



California State University, Los Angeles

***DEGREE
PROGRAM REVIEW
PROCEDURAL HANDBOOK***

Revised Fall, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1.0 Review Process/Timeline	1
1.1 Planning	
1.2 Preparing the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan	
1.3 The External Review	
1.4 Review by the Program Review Subcommittee (PRS)	
1.5 Preparation of the Action Plan	
1.6 Annual Reports	
1.7 Summary of Timeline	
2.0 The External Review Procedure	5
2.1 Selection of External Reviewers	
2.2 Coordination of the External Review	
2.3 Itinerary for External Reviewers' Site Visit	
2.4 External Reviewers Report	
2.5 Travel Arrangements and Reimbursement Procedures	
3.0 Program Review Subcommittee	14
3.1 Subcommittee Charge and Membership	
3.2 The Review Process and Schedule	
4.0 Preparation	17
4.1 Conducting the Self-Study	
4.2 Preparation of the Self Study Report and Five-Year Plan	
4.3 Modified Self-Study Report (MSSR)	
5.0 Follow-Up Responsibilities	23
5.1 The Final Summary Report	
5.2 Action Plan	
5.3 Annual Reports	
6.0 Format and Guidelines for the Self-Study Report	25
1.0 History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives	
2.0 Program Data	
3.0 Curriculum and Instruction	
4.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes	
5.0 Department Faculty	
6.0 Outreach and Recruitment	
7.0 Program Recommendations	
ATTACHMENTS	30
A. Evaluation Criteria for Sections of the Self-Study Report	
B. Title Page	
C. Faculty Verification	
D. Students in the Major	
E. Gender and Ethnicity Ratios	
F. FTES, FTEF, and SFR	
G. Sample Letter to Departments	

- H. Matrix of Courses and Instructional Modes
- I. Curriculum Map: Courses by Student Learning Outcomes
- J. Faculty Data
- K. Student Opinion Surveys
- L. Proportion of Classes Taught by Faculty Rank
- M. Five-Year Plan
- N. Annual Report Format

Introduction

The purpose of program review is to enable the University, its colleges, and its departments/divisions/schools to effectively achieve their stated objectives, and to examine on a continuing basis the quality of their academic programs.

The Academic Senate policies related to program review and assessment at California State University, Los Angeles are located in Chapter IV of the *Faculty Handbook*. This *Degree Program Review Handbook* contains the procedures for the review process. Section 1.0 provides a brief overview and timeline of the review process. Section 2.0 provides the procedures for organizing and conducting the external review. Section 3.0 includes the charge to the Program Review Subcommittee and the review process. The steps a department should follow when preparing its self-study are in Section 4.0. The reports that departments complete following receipt of the Final Summary Report from the Program Review Subcommittee are included in Section 5.0. Section 6.0 provides an outline of, and instructions for, the Self-Study Report. Following Section 6.0 are attachments* that will help in the completion of the Self-Study Report. The unit of analysis in program review is the individual degree program. The term “department” will be used throughout to signify “department,” “division,” or “school.”

1.0 Review Process/Timeline

A department’s major task in program review is to conduct a self-study of each program in the department and then prepare a report and 5-Year Plan based on the self-study to be evaluated by external reviewers and the Program Review Subcommittee.

1.1 Planning

The planning phase usually begins in Fall Quarter prior to the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan deadline in the Spring. The steps in this phase are the following:

- 1.1.1 The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the College Deans establishes the Program Review Schedule for the upcoming academic year. This schedule identifies the specific departments that will be reviewed and which of these will also be evaluated by external reviewers. In general, all departments undergoing program review are also evaluated by external reviewers unless the department’s program(s) have undergone an accreditation review within the last 3 years.
- 1.1.2 The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs provides departments scheduled for review with informational materials on the review process.

* The word “Attachment” is used rather than “Appendix” to avoid confusion when discussing portions of the Self-Study Report that itself contains several “Appendices.”

1.1.3 The College Dean meets with the department faculty and chair to review the last program review report, discuss the self-study process, outline the requirements for the Self-Study Report, and describe what assistance he/she can provide the department in preparing for the review. Accredited programs wishing to complete a Modified Self-Study Report make that request at this time (see Section 4.3).

1.2 Preparing the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan

The department collects data throughout the cycle with the assessment plan providing guidance. Beginning in Fall Quarter of the year the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan are due, the department compiles the data, analyzes and interprets the data, and completes the Self-Study Report (or Modified Self-Study Report – see Section 4.3) and 5-Year Plan by the end of the following Spring Quarter.

1.3 The External Review

1.3.1 Planning for the external review occurs in Year 1 while the department is conducting its self-study. Details of this planning process are discussed in Section 2.0.

1.3.2 The external review takes place in the Fall quarter of Year 2.

1.3.3 The external reviewers submit a jointly-written report on their evaluation of the program(s) within two weeks of their campus visit to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. (See details in Section 2.4.)

1.4 Review by the Program Review Subcommittee (PRS)

1.4.1 In the Winter of Year 2 the Subcommittee reviews the department's Self-Study Report, the 5-Year Plan, and the external reviewers' report. Questions based on its review of these reports are forwarded to the department.

1.4.2 The department prepares a written response to the questions and meets with the PRS to discuss and answer additional questions about its program(s).

1.4.3 The PRS prepares a Draft Summary Report using the criteria for evaluating programs provided in Attachment A.

1.4.4 After providing the department with the opportunity to respond to the Draft Summary Report, the PRS prepares and approves its Final Summary Report on the department's program(s) and forwards it to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (during Spring of Year 2).

1.4.5 The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs forwards the PRS's Final Summary Report to the appropriate members of the campus community, including the department under review and the College Dean.

1.5 Preparation of the Action Plan

- 1.5.1 In Fall of Year 3, following the receipt of the Final Summary Report, the Department Chair meets with the College Dean to discuss the report and collaboratively develop an Action Plan that will specify goals and objectives for the following four years (until the next program review). The Action Plan also specifies the actions to be taken by all participants to reach the goals and objectives.
- 1.5.2 The department submits the Action Plan to the Dean by the end of the Fall quarter (Year 3).
- 1.5.3 The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs responds to the plan, and the plan is reviewed by the PRS (by the end of the Winter quarter of Year 3).

1.6 Annual Reports

All Department Chairs submit a report to the College Dean each Spring except during years 1 and 2 of the program review cycle. These Annual Reports will include information on the assessment of student learning outcomes, and the actions taken by the program based on assessment results. In addition, the reports will describe the progress made toward the goals and objectives set forth in the last Action Plan and Program Review recommendations.

For accredited programs where the accrediting agency requires an annual report that includes the results of student learning outcomes assessment, the department may submit that annual accreditation report in lieu of the student learning outcomes section of the Annual Report.

1.7 Summary of Timeline

Table 1 depicts the six-year timeline for program review. The first year is repeated to emphasize the cyclical nature of program review. In Year 1, department faculty conduct a self-study, create a Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan, and select external reviewers. In Year 2, external reviewers evaluate the program and submit a report, and the PRS prepares a Final Summary Report. In Year 3, the Action Plan is approved by the Provost and PRS, implementation of the Action Plan begins, and the department submits its first Annual Report to the Dean. In Years 4 through 6, Action Plan implementation continues, along with Annual Reports to the Dean. In Year 1, department faculty begin another self-study.

Table 1. Timeline for Program Review

Year	Fall quarter	Winter quarter	Spring/Summer quarter
1	Begin self-study and 5-Year Plan prep; gather program data (IR)	Perform student and alum surveys; gather assessment data	Complete self-study; select external reviewers; Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan submitted to Dean
2	External reviewers review program(s) and submit report	PRS prepares Draft Summary Report	PRS prepares Final Summary Report
3	Action Plan submitted to Dean	Action Plan approved by Provost and PRS; implementation begins	Annual Report submitted to Dean
4	Action Plan implementation continues		Annual Report submitted to Dean
5	Action Plan implementation continues		Annual Report submitted to Dean
6	Action Plan implementation continues		Annual Report submitted to Dean
1	Begin self-study and 5-Year Plan prep; gather program data (IR)	Perform student and alum surveys; gather assessment data	Complete self-study; select external reviewers; Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan submitted to Dean

2.0 The External Review Procedure

Information regarding the selection of external reviewers, the logistical steps involved in the coordination of an external reviewers' visit, travel arrangements, and reimbursement procedures for external reviewers are included in this section.

2.1 Selection of External Reviewers

The following procedures are followed in selecting the external reviewers for a department's program(s):

- 2.1.1 Generally, the chair of the department and the College Dean each submit four to six nominees of possible reviewers based on their knowledge of institutions and other sources of information. The names and addresses should be sent to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs by the end of Fall Quarter.
- 2.1.2 In addition, the PRS seeks nominations from other institutions, higher education associations, and professional organizations.
- 2.1.3 Approximately one-half of the nominees should be from CSU campuses of comparable size to Cal State L.A., and the other half from other non-CSU institutions, preferably within California.
- 2.1.4 Invitations to be considered as a reviewer are sent to each of the nominees. Included in the invitation is the request for copies of the individual's abbreviated curriculum vitae if he/she is interested in being considered.
- 2.1.5 The department reviews the list of nominees who responded to the invitation and may reject any of them for sufficient cause, such as lack of qualifications, limited perspective, etc. A written rationale should be provided for each rejected nominee.
- 2.1.6 The nominees are then rank-ordered by the PRS, one list for CSU reviewers and another list for non-CSU reviewers.
- 2.1.7 The lists of rank-ordered nominees are sent to the College Dean who will, in most cases, select the two highest-ranked, available persons on the list to be the external reviewers.
- 2.1.8 The College Dean invites the selected external reviewers to campus for two-and-a-half days to meet with faculty and students, College and University administrators, and others, from both on and off campus, who can provide useful information on the department's program(s).

2.2 Coordination of the External Review

Primary responsibility for the coordination of the external review of a department rests with the Dean of the College in which the department is located. In particular, the College Dean or designee will coordinate the following logistics of the external reviewers' campus visit:

2.0 The External Review Procedure

- 2.2.1 A letter formally inviting the selected external reviewers to the campus for a 2½ day visit is sent by the College Dean (see Exhibit A, p. 10). Unless there are extenuating circumstances, the campus visit will be scheduled during a week in which classes are in session to enable the external reviewers to meet with students and observe classes. The College Dean will also handle all subsequent communications with the reviewers.
- 2.2.2 The itinerary for the external reviewers' visit will be established by the College Dean's office in consultation with the department and reviewers.
- 2.2.3 The Dean will provide the reviewers with a draft of the itinerary four weeks in advance and solicit feedback.
- 2.2.4 At least two weeks prior to their campus visit, the Dean will send the external reviewers the final itinerary, the University Catalog, the department's Self-Study Report, the Degree Program Review Procedural Handbook, and other materials that provide pertinent background information.

2.3 Itinerary for External Reviewers' Site Visit

- 2.3.1 As the sample itinerary indicates (see Exhibit B, p. 12), initial interviews will be held to orient the reviewers to the campus and, more specifically, to the program(s) under review. For this purpose, a meeting that includes the reviewers, the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies will be scheduled. A second meeting will be held with the Dean and Associate Dean of the College and the Department Chair. If desired, the Dean and Associate Dean may schedule a meeting alone with the reviewers early in the visit.
- 2.3.2 In the department, the reviewers should meet with faculty and students. Subsequent meetings may also be arranged with other appropriate persons, such as advisory committee members, faculty in other programs and from other institutions, officials of outside agencies, etc. The meeting times shown on the sample itinerary are for illustrative purposes only and may depart considerably from the actual times depending on the availability of the persons listed. All of the persons with whom the reviewers will meet should be contacted and scheduled for a specific meeting time. A copy of the reviewers' itinerary and vitae should be provided to all individuals scheduled to meet with the reviewers prior to the meetings.
- 2.3.3 Time will be provided for the reviewers to read the supplementary material placed in the "Readers' File."
- 2.3.4 For departments with graduate programs, the reviewers should be provided with adequate time (approximately two hours) to read and evaluate Master's theses/projects completed by students in the program(s) since the last review that are available in the University Library. The reviewers are

2.0 The External Review Procedure

expected to include a constructive evaluation of the theses/projects reviewed and an overall assessment of their acceptability as graduate level work in their report.

- 2.3.5 Time should be provided for the reviewers to develop a draft of their report.
- 2.3.6 Just prior to the reviewers' departure from campus, a one-hour exit interview will be conducted with the reviewers to answer any final questions they may have and to review a draft of their report. This exit interview will normally involve the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Associate and Assistant Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the College Dean, the Department Chair, and a representative of the Program Review Subcommittee.

2.4 External Reviewers Report

- 2.4.1 The reviewers are expected to submit a jointly written report on their evaluation of the department's program(s) to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs within two weeks of the campus visit. While this report does not have to conform to any specific format, the reviewers are requested to cover the major areas delineated in Attachment A, "Evaluation Criteria for Sections of the Self-Study Report" (page 30). The reviewers should use the evaluation criteria provided to help guide their assessments.
- 2.4.2 The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs will distribute the report to the appropriate members of the campus community (Department Chair, College Dean, Associate Dean, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, the and Program Review Subcommittee). A copy is placed in the Academic Vice Presidents/Academic Affairs Office files.

2.5 Travel Arrangements and Reimbursement Procedures

- 2.5.1 The College Dean's Office, in close coordination with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, will follow established procedures in making travel and lodging arrangements for the external reviewers.
- 2.5.2 The reviewers will be consulted to determine dates and approximate times of departure to and from Los Angeles. This information will be obtained well in advance of the trip (no less than three weeks and preferably 4-6 weeks). The College Dean's Office will then make reservations through a travel agency and authorize a prepaid airline ticket. If a reviewer prefers to make his/her own reservations, the College Dean's Office will arrange through a travel agency to have a prepaid airline ticket authorized. In either case, arrangements will then be made either to have the prepaid ticket issued at the reviewer's airport of departure, or the Dean's Office will mail the ticket to

2.0 The External Review Procedure

him/her. Every effort should be made to utilize the most economical airfares available (e.g., super-saver).

- 2.5.3 Air travel expenses for external reviewers will be reimbursed up to \$500.00. Travel costs for reviewers from within the state of California will most likely be well below this amount. Government airline rates should be secured for reviewers traveling from within the state of California. Expenditures for airline travel above \$500.00 must be approved prior to the reviewer's travel in order to assure that these costs will be reimbursed and encumbered from a Central Administration account. Exceptions to this policy can be made, but must be justified and receive prior approval. Failure to follow these procedures will result in the host College assuming all airline travel costs above \$500.00.
- 2.5.4 The reviewers will also be consulted to determine the dates on which they will need lodging. The College Dean's Office will make the hotel reservations and arrange to have the hotel bill (exclusive of meals, telephone and other expenses) charged directly to the University. The reviewers should be reminded that they are not to charge telephone and other expenses to the hotel bill. Both reviewers should be given the opportunity to stay in a hotel, even if they live within driving distance, to provide time for interaction between the reviewers. The Travel Office can provide recommendations regarding hotels with University discount rates.
- 2.5.5 The College Dean's Office will complete a Request for Travel Form (Form L110) showing total estimated expenses and submit this form to the Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs. While the reviewers are on campus, the College Dean will also obtain their signatures on blank Travel Expense Claim forms (Form 262) and license plate numbers if mileage is being claimed. Following the visit, the form (listing total expenses in detail and with receipts attached) will be submitted to the Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs for processing.

The expense breakdown is:

Transportation expenses other than airfare
(e.g., long-distance mileage @ 58.5* cents
per mile, car rental, airport bus, etc.) \$ _____

Meals (Up to \$50.00/day for each 24-hour
period. Maximum reimbursement amounts
are authorized as follows: breakfast - \$10.00*;
lunch - \$15.00*; dinner - \$25.00*) \$ _____

Miscellaneous expenses (An additional \$5.00
incidental allowance may be claimed for each
24-hour period.) \$ _____

TOTAL \$ _____

* These values are subject to change

2.0 The External Review Procedure

- 2.5.6 Arrangements will be made to pay each reviewer a \$500 honorarium through a single, lump-sum payment. A DirectPay Request (Form AP-1a) in this amount, along with an Invoice for Payment form and Vendor Data Report, will be prepared by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. While reviewers are on campus, signatures should be obtained on the invoice for payment and returned to the same office for processing. The honorarium will be mailed approximately two weeks after receipt of the reviewers' report.
- 2.5.7 The only funds available for the external review are for the honorarium and the travel expenses of the external reviewers. Any other funds expended during the visit are the responsibility of the department.

Sample Letter

June 25, 2008

Professor John L. Doe
Department of Anthropology
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94116

Dear Professor Doe:

We are pleased that you will be able to serve as one of the two external reviewers for the program review of our B.A. and M.A. programs in Anthropology. The dates of Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, November 6, 7, and 8, 2008, fit our schedule and we are pleased that they will also be convenient for you.

Flight arrangements have been made for you and your tickets and flight itinerary are enclosed. The driver for the shuttle service for the hotel will meet you at the LAX terminal outside of the baggage claim area for your airline.

Hotel reservations have been made for you at the Holiday Inn, 303 Cordova Street in Pasadena [Phone: (626) 449-4000]. We have arranged to have the hotel bill for your room charged directly to our University. During your stay at the hotel, please do not charge any other expenses, such as meals, telephone calls, etc., to this hotel bill. We will provide a single, lump-sum payment to cover these and other travel expenses. You will be required to keep receipts for these expenses and our reimbursement schedule allows for reimbursement of incidental expenses (tips, fees, etc.) during your 2½ day visit (\$5.00 per 24-hour period) and up to \$50 a day for meals (\$10.00 - breakfast; \$15.00 - lunch; \$25.00 - dinner). You should receive payment approximately 30 days after the claim is filed.

While you are on campus, you will be asked to sign a service contract for the total amount of \$500. A single, lump-sum payment will be mailed in this amount approximately two weeks after receipt of your report. In case you may have any questions and in order to provide you with more details concerning your arrangements, my assistant, Jane Jones will be in contact with you by telephone.

As you know, the external review will be conducted jointly by you and Dr. Eileen Martinez of the University of Arizona. If you wish to discuss the external review with Dr. Martinez prior to your campus visit, you may call her at (602) 444-2000 and we will reimburse you for your long distance charges. If you would prefer to contact Dr. Martinez by e-mail, the address is drm@mail.net. We would like you and Dr. Martinez to function as a team and to prepare a single joint report.

Your itinerary, the University Catalog, the University's Program Review Procedural Handbook, and the department's Self-Study Report are enclosed. You may find it particularly useful to read the section of the Program Review Procedural Handbook that covers the external review process. Other supplementary, less pertinent materials are being compiled in a "Reader's File" and will be available for your perusal while you are here. Also enclosed is a campus map to help you find your way around our campus.

We do have one very important request to make of both you and Dr. Martinez. Our time lines for completion of the program review are quite tight, and it would be greatly appreciated if your written report could be completed and sent to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs within two weeks of your campus visit. I apologize for the rush, and hope this will allow you sufficient preparation time.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. You may call me collect at the following number: (323) 343-0000.

Again, we want to thank you for your interest in our University. We look forward to meeting you and working with you on this important part of our program review process.

Sincerely,

Alice B. Smith
Dean, College of Learned Scholars

ABS:ss

Attachments

cc: (Provost)
(Associate VPAA)
(Department Chair)

**Sample Itinerary* for
Dr. John L. Doe and Dr. Eileen Martinez**

Sunday, November 5**

Dr. John Doe to arrive at LAX at 3:40 p.m.
Dr. Eileen Martinez to arrive at LAX at 8:05 p.m.
Accommodations at Holiday Inn Hotel
Shuttle to Hotel (Approximately 30 Minute Ride)

Monday, November 6 **

- 8:00 a.m. Associate Dean Donald Jones will call for Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez at the Holiday Inn Hotel.
- 9:00 a.m. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
- 10:00 a.m.*** Dr. Alice B. Smith, Dean, College of Learned Scholars
Dr. Donald Jones, Associate Dean, College of Learned Scholars
Dr. Malcolm Wheeler, Chair, Department of Anthropology
- Remainder of the day and all of the next. The reviewers should be scheduled for departmental activities. The schedule should include:
- meetings with the faculty, students, departmental staff, Department Advisory Committee members, and the Department Liaison Librarian,
 - tour of departmental facilities (if appropriate),
 - time to review the materials in the Readers' File, and
 - time to read the theses in the Library (2 hours).
- 6:00 p.m. Unless Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez have other plans, dinner arrangements should be made by mutual agreement. Dinner, if planned by the College or department, should include transportation back to the hotel at the end of the evening.

NOTES:

- * A copy of this itinerary and the external reviewers' vitae should be furnished in advance to everyone with whom the reviewers are scheduled to meet.
- ** The times listed are for illustrative purposes only. The actual dates and times must be scheduled with each administrator by the College Dean's office. Locations of meetings should also be listed.
- *** The Dean has the option of scheduling an additional meeting with the Associate Dean and reviewers.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7

- 8:00 a.m. Associate Dean Jones will call for Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez at the Holiday Inn Hotel.
- 8:30 a.m. Continuation of departmental activities (see previous day) with lunch included
- 6:00 p.m. Dinner arrangements should be made by mutual agreement.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8

- 8:00 a.m. Associate Dean Jones will call for Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez at the Holiday Inn Hotel.
- 8:30 a.m. Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez meet to discuss their preliminary findings and to discuss the preparation of their report, including which sections each of them will write. (This may be done at the hotel prior to coming to campus.)
- 11:00 a.m. Exit Interview with:
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dean of College
Associate Dean of College
Department Chair
Member, Program Review Subcommittee *
- 12:00 noon Lunch should be provided unless the reviewers are on a tight schedule to catch a plane. Arrangements should be made to return them to the hotel or to the airport.

* **NOTE:** A designated representative of the University Program Review Subcommittee should be invited to this exit interview. Contact the Office of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs for the name of the member who has been assigned to the program.

3.0 Program Review Subcommittee

3.1 Subcommittee Charge and Membership

The charge and membership of the Program Review Subcommittee (PRS), as formulated by the Academic Senate and approved by the President, are as follows:

3.1.1 Charge: The Program Review Subcommittee has the following responsibilities:

1. To implement Trustee policy on review of degree programs
2. To report and recommend to the Educational Policy Committee any proposed policies that might be desired.

3.1.2 Membership and Term of Office

1. One tenured member from each college elected for staggered three-year terms according to procedures approved by a majority vote of the college faculty. Alternate members shall also be elected by these procedures. Faculty in the Library and Student Affairs are considered the same as a college for this purpose. Members shall serve as representatives of the University, not as representatives of their respective colleges.
2. One tenured member elected annually by the Educational Policy Committee from its own membership or from the membership of its other subcommittees.
3. One tenured faculty member elected from the faculty of the college which houses the department/division/school being reviewed, excluding faculty from that department/division/school. This member serves only when programs in his or her college are being reviewed.
4. One upper division, classified graduate or post-baccalaureate credential student member selected annually by the Board of Directors of the Associated Students, Inc. The criteria for the student member are the same as those specified for student members of the Academic Senate (Constitution of the Faculty, Section h, Appendix B of the *Faculty Handbook*).
5. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee who serves ex officio as executive secretary, non-voting.

Quorum. All members of the subcommittee should be present during all of the deliberations and all members must sign the final program review reports.

3.2 The Review Process and Schedule

The review of program(s) by the PRS takes place during the Winter and Spring Quarters of the academic year after the department's Self-Study Report, 5-Year Plan, and the external reviewers' report have been received. Each department

under review will be assigned to a member of the Subcommittee who will be responsible for drafting the Subcommittee's Draft and Final Summary Reports for that department. The Subcommittee's review consists of the following five-step process that requires a series of five separate meetings of the Subcommittee with the time between meetings dependent on the number of departments being reviewed.

- 3.2.1 **Initial Review:** At its first meeting regarding a department, members of the Subcommittee share and discuss previously prepared questions based on their review of the department's Self-Study Report, 5-Year Plan, and external reviewers' report. The College Representative and Dean are invited to the meeting. The Subcommittee member responsible for the report consolidates the questions for the department. The Executive Secretary forwards the questions with a request that the department provide a written response prior to a time certain meeting with the Subcommittee to discuss the questions.
- 3.2.2 **Meeting with Program:** The PRS meets with the Department Chair and other representatives of the department to obtain and discuss the answers to its questions. The member of the Subcommittee who has been assigned to write the Summary Report on the program(s) takes notes on the answers and related discussions. This member may also follow-up with the department on any questions that were not answered at the meeting due to lack of time. The College Representative and Dean are included in the meeting.
- 3.2.3 **Recap:** Following the meeting with the department, the PRS recapitulates that meeting by discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the department's program(s). It also formulates a preliminary list of commendations and recommendations to be included in the Subcommittee's Summary Report on the department's programs(s). A first draft of the report is prepared by the responsible Subcommittee member and is submitted for distribution prior to the meeting scheduled to discuss the draft. The College Representative and Dean are included in the meeting.
- 3.2.4 **Draft Summary Discussion:** The PRS discusses the first draft of the Summary Report that was distributed to the participants (Subcommittee, College Representative, and Dean) prior to the meeting. The report is revised and placed in final draft form. This final Draft Summary Report is then sent to the Department Chair noting the date that the report is on the agenda for the Subcommittee and that the Department Chair and other representatives of the department may attend that meeting if they wish to respond to the report.
- 3.2.5 **Approval of Final Summary:** After the Draft Summary Report has been discussed with the department and College representatives, the Subcommittee discusses the report on the department's program(s). Any suggestions for revisions by Subcommittee members or by the chair and

3.0 Program Review Subcommittee

other representatives of the department are considered. After the report is placed in its final form and approved by all members of the PRS, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs forwards it to appropriate members of the campus community (Department, College Dean and Associate Dean, Chair of the Academic Senate, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, and Dean of Undergraduate Studies).

- 3.2.6 **Meeting Schedule:** To complete the five-step process described above, it is necessary for the PRS to meet a minimum of two hours per week during the Winter and Spring Quarters and to review the programs in consecutive order. Due to the impossibility of changing the meeting time to accommodate schedules other than those of the core members of the Subcommittee, individuals who must meet with the Subcommittee are expected to make the necessary arrangements to enable them to meet with the Subcommittee at its regularly scheduled meeting times.

4.0 Preparation

4.1 Conducting the Self-Study

The procedures followed by a department in conducting a self-study generally include the following:

- 4.1.1 The department organizes the self-study by defining tasks, establishing work groups, assigning tasks and resources to accomplish them, orienting the people to be involved, setting timelines, and establishing coordination and communication mechanisms. All of the department faculty should be consulted and given the opportunity to provide meaningful input to the self-study.
- 4.1.2 The department reviews and redefines its goals, undertakes goal achievement studies, and engages in long-range planning, which is necessary for the creation of the Five-Year Plan. Assessment data regarding student learning must be analyzed and incorporated into the department's goals and plans.
- 4.1.3 The department gathers information relevant to its self-study through such means as surveys of its students, faculty, alumni, and employers of alumni, and compilation of attrition/retention data, etc. Existing information should also be compiled (the last program review report, the most recent accreditation report, the most recent Annual Report, etc.).
- 4.1.4 The University's Office of Institutional Research will provide data relevant to the review, i.e., FTES, FTEF, SFR, graduation/persistence rates, student ethnicity, and number of majors.
- 4.1.5 The Equity and Diversity Program Office will provide appropriate faculty data.
- 4.1.6 The department should compile the following data that cannot presently be provided by the Office of Institutional Research but which the Program Review Subcommittee would like to see included in the Self-Study Report:
 - Summary of Student Opinion Surveys
 - Information relative to the success of graduates
- 4.1.7 The department discusses and analyzes all of the information and data gathered for the self-study. "Brainstorming" sessions involving faculty, students, and/or advisory committees may be useful for this purpose.

4.2 Preparation of the Self Study Report and Five-Year Plan

- 4.2.1 A department's Self-Study Report should be based on the self-study processes, (i.e., information gathering, data collection, discussion, and analysis, etc.), described in the preceding pages. If a department has several programs under review, it may, at its discretion, describe all of them

in a single report rather than preparing separate reports for each of them. The report should contain factual information, analyses, conceptual rationales, frank discussions of strengths and weaknesses, and other substantive discourse that will help the Program Review Subcommittee conduct an informed and thorough evaluation of the department's program(s).

- 4.2.2 The department prepares its Self-Study Report in accordance with the format and guidelines developed by the Program Review Subcommittee (see Section 6.0, p. 25). A draft of the report should be made available to the faculty for review and discussion at a departmental meeting. A draft should also be provided to the College Dean for review and comment.
- 4.2.3 The Self-Study report should be concise, should focus on the key issues without engaging in long digressions, and should provide a frank and balanced view of the department's program(s). **The narrative for Sections 1 through 7 should be no longer than 30 pages of double-spaced, printed text, using font size 12.** Reports that cover four or more programs may be up to 60 pages in length. The entire Self-Study Report should be paginated.
- 4.2.4 The Five-Year Plan will describe the department's goals and objectives for the next five years and specify the actions that need to be taken to accomplish them. This plan will inform the University, the College, and the department as decisions are made for new faculty and staff positions, additional allocation of resources, and new initiatives in program development. The plan should do the following:
- be aligned with the College and University strategic plans
 - address the recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study Report
 - take into account what the department has learned about its student learning outcomes assessment process
 - provide contextual background related to the department

The Five-Year Plan that is submitted with the Self-Study Report is considered an initial plan that may be modified after evaluation by external reviewers and the Program Review Subcommittee. After receiving the external reviewers' report the department should either amend the plan to comply with the recommendations of the external reviewers or explain why no amendment is necessary. The four areas to be addressed in the Plan are Curriculum, Students, Faculty, and Resources (see Attachment M for Format and Guidelines for the Five-Year Plan).

- 4.2.5 The final Self-Study Report contains a title page (see Attachment B) and a list of the signatures of the department's entire full-time faculty on duty indicating that they have had the opportunity to see and review the report (see Attachment C).

- 4.2.6 The Self-Study Report is signed by the College Dean to acknowledge receipt and review prior to distribution to appropriate units.
- 4.2.7 The department submits fifteen (15) copies to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and four (4) copies to the College Dean's office by June 30. Accredited programs completing a Modified Self-Study Report submit eleven (11) copies to the Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs and two (2) copies to the Dean's Office. At least one copy of supporting material should be made available to the Program Review Subcommittee.
- 4.2.8 A supplementary file, containing less pertinent materials, is compiled in a "Reader's File" in the College Dean's or department's office and made available for the external reviewers' perusal during their campus visit. These materials may include previous accreditation reports, budget requests, schedules of classes, syllabi, samples of comprehensive examination questions and answers, etc.
- 4.2.9 The Library should be checked to ascertain that all Master's theses completed since the last self-study are available for review.
- 4.2.10 Self-Study Reports are public documents. They are available in the Office of Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs for departments that may wish to review them.

4.3 Modified Self-Study Report (MSSR)

If a department has undergone accreditation within the past three years with at least one external review, the documents gathered for the accreditation can be used in response to questions posed in the Self Study Report. Therefore, one year prior to the scheduled program review, the department will develop a matrix comparing the program review standards and criteria with the standards and criteria required for accreditation, and submit it to the College Dean. The matrix, along with accreditation documents, will be reviewed by an ad hoc committee in order to determine the extent to which accreditation documents meet the program review criteria (see Exhibit C, p. 21). This ad hoc committee will be composed of the Executive Secretary of the Program Review Subcommittee, the Chair of the Program Review Subcommittee, the College Dean, and the chair of the department. At the conclusion of the review of documents, the ad hoc committee will report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs the extent to which the department's accreditation documents meet the requirements for the Self-Study Report, and identify any areas that should be addressed in a Modified Self-Study Report.

If it is determined that a Modified Self-Study Report (MSSR) is to be written, the MSSR should at least list and/or provide a matrix of all the sections and subsections required in the most recent CSULA program review handbook and follow its outline and format. If a Program Review Procedural Handbook subtopic was addressed in the specialized accreditation document, then the relevant page

numbers, etc. should be given at the appropriate point and heading in the MSSR. Even if a topic was addressed in the specialized accreditation document, an overview paragraph must be provided. Also included will be the “Verification of Faculty Review” page signed by all full time faculty members. A copy of the department/College response to the accreditation report must also be included.

The department must provide each Program Review Subcommittee member with a copy of the MSSR, the accreditation report, and a copy of the latest report from the accrediting agency. If duplication costs make this prohibitive, then a full copy must be made available in a convenient location and relevant pages must be inserted in the MSSR.

A full, regular Self-Study Report and a Five-Year Plan must be provided to the Program Review Subcommittee for any program in the department that was NOT part of the specialized external accreditation process. For example, if an accreditation focused only on the undergraduate degree(s), then a full Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan is required for any Master’s programs within the department. Sections relevant to both (e.g., faculty CV) may simply be referenced appropriately.

If the external accreditation process included more than one department (e.g., review of an entire College), then each department is to undergo a separate program review. Separate documents are to be prepared and separate meeting schedules with the Program Review Subcommittee are to be implemented.

Accreditation and MSSR Matrix

_____ Program Program Review
Modified Self-Study Report (MSSR)

Accreditation Self-Study/MSSR
Correspondence Matrix for Use with “Degree Program Review Procedural Handbook”
dated September 2008 (date of matrix)

PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY SECTIONS	ACCREDITATION SELF-STUDY SECTIONS
1.0 History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives	
1.1 Overview and history	
1.2 Mission	
1.3 Goals and objectives	
1.4 Changes in goals and objectives	
1.5 Recommendations from last program review	
1.6 Accrediting body recommendations	
2.0 Program Data	
2.1 Data tables: # of degrees awarded, # of courses and sections taught, average class size, # freshmen and transfers	
2.2 Impact of enrollment trends	
3.0 Curriculum and Instruction	
3.1 Curriculum	
3.2 Justification for greater than 180 units	
3.3 Comparison with peer institutions	
3.4 GE courses	
3.5 Service courses	
3.6 Credential or certificate programs	
3.7 GE learning outcomes	

3.8 Opportunities for student research	
3.9 Academic advising	
3.10 Masters theses and projects	
3.11 Innovations	
4.0 Assessment of SLOs	
4.1 Assessment Plan development and maintenance	
4.2 List of SLOs	
4.3 Assessment methods	
4.4 Faculty involvement in assessment	
4.5 Data for one key measure	
4.6 Student satisfaction	
4.7 How results are used for improvement	
4.8 Further education of alumni	
4.9 Student and alumni awards/achievements	
5.0 Department Faculty	
5.1 Student opinion surveys	
5.2 Trends in percent of courses taught by faculty rank	
5.3 Student involvement in faculty research	
5.4 Faculty scholarly activities	
6.0 Outreach and Recruitment	

6.1 Description of activities	
6.2 Effectiveness of activities	
7.0 Recommendations	
Appendix B	
Appendix C	
Appendix D	
Appendix E	
Appendix F	
Appendix G	
Appendix H	
Appendix I	
Appendix J	
Appendix K	
Appendix L	
Appendix M	
Appendix N	
Appendix O	
Appendix P	
Appendix Q	

5.0 Follow-Up Responsibilities

5.1 The Final Summary Report

Following approval, the Program Review Subcommittee's Final Summary Report is sent to the Department Chair and the Dean with a cover memorandum explaining follow-up procedures. Copies of the report are also sent to University and College administrators and to the Academic Senate.

5.2 Action Plan

5.2.1 Following receipt of the Final Summary Report, the Department Chair will meet with the College Dean to discuss the report and collaboratively develop an Action Plan for program changes that are necessary to implement the recommendations in the report.

5.2.2 Subsequently, the Department Chair and the College Dean will submit the Action Plan to the PRS and Vice President for Academic Affairs specifying the goals and objectives for the following four years and the actions to be taken by all participants to reach the goals and objectives. This Action Plan will be submitted by the end of the Fall quarter of the year following the review and will include:

- Plans for implementing recommendations that do not require additional resources,
- Plans for implementing recommendations that require additional resources, and
- Justification for not completing recommendations that the Department and the Dean do not feel should be implemented.

This plan should be briefly described in a **short document of no more than five pages.**

5.2.3 By the end of the next Winter quarter, the PRS and the Vice President for Academic Affairs will review and approve the Action Plan and implementation will begin.

5.2.4 The department's Action Plan, together with the Final Summary Report, may be used by various committees in reviewing curricular proposals submitted by the department to insure that they are consistent with program review recommendations.

Program review recommendations have been used to determine whether a department should be allocated new faculty positions and where to locate a department in a reorganization of the Colleges. Decisions such as these will undoubtedly continue to be influenced by the recommendations of program review. The assessment plans presented in the document will be used in consideration of meeting the University assessment policies. It is

expected that the program review process will be tied closely with both budget allocation and long-range planning processes of the University.

5.3 Annual Reports

5.3.1 To evaluate how effectively a department implements the program review recommendations and Action Plan, each department will provide an Annual Report to the Dean by August 1 in Years 3 through 6 that specifies the actions that have been taken toward the goals and objectives in the Action Plan. See Appendix N for the template for annual reporting. Information to be reported annually includes the following:

- Description of specific actions that have taken place toward achievement of goals and objectives set forth in the Action Plan.
- Identification of any problems that have arisen and any mid-course corrections that were made.
- The student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed in the last year.
- The methods that were used to assess each SLO.
- The results of the assessment for each SLO.
- How the results were used for program improvement.

5.3.2 The College Dean will review the reports and give feedback to the department. The Dean will also report to the Provost on the status of all departments' programs that have submitted an annual report each year. The University Faculty Assessment Coordinator will also provide feedback to departments upon request.

5.3.3 For programs that have professional accreditation, it is still necessary to submit a report on actions taken toward the goals and objectives in the Action Plan. If the program submits an annual report to an accrediting agency that includes results of student learning outcomes, this report can be submitted as a substitute for the student learning outcomes section of the Annual Report.

6.0 Format and Guidelines for the Self-Study Report

Title Page (Attachment B)

- A. Name of Department
- B. Official titles of approved degrees, options, minors, and credentials, including year of initiation and date of modification (if appropriate)
- C. Date of last program review and date of accreditation (if applicable)
- D. Signature of Department/Program Chair
- E. Date report was submitted
- F. Signature of College Dean attesting his/her review of report

Verification of Faculty Review Page (Attachment C)

Table of Contents

List of Appendices

1.0 History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the program(s) should be clearly defined, meet the needs of students, and be consistent with the mission of the University.

- 1.1 Give a brief overview and history of the field written for an audience of individuals who are not necessarily knowledgeable about the subject.
- 1.2 Present the current mission statement for each program within the department. Describe how it/they supports the College and University mission statements.
- 1.3 List each program's goals and objectives and indicate how they support the College and University goals and objectives.
- 1.4 Indicate whether there are any current plans to change the goals, objectives, and/or learning outcomes of any of the department's programs.
- 1.5 List each recommendation from the last Program Review Subcommittee report and describe the progress that has been made in meeting each recommendation. Attach a copy of the Program Review Subcommittee's Final Summary Report and subsequent Annual Reports as Appendix A.
- 1.6 Accredited programs should include the date of the most recent accreditation, key issues identified by the accrediting body, and recommendations from the accrediting body in Appendix A. Describe the progress made on the recommendations.

2.0 Program Data

The program data referred to in this section allow the department to determine enrollment trends, faculty utilization, success of program retention strategies, and student body composition.

2.1 Provide the following data in a clear format over the period of review:

- number of degrees awarded in each program
- number of courses and sections taught in each program
- average class size in each program
- number of freshmen versus transfer students for undergraduate programs

2.2 Using the data above and the data in Appendices B-E, describe the impact of enrollment trends on program quality.

3.0 Curriculum and Instruction

Each program's curriculum should be coherent and well developed, reflecting current theoretical and practical perspectives.

- 3.1 Include a brief overview of the curriculum of each program written for an audience of individuals who are not necessarily knowledgeable about the subject. If there have been changes in the program(s) not described in the catalog, briefly describe them. Include as Appendix F the catalog description of each program.
- 3.2 If the total number of units for one or more undergraduate programs exceeds 180, present justification(s) for the number of units.
- 3.3 Analyze how each program's course offerings and requirements compare and contrast with those of corresponding programs in the CSU system and with similar programs in peer institutions.
- 3.4 List and describe any General Education courses offered by the department and indicate how they meet the goals/criteria of GE as described in the *Faculty Handbook*.
- 3.5 List and describe any service courses offered for other departments. Include a letter from each department being served that addresses how well the course meet the needs of that department as Appendix G (Attachment G).
- 3.6 Describe any credential or certificate program(s) offered by the department, and indicate in a general way their effect on the degree programs positively or negatively.

- 3.7 Provide evidence that students are meeting GE learning outcomes. These include: written and oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy.
- 3.8 Describe opportunities for students to work with faculty on research as well as the percentage of students who do so.
- 3.9 Describe how students receive academic advising and how faculty are trained to do advisement.
- 3.10 For departments with graduate programs, summarize the number and types of theses or projects that have been completed since the last review. In Appendix H list the students, thesis/project titles, areas of concentration, and committee members for completed Master's theses or projects.
- 3.11 What teaching methods, curriculum approaches, or outreach methods are being used to stimulate program innovation and excellence?

4.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Program assessment is an integral part of program review and is an increasingly important area in accreditation. Department faculty have primary responsibility for establishing student learning outcomes, assessment methods, and implementation. At the program level, data and information can be used to effect improvement in curriculum and instruction. Program assessment also provides evidence of student mastery of the skills and knowledge of the discipline. Provide the following information for each degree program.

- 4.1 Indicate date(s) of implementation of the current Assessment Plan(s) and discuss the procedures used to develop and maintain the plan(s). Include as Appendix J the current Assessment Plan(s).
- 4.2 List the student learning outcomes for each program.
- 4.3 Describe the processes and methods used for:
 - 4.3.1 assessing each program's goals, both quantitatively and qualitatively,
 - 4.3.2 assessing student learning outcomes in the areas of written and oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy, and
 - 4.3.3 assessing students' ability to integrate the knowledge of the area, show critical and independent thinking, and, for graduate programs, demonstrate mastery of the subject matter through a culminating experience appropriate to the discipline (i.e., comprehensive examination, thesis, and/or project).
- 4.4. Describe how department faculty are involved in the assessment process.
- 4.5 Provide up to 3 years of student data on one key measure.

- 4.6 Provide evidence on level of student satisfaction with the program, including graduates. Discuss methods used to assess.
- 4.7 Describe how the department has used assessment of student learning outcomes to improve each program. For example, has assessment resulted in:

- revision of program goals and objectives,
 - modification of curriculum,
 - modification of program(s) for consistency with accreditation bodies,
 - modification of instructional strategies,
 - determination if faculty development is needed, and, if so, what kind,
 - development of opportunities for student enrichment,
 - revision of advisement,
 - revision of assessment strategies and assessment measures, or
 - achievement of other purposes.

Include as Appendix K the department's assessment measurement tools and findings.

- 4.8 Indicate the number of graduates of the program who have entered or completed advanced degrees, professional programs, or certificate programs since the last program review, by name of institution and program.
- 4.9 Indicate awards for outstanding achievement or contributions received by students and alumni since the last program review.

5.0 Department Faculty

The department faculty should be committed to ensuring quality of instruction, utilizing a wide range of instructional strategies, and demonstrating continuing professional development.

- 5.1 Provide department averages of student opinion surveys for the most recent academic year in Appendix O (see Attachment K). Comment if averages differ from University averages. Comment if there have been any changes since the last program review.
- 5.2 Explain if there are major anomalies between this year and other years regarding the data in Appendix P (proportion of major, general education, and service courses taught by each rank of faculty [tenured/tenure-track, temporary with terminal degree, temporary without terminal degree, and teaching assistants] during the present academic year) (see Attachment L).
- 5.3 Provide information on number of undergraduate majors, graduate majors, and non-majors who worked with faculty on research and scholarly and creative activities during the period of review.
- 5.4 Provide information on faculty scholarly activities as they relate to student learning.

6.0 Outreach and Recruitment

Departments should develop and implement appropriate recruitment activities, community outreach activities, and alumni relations.

- 6.1 Describe any community, professional, or outreach activities in which the department is involved related to recruitment or other activities. Indicate the level and source of resources required to support these activities.
- 6.2 Describe the effectiveness of any program recruitment activities. Include a recruitment plan if available.

7.0 Program Recommendations

Recommendations reflect important needs that are substantiated in the body of the Self-Study Report. List recommendations of the department as a result of its self-study.

Appendices

- A. Reports (last PRS Final Summary Report, last accreditation report [if applicable], and subsequent Annual Reports)
- B. Students in the Major (see Attachment D)
- C. Gender and Ethnicity Ratios (see Attachment E)
- D. Graduation/Persistence Rates
- E. FTES, FTEF, SFR (see Attachment F)
- F. Catalog Description of Each Program
- G. Letters from Departments Regarding Service Courses (see Attachment G)
- H. Masters Theses and Projects
- I. Matrix of Courses and Instructional Modes (see Attachment H)
- J. Assessment Plan(s)
- K. Assessment Measurement Tools and Findings
- L. Curriculum map: courses by Student Learning Outcomes (see Attachment I)
- M. Faculty Data (see Attachment J)
- N. Abbreviated Vitae (for each probationary and tenured faculty member)
- O. Student Opinion Surveys (see Attachment K)
- P. Proportion of Classes Taught by Faculty Rank (see Attachment L)
- Q. Five-Year Plan (see Attachment M)

Attachment A
Evaluation Criteria for Sections of the Self Study Report

1.0 History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the program(s) are clearly defined, meet the needs of students, and are consistent with the mission of the University.

2.0 Program Data

Enrollment trends, faculty utilization, retention strategies, student body composition, and other relevant information are provided.

3.0 Curriculum and Instruction

The curriculum is coherent and well developed, and reflects current theoretical and practical perspectives.

4.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment of student learning and other student achievements meets the goals and objectives and is accomplished using multiple measures.

5.0 Department Faculty

The department demonstrates a commitment to ensuring quality of instruction and utilizes a wide range of instructional strategies.

6.0 Outreach and Recruitment

Appropriate recruitment activities, community outreach activities, and alumni relations have been developed and implemented.

7.0 Program Recommendations

Recommendations reflect important needs that are substantiated in the body of the Self-Study Report.

**Attachment B
Title Page**

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

Department of _____
California State University, Los Angeles

Degree Programs:

Bachelor of Science in _____ (initiated in 20__, modified in 20__)
 Option _____ (initiated in 20__, modified in 20__)
 Option _____ (initiated in 20__; modified in 20__)
Minor in _____ (initiated in 20__; modified in 20__)
Master of Science in _____ (initiated in 20__; modified in 20__)

Accreditation received on __/__/__
Last Program Review Self Study Report was generated on __/__/__

Prepared by:

Chair

Submitted on __/__/__

Dean, College of _____

**Attachment D
Students in the Major
(from Institutional Research)**

Suggested template for number of students in the major over the time of the review.
Include Fall terms in the columns.

Undergraduate Options	F	F	F	F	F	F	Avg.
TOTAL							
College							
University							

Graduate Options	F	F	F	F	F	F	Avg.
TOTAL							
College							
University							

The template should be modified to meet the needs of the department (e.g., additional or fewer rows depending on the number of options).

Attachment E
Gender and Ethnicity Ratios
(from Institutional Research)

Undergraduates

	F	F	F	F	F	F	Avg. % last 6 yrs.
Women (N)							
% Department							
% College							
% University							
Men (N)							
% Department							
% College							
% University							

Graduates

	F	F	F	F	F	F	Avg. % last 6 yrs.
Women (N)							
% Department							
% College							
% University							
Men (N)							
% Department							
% College							
% University							

Ethnic Group	F	F	F	F	F	F	Avg.
African American							
Department N							
Department %							
College %							
University %							
Asian/Pacific Islander							
Department N							
Department %							
College %							
University %							
Latino							
Department N							
Department %							
College %							
University %							
White Non-Hispanic							
Department N							
Department %							
College %							
University %							
Other Citizen and Resident Non-Citizen							
Department N							
Department %							
College %							
University %							
Visa + Undocumented Nonresident Aliens							
Department N							
Department %							
College %							
University %							

**Attachment F
FTES, FTEF, and SFR
(from Institutional Research)**

Data should be presented for a program when appropriate; otherwise it should be for the department.

FTES

Year	Lower Division			Upper Division		
	Dept.	College	University	Dept.	College	University
AVG.						

Year	Undergraduate			Graduate			Total		
	Dept.	College	Univ.	Dept.	College	Univ.	Dept.	College	Univ.
AVG.									

FTEF

	Lower Division			Upper Division		
Year	Dept.	College	University	Dept.	College	University
AVG.						

	Undergraduate			Graduate			Total		
Year	Dept.	College	Univ.	Dept.	College	Univ.	Dept.	College	Univ.
AVG.									

SFR

	Lower Division			Upper Division		
Year	Dept.	College	University	Dept.	College	University
AVG.						

	Undergraduate			Graduate			Total		
Year	Dept.	College	Univ.	Dept.	College	Univ.	Dept.	College	Univ.
AVG.									

Attachment G
Sample Letter to Departments

The Department of _____ provides the course indicated below as a service course to your Department's program(s). As part of Program Review we want to determine how well the course meets your expectations and serves the need of your program. This form will be provided for each of the courses you use as a service course.

Using the following response format, circle the response that most clearly reflects your thinking.

- 1 = fully meets needs/expectations
2 = meets some needs/expectations
3 = doesn't meet needs/expectations

COURSE _____

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1. Course content meets your program needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. The quality of the content meets your expectations. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. The quality of delivery meets your expectations. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Sufficient sections of the course are offered on an annual basis. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Time of course offering varies to meet student needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Additional comments:

(Department Chair)

Department of _____

Attachment H
Matrix of Courses and Instructional Modes

Directions for providing the information for Appendix L (next page)

1. With the exception of internships, field experiences, cooperative education (398), graduate research, thesis or project, **all** courses taught in the department should be included in the matrix. If a large number of 1-unit courses offered have the same classification (i.e., 2 hrs activity), they may be grouped. If this is done, please indicate how many courses are included.
2. Group courses into general education, service, and major, and indicate the category (GE, S, or M).
3. The scheduled time should be provided in percentages totaling 100% for each (instructional and strategies).
4. Instructional mode refers to the instructional mode as specified in the curricular process. Therefore, a class that is classified lecture for 3 hours and lab 6 hours would be lecture = 33% and lab = 67%.
5. Teaching strategies. If more than one faculty member teaches the course throughout the year, provide the average of all that teach it. At least 5% of the instructional time during the quarter should use a given strategy in order to classify it as being used. For example, a lecture course could be "Active learning = 40%, Collaborative = 25%, Lecture = 30%, and Tech Mediated = 5%". Another course that is traditionally all lecture (100%) could be "Active learning = 20%, Collaborative = 20%, Lecture = 50%, Tech Mediated = 5%, and Service Learning = 5%".
6. Please explain "other" on a separate page.

Attachment I
Curriculum Map: Courses by Student Learning Outcomes

List Student Learning Outcomes for each program:

- SLO 1.
- SLO 2.
- SLO 3.

Example:

Courses	Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)						
	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5	SLO 6	SLO 7
EDFN 500		X			X		
EDFN 452			X				

**Attachment J
Faculty Data
(from the Office of Equity and Diversity)**

a. Number of Tenured and Probationary (Tenure-Track) faculty Fall quarter of each year under review.

20__-20__	_____
20__-20__	_____
20__-20__	_____
20__-20__	_____
20__-20__	_____
20__-20__	_____

b. Number of Tenured and Probationary Faculty by Rank, Gender, Ethnicity, and Terminal Degree
20__-20__

Rank	Gender	Ethnicity	Terminal Degree
Professor	Female - Male -	Afr Amer - Asian/PI - Latino - White - Other -	Doctorate - Masters - Bachelors -
Associate Professor	Female - Male -	Afr Amer - Asian/PI - Latino - White - Other -	Doctorate - Masters - Bachelors -
Assistant Professor	Female - Male -	Afr Amer - Asian/PI - Latino - White - Other -	Doctorate - Masters - Bachelors -
Lecturer	Female - Male -	Afr Amer - Asian/PI - Latino - White - Other -	Doctorate - Masters - Bachelors -

c. Age distribution of Tenured and Probationary Faculty as of July 1, 20__

Age Range	Number of Faculty
30 or younger	_____
31-35	_____
36-40	_____
41-45	_____
46-50	_____
51-60	_____
61-65	_____
66 or older	_____

d. Anticipated faculty retirements before the next program review:

Attachment K Student Opinion Surveys

This is an example that may be adapted by the department.

Question	Department N =		University N =	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				

1. The course syllabus clearly states course objectives, requirements and grading criteria.
2. The readings and assignments contributed to my understanding of the subject.
3. Exams, projects, papers, etc. were good measures of the course material.
4. The instructor provided timely feedback about my performance in the class.
5. The instructor clearly presented the subject matter.
6. The instructor was well-prepared.
7. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter.
8. The instructor was accessible to provide requested help in the subject.
9. The instructor was respectful and unbiased when interacting with students.
10. The course contributed to my intellectual growth and/or helped me develop useful skills.
11. Overall the instructor was an effective teacher.

Attachment L
Proportion of Classes Taught by Faculty Rank

Appt. Level	Number	Major Classes	Graduate Classes	Service Classes
Tenured/Tenure-Track		%	%	%
Temporary with Terminal Degree		%	%	%
Temporary without Terminal Degree		%	%	%
Teaching Associates		%	%	%

The Department may wish to modify the template to include different classifications of courses, i.e., activity, lab, upper or lower division, etc.

Attachment M Five-Year Plan

One of the purposes of Program Review is to develop plans for change and improvement in order to maintain leadership in the respective fields of academia. Therefore, each department will develop a plan that describes what the department intends to do during the next five years. Development of this plan should benefit departments applying for new tenure-track positions by providing information to support these requests.

The Five-Year Plan will address the recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study Report. The plan should take into account what the department has learned from its outcomes assessment process. After receiving the external reviewer's report, the department should either amend the plan to comply with the recommendations of the external reviewers or explain why no amendment is necessary. In forming this plan, the program should address the following four areas (the questions are provided as guidelines):

1. **Curriculum.** What curricular changes do you envisage during the next five years? What developments are likely to cause you to change the curriculum?
2. **Students.** Do you see the number of majors increasing or decreasing during the next five years? Will those students be similar to those currently pursuing your major, or do you expect to serve different types of students? Will career opportunities open to your graduates change during the next five years? How will your program adjust its curriculum and program practices to prepare students for those opportunities? Do you expect your total enrollment to increase or decrease during the next five years? Are changes needed in the student learning outcomes? How will you assist students in attaining those goals during the next five years? What are your specific plans in the areas of curriculum change, outreach, scheduling, and retention to increase student enrollment? If your program has inadequate resources to serve your students, what are your plans to meet their needs?
3. **Faculty.** What changes do you foresee for department faculty? What does the University need to do to maintain the current high quality of faculty? Do you anticipate that you will be requesting new regular faculty members? If so, what will be the basis for these requests?
4. **Resources.** Will your current level of resources (staff, equipment, library resources, travel funds, etc.) be adequate to permit the maintenance or improvement of program quality during the next five years? Identify needs based upon program priorities.

Each of the preceding areas addressed in the Five-Year Plan should include the following, where relevant:

- a) The expected action/change to be taken (e.g., revision of curriculum, addition of faculty, purchase of equipment, request for library resources, increase use of technology, increase travel funds, etc.).
- b) A specific timeline for when the task will be completed.
- c) Person(s) or committee(s) responsible for carrying out the needed change.
- d) Anticipated cost.

**Attachment N
Annual Report Format**

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES
Program Review Annual Report for August 20__

Department: _____

Degree Program(s): _____

Department Chair: _____

Campus extension: _____ Department Chair email: _____

1. Describe specific actions that have taken place toward achievement of goals and objectives set forth in the Action Plan.

--

2. Identify problems that have arisen and any mid-course corrections that were made.

--

3. Which Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) were assessed in the past year?

<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p>

4. What methods were used to assess each SLO?

Student Learning Outcome	Method used to assess
a.	
b.	

5. What were the results of the assessment for each SLO?

Student Learning Outcome	Results of assessment
a.	
b.	

6. How were the results used for program improvement?

Student Learning Outcome	Program improvement
a.	
b.	