



Cleveland State University

Handbook for Program Review:

Cleveland State University's Self-Study Process for Growth and Change

Spring 2005

Program Review Task Force Team

Mittie Olion Chandler, Director, Urban Child Research Center

Leo Jeffres, CRC Director, School of Communication (Chair)

Gitanjali Kaul, Vice Provost, Planning, Assessment and Information Resource Mngmt.

Lily Ng, Professor, Chemistry, College of Science

James McLoughlin, Dean, College of Education and Human Services

Table of Contents

Chapter 1.....	2
Introduction	2
Historical Perspective	2
CSU’s Self-study Process is Grounded in Principles of Efficiency and Flexibility.....	2
CSU’s Mission for Program Review	3
The Program Review Process – New Options	4
Mandatory 5-7 Year Cycle.....	4
Unit of Analysis for Program Review.....	4
Three Program Review Options.....	4
Follow-up to Program Review: How Review Findings Will Be Used on Campus	4
Relationship between Program Review and the Budget Model Adopted in 2003-04.....	5
Relationship between Program Review and Strategic Planning	5
Relationship between Program Review and Assessment.....	5
Chapter 2.....	7
Traditional Comprehensive Program Review.....	7
Eligibility	7
Program Review Calendar and Implementation Processes.....	7
Scheduling Program Review.....	7
Establishing Program Review Committees.....	7
Review Process and Scheduling	8
Program Review Committee Proceedings	9
Faculty Senate Review of Self-studies and Program Review Committee’s Findings.....	9
Follow-up to Program Review.....	10
Program Review Committee Role and Responsibilities	10
The Program Review Committee Report.....	10
Role of University Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council in Providing Feedback on Program Review Findings.....	11
Role of External Consultants	11
Selection of External Consultant.....	11
Orientation for Units Preparing Self-studies.....	12
Chapter 3.....	13
Self Study Guidelines	13
Traditional Option Departmental Self Study Guidelines	13
I. Purposes, Goals, and Objectives.....	13
II. Curriculum and Program Quality	13
III. Faculty	14
IV. Students	14
V. Assessment.....	15
VI. Resource Support.....	15
Special Emphasis Self-Study Option.....	17
Eligibility	17
Selected Topics for Areas of Special Emphasis.....	18
Review Process and Scheduling	18
Common Theme Option:	19
Review of Several Units Based on a Common Theme	19
Eligibility	19
Review Process and Scheduling	19
APPENDICES	20

Chapter 1

Introduction

Cleveland State University's (CSU's) Handbook for Program Review - 2004 brings together, in one publication, all the relevant information that currently exists on program review process, procedure and guidelines. This book is not only designed to be a helpful reference which captures the current Faculty Senate approved practices as they relate to the review process, but also to shed some light on the rationale behind adopting these guidelines. Where possible, the handbook includes samples of suggested best practices that can be used by faculty or departments undergoing review or by others engaged in assessing self-studies.

A key issue in reinstating program reviews after a one-year moratorium in 2003 was that the campus makes a commitment to providing clear and systematic follow-up for findings that result from the review process. This handbook is prepared with special attention to follow-up of reviews, and other considerations of CSU's unique history and traditions.

Historical Perspective

Early beginnings of program review at Cleveland State University can be traced back to 1978 when Faculty Senate approved the creation of a University Curriculum Review Committee and charged it with the review of academic programs. A year later the Senate approved a self-study questionnaire and review statement. By early 1980 the campus had established a program review schedule. For a complete history of programs reviewed in since then see Appendix A, p. 20.

CSU's Self-study Process is Grounded in Principles of Efficiency and Flexibility

A principal aim of this implementation has been to assure that the process is efficient, flexible and supportive, and listed below are some of the strategies for achieving these objectives.

- Program reviews shall be efficient in drawing on existing committees. Plans for reviews will take into account strategic planning needs, accreditation schedules and processes, and the university mission.
- Program reviews shall be flexible in allowing for reviews tailored to the needs of programs and the university rather than requiring a uniform review for all units.
- Reviews shall be supportive in providing useful information about problems but also in providing units with the opportunity to demonstrate their needs and opportunities and make cases for additional resources.

CSU's Mission for Program Review

Significant institutional resources are devoted to academic program review on campus, and it is important for all engaged in this effort to have a clear understanding of why we review programs. Accreditation agencies and the Ohio Board of Regents require us to engage in systematic review. However, the University conducts these required reviews with an eye towards accountability and a need for creating conditions that stimulate introspection, program planning, and a climate for reaching progressively higher standards of excellence in each department and curricular area. Following are some of the key reasons for engaging in Program Review at CSU:

External

- The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association and the Ohio Board of Regents require member institutions to engage in program review.

Internal

- Reviews provide a time for reflection in which the departments undertaking this exercise have an opportunity to carefully observe how their program works and to prioritize their needs based on their strengths and weaknesses.
- Reviews facilitate connections between the most recent developments in the field and programmatic aspirations, and provide faculty and administrators with a sense of stewardship in capitalizing on emerging opportunities.
- Reviews open up opportunities for exploring connections between existing curricular structures of the major within the department, and other disciplines, as well as with political, ethical and social aspects of liberal learning.
- Reviews become an occasion for collective faculty discussions regarding administrative support, rewards, recognition, scholarship in the field, advising, funds for faculty development, space, etc., that can be used for determining strategic direction.
- Departmental reviews provide a basis for University-wide decisions.
- Reviews provide opportunities for external visibility for the unit undergoing review in that the findings often highlight discipline-specific needs and other differences in governance of departments within sciences, humanities and professional programs. These differences help to sensitize the University community in recognizing and addressing unique departmental needs in constructive ways.

Successful integration of program review into the overall planning process of the institution depends on a number of factors. The review process must fit the campus environment; it must be supported by the interest and leadership of key personnel; the review policies must be straightforward and must adhere to principles of good practice. The current policies reflected in this handbook build on what we know about creating a useful framework for program review and on CSU's past experiences in implementing reviews since 1978. The new guidelines are developed on realistic assumptions of what can and cannot be achieved through the review process.

The Program Review Process – New Options

Mandatory 5-7 Year Cycle

All CSU academic programs are required to undergo program review on a 5-7 year review cycle.

Unit of Analysis for Program Review

Traditionally, the unit of analysis at CSU has been the academic department in larger schools or colleges, a combination of departments supporting a single degree or academic program, smaller colleges as a whole, or other credit generating units. Program review as currently defined can still be conducted using any of these units of analysis as appropriate.

Three Program Review Options

Beginning with 2004, the scope of program review is adapted to include more flexibility by including the following three options for conducting reviews:

- **Traditional Comprehensive Program Review** – a conventional review of an entire department/unit following established guidelines
- **Special Emphasis Self-study Option** – a review focused on a particular theme or subunit
- **Common Theme Option** – a review of several units focused on a common theme

For each of these options documentation is provided below on topics such as who is eligible, how reviews are scheduled, the report format and review process and follow-up.

Option	Eligibility	Scheduling	Report Format	Evaluation and Follow-up
Traditional (p. 12)	No external accreditation	5-7 yr. minimum or at Dean's discretion	To follow self-study guidelines	Implementation through Provost, Dean and Chair
	Has not had a review for many years			
	New program			
	Unit request			
Special Emphasis (p. 16)	Designed for programs with accreditation	5-7 yr. minimum or at Dean's discretion	To be approved at time of scheduling	Implementation through Provost, Dean and Chair
Common Theme (p. 18)	Designed for programs administered through multiple departments	Based on need	To be approved at time of scheduling	Implementation through Provost, Dean and Chair

Follow-up to Program Review: How Review Findings Will Be Used on Campus

The strongest criticism of program review at CSU has been that the results of reviews have little or no effect on decisions on campus, so the investment of time and resources seem for naught. It is important to develop procedures to ensure that the results of reviews are introduced systematically into planning and budgeting at multiple levels. To accomplish this, a two-pronged strategy involving the direct engagement of those individuals with direct and indirect responsibility for overseeing implementation is outlined below.

Immediately following the submission of review findings to the Provost, the Provost will initiate a series of meetings with the department chair/director, dean, and vice provost of Planning, Assessment and Information Resource Management (PAIRM) to develop a memorandum of agreement clarifying steps for follow-up and assignment of responsibility for each planned activity. The purpose of these meetings, which will culminate in a written document, will be to (1) create an opportunity to clarify expectations regarding the outcome of the review, (2) discuss potential links between the review findings and decision making in the future, and (3) identify strategies that allow the conclusion of the review to be used fruitfully at the department, college, and campus level. See Appendix B, p. 21 for a template to develop a memorandum of agreement.

Relationship between Program Review and the Budget Model Adopted in 2003-04

Whatever the particulars of the budget model and the revenue sharing practices adopted on campus, there must be a clear link between program review and resource allocation. Connecting review findings to resource allocation entails clarification of the shared responsibilities of the Provost, dean, and department chair. Under the 2004 budget model, the deans and chairs retain a larger share of their unit's marginal earnings, and, consequently, have a larger role and greater flexibility in addressing review recommendations. The Provost has responsibility for providing follow-up of review findings, particularly in those cases where recommendations cross disciplinary or college boundaries. Approved recommendations that require permanent reallocations, as opposed to one-time funding, may have to be implemented over an extended period of time, and competing claims on resources will need to be prioritized on the basis of discussions between Provost, Dean and Department Chair. The program review process is a means for formalizing and recording the results of these discussions.

Not all program review findings have budget implications alone. They may entail shifts in programmatic emphasis, improvement of support services, new linkages or synergies with other departments or with related programs in other colleges, or modification of administrative arrangements.

Relationship between Program Review and Strategic Planning

In December 2004 the Faculty Senate approved a strategic planning process proposed by the President's University Planning Steering Committee. Implementation of this strategic planning process started immediately following the approval by the Senate. This new process states that academic program review will be carried out through the procedures and guidelines established in this handbook. The results and findings stemming from academic program review will be reported to University Curriculum Committee (UCC), which will, in turn, report these findings, along with relevant comments, to the newly established Strategic Planning Committee (SPC). The findings and decisions emerging from the academic program review process will thus provide valuable input to strategic planning.

Relationship between Program Review and Assessment

A close link exists between the traditional Program Review and CSU's Assessment program. Departments reviewed under the traditional program review are required under Section V of the Self-Study Guidelines to prepare a report on the

program's specific goals for student learning, evidence that these goals were being met in the prior 5 to 7 years, and a discussion of how information about learning is used to guide curricular decisions. All CSU academic and student service units are required to participate in the campus Assessment program, which mandates that units provide ongoing annual accounts of their assessment practices. Participating in the campus Assessment program for 5 to 7 years will generate the information needed under the Assessment section of Program Review Self-Study Guidelines. Annual assessment reports submitted to the Office of Student Learning Assessment are summarized for the self-study developed under program review.

Chapter 2

Traditional Comprehensive Program Review

Eligibility

A comprehensive program review, which is the most common form of review in CSU's mandatory 7-year review cycle for all academic units, is appropriate for programs that do not undergo disciplinary accreditation through external agencies. It is also the appropriate form of review for new programs, or for any program that requests such a review.

Departments and schools may self nominate their units for review. In addition, the Provost, college deans, and senate committees may nominate units for review.

Program Review Calendar and Implementation Processes

Scheduling Program Review

Using the current Program Review schedule as a basis, a 5-year plan of program review is developed by Vice Provost for Planning Assessment and Information Resource Management (PAIRM) through consultation with the college deans, and departments and schools. The plan is made available for consideration by all the units before it is adopted as a guide and implemented starting in the spring of 2005. In the spring of each subsequent year, an additional year will be added to the plan, subject to changes in needs of the units and the university.

Revisions to an existing schedule need to be addressed to the Vice Provost (PAIRM). The request should provide justification for the change and evidence of support from the applicable dean's office. A transition in the chair's position alone is not considered sufficient grounds for delaying program review.

The evolving 5-year plan and subsequent revisions will identify the bases for program review and the nature of the review.

Establishing Program Review Committees

By August 30 each undergraduate college shall establish a Program Review Committee consisting of four to six faculty members. The membership of this committee will be composed of the following:

- 1 Member representing UCC
- 1 Appointee of the College Curriculum Committee
- 1 Appointee of the Dean of the Undergraduate College
- 1 Elected member of the Graduate Council (for programs with graduate components)
- 1 Appointee of the Dean of Graduate College (for programs with graduate components)
- 1 External consultant selected for units with programs without any external accreditation; 2 such consultants for units with doctoral or other programs with sufficient diversity in their specialized offerings. The external consultant provides a written report to the committee but is not a voting member of the committee.

The chair of this group is elected by the committee members. The Dean of the Graduate College and Graduate Council will be encouraged to appoint members from outside the program and college being reviewed, but within the University.

Review Process and Scheduling

Late Spring Activities: April – May of year prior to submission of self studies.

- Vice Provost for Planning, Assessment and Information Resource Management (PAIRM) notifies department chairs and deans of upcoming program reviews and provides information regarding program review process, procedures and guidelines by April 15.
- Vice Provost (PAIRM) submits a request to Dean's offices, UCC, Graduate Council, and Graduate Dean to identify Program Review Committee members according to guidelines specified in the section on Establishing Program Review Committees. Names of individuals nominated for the Program Review Committee are to be submitted to Vice Provost (PAIRM) by August 30.
- Units undergoing review form self-study teams comprised of 3 to 4 members including chairs, directors and other full-time faculty.
- Vice Provost (PAIRM) schedules a comprehensive, half-day orientation session for self-study teams by April 20, during which programs receive all centrally collected program data required to prepare a self-study. This session provides opportunities to request additional data/statistics from the Office of Institutional Research and also to learn about most frequently asked questions regarding the review process and procedure. (See Orientation for Units Preparing Self-studies, p. 11)
- The self study team and dean of the college meet in May to identify key issues to be addressed through the review process and determine a list of 3 to 4 external experts in the field who would qualify as appropriate candidates for selection as external consultants to Program Review Committee. For selection of external consultants, see p. 10. Nominations for external consultants and names of self-study team members for each program being reviewed are submitted by Deans to the Vice Provost's (PAIRM) office by May 30th.
- If departments, particularly those with 9-month chairs, undergoing review want to utilize the summer months in developing their self-studies then they should submit requests for summer support stipends to their Dean's office.

Fall Activities: Steps Leading to the Development and Submission of Self-studies

- Self-studies developed in accordance with guidelines provided in Chapter 3, p. 12 shall be completed by October 30. If a department is unable to complete the review in time because of extenuating circumstances, it may appeal to the Vice Provost (PAIRM) for an extension.
- The final report on a self-study shall be reviewed and approved by the department's faculty before it is submitted to the Program Review Committee.
- In addition to the self-study document, each selected department shall compile a list of their courses that carry a university general education nomination. For each course, a syllabus plus other information where appropriate shall be provided to UCC by October 30 to allow the UCC to decide whether the course will continue with the nomination(s) that it currently has. Please refer to the General Education Nomination

forms for the information required.

- An electronic file containing each self-study as well as 8 copies of all hardcopy attachments of the self-study are due in the Vice Provost (PAIRM)'s office by October 30.

Program Review Committee Proceedings

- Program Review Committees will begin to convene their meetings by late August and prepare to receive the self-studies, learn about the review process and their role, meet with the college dean if needed and begin interacting with the external consultants and department chairs undergoing review to schedule the site-visit.
- Review of self-studies begins after October 30 and external consultant site visits occur during November - January.
- The external consultant's itinerary and program for the site visit is prepared by the Chair of the College Program Review Committee in consultation with the Chair of the Department being reviewed.
- During the site visit the external consultant and the Program Review Committee will meet with chairs/directors, faculty, student and, where possible, alumni groups or visiting committees. They will tour facilities and, where possible, visit external sites where departmental programs are delivered.
- Within two weeks of completion of the site visit, the external consultant provides a written report to the Program Review Committee and the program under review, which then finalizes its committee report, which is completed and forwarded to the UCC and, in the case of graduate programs, to Graduate Council, along with the external consultant's report by March 1.
- The final report of the Program Review Committee is forwarded to Vice Provost (PAIRM). At this point the Program Review Committee has completed its charge. Vice Provost (PAIRM) first forwards the review reports from the committee and consultant to the chair/director for comments and after receiving their comments forwards all three documents to the appropriate dean for his/her comments.
- Program review findings and reports are shared with all relevant parties: i.e.: departments, deans, the Provost, UCC, Graduate Council, etc.

Faculty Senate Review of Self-studies and Program Review Committee's Findings

- If the department under review has a graduate program, the Program Review Committee report and accompanying self-studies, as well as the departmental response to the Program Review Committee Report, are also forwarded to Graduate Council for its review by March 1.
- The Program Review Committee Report and accompanying self-studies, as well as the departmental response to the Program Review Committee Report and Graduate Council's comments, are forwarded to University Curriculum Committee by April 1 for transmission to the University Steering Committee (SPC) and Faculty Senate.
- A folder containing the Program Review Committee Report, External consultant report, responses from Dean, chair/director, UCC and from Graduate Council becomes available in the Provost's office by May 1; the stage is then set for program review follow-up to begin.

Follow-up to Program Review

- Once all the above mentioned reports are received the Provost will initiate a meeting with the dean, chair/director, and Vice Provost (PAIRM) to address each review finding. The Provost, dean and chair/director will develop a written memorandum of agreement concerning any actions to be taken in response to the review and their individual responsibilities vis-à-vis each finding. For more information on purpose of these meetings and mechanisms employed to insure follow-up, see *Follow-Up to Program Review*, p. 4.
- SPC will continue to be updated on follow-up of individual department reviews for up to 2 years.

Program Review Committee Role and Responsibilities

The Program Review Committee will carefully examine the self-study document and review it for accuracy, reliability and validity. The committee will focus its work to allow findings to be developed to address various review criteria. Commonly addressed review criteria include such things as program quality, need, demand, delivery, cost, etc. Among other things, the committee assesses the extent to which a department is meeting its objectives, which activities affect its programs, what the program looks like from a variety of perspectives and the extent to which it is effective. The work of this committee adds to the institutional knowledge of a department by complementing and extending the information found in a self-study. The committee also provides formative and summative evaluation leading to growth and change in each program.

The Program Review Committee will coordinate one and a half day site-visits for external consultants. In preparing schedules for site-visits, the committee works in consultation with chairs/directors to schedule meetings with program faculty, students, and advisory groups. The Vice Provost (PAIRM) provides funding and logistical support for inviting reviewers to campus.

The Program Review Committee Report

The work of Program Review Committee concludes with the submission to Vice Provost (PAIRM) of its report consisting of the following:

1. A Program Review Report Cover Sheet (Appendix C, p. 22)
2. A five to seven page report evaluating the self-study based on information assembled and synthesized through its committee deliberations. A key function of the report is to communicate a general evaluation of the program, which is based as much on experience and judgment of its committee members as it is on quantitative indicators.
3. Rating Sheet for Program Review Committee (Appendix D, p. 23)
4. Undergraduate Executive Summary by Program Review Committee (Appendix E, p. 24)
5. Graduate Executive Summary by Program Review Committee (Appendix F, p. 25)

Role of University Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council in Providing Feedback on Program Review Findings

UCC will receive the Program Review Committee Reports from Vice Provost (PAIRM) for transmission to Senate, and in instances where reviewed programs have a graduate component these reports will be forwarded to Graduate Council as well. In transmitting these reports to Senate, UCC should identify recommendations that require the approval of Senate committees and make recommendations as appropriate. The purpose of forwarding these reviews to the Senate groups is to inform them of the findings and to seek their feedback. This can be accomplished by expanding on certain recommendations, supporting some initiatives, or suggesting a change in direction with others. The Graduate Council may also take into account the results of program reviews in its deliberations concerning graduate policies and direction of graduate education at CSU.

The feedback from UCC and Graduate Council should not be longer than 2 pages, focus on the review findings, and be prepared within two months of reviewing the Program Review Reports. This feedback should be forwarded to Vice Provost (PAIRM).

Role of External Consultants

The external consultant's role is to serve as a content expert in the discipline being reviewed. The other committee members turn to the external consultant for information about current trends in the discipline and opportunities for external funding. They also look to him/her for two key comparisons: where the program being reviewed is in comparison to departments in other universities that have similar mission, demographics, and funding base; and, a critique of how the program measures up in relation to those departments who are at a higher level of functioning, i.e. aspirational peers. Consultants will be sent a copy of Appendix D to guide them regarding their role.

Selection of External Consultant

The dean of a college shall consult with department faculty and the chair/director of the unit being reviewed. Faculty shall identify and submit to their chair/director a list of four candidates--ranked in the order of preference--who would be appropriate to serve in the role of an external consultant for a unit. The chair/director may add additional comments and shall forward the list of candidates to the dean of the college.

The following information is needed for each external consultant nominated by the department undergoing review:

Required information:

1. Name, address, phone number, email address, and web site information, if a web site is available.
2. A brief description on no more than 2 to 3 sentences on how the reviewer was selected for recommendation by the department.
3. Why each recommended reviewer represents a "good-fit" in reviewing the CSU department. For example, does the nominated individual have experience with units similar to CSU's in scope and size? Does the person have a background in

- developing or overseeing a department with the same mix of graduate and undergraduate programs offered in the department? Or, perhaps the reviewer has a background in an area in which a CSU department wants to grow, and the reason for nominating him/her is that the reviewer will provide expertise needed for moving the department to the next level of excellence.
4. Any prior professional or personal relationships that department members have with the individual being nominated.
 5. Whether the nominated reviewer may be in a position of competing with the department, which would disqualify him/her from being a reviewer for us?

Optional Information:

1. A vita for each individual being nominated.

Orientation for Units Preparing Self-studies

Vice Provost for PAIRM and Director of Institutional Research will offer a half-day orientation sessions for all program chairs/coordinators preparing self-studies during April/May prior to when their self-studies are due. These orientation sessions will create an opportunity for learning about the University review process and how to use it effectively to advance the goals of each program. Vice Provost for PAIRM will explain the types of activities, information needs, and deadlines involved in successfully completing a review. During this session program chairs/coordinators will benefit from hearing about the issues and concerns of their colleagues who are also preparing self-studies.

A complete dataset on all institutionally collected information on the programs being reviewed shall be assembled by the Office of Institutional Research to provide information about enrollment, majors, productivity, resources available, past assessments and reviews. During the orientation session, programs will have opportunities to review their data and ask questions regarding its accuracy. The attendees will also be able to as request new reports or existing reports in new formats at any time leading up to the submission of the self-study.

Chapter 3

Self Study Guidelines

Traditional Option Departmental Self Study Guidelines

A self-study must be prepared by each department under review.¹ Following is a description of what should be included in each section of the self-study. Also included are questions to be used as guidelines in completing the document. Departments may include other information they deem relevant to the self study. **Note: Not all questions will be pertinent to all programs; write a brief, coherent narrative for each section, using the applicable questions as guidelines. The self-studies are to be no more than 12 pages long.**

Please list each program offered by the Department and provide the requested information about each. If the information provided is common to programs within a department, please state this in appropriate places in the self-study.

I. Purposes, Goals, and Objectives

This section contains a brief statement of the philosophies, goals, and academic objectives of the academic program(s) under review, as well as a brief description of the program(s). This section of the self-study document should also contain a discussion of how those responsible for the program ascertain that the goals, objectives, and purposes are being met. There should also be a brief discussion of the ways in which the program serves the needs of its constituency, of the relationship of the program to the goals and objectives of the university, and of the interrelationship of the program to other programs in the University.

1. What programs does your Department offer? What are the primary purposes, goals, and objectives of the programs? How do they relate to students', society's, and/or the community's needs?
2. How well is each program meeting its primary goals and objectives? How is this determined?
3. What educational objectives are being considered for the program in the future, and what resources would be required to support those objectives?

How does the program contribute to the full range of the University's instructional needs: service, undergraduate, graduate, evening, weekend, etc.?

II. Curriculum and Program Quality

Describe the curriculum offered by your department and explain how well it fits the department's goals and programs. In doing so consider the following questions:

1. What are the major features of the curriculum offered by your department? Of your department's curriculum?

¹Interdisciplinary programs will also be reviewed. The procedures for the reviews of such programs are to be worked out among the Director of the Program, its Curriculum Committee or its equivalent, and the Program Review Committee(s) and dean(s) of the College(s) in which such programs reside.

2. In what ways does your curriculum relate to the programs and service functions offered by your department?
3. What are the current national trends in your discipline and to what extent do your department's instructional and research activities match those trends?
4. What recent, ongoing, or planned curriculum revision is occurring in your department and what is the rationale supporting it?
5. To what extent does the program contribute to the instruction of students in other undergraduate and graduate programs at Cleveland State University? In what other undergraduate or graduate programs does your department play a key role?
6. If the program or any of its components is subject to outside accreditation, what have been the results? Has the program become stronger or weaker since the last accreditation? In what ways? What is the evidence?

III. Faculty

This section should describe the characteristics of the faculty in your Department. Include evidence of teaching quality in your programs. Include evidence of research, creative/scholarly activity, publications, external funding, and University and professional service, and include information on how much time is spent by faculty on research, scholarship/ creative activities, and on University and professional service. Include information on special awards, external research funding, and activities. As a supplement attach brief (no more than three pages) curriculum vitae from each of your faculty members. As a guideline use the following questions:

1. How well do the expertise, education, and numbers of the departmental faculty match the needs of the programs it offers? In what ways, if any, does the faculty need to be augmented to strengthen existing programs or to respond to current trends in your discipline?
2. How many of the faculty are engaged in productive scholarly/research and creative activities, and how is productivity measured? How does the scholarly/creative activity of the faculty (as reflected in the production of articles, books, performances, etc.) compare to that of peer institutions?
3. What are the internal and external sources of support for the program's scholarly, research, and creative activities? Is this pattern typical of the discipline, and if it is not typical, how are the differences explained?
4. How is effective teaching identified, supported, and rewarded?
5. What is the average teaching load in this program?
6. What is the average number of students in the courses?
7. What university, community, and professional service contributions do the faculty in this program make?
8. How do these various types of service contribute to the goals and/or functioning of the University?

IV. Students

Included in this section should be information on the proportion of entering students who complete the degree program, the involvement of students in projects with applications beyond the classroom, and the types of positions obtained by graduating students. Describe the assistance provided in the areas of academic advising for undergraduate and graduate students. Also describe the supervision of dissertation and thesis research, independent study, and practice for graduate students. Information on internships and field experience for both undergraduate and graduate students should be provided when

appropriate. An analysis of the demand for those graduating from the program should also be included. The following questions may be helpful:

1. How is academic advising provided for the program, and how effective are the processes? How could advising be improved?
2. What percentage of entering students complete the degree program? What is the rationale for this figure?
3. What pertinent honors and awards have been won by students in the program or by graduates of the program?
4. How many students in the program are involved in internships, co-op, field placement, etc.? Please describe the range of activities and their relationship to the program.
5. To what extent are graduates of the program successful in obtaining positions appropriate to the level of their education, training, and ability, and what is the evidence?
6. What assistance is provided to help students find suitable employment or opportunities for further study?
7. Are students in the program continuing and succeeding in graduate and professional study?

V. *Assessment*

Information should include a list of the program's specific goals for student learning, evidence that the goals are being met, and discussion of how information about student learning is being used to guide curriculum development or budget decisions. The following questions may be helpful:

1. What are the specific goals and objectives for student learning in the program major?
2. How do the courses in the program relate to the program goals and objectives for learning? (course syllabi, evaluations, and other materials may be helpful in documenting the relationship)
3. What methods and practices are used in assessing student learning in the program (for example, standardized tests or licensing exams, student portfolios, capstone projects, performance in courses, alumni surveys, etc.)?
4. What evidence has been developed to show the effectiveness of the program in meeting its goals for student learning?
5. How is information about student learning outcomes used in planning, budget processes, or other program development activities?

VI. *Resource Support*

Discuss the strengths and limitations of the library holdings in the program under review. Also discuss how library acquisitions are determined to meet the needs in this particular program. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the technological support, the facilities, and the staff support for this program.

A. Library

1. To what extent does the library have sufficient resources to support current academic activities and provide for future activities?

2. To what extent do the budget resources support the purchase of or access to the necessary range of library materials for current and for future academic activities?
3. To what extent are the materials in the collections readily available and accessible to meet the needs to students in the program?
4. To what extent are necessary services--e.g. access to copy machines, inter-library loans, access to data bases, computers, etc.--readily available to faculty and students?

B. Technology

C. In what ways is technology incorporated into your program?

D. To what extent are the technology resources available adequate for your program's needs?

E. What specific technological limitations need to be addressed and how can they be improved?

F. Other Support--Facilities, Travel, Staff, etc.

1. To what extent does the program have enough office and classroom space to accomplish its goals? Are the offices and classrooms properly equipped? What, if any, improvements are needed?
2. To what extent are the physical space and facilities provided for graduate students adequate?
3. To what extent are adequate numbers of properly equipped laboratories available?
4. To what extent are the telephone, copying, and other allowances adequate to support faculty in their professional activities? To what extent do faculty have sufficient travel allowance support to attend seminars and conferences?
5. To what extent are there enough support staff to support both faculty and students?

VII. *Statistical Trends Analysis* Insofar as data are available and the information is not already provided above, write an analysis of statistical trends in the program for the last three years. Consider such things as the following: student credit hour production at various levels, number of full-time faculty vs. number of part-time faculty, number of students enrolled in the program, the average annual number of graduates (if applicable), graduation rates (if applicable), number of students involved in internships, co-op, field placement, etc. Include an analysis of any other statistical information available which sheds light on the programs current state and likely future directions.

Special Emphasis Self-Study Option

Starting in 2004, the special emphasis self-study option is made available to departments who wish to eliminate the duplication of effort involved in preparing a self-study for a professional accreditation as well as for CSU's internal program review. The new option is designed to go beyond accreditation in realizing a department's full potential. The orientation of accreditation agencies is one of stipulating compliance with minimum standards. Typically, language capturing the essence of accreditation is along the lines of meeting general institutional requirements or standards that apply to all programs, irrespective of their resources, or experiences in fulfilling unique educational needs. The new special emphasis option will give the department or college credit for successfully completing a round of accreditation review. However, the department will be invited to explore, within the context of CSU's program review, its unique opportunities and challenges that may only be of cursory interest to accrediting agencies. Using the special emphasis option for review will pave the way for aligning a department or program's goals with the strategic direction adopted by the college, and the university as a whole. One example of differences in accreditation vs. internal priorities is CSU's need to affirm its responsiveness to the complex issues of its urban community through teaching and research. An emphasis such as this and many others may be outside the sphere of accreditation.

In other instances where a program has completed an accreditation review, the data compiled for the initial dossier may show that a particular weakness deserves attention or that a particular strength provides an opportunity for growth given sufficient resources; in these cases, the self study may focus on a single theme.

This new feature of program review at CSU has been adapted from NCA's Existing Practices Regarding Institutional Improvement (1997).

Eligibility

This option is available as an alternative to the traditional program review to academic programs that meet one of the following conditions: (1) are accredited through professional or specialized accreditation agencies outside the university; or (2) are well-functioning CSU departments that are willing to commit serious attention to a select group of critical issues in order to strengthen the quality of their programs. The option of engaging in a focused review is not for everyone; however, some departments may be able to seize this opportunity to build their self-study around a small number of carefully selected critical areas in which they want to improve.

A special emphasis review is approved by the Provost on the recommendation of the Dean of the college in which the program resides, and the Vice Provost for Planning, Assessment and Information Resource Management (PAIRM). A department contemplating such a review should contact the Vice Provost early in the planning process for assistance in judging whether such an option is appropriate for their unit, and if it is, in discussing potential topics for focused study. Once the department decides to pursue this option it needs to submit documentation that confirms that there is a strong consensus among the department's faculty and dean regarding the selected areas of

emphasis as being appropriate, timely, and among the most critical issues faced by the department.

Selected Topics for Areas of Special Emphasis

A program review with a special emphasis can be limited to particular themes or subunits, e.g., a curricular sequence, a graduate program, advising, or recruitment. This type of program review may be warranted for units that have recently undergone external review for accreditation. In such instances, data compiled for the initial dossier may show that a particular weakness deserves attention or that a particular strength provides an opportunity for growth given sufficient resources; in these cases, the CSU special emphasis self-study may focus on a single theme.

The potential special emphasis topics listed in this section reflect actual challenges reported by CSU departments during an exercise on building Academic Unit Profiles in Fall 2003. Following are examples of topics that could be addressed through a focused study:

- Designing new programs, assessing the market for such programs
- Designing interdisciplinary or international programs
- Curriculum realignment, developing new majors or phasing out others
- Strengthening instruction in courses with large enrollment
- Addressing the issues of part-time faculty as it relates to the quality of the programs
- Developing interdisciplinary collaborations in research or instruction
- Developing partnerships with other regional or national universities
- Strategic planning, engaging alumni, advancement, development, promotions, marketing
- Pursuit of external funding
- Coping with rapid enrollment growth or decline
- Strengthening the graduate or undergraduate curriculum or programs
- Developing new electives in the major or strengthening service courses
- Improving student performance – working on quality, rankings or accreditation
- Recruiting majors, developing links with feeder institutions and high schools
- Developing distance or web delivered courses
- Introducing technology or adapting to new technology in the field

Review Process and Scheduling

Like a traditional self-study, the Special Emphasis report would include a well developed report that contains the following: table of contents, an introduction, a body, summary, and appendices. This report will be evaluated by a Program Review Committee in the same manner as a traditional self-study. The policies and procedures that pertain to the scheduling, development and of evaluation of self-study material of traditional CSU program reviews will apply to these reviews as well.

See procedural details under Traditional Option, p. 6, for information about the following: Establishing Program Review Committees, Program Review Committee Proceedings, Faculty Senate Review of Self-studies and Program Review Committee's Findings, and Follow-up to Program Review.

Common Theme Option: Review of Several Units Based on a Common Theme

Under a third option, several units, departments or school, may be reviewed based on a single theme, such as general education requirements, writing across the curriculum, distance education, introducing technology in the curriculum, or the need for adjunct faculty. In some cases, several units may be reviewed for common resources, e.g., all the fine and performing arts in anticipation of a new building or school.

Eligibility

Nominations for review of several units based on a common theme can originate through the following sources: College and University Curriculum Committees, senate committees, deans, provost, or other non-academic units on campus. These nominations should be forwarded to the Provost with a detailed rationale for the request and, list of all programs affected by the review, and, where possible, letters of interest from affected programs. The Provost will consult with all involved programs and seek their input prior to include a theme based review on the review schedule. Such a review is to be approved by the Provost on the recommendation of the Deans of the colleges in which the program resides, and Vice Provost (PAIRM).

Review Process and Scheduling

Like a traditional self-study, the Common Theme report would include a well developed report that contains the following: table of contents, an introduction, body, summary, and appendices. This report will be evaluated by a Program Review Committee in the same manner as a traditional self-study. The policies and procedures that pertain to the scheduling, development and of evaluation of self-study material of traditional CSU program reviews will apply to these reviews as well.

See procedural details under Traditional Option, p. 6, for information about the following: Establishing Program Review Committees, Program Review Committee Proceedings, Faculty Senate Review of Self-studies and Program Review Committee's Findings, and Follow-up to Program Review.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Historical Program Review Schedule.....	20
Appendix B: Memorandum of Agreement Template.....	21
Appendix C: Program Review Report Cover Sheet.....	22
Appendix D: Rating Sheet for the Program Review Committee.....	23
Appendix E: Undergraduate Executive Summary of the Program Review Committee.....	24
Appendix F: Graduate Executive Summary of the Program Review Committee.....	25

Appendix A

Historical Program Review Schedule

Schedule 1979 - 1985

REVIEW YEAR	PROGRAMS
1979 - 80	Anthropology*, Geology*, History*, Mathematics*, Modern Languages*, Philosophy*, Physics*, Religion*
1980 - 81	College of Engineering (Undergraduate)*
1981 - 82	College of Engineering (Graduate)*, College of Education*, College of Business*
1982 - 83	Communication*, First College*, College of Urban Studies*, Master of Public Administration
1983 - 84	Chemistry (incomplete), Economics (incomplete), Evening Division*, Law College (incomplete), Master of Public Administration (continued study), Sociology (incomplete)
1984 - 85	<i>Continuing/In progress: Chemistry, Economics, Law College, Sociology, Political Science. Art, Biology, English, Health Sciences, Music, Nursing, Psychology, Speech and Hearing</i>
1985 - 86	<i>No new reviews - in progress: Biology, Chemistry*, Law*, Political Science*, Psychology*, Sociology.</i>
1986 - 87	<i>No new reviews to facilitate completions of those still in progress: Biology, Sociology.</i>

Data Source 1979-85: Memo to Academic Steering Committee from Paul Olynyk, Chair, UCRC Faculty Council Minutes, Oct. 14, 1979, UCRC (University Curricular Review Committee Report) (Report No. 4, 1982-83) June 1982

Data Source 1985-86: Memo to Faculty Council from Derwood Smith, Chair, UCRC, May 30, 1986, (Annual Report 1985-86)

Data Source 1986-87: Memo to Faculty Council from Elizabeth Cagan, Chair, UCRC, May 30, 1987, (Annual Report 1986-87)

Schedule 1989 - 1998

REVIEW YEAR	PROGRAMS
1989 - 90	Biology (MS, PhD)*
1991 - 92	Counseling, Testing & Health Services (June 1992)*, Career Services (June 1992*), Theatre Arts (June 1992)*, Library, Viking Hall (Dec 1992)*
1992 - 93	MLR*, Graduate College *, Continuing Education*, Physics*
1993 - 94	University Architect Program (Sept 1993)*, Grounds (May 1993)*
1995 - 96	Law (consultant report: Apr 1995)*

Data Source: Memo Program Review Research from Mike Wells, Chair (January 21, 2003)

Schedule 1998 - 2005

REVIEW YEAR	PROGRAMS
1998 - 99	Chemistry, Philosophy, OMS, Health Care, Early Childhood, Community Agency Counseling, Electrical Engineering, Industrial Engineering, JD (Law), Urban Studies
1999 - 00	Electrical Engineering (BS), Urban Studies (MS), Early Childhood Education (BA), Chemistry (BS, MS), Psychology (BA, MA), BGES (BS, MS), Mathematics (BS, MS)
2000 - 01	Anthropology*, First College, History and Social Studies*, Modern Language*, College of Business (all programs), College of Urban Affairs (Urban Studies (Undergrad), MPA) College of Engineering (Civil (Undergrad), Electrical (Masters), College of Education (Curric. & Instruction, Educational Technology)
2001 - 02	Religious Studies, Political Science, Dramatic Arts, Communication
2002 - 03	<i>Moratorium on Program Review for FY03</i>
2003 - 04	Health Sciences*, Physics*, Sociology*
2004 - 05**	Art, Linguistics, Chemistry, Continuing Education

Data Source 1998-99: Memo to Academic Deans, Marsha V. Krotseng, Assoc. Provost (Final Program Review Guidelines) Dec. 15, 1998

Data Source 2000-01: Marie Zeglen, Vice Provost, Status Report FY01

Data Source 2001-02: IR files

Data Source 2002-03: Memo/Chin Y. Kuo, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, April 25 ,2002

Data Source 2003-05: PAIRM files

*Completed reports/self-studies

** Currently in progress

Appendix B

Program Review: 20XX-XX Implementation Agreement

Department of _____

(Based on the xx/xx/xx meeting of Provost, Vice Provost for Planning, Assessment and Information Resource Management, the Dean and Department Chair)

FOLLOW-UP EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program/Unit Name: _____

College Program Review Committee Findings	FOLLOW UP PROVIDED BY:		
	Provost	Dean	Unit Head/Department
<i>Undergraduate</i>			
(1)			
(2)			
(3)			
<i>Graduate</i>			
(1)			
(2)			
(3)			

Appendix D

Rating Sheet for Program Review Committee

EVALUATION OF _____
 (name of department, program, institute, etc.)

PROGRAM TYPE(S): check all that apply

___ Bachelor's degree
 Please specify: ___ BA, ___ BS, _____

___ Graduate degree
 Please specify: ___ Certificate ___ MA, ___ MS, and/or ___ PhD

___ Other
 Please specify: _____

DATE _____

SECTION I.

Please rate each element I – VII below by placing an ‘X’ in the appropriate box. Indicate N/A where applicable.

Program Review Elements	N/A	Exceeds Expectation		Meets Expectation		Fails to Meet Expectation	
		Department Expectations ¹	Broader Expectations ²	Department Expectations ¹	Broader Expectations ²	Department Expectations ¹	Broader Expectations ²
I. Purposes, Goals, and Objectives							
II. Curriculum and Program Quality							
III. Faculty							
IV. Students							
V. Assessment							
VI. Resource Support							
A. Library							
B. Technology							
C. Other Support (facilities, travel, staff, etc.)							
VII. Analysis of Statistical Trends							
Overall Evaluation							

¹Department Expectations are listed in the “Purposes, Goals and Objectives” section of the self-study.

²Broader Expectations are expectations based on the College/University mission, CSU’s location, demographics or other characteristics, and emerging opportunities in the field/discipline being reviewed.

SECTION II.

Comments:

(Please attach additional paper as needed.)

Appendix E

Undergraduate Executive Summary by the Program Review Committee

EVALUATION OF _____
(name of department, program, institute, etc.)

<p><u>PROGRAM TYPE(S):</u> <i>check all that apply</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree Please specify: <input type="checkbox"/> BA, <input type="checkbox"/> BS, <input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other Please specify: _____</p>
--

DATE _____

Commendations:

Concerns:

Recommendations:

Appendix F

Graduate Executive Summary by the Program Review Committee

EVALUATION OF _____
(name of department, program, institute, etc.)

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>PROGRAM TYPE(S): check all that apply</u></p> <p>___ Graduate degree Please specify: ___ Certificate ___ MA, ___ MS, and/or ___ PhD</p> <p>___ Other Please specify: _____</p>

DATE _____

Commendations:

Concerns:

Recommendations: