

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part A: Introduction	3
 Reasons for Program Review Relationship to Stretogic Planning 	
 Relationship to Strategic Planning Theoretical Framework 	
Part B: The Review	4
• The cycles of review, with timeline	4
• The self-study: overview, external review, guidelines, preparation	5
• The format for self-study:	6
 Contents of self-study: Questions for review 	7
The conduit for review with roles and responsibilities defined.	10

Part A: Introduction

Program review is a formal review undertaken every five or six years by every degree granting program and by general education departments. In the case of a degree program that is reviewed by an outside accrediting agency, the program review will be conducted in conjunction with that accreditation activity.

Program review is mandated. The CSU Board of Trustees established an academic planning and program review policy requiring each campus to establish criteria and procedures for planning and developing new programs and as well as to conduct regular reviews of existing programs. Additional "regular periodic reviews of general education policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs" are also mandated.

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) considers program review one of the foundations of the assessment of educational capacity and effectiveness. WASC Standards 2 and 4 require program review of all degree programs.

Program review also allows a department to determine whether it is meeting the needs of students and other constituents. The review can help the department prepare for future challenges in a time of change and determine the best plan for allocation of resources. This review allows the department to develop a strategy for "continuous improvement". Only by a continuous cycle of review can levels of expectation be aligned to provide students with a coherent learning experience geared to the demands of an ever-changing world. Only with a continuous cycle of review can an institution determine whether students are learning, whether learning objectives are being met and what will require curricular changes. Additionally, program review allows the department to carry out strategic planning at the department level.

The success of program review depends upon a willingness to engage in an intensive and comprehensive self-study process, with an honest professional discourse about the criteria to be applied, the relationship of programs to the institution, and the educational needs of students and society at large. External review of the program can provide validation of the program and provide additional prospective on how the program is doing. A review allows faculty to highlight program strengths and achievements, to identify goals, and to address needs through long-range planning. A key issue to be examined in program review is how the program fits with the institutional mission and goals. It is important that program review be viewed not as an empty exercise in checking boxes and filling in numbers, but rather be conducted in the spirit of improvement and progress.

Those programs that have accreditation from a national organization can substitute that organizational approach for the questions in this program review. However, all program reviews must include section VIII: Recommendations of the Department as a Result of the Program Review.

Part B: The Review

The following requirements apply to program review process:

- The cycles of review, with timeline
- The self-study preparation
- The format for self-study: overview, guidelines, format, and questions
- The review process with roles and responsibilities defined
- The use of findings and recommendations.

Program Review Cycles

Normally, a program will be reviewed on a five-year cycle. However, whenever possible, the program review will coincide with specialized accreditation or other mandated reviews. For example, engineering programs are subject to accreditation by ABET on a six-year cycle. The program review for these programs will correspond to the six year cycle.

Programs in related disciplines should also be reviewed concurrently. If a department is conducting a review for new degree programs, it will be subject to a general program review for the entire department.

General Guidelines

A self-study document must be submitted for each program under review within a department. Where appropriate, the department should provide information about minors, concentrations, and options. If a department has more than one degree program and those degree programs contain at least 50% common curriculum, only one self-study is required. If a department has multiple degrees with separate curriculum, or one degree program and general studies requirement, the separate self-study documents should be submitted but may reference common appendixes.

A scheduled review by an external accrediting agency such as ABET or IACBE may be submitted in lieu of this program review. In this case, a memo should be prepared, explaining how the categories and structure of the document relate to those of the program review self-study questions.

Programs that do not have external accrediting agencies should, with assistance from the Academic Dean, Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the Provost, establish an external review team. This team may include members of the Industrial Advisory Board, alumni, or invested parties from outside Cal Maritime.

Self-Study Preparation

Overview

The self-study is a comprehensive written report prepared by an academic department. It examines the current status of the department based on its program, activities, and achievements since its last program review. The document should identify strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction. The assessment plan for the period until the next review should be included. Current objectives and outcomes should be used to assess student learning. Finally the self-study should serve as a strategic plan by which the department can plan for the future.

Preparation: Academic Program Review Data

The Chair of the department preparing a self-study should submit a request to the Dean, Institutional Support for any data required to prepare the self-study. This data may include:

- A. Student Characteristics
 - 1. Ethnicity
 - 2. Gender
 - 3. Age
- B. Enrollment: Student Credit Hour Generation (FTES) for all courses offered by the program
- C. Number of Students Repeating a course.
- D. Number of Current Students
- E. Number of degrees Awarded in the past 5 years
- F. Student/Faculty Ratio (SFR)
- G. FTEF Generated

Other data that the department deem important in the review of the effectiveness should be requested. This might include number of students not proficient in Math or English upon entry, graduation rate, retention rate or faculty retention rate.

Organization of the Self-Study Report

The following is a recommended organizational template for the content for the self-study report, which is drawn from the "WASC Resource Guide for Good Practices in Academic Program Review." <u>Unless superseded by requirements of an external accrediting body</u>, the department may select any approach to the self-study it feels is most conducive to demonstrating its educational effectiveness provided that all of the required elements listed below are addressed.

I. Title Page

- A. Name of instructional department and program
- B. Name of department chair and/or program coordinator
- C. Official titles of approved degrees, options, concentrations, minors. The year each was initiated, dates of accreditation by professional associations, and the date of the last program review
- D. Name(s) of those responsible for the preparation of the report
- E. Signatures of the department chair and all full-time department members attesting that they have participated in the review and have read the report
- F. Signature of the Academic Dean attesting that he have reviewed the report and have appended summary comments and recommendations
- G. Date report completed and submitted

II. Introduction: Program Mission, Objectives, and Outcomes

This section should provide a context for the review, and in contrast to subsequent sections, this is primarily descriptive in nature.

Program history. Give a brief overview of the major issues, current developments, and emerging trends in the field, and summarize the history of the program offered, with particular emphasis on modifications and changes made in response to each of the recommendations from the last program review.

Department Mission. What is the conceptual, philosophical, or theoretical framework for the program?

Program Objectives. What are the overall goals/objectives of the program? In what way do they support mission of Cal Maritime?

Educational Outcomes. What are the specific educational outcomes expected of students upon graduation? This should include any CMA wide outcomes.

External Context. How is the program responsive to the needs of the region or area in which it serves?

III. Analysis of Evidence about Program Quality

This section of the Self-Study should include a presentation and analysis of evidence about the quality and viability of the program.

Assessment of Program's Objectives and Outcomes. What are the procedures and measures used to evaluate these objectives and outcomes? What strategies are in place to determine attainment of these objectives and outcomes? What procedures are in place to make any appropriate changes? There is a series of rubrics developed by WASC which should be consulted when producing the Program Review Self-Study. These include rubrics designed to measure the efficacy of the program as a whole, and rubrics designed to measure components within the program, including capstone and portfolio reviews. The can be found at csum.edu/wasc.

Sources for Objectives and Outcomes. What are the ways in which the ideas of students, faculty, and any appropriate community advisory groups are used to determine program objectives and desired educational outcomes? How are these objectives and outcomes reviewed and changed as appropriate?

Assessment Plan: How are objectives and outcomes measured? How is this measurement used to make decisions about the program? What improvements have been made as a result of the assessment?

IV. Curriculum:

The basic purpose of this section is to assess the quality of the curriculum, emphasizing both strengths and weaknesses. Furthermore, if program weaknesses are indicated, actions planned to address them should be indicated.

Trends in Curriculum Development. What are the intellectual bases of the curriculum? Discuss the faculty's views on desirable new trends in curriculum development over the next five years.

General Education and Service Courses. Describe the quality of the program's General Education and service courses for non-majors and the nature of the faculty's commitment to these roles. In addition, what is your assessment of the courses offered for your majors by other departments?

Content of the Curriculum Describe how the content of the curriculum relates to the program's objectives and outcomes and how well it prepares students for their field of study.

Organization of the Curriculum. How does the organization of the program curriculum (especially in the major/minor) provide students with an understanding of the foundation, factual knowledge, values, methodology, and integration of the discipline?

Curriculum Flow Chart: How does the curriculum address the learning outcomes of the program?

Curriculum Review Process. What is the process by which all curricular matters are reviewed by the program faculty?

Curricular Changes. What courses have been added, deleted, or modified during past five years? What was the rationale for these changes?

Units in the Major. Describe how the total credit units in the major (including prerequisites) are appropriate for achieving program goals. What efforts are being carried out to reduce the curriculum to reach the CSU goal of 120 units?

Curriculum Comparison: How does the program's curriculum compare with curricula at selected other institutions and with disciplinary/professional standards?

Pedagogical Narrative: How does the faculty's pedagogy respond to various learning modalities and student learning preferences?

V. Faculty

This section addresses issues of the quality of the faculty. A copy of the resume of each full time faculty member should be included in the appendix.

Faculty Expertise. Who are the faculty, and what are their areas of expertise? Are there areas of needed expertise or aspects of the discipline that are not represented by present faculty? If so, indicate what plans the program has to remedy the situation. Also, what are the implications of projected retirements? Is the proportion of full-time tenured, tenure-track, and visiting lecturers to part-time faculty sufficient for the delivery of a quality program?

Assistance to New Faculty. What procedures are used to assist new full-time and part-time faculty (a) in becoming oriented to the policies and procedures of the university, (b) in providing instruction of high quality, and (c) in obtaining needed assistance and services?

Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness. Describe the comprehensive and varied methods for evaluating teaching effectiveness. How are the evaluations used to enhance program quality? By what means are faculty members assisted in improving their teaching performance? What is the assessment of the quality of instruction in this program?

Non-Instructional Responsibilities. What efforts are made to ensure that appropriate faculty are assigned non-instructional responsibilities, including campus committees, student advising, departmental responsibilities?

VI. Students:

This section addresses the academic program's ability to meet student needs.

Student Characteristics. What are the characteristics of the students majoring in the program? What are the implications of demographic patterns in student enrollment in the program's courses? What attempts have been made to assure greater diversification as consistent with the institutional mission?

Advising. What efforts have been made in the past five years to assure strong academic advising? Specifically, what efforts are made to handle student advising needs for General Education, majors/minors? Is there an equitable distribution of the advising load among faculty?

Enrollments. List the actual student enrollments for this program for the past five years, including number of majors, number of graduates, student credit hours, and FTES. Is student enrollment at the appropriate level for the program in its present form? Can all of the concentrations, options, and individual courses currently authorized be supported by current enrollment demands? Is it possible for a student to complete this major in four years? Provide additional information, as appropriate, regarding special circumstances that will explain low enrollment.

Assistance to Students. What special assistance, services, or activities have been provided students by the program during the past five years in the following areas: (a) grants, scholarships, traineeships, assistantships, awards, and recognition; (b) job placement, career planning, tutorial help, specialized libraries, study space, etc.;

Student Preparedness for Success. Are students prepared for advanced study or the world of work? Evidence in this category could include placement of graduates into graduate schools; graduating student satisfaction surveys (and/or alumni surveys); employer critiques of student performance or employer survey satisfaction results; disciplinary ratings of the program.

VII. PROGRAM RESOURCES

This section identifies the adequacy of existing resources and recommendations for enhancement.

Staff Resources. What are the current secretarial, clerical, and technical resources of the program? Are these sufficient to meet the institutional and administrative requirements of the program?

Operating Budget. Describe the adequacy of the operating budget in support of the program's needs. Describe efforts to secure external funding in support of the program.

Equipment Resources. What are the current facilities and equipment needs of the program? What is the role of information technology and the use of computing resources?

Library, Media, and Computing Resources. Describe the adequacy of the library, media, and computer services. Do these resources support the institutional, research, and administrative needs of the program?

Facilities. Describe the adequacy of the facilities to support the program's needs.

Demand for the Program. What are the trends in number of student applications, admits, and enrollments reflected over a 5-8 year period? What is happening within the profession, local community or society generally that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future (including market research)?

VIII. Recommendations of the Department as a Result of its Self-Study

On the basis of the self-study findings, the program should develop a strategic plan for the next five years. It should identify existing and new resources and address each of the following six areas.

Student Learning Goals. Do you envisage changes in student learning outcomes? Do you expect to see changes in student accomplishment of those outcomes during the next five years? What process is in place to review the student learning outcomes?

Curriculum. What curricular changes do you envisage during the next five years? What developments will likely cause you to change the curriculum?

Program Students. Do you see the number of students in the majors increasing during the next five years? Will those students be similar to those currently pursuing your major or do you expect to be servicing different students.

Career Preparation for Graduates. Will career opportunities for your graduates change during the next five years? How will your program adjust its curriculum and program practices to prepare the students for those opportunities?

Faculty. What changes do you foresee for the program faculty? Will there be additional or decreased numbers of faculty? Will the increase be due to increase in students in the major or from new programs? What does the program need to do to maintain the current high-quality faculty?

Resources. Will your current level of resources (staff, equipment, library resources, travel funds, etc.) be adequate to permit the maintenance of program quality during five years? What else is needed and why?

IX. Recommendations for Improving the Review Process

The department should comment on how well the program review and self-study worked for the department. Also any recommendations the department may have for improving the program review process should be offered.

X. Appendix

The appendix should contain data that is used to support the self-study. Items that should be in the appendix include resume of all full-time faculty, data such as numbers of students in the program, graduation rates, class size, and percentage of employment and any surveys that are used to support the self-study.

Conduit for Review:

The Provost announces programs to be reviewed and provides each department with written guidelines for the preparation of the self-study.

The Academic Dean and the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) meet with the Department Chair to review the last program review report(s), to discuss the self-study process, to outline the requirements of the self-study report(s), and to describe what assistance they can provide the department in preparing for the review. If the department seeks to utilize an established accreditation organization to conduct the external review, that will be discussed. If there is no established accreditation organization, an external review team should be established by the Department Chair with the assistance of the Academic Dean, the ALO, and the Provost.

The Department Chair/Program Coordinator (or designee) prepares a separate self/study report for each program, in accordance with this established format in consultation with all department faculty, and submits the report to the Deans. All full-time faculty sign the self-study report(s) to indicate that they have read the report.

The Deans review the self-study, provide recommendations for improvement and changes to the self study. The department then has the opportunity to make corrections to self-study and produces the Final self-study. This Final self-study is then resubmitted to the Academic Dean and the ALO who then submit it to both the external review committee and the Curriculum Committee.

Procedures for the external review will then occur. The report of the external review will be submitted to the Academic Dean and ALO. The Dean will then submit the Final self-study, the report of the external review and their evaluation of the self-study to the Curriculum Committee.

The Curriculum Committee will form a Sub-Committee to review the program's self-study and all other reviews. The Sub-Committee will prepare a report on the Program Review based on its review, the Dean's reviews and the external review. This should include an evaluation of the department's programs, its recommendations for improvements and changes, comments on future growth and its recommendations for program continuance or discontinuance. This report and any questions that have arisen as a result of the review are then submitted to the entire Curriculum Committee for comment and modification. A final Curriculum Committee report will then be sent to the department and to the Academic Dean and the ALO.

The Curriculum Committee's review should look at the program with particular focus on the quality of assessment of student learning. Additionally, the review should look at strengths, weaknesses and areas of concern with the program. An examination of how the program fits into the overall academic program at Cal Maritime should be examined as well as recommendations for the next 5 years. Any additional evaluations of the program that the Curriculum Committee believes are important should be included. The member of the committee from the department that is being reviewed may participate in the discussion but should not be the author of the committee report. All members of the committee should sign the report.

The Department Chair/program coordinator, Academic Dean, and ALO Support meet with the Curriculum Committee to discuss and answer questions about the report. A response is written by the department to the Curriculum Committee.

The Curriculum Committee report is forwarded to the Academic Dean with any department comments. The Academic Dean and Department Chair will develop a proposed "Memorandum of Understanding" based of the results of the Program Review. This MOU will lay out the direction of the program for the upcoming years.

The Provost submits to the President the Final Report of program review along with his/her recommendations for program continuance or discontinuance and for appropriate action as related to budgetary allocations and program planning along with the proposed "Memorandum of Understanding".

The Provost submits a summary of the Program Review to the Chancellor's Office as per system guidelines. The Dean of Instructional Support will maintain a copy of all program review activities for review by Chancellor's Office or accreditation agencies.

Conduit for Academic Program Review

