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# 1.0 History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

| Progress | Stage Element | INITIAL (1) |  EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)  | DEVELOPED (3) | HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| History, Mission, Goals and Objectives (MGOs) (1.0) | History is incomplete, omitting dates of creation, and modification of programs.  | History is incomplete, omitting dates of creation, and modification of some programs.  | History is complete, with dates of creation, and modification of programs. | History is complete, with context and dates of creation, and modification of programs. |
| Program has not created MGOs, or MGOs are not unique to the program. MGOs are not aligned with college or university outcomes. No inclusion of diversity, equity, and inclusion. | Program has established its own set of MGOs that are somewhat unique to the program, but are not aligned with college or university outcomes. Program assumes diversity, equity, and inclusion is addressed, but does not state it. | Program has established its own set of MGOs that are unique to the program and that are somewhat aligned with college and university outcomes.Program somewhat addresses diversity, equity, and inclusion. | Program has established its own set of MGOs that are both unique to the program and are aligned with college and university outcomes. In addition, they are stated in a clear, concise fashion. Embeds diversity, equity and inclusion into the mission |
| Responses to previous PR recommendations | Program has not implemented recommendations nor explained why.  | Program has implemented some recommendations. | Program has implemented most recommendations. | Program has addressed recommendations or incorporated them into its current five-year plan.  |

1.1 Overview of the field and department history

This section provides background.

1.2 Mission

This section states the program’s mission. Discuss how the mission addresses issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

1.3 Goals and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

This section states program learning outcomes. Review each program’s mission, and PLOs are linked to the University’s mission and strategic plans, including diversity, equity, and inclusion. (<https://www.calstatela.edu/strategicplan>).

1.4 Changes in goals and PLOS

This section states any changes in the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last Self Study. Include information about changes and trends in the discipline, and describe if any external factors have impacted and how the program is responding.

1.5 Recommendations from last program review and accrediting body recommendations (if applicable) and actions taken by Programs

List the recommendations and briefly describe actions taken, if any, to address them. Include PRS Summary report from last program review in Appendix A.

# 2.0 Program Data

| **Progress |** **Stage Element** | **INITIAL** **(1)** |  **EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)** | **DEVELOPED** **(3)** | **HIGHLY DEVELOPED** **(4)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation and Organization of Program Data (2.0)** | Some data are reported but little analysis is evident. Not all required elements are present. | Data are reported and some rudimentary analysis is evident. Most of the required elements are present. | Data are displayed in tabular and graphical forms with analysis of the evident trends. Most of the required elements are present. | Data are displayed in tabular and graphical forms and analyzed in terms of both internal and external forces. The evidence presented is used to develop the 5-Year Plan. All required elements are present. Data addresses impacts on different groups, including diversity, equity, and inclusion. |

This section describes the program's size in terms of majors and students served by the Department/School/Division in majors, service, and general education courses. The numerical data can reside in Appendices B, C, and D.

2.1 Student data in the Program

You can find the data for the Appendix tables in the [Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/workbooks/76/views). Please note that the dashboard is on a secure server. Therefore, you need to request access to the dashboard by contacting Institutional Effectiveness (IE@calstatela.edu). To access it from a laptop or off-campus device, you need to establish a secure connection with the [VPN client](http://www.calstatela.edu/its/services/network/vpn.php).

You can find the data for *Appendix B.1 – Undergraduate Students* in the [first tab of the Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixB_1UndergraduateStudents?:iid=1) and the data for *Appendix B.2 – Graduate Student*s in the [second tab of the Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixB_2GraduateStudents?:iid=1). Use the filters on the right to select your department/plan. In these two tabs, you can obtain the data for # of new students, trends of headcount and student-based FTES, course-based FTES, and # of degrees awarded.

The [third tab of the Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixC_GraduationandPersistenceRates?:iid=1) shows the data for *Appendix C – Graduation and Persistence Rates.* Again, please use the filters on the right to select your department/plan. The data/trends in the *first-year retention* for freshmen and transfer students and *graduation rate* listed in Appendix C should be discussed here and in other relevant sections. Low six-year graduation rates are a concern, and programs should work to determine what factors are at play that result in low rates, for example, poor freshman retention.

The Graduation Initiative 2025 (GI 2025) should be considered and discussed in this section. In our pursuit of promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, the Graduation Initiative 2025 (GI 2025) stands central. It is vital that you engage with the data and evaluate how your program supports these goals. Include information about the equity gap in graduation rates for your program and discuss what efforts the program is taking to address this. Discuss concrete measures the program has taken, or plans to take, to bridge these gaps. In what other ways is the Department and programs supporting the goals of GI 2025? What initiatives, if any, have the Department or programs implemented or plan to implement?

Review and discuss any issues related to a gender gap in the graduation rates for students in the major, as reported in Appendix C, Table C1.1, and Table C.2. Review and discuss any gaps with ethnicity, socio-economic status, or physical or learning differences. Engage in a comprehensive review of any disparities related to ethnicity, socio-economic status, or gender differences, and propose or discuss actionable solutions.

Include a presentation and discussion of any additional student data requested by the Department from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to help the Department tell its story about the students enrolled in program courses.

2.2 Impact of enrollment trends

Discuss the adequacy of your faculty to provide quality instruction for students to satisfactorily achieve the Program Learning Outcomes. You should make sure to look at different key constituencies, including gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity, and students with learning and physical differences. You can compare your enrollment data to that of other CSU system campuses at the following website: <https://www2.calstate.edu/data-center/institutional-research-analyses/Pages/default.aspx>.

# 3.0 Curriculum and Instruction

| **Progress |****Stage Element** | **INITIAL****(1)** | **EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)** | **DEVELOPED****(3)** | **HIGHLY DEVELOPED****(4)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Curriculum and Instruction (3.0)**  | Static, conservative curriculum unreflective of changes in the field. Stand-alone courses are not integrated or reflective of student needs. No capstone/culminating or service learning courses.  | Somewhat static curriculum may reflect current practice in the field but is not developmental in design to reflect the needs of students. No capstone/culminating or service learning courses. | Curriculum is mostly reflective of current practice in the discipline. Well-planned program incorporates capstone/culminating service courses, although these are not necessarily integrated into the curriculum.  | Innovative, dynamic curriculum is reflective of current practice in the discipline. Well-planned program design reflects students’ developmental (pedagogical) needs. Intentionally incorporates capstone/culminating events and service learning courses into the curriculum.  |
| **Service and General Education Course Instruction** | Evidence does not demonstrate that instruction of these courses fulfill the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs. | Evidence demonstrates that instruction of these courses fulfills some of the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs. | Evidence demonstrates that instruction of these courses fulfills most of the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs. | Evidence demonstrates that instruction of these courses fulfills the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs. |

3.1 Curriculum

In this section, describe the general structure of the curriculum - is there a core that must be completed before students can select from a wide variety of electives? Or, is the curriculum very structured that requires students to attain skills in lower division classes that will be necessary in upper division classes? How aware are students of the structure? What, if any, adjustments might be made to the curriculum so that students achieve the program outcomes, but the curriculum is streamlined? How is DEI integrated into the curriculum and teaching pedagogy as appropriate for your discipline?

3.2 Compliance with EO 1071

According to Executive Order 1071—Revised January 20, 2017—additional discipline-based required content may be achieved through an option, concentration, or special emphasis or similar subprogram—referred to as simply “concentration” in the CSU Degrees Database and in this coded memorandum. In order to ensure accurate reporting of enrollments and degrees granted, **the major program core must have more required units than the number required in a concentration**. When a concentration requires the majority of discipline units in the degree, the federal reporting CIP code and program definition assigned to the degree major program no longer match the majority of the curriculum—resulting in inaccurate reporting to the federal government. This section should provide evidence that the academic program has more units in the core curriculum than in the option.

3.3 Comparison with peer institutions

Is your curriculum novel and cutting edge, or is it on par with that in peer programs? Are there programs whose features you would like to emulate, and how could you incorporate those features into your programs?

3.4 GE courses

How many GE courses does your Department/School/Division offer? Describe how each course is aligned with specific GE outcomes (Complete Appendix F for all GE Courses offered by the Program).

Describe the criteria employed by the Department to assign faculty to teach General Education courses. Describe how the Department’s student learning outcomes (SLOs) are aligned with the General Education SLOs. How does the Department ensure that course coordination occurs across multiple sections with respect to disciplinary and GE SLOs? You can retrieve the list of GE courses your Department offered from the [Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixFGEcoursesoffered?:iid=3).

3.5 Service courses

Service courses are courses that are offered by a Department/School/Division for another Department/School/Division and for GE Curriculum.

How many service courses does your Department/School/Division offer? What feedback did you receive from the degree programs they serve, and does this suggest any changes to content/pedagogy/ scheduling?

Use the table below to list the courses your Department offers to support programs outside the Department. You can retrieve the data using the [last tab of the Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/3_5Servicecourses?:iid=2).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Semesters Offered** | **# of Sections** | **# of Students Enrolled** | **Major/ Dept(s) Served** | **GE Served** | **% of students from majors/ departments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Add lines as needed* |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Based on the process of data gathering and evaluation detailed in Appendix G, briefly explain/describe the program’s effectiveness in providing courses to programs outside the Department.

3.6 Minors, credential or certificate programs

Describe these programs and how they contribute to your degree programs or if they are stand-alone programs. Include programs offered at downtown LA.

3.7 Opportunities for student research/scholarly/creative activity (RSCA)

How many undergraduate students in your programs performed research/ scholarly/creative activity in your Department/School/Division in the period of review? What types of products (papers, presentations, exhibits, performances, etc.) resulted from this high-impact practice? (Refer to faculty summary vitae for this information) Do your academic programs utilize other high-impact practices such as learning communities, cohorted/linked courses or community engagement?

**Undergraduate Student Participation in RSCA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Number of Undergraduates |
| Professional Presentations\* | Poster Presentations |  |
| Panel Presentations |  |
| Paper Presentations |  |
| Workshops |  |
| Exhibitions |  |
| Performances |  |
| Other - Please specify: |  |
| Professional Publications | Author |  |
| Co-Author |  |
| Attendance at Professional Conference |  |
| Public Presentation of Culminating Project |  |
| RSCA related awards/scholarships |  |

\*Please identify where these took place\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty Participation in Undergraduate RSCA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Number of Faculty |
| Department sponsored RSCA event |  |
| Faculty mentoring of students | Funded through a grant |  |
| Course-based (e.g., Independent Study) |  |
| Other – Please specify: |  |
| Professional Presentations with students\* | Paper presentations |  |
| Panel presentations |  |
| Workshops |  |
| Exhibitions |  |
| Performances |  |
| Professional Publications |  |
| Attendance at Conferences |  |

\*Please indicate where these took place\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3.8 Academic advising

Briefly describe your department’s academic advising plan and evidence of its effectiveness.

3.9 Masters theses, projects and dissertations

If your Department/School/Division offers Master’s or Doctorate Degrees, how many students wrote theses, projects or dissertations (listed in Appendix G)? Is there evidence that these culminating experiences demonstrate student achievement of Program Student Learning Outcomes? (e.g., Is there an assessment rubric for evaluating theses, projects or dissertations)

3.10 Innovations in the curriculum

Identify number and names of faculty members that have participated in CETL curriculum development workshops/activities. Identify number and names of faculty members that have participated in discipline-specific or other professional activities related to curriculum re-design and development. Describe innovative teaching strategies (e.g., service learning, the use of educational technology.) Identify the number/percentage of courses that are face-to-face instruction, hybrid, and fully online.

How is the program addressing equity issues through teaching and the classroom environment? Describe the program’s efforts to support the academic success and graduation of diverse learners.

| **rogress |****Stage Element** | **INITIAL****(1)** | **EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)** | **DEVELOPED****(3)** | **HIGHLY DEVELOPED****(4)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment of Student Learning (4.0)** |  |  |  |  |
| **Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)** | Student learning outcomes vague and not measurable. | Student learning outcomes are specific, measurability unclear. | Student learning outcomes specific to program and measurable. | Student learning outcomes specific to program, detailed, and measurable. |
| **Curriculum/ Program Mapping** | Courses or experiences listed but there are no links to PLOs. | Courses listed and may be linked to PLOs, but no clear levels of learning defined. | Courses are listed and are linked to PLOs. Clear levels of learning are defined for PLOs at all levels (I, D, M)\*. Some mapping evident. Program level outcomes map to college and institutional outcomes. | Courses listed and linked to PLOs. Levels of learning defined for PLOs at all levels (I, D, M)\*. Clearly defined curriculum map with defined levels.Program level outcomes map to college and institutional outcomes. |
| **Methods/ Measures** | Methods/measures listed but are vague and not linked to PLOs. Methods not specified. | Methods/measures listed and linked to PLOs. Only indirect measures/methods used (e.g. surveys). | Multiple methods and measures used and linked to PLOs. Assessment at only 1 level of learning. Indirect and direct methods used. | Multiple methods and measures used & linked to outcomes. Assessment performed at all levels (I, D, M)\*. Authentic performance-based direct & indirect methods are used. |
| **Assessment Infrastructure** | Assessment is assigned to a core faculty working group. Uses of technology identified. Lack of administrative support. Very little data collection. | Identified faculty committee w/some limited administrative support. Some evidence of data collection. Some use of technology.  | Faculty committee and program faculty communicate regularly. Admin support evident and evidence seen of regular data collection. Regular use of technology seen. | Faculty committee & assessment coordinator communicate with program faculty, connect to college and institutional efforts. Admin support evident. Regular data collection. Sophisticated use of technology evident.  |
| **Presentation and Publication of Findings** | Some findings are presented, but are unavailable online or inaccessible/vague/not comprehensive. Students are not aware of findings  | Findings are explain-ed, but not linked to PLOs or standards. Findings are current, but not accessible online. Some students are aware of findings. | Findings explained and available online, current and accessible and some are linked to PLOs or standards. Some students are aware of findings  | Current findings are available online and are linked to PLOs or standards. Graphs are used to displays patterns and trends. Most students are aware of findings. |
| **Use of Findings** | Findings discussed among faculty but no change made in program. No annual reports. | Findings regularly discussed by faculty and issues are identified. Annual reports are sometimes seen. | Findings discussed among faculty, issues are identified and changes are made to program (e.g. pedagogy, courses changed or added)Annual reports seen. | Findings widely disseminated among faculty. Faculty actively use and promote findings and make changes for program improvement. Annual reports consistently show all elements of assessment - especially “closing the loop”. |

# 4.0 Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

4.1 Program Level Outcomes and Curriculum Map

Submit a **Curriculum Map** the identifies Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and where they are introduced, developed and Mastered in your curriculum (See Appendix H for a template and sample Curriculum Map)

4.2 Comprehensive Assessment Plan

In this section, you should provide a **Comprehensive Assessment Plan** describe what stage you have attained in your assessment plan (See Appendix I). Include programs offered in Downtown LA if offered.

4.3 Program PLO Assessment:

Discuss assessment data collected since the last program review (including the frequency and schedule with which the data were collected) and how the results were using to improve student learning.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Indicate which Program PLOs were assessed since the last Self Study and how they were measured. Enter each PLO into a separate row.** | **2. Describe the results: (For example, how many students reached what level of proficiency on the PLOs assessed?)** | **3. Based on the results, what instructional, programmatic, or curricular improvements were made (If the findings indicated a need for changes)?** |
| Students can analyze and interpret data. The Department systematically measures this skill using a multiple-choice test assessing students’ ability to read charts and graphs. In addition, the same test is given to students in introductory, core, and graduate courses so that the Department can look at levels of achievement at different points in the program | In the introductory course BIOL 100A, 65% of students achieved proficiency in embedded questions used in AY 2009-2010.  | More work with interpretation of graphical data has been incorporated into these courses over 2010-2011. Re-assessment of this skill will be performed in AY 2011-2012. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

4.4 Assessment of Equity Gaps

Review data identifying equity gaps in core courses and discuss instruction-related strategies to address identified gaps. Refer to the [Grade Distribution DFW Dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/%22%20%5Cl%20%22/site/LA-PRD/views/GradeDistribution/DFWNCAY?:iid=2) and Table C.3.1.

4.5 Faculty involvement in assessment

Describe your Department/School/Division’s faculty involvement in assessment. Is there an assessment committee? Is assessment work performed by only one or two faculty members? Who reviews results and where are those results archived for future reference?

4.6 Further education of alumni

Describe your Department/School/Division’s alumni’s pursuit of post graduate degrees as evidence for successful attainment of Program Outcomes. Put the achievements in the perspective of the total number of the Department/School/Division’s alumni.

4.7 Student and alumni awards/achievements

Describe your Department/School/Division’s alumni’s awards and achievements as evidence for successful attainment of Program outcomes. Put the achievements in perspective of the total number of Department/School/Division’s alumni.

4.8 GE Program PLO Assessment (for Department/School/Divisions offering GE courses): Assessment methods; Data for one key measure; Student satisfaction and; How results are used for improvement in the GE Program courses offered by the Department/School Division.

Complete Appendix F to describe assessment plan for all GE Courses offered by the Program. You can retrieve the list of GE courses your Department offered from the [Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixFGEcoursesoffered?:iid=3).

# 5.0 Department Faculty

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Progress | Stage Element** | **INITIAL (1)** |  **EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)** | **DEVELOPED (3)** | **HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)** |
| **Program Faculty Engagement in Educational Performance, Professional Achievement, and Contributions (5.0)** | No evidence of instructional excellence is presented | Evidence for instructional excellence is scant  | Evidence for instructional excellence, is found for many of the program faculty.  | There is a range of evidence for instructional excellence.  |
| Program faculty have a meager track record in their record of professional achievement. | A minority of program faculty is engaged in scholarship, research, and creative activities as evidenced by their record of professional achievement. | A majority of program faculty is engaged in scholarship, research, and creative activities as evidenced by their record of professional achievement and awards.  | Campus and professional peers for active engagement in publications and scholarship generally recognize program faculty.  |
| Little evidence for participation in shared governance and service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community are weak. | A minority of faculty participate in shared governance and/or provide service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community. | A majority of faculty members participate in shared governance or provide service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community | The whole faculty participates actively in shared governance and provides service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community. |
| **Faculty Utilization within a Program (5.0)** | Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline is informed by historical assignments without consideration of evolving curricula.  | Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by perceived curricular needs, not results of outcomes assessment or a review of peer institutions. | Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions or by results of outcomes assessment.  | Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions, disciplinary trends and results of outcomes assessment. |
| Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a large portion of courses across the curriculum.  | Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a significant portion of courses mostly in the lower division.  | All upper division/graduate courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field.  | All courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified Temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field. |
| There is no evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record. | There is little evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record. | Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are trained before they can be the instructor of record. | Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are well trained before they can be the instructor of record. |
| **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion** | No discussion of representation of current faculty. | Limited discussion of faculty representation, but no analysis of gaps and no goals for improvement. | Discussion of faculty representations and gaps, and some preliminary discussion of goals for improvement. | Explicit planning for improvement, including discussion of strategies for consideration of DEI in current or future recruitment and hiring processes. |

Here the evidence is presented to determine the effectiveness of the faculty in all aspects of University life: instructional, scholarly activity and University service. If a Department Self Recommendation is for hiring more faculty, these sections (in conjunction with sections for curriculum and assessment) should: (1) provide evidence that the current faculty is lacking in important areas to achieve program PLOs; and (2) provide evidence that diversity, equity, and inclusion are being considered in the recruitment and hiring process (or how it will be considered if/when the process begins).

Refer to Appendix J, Faculty Composition, to discuss whether current faculty are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity to achieve programmatic and institutional objectives. Use data from [The Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixJ_aFacultyComposition?:iid=1) of the Institutional Effectiveness website, specifically the Faculty Hiring Workbook. Any updates in faculty profile not in the Hiring Workbook can be added by the Department (e.g., recent hires).

5.1 Student feedback on instruction

This section describes student satisfaction with different aspects of the Department/School/Division’s instructional faculty. Data can be collected through surveys, assessment, and other avenues. A brief discussion of the strong points and weaker areas should be present.

5.2 Trends in percent of courses taught by faculty rank

This section uses the information in Appendix L to determine if the classes in the Department/School/Division are taught by appropriately qualified faculty. You can retrieve the data from [the Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixL_InstructionalFacultyTypesintheProgramsCourses?:iid=4). See the rubric element *Faculty Utilization* for evaluation criteria. A brief discussion to justify appointments or to request hires in areas may be present.

5.3 Faculty scholarly activities

This section describes the activity of the Department/School/Division faculty as scholars over the past five years. Some notes should be made of emerging areas that will require expertise or traditional core areas where expertise may be lacking. Evidence to support these arguments should be drawn from the summary vitae (Appendix K).

5.4 Faculty Service to the University.

This section summarizes the involvement of the faculty in serving the University. Evidence to support these arguments should be drawn from the summary vitae, with some specific examples used for emphasis as needed.

# 6.0 Student Engagement, Outreach and Recruitment

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Progress | Stage Element** | **INITIAL (1)** | **EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)** | **DEVELOPED (3)** | **HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)** |
| **Student Engagement and Learning Experiences (6.0)** | Almost no students are involved in high-impact activities (clubs, service learning, or research with faculty). Program lacks culminating experience that allows integrative learning.  | Very few students are involved in high-impact activities (clubs, service learning, or research with faculty). Program lacks culminating experience that allows integrative learning.  | Some program students are actively engaged in high-impact activities (clubs, service learning, internships, research with faculty, or learning communities). Program has a culminating experience but it may not allow integrative learning.  | Large numbers of program students are actively engaged in high-impact activities (service learning, internships, research with faculty, or learning communities). Program has a culminating experience that promotes integrative learning.  |

6.1 Description of activities

This section summarizes the types of engagement, outreach, recruitment and retention activities in which the Department/School/Division engages. These can address the grade levels K-16 off campus as well as students in your programs. Discuss how diversity, equity and inclusion are reflected in these activities.

6.2 Effectiveness of activities

This section summarizes the effectiveness of these activities. Data for overall recruitment can be found in the [*Admission* dashboard](https://latabpubsrc.calstatela.edu/t/LAIR-PUBLIC/views/Admission/Admissions?iframeSizedToWindow=true&%3Aembed=y&%3Adisplay_spinner=no&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3Aembed_code_version=3&%3AloadOrderID=0&%3Adisplay_count=n&%3AshowVizHome=n&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link) at the Institutional Effectiveness website. Admission statistics such as admission rates, yield rates and top feeder schools can be generated for a given program using interactive filters. Retention data can be found in the [Program Review dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/ProgramReview/AppendixC_GraduationandPersistenceRates) or [*Retention & Graduation Initiative 2025* dashboard](https://latabpubsrc.calstatela.edu/t/LAIR-PUBLIC/views/RetentionandGraduation/StudentSuccess?iframeSizedToWindow=true&%3Aembed=y&%3Adisplay_spinner=no&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3Aembed_code_version=3&%3AloadOrderID=0&%3Adisplay_count=n&%3AshowVizHome=n&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link).

# 7.0 Program Self-Recommendations

Here the program proposes recommendations for program improvement (increasing student learning, graduation rate, etc.) using the information provided above. Implementing these recommendations should be a significant part of the Five-Year Plan in the following section.

## Five-Year Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Progress | Stage Element** | **INITIAL (1)** | **EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)** | **DEVELOPED (3)** | **HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)** |
| **Student Factors (including PLOs)** | No student factors discussed in plan. No documented planning in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling, and student retention. | Student factors mentioned but not used to inform planning. Limited planning in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling, and student retention is documented. | Some student factors based on trends are described. Preliminary planning in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling and student retention are documented. | Multiple student factors based on trends are described and used in planning. Specific plans in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling, and retention are discussed. Inadequately funded programs also show planning to meet students’ needs. |
| **Resources** | No discussion of resource adequacy. No 5-yr planning for resources. | Limited discussion of adequacy of resources; no resource planning for a 5-yr period. | Preliminary analysis of adequacy of resources for 5-yr period. Needs are identified but not based on program priorities or data. | Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 5-yr period. Identify needs based on program priorities using data. |
| **Action Plan and Timeline** | No action plan or timeline included. | Partial action plan and brief timeline included. | Preliminary action plan included. May include revised curriculum, timeline for task, person/committee. responsible, and cost). | Full plan includes: specific actions or changes to be taken (e.g. revision of curriculum, timeline for task, person/committee responsible, and cost). |
| **Faculty Issues** | No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development; no planning is evident. | Limited discussion of faculty trends (program development, recruitment, retention) based on anecdotal evidence. | Discussion of faculty trends. Preliminary planning for program development as affected by faculty recruitment/retention/needs. | Explicit planning for program development based on faculty recruitment/ retention/needs. Supporting data used in planning. |
| **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion** | No discussion of DEI in the five year plan | Limited discussion of DEI data, but no analysis of gaps and no goals for program improvement. | Discussion of DEI data, and analysis of stregnths and gaps in the areas of student representation, faculty representation, curriculum integration and student success. | Explicit planning for program development based on analysis of strengths and gaps in the areas of student representation, faculty representation, curriculum integration and student success. |
| **Faculty Utilization within a Program** | No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development; no planning is evident. | Limited discussion of faculty trends (program development, recruitment, retention) based on anecdotal evidence | Discussion of faculty trends. Preliminary planning for program development as affected by faculty recruitment/retention/needs. | Explicit planning for program development based on faculty recruitment/ retention/needs. Supporting data used in planning |
| Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline is informed by historical assignments without consideration of evolving curricula.  | Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by *perceived* curricular needs, not results of outcomes assessment or a review of peer institutions. | Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions *or* by results of outcomes assessment.  | Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions, disciplinary trends and results of outcomes assessment. |
| Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a large fraction of courses across the curriculum.  | Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a significant fraction of courses mostly in the lower division.  | All upper division/graduate courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field. | All courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field. |
| There is no evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record. | There is little evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record. | Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are trained before they can be the instructor of record. | Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are well trained before they can be the instructor of record. |
| **Use of Evidence** | No assessment plan in place. Assessment does not occur on regular basis. Findings of assessment are not reviewed or analyzed. No changes are made based on evidence. | An assessment plan is evident, but assessment does not occur on regular basis. Findings are sometimes reviewed. One or two changes have been made to program based on data/evidence. | Assessment plan is in place and assessment occurs somewhat regularly. Findings are reviewed and some changes are made based on evidence. Little evidence that changes lead to improved student learning. | Faculty are engaged with continual implementation of the assessment plan. Find­ings are systematically reviewed and changes are made to program based on data and evidence. There is evidence that changes lead to improved student learning. |
| **Faculty Involvement in Self-Study** | Self-Study is compiled primarily by program head with limited faculty input. Faculty attitude of PR process is one of compliance. | Broader faculty input, but process is compartmentalized; college administrators provide feedback to process. Culture created by faculty that views PR process as a vehicle for improvement/change.  | Full participation of appropriate faculty; process collaborative at department level with engagement of college administrators; culture of “by faculty, for the use of faculty”. | Faculty-driven process; Faculty committee organizes and implements the PR review process; collaborative involvement with College and University administrators; PR process is an integral component of program’s operations. Report is self-reflective.  |

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/School/Division will develop a plan that describes what the unit intends to do during the next five years. Development of this plan should benefit those units applying for new tenure-track positions or space by providing specific data 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. **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.** What DEI goals need to be established in the areas of student representation, faculty representation, and curriculum integration? Are there opportunity gaps in the area of student success that should be addressed?

5. **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, increased use of technology, increased 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.

# **Appendices**

# Appendix A. Report from Previous Program Review

Please insert in this section the last program review summary report (you should be able to obtain an electronic copy from the Office of Academic Affairs), the last accreditation report (if applicable) and Section B items from the Annual Reports on Program Improvement (you can request copies from Academic Affairs if you did not retain electronic files of those reports).

# Appendix B. Students in the Major

Appendix B.1 Undergraduate Students

TABLE B.1.1 New Undergraduate Enrollments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fall | # of new students entered as first-time freshmen | # of new students entered as transfers |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |

TABLE B.1.2 Undergraduate Student Enrollments in Headcount and FTES (major students only)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Academic Year | Major students only |
| Lower-division (freshmen and sophomore) | Upper-division(junior, senior, post-bac & 2nd Bac) | Total |
| Headcount | FTES1 | Headcount | FTES2 | Headcount | FTES3 |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*1 FTES of the lower division students who are majoring in the program.*

*2 FTES of the upper division students who are majoring in the program.*

*3 FTES of all students who are majoring in the program.*

TABLE B.1.3 Undergraduate Course Enrollment by *course-based FTES*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Academic Year | Course Enrollments in FTES |
| Lower-division FTES1 | Upper-division FTES2 | Total FTES |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |

*1 All students’ FTES enrolled in lower-division courses of the program, regardless of student major.*

*2 All students’ FTES enrolled in upper-division courses of the program, regardless of student major.*

TABLE B.1.4 Undergraduate Degree Awarded in the major

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| College Year |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |

Appendix B.2 Graduate Students

TABLE B.2.1 New Graduate Enrollments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year | # of new students entered as master’s students | # of new students entered as doctoral students |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |

TABLE B.2.2 Graduate Student Enrollments in Headcount and FTES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year | # of master’s students | # of  doctoral students |
| Headcount | FTES | Headcount | FTES |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |

TABLE B.2.3 Graduate Degree Awarded in the major

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| College Year | Master’s Degrees Awarded | Doctoral Degrees Awarded |
|  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |
| 20\_\_-20\_\_ |  |  |

#

# Appendix C. Graduation and Persistence Rates

Appendix C.1. Graduation Rates for Undergraduate Program

For each undergraduate degree program, tables will be provided showing the 1-year retention, 4-year/ 6-year graduation rates, and equity gaps for 6-year graduation rates by entry type of first-time full-time freshman students (Table C.1.1), and the 2-year graduation rates, 3-year graduation rates, and 4-year graduation rates, and equity gaps for transfer students (Table C.1.2).

TABLE C.1.1 First-time, Full-time Freshmen Graduation Rates

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Entered In Fall | % retained in 1st year | % Graduated in 4 years | % Graduated in 6 years | Pell Gap | UR Status Gap | Gender Gap |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE C.1.2. Transfer Student Graduation Rates

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Entered In Fall | % Graduated in 2 years | % Graduated in 3 years | % Graduated in 4 years | Pell Gap | UR Status Gap | Gender Gap |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix C.2. Graduation Rates for Graduate Program

The tables below will be provided showing the graduate rates for master’s or doctoral programs.

TABLE C.2.1 Graduation Rates for Master’s Programs

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Master’s Entered in Fall | % Graduated in 2 years | % Graduated in 3 years | % Graduated in 4 years |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |

TABLE C.2.2 Graduation Rates for Doctoral Programs

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All Doctoral Entered in Fall | % Graduated in 3 years | % Graduated in 4 years | % Graduated in 5 years |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |
| 20\_\_ |  |  |  |

Appendix C.3. Equity Gaps in Core Courses

For each core course listed below, the table will provide information showing the DFW rates and equity gap per course. Please list all core courses relevant to your department.

Table C.3.1. Equity Gaps in Core Courses

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Core Course | Number of Students Enrolled | DFW RateOverall | Pell Gap | UR Gap | Gender Gap |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Add lines as needed* |  |  |  |  |  |

*Note. Add lines as needed for additional courses for core courses. Core courses are required courses (non-elective courses) in your program.*

# Appendix D. Faculty Utilization

Refer to the [Faculty Headcount Dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/#/site/LA-PRD/views/FacultyHiring/FacultyHeadcount) and [Faculty Workload and Assignment Dashboard](https://lair.calstatela.edu/t/LA-PRD/views/FacultyWorkloadandAssignment/FacultyAssignment?:showAppBanner=false&:display_count=n&:showVizHome=n&:origin=viz_share_link)  that department chair has access at IE [login-dashboard](http://www.calstatela.edu/InstitutionalEffectiveness/dashboards-id-login).

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness publishes additional publicly available reports that provide this information.

The [FTES-FTEF-SFR](https://latabpubsrc.calstatela.edu/t/LAIR-PUBLIC/views/SFR/SFR?iframeSizedToWindow=true&:embed=y&:display_spinner=no&:showAppBanner=false&:embed_code_version=3&:loadOrderID=0&:display_count=n&:showVizHome=n&:origin=viz_share_link) dashboard; older data is posted under IE’s [Resources](https://www.calstatela.edu/InstitutionalEffectiveness/resources) page. These files are downloadable Excel files that include all departments and totals by College. Each academic term is reported on a separate tab in the file. Include data since the last Program Review.

This data can be used in discussing the adequacy of your faculty to address the instructional needs of your programs.

# Appendix E. Catalog Description of Each Program

The information requested here can be obtained from the online catalog and reproduced here. This information is important as background for your curriculum section (3.0) and to familiarize the reviewers with the particulars of your academic program(s).

# Appendix F. GE Assessment

List the courses that are meeting a GE requirement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Identify GE Course Number** | **GE Designation\*** | **Method of Assessment** |
|  |  | Evaluation of student work by program offering course |
|  | Signature Assignment | Assessment results | Course improved |
|  | Describe assessment method (e.g. survey, signature assignment, exam) | Report results from assessment data | Describe how data was used to improve course |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [Oral Communication (Block A1)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-a1-oral-communications) | [Block C2 Humanities (Literature, Philosophy, Languages other than English)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-c-arts-and-humanities) |
| [Written Communication (Block A2)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-a2-written-communications) | [Block D. Social Sciences](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-d-social-sciences) |
| [Critical Thinking and Composition (Block A3)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-a3-critical-thinking-and-composition) | [Block E. Lifelong Understanding and Self-Development](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-e-lifelong-learning-and-self-development) |
| [American Institutions](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/american-institutions-government-ge-requirement) | [Diversity Requirement (*d*) (*RE*)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/diversity-requirement-d-and-re) |
| [B1 Physical Science](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/blocks-b1-b2-b3-natural-sciences) | [Civic Learning/Community Engagement (*cl*)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/civic-learningcommunity-engagement-upper-division-ge-requirement) |
| [B2 Biological Science](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/blocks-b1-b2-b3-natural-sciences) | [Writing Intensive (*WI*)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/writing-intensive-requirement) |
| [B3 Interdisciplinary Physical-Biological Science](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/blocks-b1-b2-b3-natural-sciences) | Written communication (required in all GE courses)  |
| [B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-b4-mathematicsquantitative-reasoning) | [Information Literacy](http://calstatela.libguides.com/tutorial)  |
| [Block C1 Arts (Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, and Theatre)](http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudies/block-c-arts-and-humanities)  |  |

Describe your Department’s process of gathering information about the effectiveness of the service courses your Department offers for other programs. Your description could include.

* Identify services courses in your Department
* Identify which majors the course services
* Gather and report information on the effectiveness of service courses to other programs/majors
* Describe the communication process you use to solicit information about course effectiveness from departments receiving service
* Discuss how/whether this work is part of the work of your Department’s curriculum and/or assessment committees

# Appendix G. Masters Theses, Projects and Dissertations

In this section your program will report on the work completed by graduate students as Masters’ theses, projects or dissertations. Please report theses, projects and dissertations starting from the last Self Study to the present.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Semester/Year Completed | Student Name | Thesis/Project Title |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | *add more cells as needed* |

# Appendix H. Curriculum Map for Each Academic Degree Program

**Curriculum Map: Indicating the courses in which students achieve the programmatic**

**Student Learning Outcomes**

State to what extent student learning of that outcome is expected in that class in a table such as that below. You may use “I” for Introduced; “D” for Developed and “M” for Mastered or develop and define your own terminology for levels of student learning.

Template:

  ***Curriculum Map Matrix (Sample Template)***

 *(Where are SLOs Introduced, Developed, and Mastered)?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *COURSE**# XXX:**Title* | *COURSE**# XXX: Title* | *COURSE* *# XXX: Title*  | *COURSE**# XXX: Title*  | *COURSE**# XXX: Title* | *COURSE**# XXX:**Title* |
| *SLO 1: (write SLO here)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *SLO 2: (write SLO here)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *SLO 3: (write SLO here)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *SLO 4: (write SLO here)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *SLO 5: (write SLO here)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *SLO 6: (write SLO here)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *SLO 7: (write SLO here)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Place an I, D, or M in each cell above to indicate where the program content related to each SLO is introduced (I), developed (D), and/or mastered (M). SLO content may be delivered in more than just six courses as indicated in the above table.*

## *Example of a Curriculum Map:*

 **Curriculum Map for MS in Industrial Management**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fall Semester | Spring Semester |  |
|  | TECH 5900: Research Development for Technology Leadership | MGMT 5106: Employee Motivation and Work Behavior | MGMT 5501: Project Manage-ment | TECH 5100: Technology Forecasting and Assessment | TECH 5510: Product Conceptualization and Realization | TECH 5520: Six Sigma for Manufacturing | TECH 5960 5990, 5995: Comprehensive exam, Thesis, Culminating Project |
| SLO 1: Use techniques, skills, and modern engineering management tools necessary for industrial practice | I |  | D |  | M |  |  |
| SLO 2: Design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, social, safety, environmental, manufacturability, and sustainability | I |  | D | D | D/M |  | M |
| SLO 3: Apply knowledge of engineering, technology, and management to industrial and manufacturing operations  |  | I | D |  |  |  | M |
| SLO 4: Design a research project, analyze and interpret data to assess or improve industrial and manufacturing operations | I |  |  | D/M |  |  | M |
| SLO 5: Implement a quality control system to improve manufacturing processes and product improvement that applies knowledge from STEM and management | I | D | D |  |  | M |  |

Introduced (I), Developed (D), and Mastered (M)

# Appendix I. Assessment Plan(s)

Insert the assessment plan for each program in your Department/School/Division. Indicate the date that it was created and also the date that it was last revised as the plan may change as student learning data is obtained. See below for a template and sample. To download a working template of an assessment plan, visit [this](http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/users/u50136/comprehensive_assessment_plan.xlsx) link.

*The Comprehensive Assessment Plan*

*The comprehensive assessment plan displays all elements of the assessment cycle. Assessment elements are coordinated to match many accreditation agency assessment requirements, e.g., WSCUC, ABET, NASM and many others.*

*The comprehensive assessment plan should identify:*

*a. Institutional learning outcomes: institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) typically highlight the general knowledge, skills, and dispositions all students are expected to have upon graduating from an institution of higher learning.*

 *b. Program learning outcomes: program learning outcomes (PLOs) highlight the specific discipline’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions students are expected to know as program graduates.*

*c. Student learning outcomes: student learning outcomes (SLOs) clearly convey the specific and measurable behaviors students will demonstrate in order to achieve the program’s outcomes.*

*d. The course(s) where each student learning outcome is assessed: specific courses in the major can be designated as SLO assessment courses. Not all courses in a major will be designated as an SLO assessment course.*

*e. An assessment activity (also called signature assignment): a reliable and valid assignment that directly measures the stated behavior in the SLO. Examples include (but not limited to): final exam, presentation, project, performance, observations, classroom response systems, computer simulated tasks, analytical paper, case study, portfolio, critique, policy paper, comparative analysis project, qualifying or comprehensive examination, project, thesis, dissertation, and many others. Only one assessment activity is needed to assess an SLO. It is possible that one major assessment will assess between one and three SLOs.*

*f. Assessment tool: an instrument used to score or evaluate the assessment activity. Examples include: rubrics (that produce scores based on established criteria), observational checklists, observational narratives, video or audio recording with written analysis, rating scales.*

*g. Assessment schedule: the timeline for administering the assessments and collecting the data. Examples include staggering SLO assessments over a five-year period.*

*h. How the assessment data and findings will be quantitatively or qualitatively reported: examples of ways to report assessment data include the number/percentage of those scoring at or above 4.0 on a 5.0 point scale on the assessment used to measure mastery of a specific SLO; number or percentage of students scoring at the highly proficient level; instructor observational narrative that includes analysis and findings to qualitatively show trends and patterns; mean scores of all who exhibited desired traits or behaviors on an observational checklist.*

*i. Who will collect, analyze, and interpret student learning outcome data: possibilities include a faculty committee, college or university assessment office personnel, assessment coordinator or college administrator who assumes data collection, analysis and interpretation responsibilities.*

*j. Program data/findings dissemination schedule: the frequency data will be disseminated to identified stakeholders.*

*k. Anticipated strategies on how outcome data will be used to “close the loop”: how data will be used to respond to issues or areas of concern. Examples include revising a) syllabi, b) SLOs, c) assessment assignments, d) teaching methods, e) program curriculum.*

*The basic template below provides a sequential and developmental picture of every component in the assessment plan. Graphically displaying ILOs, PLOs and SLOs show the unifying thread between all outcome levels.*

*Sample Template: Comprehensive Assessment Plan*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *a* | *b* | *c* | *d* | *e* | *f* | *g* | *h* | *i* | *j* | *k* |
| *ILOs* | *PLOs* | *SLOs* | *Course**where each SLO is assessed* | *Assessment activity/**assignment used to measure each SLO* | *Assessment tool used to measure outcome success* | *Assessment schedule – how often SLOs will be assessed* | *How data/**findings will be quantitatively or qualitatively reported* | *Designated personnel to collect, analyze, and interpret student learning outcome data*  | *Program**data/**findings**dissemination schedule* |  *Closing the loop strategies* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Example of a Comprehensive Program Assessment Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k |
| Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) | Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) | Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) | Course where each SLO is assessed | Assessment activity/assignment used to measure each SLO | Assessment tool used to measure outcome success | Assessment schedule – how often SLOs will be assessed | How data/findings will be quantitatively or qualitatively reported | Designated personnel to collect, analyze, and interpret student learning outcome data | Program data/findings dissemination schedule | Closing the loop strategies |
| ILO 1: Knowledge — Mastery of Content and Processes of InquiryILO 2: Proficiency — Intellectual skills | PLO 1: apply application of engineering principles to the planning and operational management of industrial and manufacturing operations | SLO 1: apply knowledge of mathematics, science, engineering, technology, and management | TECH 5100 | Solving exercises | Rubric designed around criteria for each SLO | First year of 2 year cycle | Report on percentage of students that meet or exceed a minimum level established for each SLO | Instructor will collect assessment.Graduate Program Director will analyze and interpret the data. | Assessment data will be reported to Academic Programs and Planning Office. The University Academic Assessment Council will review the reports to provide feedback on assessment activities and data. Feedback will be used to improve assessment plans for the following year. | An assessment committee will review the data and identify where improvement is needed. Advisory committee will also provide inputs. |
| SLO 2: develop and conduct research, as well as to analyze and interpret data | TECH 5900 | Research paper | First year of 2 year cycle  |
| ILO 2: Proficiency — Intellectual skillsILO 3: Place and Community — Urban and Global MissionILO 4: Transformation — Integrative Learning | PLO 2: demonstrate ability to plan and manage industrial and manufacturing operations | SLO 3: design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, social, safety, environmental, manufacturability, and sustainability | TECH 5510 | Design project | Second year of 2 year cycle |
| SLO 5: communicate effectively in written and oral forms | TECH 5990/5995 | Written project or thesis | Second year of 2 year cycle |
| ILO 3: Place and Community — Urban and Global MissionILO 4: Transformation — Integrative Learning | PLO 3: possess a solid knowledge in accounting, engineering economy, financial management, industrial and human resources management, and quality control | SLO 4: identify, formulate, and solve industrial problem | TECH 5520 | Group project  | Second year of 2 year clcle |
| SLO 6: demonstrate the ability to use techniques, skills, and modern engineering management tools necessary for industrial practice | MGMT 5501 | Case study | First year of 2 year cycle |

 *Template originally created by Mary Pederson and San Luis Obispo faculty.*

# Appendix J. Faculty Composition

a. Number of Tenured and Probationary (Tenure-Track) faculty Fall semester 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 |
| FERP | Female - Male -  | Afr Amer - Asian/PI -Latino -White -Multi -Other - | Doctorate -Masters -Bachelors - |
| Professor | Female - Male -  | Afr Amer - Asian/PI -Latino -White –Multi -Other - | Doctorate -Masters -Bachelors - |
| AssociateProfessor | Female - Male -  | Afr Amer - Asian/PI -Latino -White –Multi -Other - | Doctorate -Masters -Bachelors - |
| AssistantProfessor | Female - Male -  | Afr Amer - Asian/PI -Latino -White –Multi -Other - | Doctorate -Masters -Bachelors - |
| Lecturer | Female - Male -  | Afr Amer - Asian/PI -Latino -White –Other - | Doctorate -Masters -Bachelors - |
| Teaching Associate | Female - Male -  | Afr Amer - Asian/PI -Latino -White –Multi -Other - | Doctorate -Masters -Bachelors - |

c. Number of anticipated faculty retirements before the next program review: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# Appendix K. Faculty Summary Vitae

Each faculty vitae not to exceed three pages. Please use the format below.

**Faculty Name**

**Education and Relevant Experience**

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught

Selected service to the Department, College, and University in the past five years or since the last self-study

Selected Professional Presentations in the past five years or since the last self-study

Selected Presentations by mentored students in the past five years

Selected publications since the last Self Study in the past five years or since the last self-study: please separate peer-reviewed articles from scholarly books and from textbooks. Indicate those with student co-authors with a “\*”

Selected grants *funded* in the past five years or since the last self-study

#  Appendix L. Instructional Faculty Types in the Programs’ Courses

In this section, complete the following table for the past two years (total number of classes, not average). Use this data in Section 5 in describing student evaluation of your faculty’s classroom effectiveness.

**Proportion of Classes Taught by Faculty Rank**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Appt. Level | Number of classes | Major Classes | Graduate Classes | Service/GE Classes |
| FERP |  | % | % | % |
| 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.

# Appendix M. Recommendations for External Reviewers

In the table below, please provide the name, contact information, and CVs of six potential external reviewers who are willing to serve on your program’s review team. Three recommended external reviewers should be from institutions within the CSU system and three recommendations should be from institutions outside of the CSU system.

Recommendations for External Reviewers

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Institution | Email Address | Phone Number | Institutional Affiliation |
|  |  |  |  | CSU |
|  |  |  |  | CSU |
|  |  |  |  | CSU |
|  |  |  |  | Non-CSU |
|  |  |  |  | Non-CSU |
|  |  |  |  | Non-CSU |