately one year before the self study is due. Once notification has been received from the Office of Academic Affairs, the department should immediately prepare for the self study. The department's responsibilities encompass three phases.

A. Preparing for the Self Study (April through October, Year 1)

The department/program:

1. Receives notification that the program review cycle is beginning and that the self study will be due in one year.
2. Attends the Spring Self-Study Workshops conducted by the Graduate and Planning and Educational Policies Councils and the Office of Institutional Research.
3. Contacts Institutional Research at extension 5-5462 for assistance with the department or program's Alumni Survey (Appendix 6.5), and initiates Alumni Survey.
4. Reads Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major (Appendix 6.1)
5. Obtains and reviews previous department/program Self-Studies and External/Internal Reviews to evaluate changes made since the last review.
6. Updates department/program faculty curriculum vitae (CVs).
7. Attends Fall Workshop to review self-study statistics provided by Institutional Research (see Appendix 6.2) and receives summary and evaluation of library resources.

B. Writing the Self Study (September through March, year 1)

Using the information and resources described above, the department/program writes the self-study with the entire program faculty participating. If the department/program has both graduate and undergraduate programs under review, the department/program may either prepare two separate reports, one for the undergraduate and one for the graduate program, or a single combined report. The maximum length is 30 double-spaced pages for a report on either an undergraduate or a graduate program, or 45 double-spaced pages for a combined report. The document Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major should be used as a framework. However, it is not expected that each department or program will answer every question in Chapter 4 ("A Framework for Program Review").

Instead, the department/program should focus on the following areas:

1. Program Goals
 - (a) What are the educational goals of your program?
 - (b) How are they different from the time of your last review?
 - (c) What success have you had in implementing the recommendations of your last review?
 - (d) How do you anticipate that your goals will change before your next review?
 - (e) How adequately does your curriculum reflect these goals?
2. Assessment of the outcomes of the program:
 - (a) Describe how outcomes of the program are assessed;
 - (b) Note areas in which goals are not being met satisfactorily; and
 - (c) Illustrate how the assessments could both further enhance success and lead to improvements in the program.

In addressing the above topics, the report should respond to each of the eight major sections in Chapter 4 ("A Framework for Program Review"), listed below. Note that sections 1 (Goals) and 8 (Outcomes Assessment) overlap the two central components described above. An organizational strategy that has proved effective for many programs is to divide the report into 8 sections corresponding to the list below, making sure that the specific questions above are addressed. Within each section, it is the responsibility of the department/program to respond to the sense of this section but not necessarily to each question listed. The department or program should answer those questions that are most relevant to the program, and may construct related questions that address the same themes but are a better fit to the particular situation. Where possible, departments/programs should support claims with evidence that outcomes are being achieved.

Certain questions have been flagged as "CSULB-specific." These questions were added to address specific concerns that apply primarily to graduate programs, or to the impact of graduate programs on undergraduate programs.

The eight categories described in Chapter 4 are:

1. Goals
2. Curriculum
3. Connections
4. Teaching quality
5. Advising
6. Inclusiveness
7. Institutional support
8. Outcomes assessment

Following completion of the self-study report, the department:

1. Approves the Self-Study Report following review by the entire faculty.
2. Writes a three page Executive Summary
3. Submits the Self Study to the College Office for review by April 1.
4. Submits the Self-Study to the Academic Senate Office by May 1 with a "Coversheet for Review of an Existing Program" (see Appendix 6.3) in the appropriate number of copies.

If separate Self-Studies were written for the graduate and undergraduate programs, the department submits to the Academic Senate Office:

Seven copies of the Self-Study (including Executive Summary), distribution:

Two copies for Academic Affairs

Four copies for the Council

One copy held in the Senate Office until completion of the review cycle, then forwarded to University Archives

If a single Self-Study report was written to include both the undergraduate and graduate programs, the department/program submits eleven total copies of the Self-Study, including the Executive Summary (four to the Graduate Council, four to the Planning and Educational Policies Council, two to Academic Affairs, and one to be held in the Senate Office, then forwarded to University Archives.).

- C. Hosting the External and Internal Reviews (academic year following submission of the self study)
Detailed guidelines for conduct of the External and Internal Reviews are described in Sections II and III. If an external review has been scheduled early in the academic year, the internal review(s) will normally follow the external review. Note that graduate and undergraduate programs undergo separate internal reviews, even if a combined self study report was submitted. The role of the department or program is to facilitate these reviews. The department:
1. Collects the following materials and makes them available to reviewers in the department/program office:
 - a. Updated Curriculum Vitae of program faculty
 - b. Institutional Research data (i.e. Self-Study Statistics)
 - c. Most recent internal and external reviews (available in University Archives if not in department files)
 - d. Results from Alumni Survey
 - e. University Library resources and services evaluation.
 - f. Course outlines and syllabi
 - g. Other descriptive materials, such as program advising guides, informational materials, brochures, newsletters, etc., as appropriate
 2. Arranges for the External Reviewer or the Internal Review Team to meet with:
 - a. Students
 - b. Faculty
 - c. Other constituencies, such as staff, alumni, or faculty from other areas, as appropriate

II. EXTERNAL REVIEW

It is the intent of the University that all programs receive external review on a periodic basis. Programs subject to Professional Accreditation will use the Association's review process in lieu of an external reviewer. Most non-accredited programs will be scheduled for external review during the academic year following submission of the self study. If time or financial constraints make it impossible to review all programs in a particular year, Academic Affairs will consult with the College Deans to determine the highest priorities for external review.

- A. Selection of Reviewers for departments/programs where professional accreditation is not utilized:
1. Academic Affairs requests nominations for external consultants from the College Deans of Departments scheduled for review. Department/program chairs may recommend reviewers, but these recommendations must be considered in the context of all nominations. Area of sub-disciplinary specialty and expertise is a major, but not an overriding consideration. Academic Affairs contacts potential reviewers and requests vitae.
 2. Academic Affairs presents a representative collection of nominations and vitae to the Department/Program faculty for review.
 - a. The faculty or dean may challenge any nomination for cause, but must specify the conditions and indicate the undesirability of a specific nominee.
 - b. Challenges from Departments/Programs must be submitted through the College Dean.
- B. Preparation for a Campus Visit
1. Upon completion of the External Reviewer's selection, Academic Affairs will provide the department chair with a copy of the letter confirming the consultant.
 2. The department/program chair is responsible for working with the Office of Academic Affairs to coordinate the programmatic elements of the site visit:
 - a. Travel, lodging and honorarium
 - b. Planning the itinerary covering the visit (usually 1.5 to 2 days)
 - c. Making sure all appropriate documents are available to the reviewer upon request

III. INTERNAL REVIEW

Internal Review is the responsibility of the Planning and Educational Policies Council (for undergraduate programs) and the Graduate Council (for graduate programs.) In the year following submission of the self study, the Council with responsibility will assign a team to conduct the review. If possible without excessive delays, the Internal Review Team will carry out its review after the external review has been completed.

- A. Procedures for the Internal Review Subcommittee of the Graduate and/or Planning and Educational Policies Council(s).
 1. Chair of the Internal Review Subcommittee obtains self study reports from the Academic Senate office and distributes them to the subcommittee.
 2. Chair of the Internal Review Subcommittee contacts the Department Chair/Program Director to introduce members of the subcommittee, explain the process, and arrange interviews with the following:
 - a. Department/Program Chair
 - b. Department/Program Faculty, part-and full-time
 - c. Dean and/or Associate Dean of the College
 - d. Students (See Appendix 6.4, PEP Council Guidelines for Student Input)
 - e. Others, such as alumni, staff, or faculty from other areas as appropriate
 3. The Internal Review Subcommittee reviews the following documents before meeting with the Department. All should be available through the department. However, University Archives keeps old internal and external review reports. The subcommittee decides for itself which of the listed documents are most critical to review. However, at minimum a thorough reading of the self study and previous reports is necessary.
 - a. The Department's Self-Study Report and Executive Summary
 - b. Previous Internal Program Review report
 - c. Recent External Review/Accreditation report
 - d. Supporting documents on file in the department office including:
 - (1) Course outlines and syllabi
 - (2) Faculty curriculum vitae
 - (3) Statistical data from Institutional Research
 - (4) Alumni surveys
 - (5) University Library resources and services evaluation.
 - (6) Other materials as appropriate, such as newsletters, advising guides, brochures, etc.
 - e. Catalogs/bulletins from universities offering comparable programs.
 4. If the Internal Review subcommittee finds the department's Self-Study to be inadequate, the subcommittee may refer it back to the department/program for revision.
 5. The Internal Review subcommittee shall interview the following constituencies. These interviews should serve to clarify issues raised by the self study and the other documents described above, to extend the self study, or to address issues which may not have been covered in the self study.
 - a. Department/Program Chair
 - b. Department/Program faculty members, part- and full-time
 - c. Dean and/or Associate Dean of the College
 - d. Students (see PEP Guidelines for Student Input)
 - e. Others, such as alumni staff, or faculty in other areas, as appropriate.
- B. Writing the Internal Review

The Internal Review Team prepares a "Council Program Review Report" summarizing its findings. The report should be a constructive evaluation and provide not only criticism and/or praise but recommendations for improvements. The report should include the following:

1. Overview of the Internal Review committee's review process, including supplementary information obtained outside the written Self-Study document.
2. Problems in the review process, if any.

3. Report on actions taken on recommendations made in previous reviews.
 4. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the department/program in meeting its mission and goals and in planning. In this section, attention should be given to the major themes described in the program review framework: goals, curriculum, connections, teaching quality, advising, inclusiveness, and institutional support.
 5. Evaluation of the program's efforts to assess program outcomes.
 6. Adequacy of University Library resources and services.
 7. Recommendations to the Department/Program (these should be in priority order).
 8. Commendations to the Department or Program, if appropriate.
 9. Recommendations to the College or University administration, if appropriate.
 10. Recommendations to the Council:
 - a. Specific recommendation for actions by the Council, including interim reviews, development of policies, etc.
 - b. Written motion for acceptance of the Self-Study report.
 - c. Written motion for acceptance of the Internal Review committee's report.
- C. Completion of the Report by the Internal Review subcommittee. Upon completion of the internal review report, the Internal Review subcommittee:
1. Forwards a copy to the Department Chair and College Dean.
 2. Meets with the Department Chair to correct erroneous information, if any.
 3. Makes revisions, if necessary, and completes the final draft.
 4. Forwards final draft to the Council Executive or Steering Committee for inclusion on the agenda.
 5. Arranges time and date for the Council Review .
- D. Presentation at Council meeting.

The Internal Review Team presents the report to the Council after it has been reviewed by the department/program and by the Dean. A mutually convenient time is arranged for the presentation. Normally the department chair or program director attends, as do other faculty from the department or program with a particular interest in the report. In addition, the Dean or Associate Dean normally attends. These guests are invited to respond to the presentation and to answer questions posed by members of the Council. The Council may introduce amendments to the report at the presentation. Following discussion of the recommendations, the subcommittee chair moves (1) that the Self Study be accepted, and (2) that the Internal Review report be accepted. Additional motions may be introduced at this time, as well, if necessary.

After the Internal Review report has been accepted by the Council, the subcommittee chair makes any corrections to the report and submits it to the Chair of the Council, who transmits it to the Academic Senate. The Senate office then distributes final copies to relevant parties, including the department/program, dean, Academic Affairs, and University Archives.

IV. TIMELINES FOR DEPARTMENT REVIEWS (years are calendar, not academic years)

Year One

April

Academic Affairs notifies Departments/Programs that Self-Studies are due to the College Dean on April 1 of the following year, and must be forwarded to the Academic Senate office by May 1.

May

Chairs of the Graduate and Planning and Educational Policies Council conduct workshops for Departments/Programs and Colleges. Representatives of Institutional Research and the University Library are included in the workshops.

May – August

Department/Program arranges design, sends and receives Alumni Survey (in cooperation with Institutional Research if desired).

September

Institutional Research conducts workshops and distributes statistical data to Departments and Programs preparing for review.

September – March

Department/Program prepares self-study report:

1. Data from alumni surveys is summarized.
2. Department/Program writes Self-Study Report.
3. Department/Program faculty approves Self-Study Report.

Year Two

April 1

Department/Program submits Self-Study Report & Executive Summary to College Dean for review.

May 1

College submits copies of reviewed Self-Study and Executive Summary to Academic Senate Office.

May

Department/Program works with Academic Affairs in identifying potential external reviewers for those programs not undergoing accreditation review.

June

Academic Affairs selects and contacts external reviewers.

September – November

1. External Review occurs with reports submitted to Academic Affairs.
2. Department/Program submits written response to External Review to Academic Affairs via the College Dean. Copies are provided to the Graduate and PEP Councils.

February – May

1. Internal Review (with input from External Reviewer's Report) is completed by subcommittee of the Graduate and/or PEP Council. Reports are made to the Councils.
2. Academic Senate files a copy of the report and distributes copies to Academic Affairs and University Archives.
3. Department/Program submits a written response to the internal report to Graduate or PEP Council with a copy to Academic Affairs.

Year Three, Fall

1. Department/Program meets with Dean/Director, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Associate Vice President(s) to finalize agreement on recommended actions.
2. Academic Affairs files report with Chancellor's Office.

V. REVIEW OF NEW DEGREES

After a new degree has been approved and implemented, it is reviewed three years following implementation to assess progress against the implementation proposal. Review is not required for new options under existing degrees, changes to existing degrees, or for non-degree programs such as minors or certificates. The review is conducted by a subcommittee of the Graduate Council (for new masters or doctoral programs) or Planning and Educational Policies Council (for new baccalaureate programs.) Academic Affairs will notify programs of pending review in April of the third year of operation. The Department/Program compiles a report during the fall semester of the fourth year of operation that is due no later than the last day of the fall semester. This report should include three sections. Specifically, the department should:

1. Attach a copy of the proposal that was approved for implementation.
2. Describe any changes that have occurred in the program since it was implemented. Consider the areas addressed in the implementation proposal, including the mission and goals of the program, structure of the curriculum, resources used to support the program, and faculty members who participate in the program. If changes have occurred in program requirements or admissions criteria, include the current catalog copy. Provide the rationale for any changes indicated. If no changes have occurred, so indicate.
3. Assess the program to date. Report on the number of majors currently in the program, the number of graduates, activities of graduates, anticipated growth of the program, adequacy of resources, and other aspects, including problems encountered since implementation, that are relevant to the functioning of the program. If problems have been encountered, describe steps taken to remedy them. Describe any recommendations for changes in the program identified since implementation.

The total length of the report, excluding the original proposal, should not exceed 5 pages.

Following completion of the program report, the appropriate Council reviews the new program. This review occurs in the Spring semester of the fourth academic year of implementation. The reports from the Department and the Council are forwarded to Academic Affairs.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. May the Department/Program use the Accreditation Report for our Self-Study Report?

No. Accreditation reports generally do not see all University needs or address the eight categories mentioned in the "Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major." In some cases the accreditation report may be easily adapted to the University's format.

2. Must the Department/Program provide separate Self-Studies for its undergraduate and graduate programs?

Not necessarily. The policy says if the department/program has both graduate and undergraduate programs under review then the department/program has the option of preparing a separate report for each program (maximum of 30 pages each or of preparing a single combined self-study with a maximum length of 45 pages.

3. If the Department/Program receives a delay in its program review, does this alter the date for subsequent reviews?

Not necessarily. The Program Review Process for the University is mandated by the Chancellor's Office and their Review Calendar. Therefore, in most cases, if the department/program is unable to meet the deadline and receives approval for a delay in the due date for the current self study, the calendar for the subsequent review cycle is unaffected. However, in unusual cases where delays in reviews are beyond the control of the department/program, the dates for the subsequent review cycle may be moved forward as well.

4. Must the Department/Program answer every question listed in Chapter 4 of "Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major"? If not, is the Department/Program responsible for the other unanswered questions?

Chapter 4 includes nearly 200 questions organized into eight categories. Departments must address all eight categories but are not required to answer every question individually. Within each category, all of the bulleted questions must normally be answered. Each bulleted question has one or more additional questions that will need to be addressed to provide a complete answer to the bulleted question, but may not require a separate response. If the Internal Review Team believes that some of the questions were not adequately addressed, it will ask the Department/Program to provide the missing information.

5. Does the Department/Program really have to write a Self-Study?

Yes. The findings of Program Reviews are required by the Chancellor's Office. The goal of this process is to improve programs. The findings are also reflected in tenure track hiring and budget decisions.

6. How is the Internal Review Team selected?

Each Council (PEP and Graduate) select members to serve on their Internal Review Teams each year. The practice is to assign a three person team, none of whom are members of the Department/Program being reviewed.

7. Who actually writes the Self-Study?

This should be an undertaking by all faculty, including the department/program chair. A smaller steering committee may be employed to assist in compiling and editing of the final report. The final version must be approved by the Department/Program as a whole.

8. Should Department/Program read "Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major" in its entirety?

The entire document offers valuable information about the nature of program assessment and places the questions in Chapter 4 in context. Ideally, program review includes opportunities for Departments/Programs to engage in planning and to develop strategies for program improvement. A reading of the entire document will help the Department/Program to get the most benefit from the process.