ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Program Review Timeline

August  Programs notified one year in advance of Self-Study due date.

Sept.  Programs appoint committee and Chair to carry out Self-Study. Programs notify UPRC of Chair and committee members. Chair meets with Associate Vice President for Academic Programs (AVP-AP) to review policies and procedures.

Oct.  Chair and committee members attend UPRC workshop.

Feb.  Chair checks in with UPRC Chair apprising of progress toward completion of the Self-Study and Program Plan.

Sept. 15 Program Committee sends completed Self-Study and Program Plan electronically to UPRC Chair and delivers three complete hard copies (including all appendices) and ten copies without the appendices, all double-sided and spiral bound, to the Office of Academic Programs. Committee Chair and Dean recommend to AVP-AP an external reviewer at the time of submission.

Oct. 1 The Office of Academic Programs, in consultation with the Provost, Dean, and Program sets a time for the campus visit and exit interview. The program coordinates a schedule that includes meeting with the Dean, faculty, students, and all other interested parties.

Oct/Nov External reviewer conducts an on-site visit to examine program and assess the Self-Study and Program Plan. The visit culminates with an exit interview with the Program Coordinator, faculty, School Dean, Chair of the UPRC, the AVP-AP, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Dec  Dean has option to provide written comments and recommendations.

Feb/Mar UPRC delivers report to Chair of the Academic Senate, with a copy to Program Chair and Provost.

April Dean and Program faculty develop a draft MOUAP to present to the UPRC Chair and Provost for discussion. The finalized MOUAP is signed by the Chair, Dean, and Provost, and them forwarded to the UPRC and AVP-AP.

May  UPRC submits an annual report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Senate, which includes all program reviews from that academic year.
Recommendations for completion of the Self-Study and Program Plan

The UPRC provides the following advice regarding preparation of the self-study and program plan.

1. The UPRC has members who may be unfamiliar with the discipline being reviewed. It is helpful to avoid too much discipline-specific jargon and/or bring them up to speed with introductions, where necessary. Whenever extensive use of jargon or acronyms is required, a glossary should be provided to assist the reviewers.

2. Evidence-based claims and requests are essential components that precede a UPRC endorsement of a program request. For example, a request for a tenure-track hire will be better received if the argument goes beyond “replacement of lost faculty lines” or “necessary expertise” and also establishes need for the new hire based on meeting enrollment demand within a sustainable student-to-faculty ratio and addressing the current proportion of entitled faculty within the unit.

3. The UPRC would appreciate a double-sided format that includes sequentially numbered pages and spiral binding, if size is extensive. Three complete hard copies (including all appendices) and ten copies without the appendices should be delivered to the Office of Academic Programs.

4. Figures and tables should be numbered, have proper titles and captions, and be referenced within the text.

Please use the following template face page and content headings.
[LIST DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE(S)]
SELF-STUDY AND PROGRAM PLAN

20XX-20XX

Prepared by [insert names of self-study committee chair and members]

Approved by majority vote of the program faculty on [insert date]
I. SELF-STUDY

NOTE: All self-study reports must be paginated and contain a Table of Contents. Please attach evidence that the self-study was approved by a majority vote of the department faculty.

A. Introduction (1 page maximum) Should include:
   1. Purpose of the self-study is to describe the mission, role, and function of the program within the context of the larger University educational experience. Briefly describe the role of the program within the university context. Include any noteworthy differences in scope or approach when compared to similarly named programs at other institutions.

B. What has changed since the Previous Review? (2-3 pages maximum)
   1. How were the recommendations from previous External Reviewer, UPRC, and Provost addressed by the Program?
   2. Other relevant changes may be included here if not discussed elsewhere.

C. Program’s Role in Relationship to the University: This section should: (2 pages maximum)
   1. Relate the Program mission, goals, and objectives to those of the University.
   2. Describe the relationship between program objectives and the university learning outcomes (ULOs).
      • The UPRC suggests the use of an alignment matrix like that found at the following link http://www.csub.edu/q2s/_files/fac-staff/prgmlInfo/NSME/CHEM/BCHEM_BS_map.pdf. It can serve as a useful tool for understanding how the course, program and ULOs are aligned.
   3. Describe how the curriculum is designed and how that design serves the program objectives and intended outcomes.
   4. Briefly describe the program’s role in all associated programs that significantly affect the degree program resources (General Education and other university-wide requirements, developmental coursework, service courses for other majors, certificate programs, interdisciplinary programs, minors, pre-med, pre-law, etc.).

D. Evidence of Program Quality: Should include: (20 pages max - excludes graphs and tables)
   1. Evidence of student learning outcomes based on the Program assessment criteria
      a. Use SLO data to demonstrate program quality as it relates to the degree curriculum and other impacted programs (e.g., general education or service)
         • Disaggregate and compare data by mode of delivery (online, remote ITV, face-to-face) and other significant populations
      b. Changes in the curriculum brought about by assessment of student learning outcomes
      c. Placement of students in careers, graduate/professional programs
      d. Measures of student involvement in scholarship or creative activities
      e. Other evidence (e.g., alumni satisfaction surveys, employer satisfaction surveys)
   2. Evidence of Faculty and Program Effectiveness
      a. Measures of successful degree completion
         • Analyze student retention and graduation measures (graduation rates, time-to-degree, units at degree), describing efforts to improve such measures
      b. Describe how the CSUB Program compares to similar programs at other
universities.
c. Record of peer-reviewed scholarship for each faculty member (e.g., grants, professional presentations, journal manuscripts, exhibitions, performances, and creative works).
   • Do not include scholarship prior to the last review
   • Provide indicators of quality that may not be apparent outside of the discipline (e.g., indicate peer-review status and impact factor, where applicable)
   • Describe how the scholarship has enhanced the degree program
3. Evidence of how the Program serves the community
   a. Describe Program activities for applied learning
      • Field placements, internships, practice-based learning opportunities, grant partnerships, etc.
   b. Efforts to recruit students who reflect the diversity of the community
   c. Efforts to recruit faculty who reflect the diversity of the community

E. Evidence of Program Viability and Sustainability: (10 pages maximum)
1. Analyze trends for demand and need for the Program
   • Numbers of student majors, applications and admits in the case of post baccalaureate programs, enrollments, and degrees granted since the previous review
   • Trends within the profession, local community or society generally that identifies an anticipated need, or lack thereof, for the program in the future (including, if available, market research)
2. Faculty Resources
   • Proportions of faculty ranks, SFR, cost/FTES, class size and FTES by category
   • Trends since the previous review
   • Faculty workload (i.e., direct WTU teaching assignments and reassigned time by faculty member) disaggregated by course category (GE, major, service, developmental)
   • Professional and Leadership Development
   • Mentoring
   • Retention and Succession planning
3. Financial Resources
   • Analyze the operational budget (revenues and expenditures)
   • Percentage of external funding in relationship to operational costs
   • Assessment of administrative support services
4. Supplies, Equipment, and Other Resources, as appropriate
   a. Information and Technology Resources
   b. Equipment
   c. Facilities
5. Oversight and Management of Required Resources

F. Summary Reflections: provide an interpretation of the significance of the findings in the above analysis of program evidence. The purpose of these reflections is to determine a program’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges to improvement.

The following questions should be addressed:
1. How are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with
the goals of the program?
2. How are department/program goals aligned with the goals of the constituents that the program serves (e.g., the students, the university as a whole, the service community)?
3. How is the level of program quality aligned with the college/university’s acceptable level of program quality? Aligned with the constituents’ acceptable level of quality?
4. How well are program goals being achieved?
5. What student learning outcomes are achieved at the expected level?
6. What are the challenges to Program quality?

II. PROGRAM PLAN (15 pages maximum)

The Program uses the evidence-based inquiry and analyses documented in the comprehensive Self-Study to inform future planning for program maintenance and improvement.

This section might address such questions as:
- What are the program’s goals for the next seven years?
- How will the program specifically address any weaknesses identified in the self-study?
- How will the program build on existing strengths?
- What internal improvements are possible with existing resources (through reallocation)?
- What improvements can only be addressed through additional resources?
- Where can the formation of collaborations improve program quality?

In addressing such questions, program faculty should consider how program review results are used in the planning and budgeting progress, for program review provides a way for institutions to link evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and budgeting. That is, the findings in the self-study, the recommendations in the external review, and responses to previous reviews can be used as evidence to inform decision-making processes at various levels in the institution, from the program-level through the university-level.

In the Program Plan, the program faculty should consider how the results from their Self-Study can be used to:

A. Inform curriculum planning: Items should include:
   1. Changing the sequence of courses in the major curriculum
   2. Adding or deleting courses
   3. Refinement or articulation of pre-requisite or disciplinary requirements
   4. Re-design of the content or pedagogy of specific courses
   Obviously, the primary questions driving such changes would be:
      - Are our students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program?
      - If not, what elements of the curriculum could be changed to improve learning?

B. Inform changes in how resources are used within the program, items should include:
   1. The Program should evaluate whether its current offerings are the right mix going forward. Should some programs be placed on moratorium, discontinued, return from
moratorium? Should new programs be developed?
2. Assignment of faculty to teach specific courses or sections
3. Changing the scheduling of certain courses or the frequency with which they are offered
4. Changing the number of students required in course sections so that student learning and effectiveness of teaching are maximized
5. Implementing improved advising and support services to increase learning, retention, and/or graduation rates
6. Adjusting the allocation of faculty resources across General Education, the major, and the graduate program (if appropriate)
7. Providing additional professional development or research resources for faculty
8. Adjusting faculty teaching loads and assigned/release time

Some guiding questions that should be addressed are:
• How can resources within the department be allocated in such a way as to better achieve the mission and goals of the department?
• At what point in the prioritization of departmental goals do these recommendations fall?
• What are the costs of each recommendation (both the direct monetary cost and the opportunity cost in the form of lost resources for other initiatives)?
• What is the extent of departmental funds available and where might the department turn for external funding?

C. Make recommendations for how resources outside the program should be used. (May want to refer to the section on Supplies, Equipment, and Other Resources)

D. Make a case to the dean and to the University Program Review Committee for specific additional resources as indicated. For example, the program may request:
• Additional or reduction of faculty or support staff
• Additional funds to support faculty professional travel or research
• Release time for program assessment activities, curriculum development or research-related activities
• A reduction or increase in program enrollment target

III. APPENDICES

In appendices provide supporting evidence that is too detailed to be included in the text itself but may be referenced throughout. In addition to those appendices outlined below, the program may choose to add its own.

A. Academic Program Data Profile (provided by IRPA)
B. Up-to-date catalog copy
C. Roadmaps to graduation
D. Faculty Abbreviated Vitae (2 pages each)