Outcomes-Based Program Review Workshop

November 10-11, 2011
The Renaissance Hotel
Long Beach, CA

Resource Binder
Effective Solutions for Outcomes Assessment

TaskStream provides the highest quality Web-based software and supporting services to help colleges and universities establish sustainable processes for multi-year assessment and continuous improvement.

**Foster Engagement Campus-Wide**
Promote a culture of inquiry by providing a clear and consistent process framework employing regular feedback and review and increasing transparency of assessment activities.

**Streamline Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**
Identify methods for assessing SLOs, set target achievement levels, assess student work, aggregate and analyze data at course, program, and institutional levels, and document findings and plans for improvement.

**Advance Institutional Effectiveness**
Collect data from throughout your college or university in one centralized system, and utilize advanced reporting tools to track, demonstrate, and learn from ongoing assessment processes.

We are proud to partner with our many WASC member clients in their commitment to institutional and educational excellence.

We invite you to learn more about why TaskStream is the leading campus assessment solution. Visit us online or email us at info@taskstream.com.

“The transparency and ease of use that AMS offers has really transformed the attitudes towards assessment on campus in a very positive way. In the past, faculty and staff were frustrated by the need to respond to multiple requests for the same assessment data over time. Now, everyone can enter and access the information efficiently from one system. As a result, faculty and staff in different programs can spend more time gaining ideas by viewing different assessment methods and learning about student outcomes from one another.”

**Laura Hecht**, Ph.D.,
Assistant VP for Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment,
California State University, Bakersfield

“The level of support provided by TaskStream is amazing. We were able to ‘hit the ground running’ and smoothly transition the former paper process into a much more efficient online process. Zero technical difficulties allow us to focus on what’s important.”

**Dotti Cordell**, M.P.H., R.N.,
Student Learning Outcome Co-Coordinator,
San Diego City College
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OUTCOMES-BASED PROGRAM REVIEW WORKSHOP

SCHEDULE/PROGRAM

Thursday, November 10, 2011

8:30 – 9:30 am  Arrival, check-in, registration  First Floor Vestibule
9:30 – 10:00 am  Welcome, workshop overview, introduction of mentors  Naples Ballroom (1st Fl)
10:00 – 11:15 am  Plenary - Overview of Outcomes-Based Program Review: Purposes and Design (C. Jenefsky)  Naples Ballroom (1st Floor)
11:15 – 11:30 am  Snack break  Promenade (2nd floor)
11:30 – 12:30 pm  Mentor groups: purpose and design of team projects

Designated mentor rooms:

- Marilee Bresciani – Sicilian (2nd Floor)
- Linda Buckley – Board Room I (3rd Fl)
- Jill Ferguson – Board Room II (3rd floor)
- Joseph Hoey - Capri (2nd Floor)
- Cyd Jenefsky – San Marco (2nd Floor)
- Paula Krist - Sienna (2nd Floor)
- Michael Webber - Corsican

12:30 – 1:30 pm  Lunch in teams  La Trattoria Restaurant (1st Floor)
Team leader only -- sign up for available mentor slots  Naples Ballroom (1st Floor)

1:30 – 3:00 pm  Break-out sessions: Strategies to implement purposeful design

- Integrating Outcomes-Based Assessment and Evidence-Based Decision-Making into Program Review (C. Jenefsky)  San Marco (2nd floor)
- Working with Faculty to Implement Program Review (M. Webber)  Sienna (2nd floor)
- Evaluating Student Support Services (M. Bresciani)  Sicilian (2nd floor)
- Comparing Programs: Multiple Sites, Multiple Modalities (J. Hoey)  Capri (2nd floor)

3:00 – 3:15 pm  Snack break  Naples Foyer (1st floor)

3:15 – 4:30 pm  Plenary - Evidence to Support Purposes: Types and Sources of Data for Program Review (L. Buckley)  Naples Ballroom (1st Floor)

4:30 – 6:30 pm  Work session: Team planning and appointments with mentors
Designated rooms (see above for mentor rooms)

4 slots:  4:30 – 5:00
5:00 – 5:30
5:30 – 6:00
6:00 – 6:30

6:30 pm  Dinner on your own
Friday, November 11, 2011

7:00 – 8:00 am  Breakfast & mentor-led roundtables on topics of interest Naples Ballroom (1st fl)
Roundtables in Naples Ballroom:
- External Reviewers (L. Buckley)
- Roles & Responsibilities in Program Review (C. Jenefsky and M. Webber)
- WASC Handbook Revision (J. Ferguson)
- Program Accreditation and Program Review (P. Krist)
- Other Uses of Program Review (J. Hoey)

8:00 – 9:15 am  Break-out sessions: Designing for challenges
- Incorporating General Education into Program Review (M. Bresciani) Sicilian (2nd floor)
- Incorporating Benchmarking and Comparable Data Sources into Program Review (J. Hoey) Capri (2nd floor)
- Interpreting Data for Program Review – Case Studies (L. Buckley) Sienna (2nd floor)
- WASC and Program Review (J. Ferguson) Corsican (2nd floor)

9:15 – 9:30 am  Snack break Promenade (2nd floor)

9:30 – 11:30 am  Work session: Team planning, appointments with mentors, open office hour
Designated rooms (see Thursday for mentor rooms)
2 slots:  
9:30 – 10:00
10:00 – 10:30
Open office hour:  10:30 – 11:30 (feel free to drop by any mentor's room to ask a question)

11:30 – 12:15 pm  Lunch in teams La Trattoria Restaurant (1st floor)

12:15 - 1:45 pm  Plenary - Eyes on the Prize: Program Review MOUs, Action Plans and Budget Reallocations (M. Bresciani, L. Buckley, J. Hoey, C. Jenefsky) Naples Ballroom (1st floor)

1:45 – 2:00 pm  Snack break Naples Foyer (1st floor)

2:00 – 3:00 pm  General session: Evaluation and refinement of team plans (C. Jenefsky) Naples Ballroom

3:00 – 4:00 pm  Final mentor group session: Report-out on lessons learned and next steps in team plans
Designated rooms (see Thursday for mentor rooms)

4:00 pm  Retreat ends
Mentor Biographies
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Mentor Biographies

Marilee Bresciani

Marilee J. Bresciani, Ph.D is Professor of Postsecondary Education Leadership at San Diego State University, where she coordinates the certificate in institutional research, planning, and assessment, and the masters and doctorate in community college leadership. The curriculum at San Diego State University emphasizes student learning centeredness, integration of the curricular and co-curricular learning paradigms, and analysis, planning, and responsible practice of leaders in a socially just and global environment.

Dr. Bresciani's research focuses on the evaluation of student learning and development. She uses grounded theory to explore how systems and processes contribute to student learning centeredness, which includes the study of leaders' roles in these systems and processes as well as the role of intuition in evidence-based decision-making.

Dr. Bresciani has been invited to present and publish her findings on assessment and is a leading author of five books on assessing student learning and outcomes-based assessment program review. Dr. Bresciani has developed and delivered several courses on assessment of student learning, and serves on the editorial board of the Journal of Assessment Research and Practice. She is the assessment editor for About Campus and a managing partner in an international assessment and enrollment management consulting firm.

Dr. Bresciani holds a Ph.D. in Administration, Curriculum, and Instruction from the University of Nebraska and a Masters of Arts in Teaching from Hastings College.

Contact email: mbrescia@mail.sdsu.edu

Linda Buckley

Linda Callis Buckley, Ph.D. is Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Development and Dean of the College of Extended Learning at San Francisco State University, where she is responsible for institutional and program assessment, regional and specialized accreditation, program review, strategic planning, and institutional research. Her current portfolio includes oversight of the Facilitating Graduation Initiative, Departmental Capacity Analysis, and participation in institutional reorganization planning. Dr. Buckley frequently holds workshops on assessment and program review and often teaches courses in higher education at Ramkhmahaeng University in Bangkok, Thailand. She has served on many WASC site visit teams, and also participated for three years on the WASC Proposal Committee. She is a frequent presenter at the WASC Academic Resources Conference and AAC&U meetings.

Before entering administration, Dr. Buckley taught both graduate and undergraduate courses in phonetics, phonology, syntax, literacy, language and culture and sociolinguistics. Her academic research focused on literacy training, pedagogy, and language and culture. She has worked on Fulbright and USAID sponsored projects, as well as on contracts in Egypt, Japan, Thailand, China, Korea, Singapore, and Ivory Coast.

Dr. Buckley received her B.A. in English from the University of Georgia, her M.A. in Linguistics from UC, Davis, and her M.A. and Ph.D. in Anthropology from UC, Davis. She has worked in higher education for over 25 years.

Email: lbuckley@sfsu.edu
Jill Ferguson

Jill L. Ferguson is Director of Organizational Change at WASC. Previously she held the positions of General Education Department Chair, Assessment Coordinator, Task Force on Student Learning Chair, WASC ALO, and Professor of Literature, Writing, and Communications at the San Francisco Conservatory of Music. She also has been core faculty and then a senior lecturer in the School of Business and Management at Notre Dame de Namur University. Jill has spoken frequently at conferences and workshops on assessment topics, such as assessment of creativity and why accurate self-assessment needs to be the cornerstone to any other assessment activities. She is the author of a novel, Sometimes Art Can’t Save You, and co-author of two business books for women, Raise Rules for Women: How to Make More Money at Work and WOMEN are Changing the Corporate Landscape: Rules for Cultivating Leadership Excellence. An award-winning writer, Jill has published hundreds of poems, essays, and articles on a variety of subject matter in newspapers, magazines, and online journals.

Contact email: jferguson@wascsenior.org

J. Joseph Hoey, IV

J. Joseph Hoey, IV is Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation at Bridgepoint Education, where his responsibilities include regional and specialized accreditation, strategic planning, and institutional effectiveness. He is past president of the Southern Association for Institutional Research (SAIR), chair of the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) Professional Development Services Committee, and a member of the Selection Committee for the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability. Joseph’s background includes development of institutional effectiveness at the Savannah College of Art and Design, eight years as the founding director of the Office of Assessment at the Georgia Institute of Technology, five years in University Planning and Analysis at NC State University, and seven years in the North Carolina Community College System. His published research encompasses engineering program assessment, graduate program assessment, academic program review, building trust in assessment processes, alumni and employer feedback, validating student engagement research, community college transfer, and evaluation of online academic programs. He serves frequently as a speaker and workshop presenter on assessment, evaluation, and accreditation issues.

Contact email: joseph.hoey@bridgepointeducation.com
Cyd Jenefsky

Cyd Jenefsky is Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director of the Office for Educational Effectiveness at John F. Kennedy University. She led the collaborative design and implementation of the University’s outcomes-based academic program review process. She works with faculty, deans and senior administrators to build institutional capacity for assessment of student learning at multiple levels within the University. Dr. Jenefsky serves as a consultant and workshop leader in the U.S. and internationally to assist senior leadership and faculty with developing systems and skills for assessing student learning, conducting program review, and building a culture of collaborative organizational learning. She is currently leading the development of a Hub for Educational Innovation at JFKU.

Dr. Jenefsky has spearheaded diversity initiatives and designed/directed academic programs in multicultural studies, women’s studies, and social ecology at the University of Georgia and JFKU. Her research focuses on the multiple constructions of gender, race and ethnicity in U.S. culture, including higher education. She received her BA from UC-Davis, and her MA and PhD in Communication Arts from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Contact email: jenefsky@jfku.edu

Paula Krist

Paula S. Krist is Assistant Dean for Assessment Support in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES) at the University of San Diego. She supports SOLES faculty efforts to continuously improve their programs and to ensure student learning, as well as program and university accreditation efforts. She is on USD’s WASC Steering Committee and the University Assessment Committee. She has consulted with many colleges and universities on academic and student affairs assessment. Prior to USD, Dr. Krist, was the Director of Operational Excellence and Assessment Support at the University of Central Florida and, before that, the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment and a visiting Assistant Professor at Florida Institute of Technology. She regularly presents workshops on assessment topics at national conferences and institutes, most recently the October 2011 PACT/TPAC Conference and the April 2011 WASC ARC. Dr. Krist’s Ph.D. is in Educational Psychology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Contact email: pkrist@sandiego.edu
Michael Webber

Michael J. Webber is Interim Dean of the School of Management and Professor of Sociology at the University of San Francisco. He was formerly Academic Vice Provost with responsibilities for academic program review and assessment and in this capacity supervised over thirty (30) program reviews in various disciplines across the university. In addition, he has been a member of WASC re-accreditation teams and has also served on the WASC Interim Report Committee. He received his M.A. and Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of California, Santa Cruz and also earned an M.Sc. in Industrial Relations from the University of Wales, Cardiff and a B.Sc.(Econ) in Politics and History from the University of Wales, Aberystwyth. His research focuses on business and politics during the New Deal and has recently co-authored (with G. William Domhoff) *Class and Power in the New Deal: Corporate Moderates, Southern Conservatives and the Liberal-Labor Coalition* (Stanford University Press, 2011).

Contact email: webberm@usfca.edu
Mentor/Team Pairings
MENTOR GROUPS

MARILEE BRESCIANI
Room: Sicilian (2nd Floor)
Teams:
  - Ashford University
  - Keck Graduate Institute
  - Pepperdine University
  - Simpson University
  - The Scripps Research Institute
  - University of the Pacific

LINDA BUCKLEY
Room: Board Room 1 (3rd Floor)
Teams:
  - Cal Poly San Luis Obispo
  - CSU Channel Islands
  - CSU San Bernardino
  - Lincoln Law School
  - San Jose State University
  - UC Hastings College

JOSEPH HOEY
Room: Capri (2nd Floor)
Teams:
  - Azusa Pacific Online University
  - Cogswell College
  - Fashion Institute of Design & Merchandising
  - Kaiser School of Allied Health Sciences
  - Point Loma Nazarene University

JILL FERGUSON
Room: Board Room II (3rd Floor)

CYD JENEFSKY
Room: San Marco (2nd Floor)
Teams:
  - American University of Health Sciences
  - Biola University
  - Coleman University
  - Life University
  - Pacific States University
  - United States University

PAULA KRIST
Room: Sienna (2nd Floor)
Teams:
  - Allied American University
  - Charles R. Drew University
  - Columbia College Hollywood
  - National University
  - Pacific College of Oriental Medicine
  - West Coast University

MICHAEL WEBBER
Room: Corsican (2nd Floor)
Teams:
  - Northern Marianas College
  - Point Loma Nazarene University
  - San Diego Christian College
  - University of La Verne
  - Westmont College
WASC Program Review Workshop  
Reporting on Your Project

Your team is attending this program review workshop with a specific project to work on. We hope you make good progress gathering information, getting answers to your questions, developing a strategy, etc. In other words, we hope you’ll learn specifics relevant to your project and develop an action plan for implementation. At the end of the workshop, you’ll present your progress and receive feedback from colleagues in your mentor group. This is the culmination of the workshop. It will guide your response to that nagging question, “What do we do on Monday?” – and it’s your opportunity to help other teams figure out their next steps, too.

What Is an Action Plan? An action plan outlines the components of successful project implementation. These components typically include needs of stakeholders, your audience, and decision-makers; capacity-building; assets as well as potential obstacles; and a timeline. Each component may have multiple dimensions. For example, “next steps” may pertain to curricular, co-curricular, pedagogical, student support, or administrative processes. Capacity-building may include dissemination strategies for sharing process plans, assessment data, and best practices. Assets may include existing assessment expertise on campus in a department, the library, or a writing center. Obstacles may include resources, institutional reward structures (i.e. promotion and tenure considerations), and campus culture.

At the Beginning of the Workshop: Key Questions (for the first mentor group meeting):
1) What are the goals of your project? What are you trying to accomplish?
2) How can the workshop help you meet these goals?
3) What specific help do you need? Which sessions or mentors can provide that help?
4) How will you know you’ve had a successful experience at the workshop?

During the Workshop: Questions for Your Ongoing Work:
1) Are the goals of your project changing? Have they become more nuanced? Focused?
2) Can you briefly describe the process you envision for accomplishing this project?
   a. What are the steps needed to accomplish your goals?
   b. Whom do you need to involve in the process to ensure success?
3) What are the barriers or roadblocks you foresee to accomplishing this work?
   a. What are your strategies for addressing these barriers?
   b. Are there steps you can take to avoid these barriers?
4) Who are the campus champions, stakeholders, or decision-makers who need to facilitate this work?
   a. Whose support do you need in order to encourage others to join the conversation?
   b. Whose support do you need to assure you have the necessary resources to accomplish your plan?
5) What is your communication strategy?
   a. Who or what groups of people on campus do you need to engage first? Second?
   b. What methods of communication will you use at each phase of your plan?
6) What are the short-term and long-term measures that will gauge your project’s success?
   a. What evidence do you need to demonstrate success to your team and to others on campus?
   b. How will evidence be gathered, analyzed, and disseminated?

Presentation of Your Project and Action Plan (final mentor group meeting):
Each team will present its project and action plan for implementation. Your presentation should be brief (about 5 minutes). You should review the project you came with; describe what you have learned at the workshop and how you applied it to the project; and talk briefly about the process you will follow back on campus. Each presentation should be followed by questions, ideas, and comments from members of the other teams. This is a great opportunity for you to gather ideas. The group can also help you identify possible challenges, strategies, and resources.
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<td>WASC Workshop: Outcomes-Based Program Review</td>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Lois Garland-Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coleman University</td>
<td>Bruce F Gilden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Yi Gong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>Teresita Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Marianas College</td>
<td>Roy Greenland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Law School of Sacramento</td>
<td>Angela Harlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>Lynda Heiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion Institute of Design &amp; Merchandising</td>
<td>Andrea DeNike Helekar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Coast University</td>
<td>Erin Heyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Christian College</td>
<td>David Hillaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>Susan Hines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coleman University</td>
<td>Steven Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific States University</td>
<td>Deborah Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>United States University</td>
<td>Godwin O Igein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keck Graduate Institute</td>
<td>Lindsay Jassen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Ivy Javaluyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Gregory A Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Scripps Research Institute</td>
<td>Sharon A J Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life University</td>
<td>Jake Jung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Coast University</td>
<td>Miriam Kahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life University</td>
<td>Richard Kang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cogswell College</td>
<td>Karen Keister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia College Hollywood</td>
<td>Richard Kobritz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles R. Drew University</td>
<td>Ron Lau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>Matthew Laubacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allied American University</td>
<td>Alex Lazo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Poly San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Deolores Lencioni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>United States University</td>
<td>Sheila Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles R. Drew University</td>
<td>Richard Lindstrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coleman University</td>
<td>Kimberly Lobera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allied American University</td>
<td>Bill Luton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name (First Middle Last)</td>
<td>Company/Organization</td>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shauna Marshall</td>
<td>UC Hastings College</td>
<td>Academic Dean</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marshall@uchastings.edu">marshall@uchastings.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy McConnell</td>
<td>Point Loma Nazarene University</td>
<td>Dean, College of Arts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KathyMcConnell@pointloma.edu">KathyMcConnell@pointloma.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen McFall</td>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>Director of Assessment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:npappas@pacific.edu">npappas@pacific.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Modesto</td>
<td>Point Loma Nazarene University</td>
<td>Dr. Kevin Modesto, Chair, Sociology and Social Work Department, Point Loma Nazarene University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevinmodesto@pointloma.edu">kevinmodesto@pointloma.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younes Mourchid</td>
<td>Cogswell College</td>
<td>Professor, DDP Director</td>
<td>ymourchid@ cogswell.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Orum</td>
<td>Charles R., Drew University</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>gailorum@ cdrewu.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenni Parrish</td>
<td>UC Hastings College</td>
<td>Professor of Law</td>
<td><a href="mailto:parrishj@uchastings.edu">parrishj@uchastings.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espie Pasigan</td>
<td>Charles R., Drew University</td>
<td>Sr. Exec. Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:espiepasigan@cdrewu.edu">espiepasigan@cdrewu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E Pedersen</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost, Programs and Planning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpedersen@calpoly.edu">mpedersen@calpoly.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Power</td>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>Executive Dean</td>
<td><a href="mailto:suzanne.power@ashford.edu">suzanne.power@ashford.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narayana Prasad</td>
<td>Kaiser School of Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:narayana.g.prasad@kp.org">narayana.g.prasad@kp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Pulcipher</td>
<td>San Diego Christian College</td>
<td>Assistant Resident Life Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Brad.Pulcipher@sdcc.edu">Brad.Pulcipher@sdcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary L. Railback</td>
<td>Point Loma Nazarene University</td>
<td>Dean, School of Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garyrailsback@pointloma.edu">garyrailsback@pointloma.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Rieger</td>
<td>Allied American University</td>
<td>Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
<td>jriege@ allied.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylyn Rinaldi</td>
<td>The Scripps Research Institute</td>
<td>Administrative Director</td>
<td>mrinaldi@ scripps.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Rohif</td>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grohif@pacific.edu">grohif@pacific.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ryan</td>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.ryan@ashford.edu">mark.ryan@ashford.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Sangren</td>
<td>Point Loma Nazarene University</td>
<td>Chair, Department of Art and Design</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karensangren@pointloma.edu">karensangren@pointloma.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Sawyer</td>
<td>Charles R., Drew University</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>ritasawyer@ cdrewu.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Shay</td>
<td>Charles R., Drew University</td>
<td>Director of Academic Personnel</td>
<td>williamshay@ cdrewu.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stender</td>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.stender@ashford.edu">john.stender@ashford.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Sundberg</td>
<td>Kaiser School of Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>Education Advisor</td>
<td>bsundberg@ earthlink.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jieanny Sy</td>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Student Services of School of Nursing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsy@auhs.edu">jsy@auhs.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt S. Takamine</td>
<td>Azusa Pacific Online University</td>
<td>ALO/Academic Dean</td>
<td>ktakamine@ apou.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Taylor</td>
<td>Biola University</td>
<td>Dean of University Effectiveness</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deborah.taylor@biola.edu">deborah.taylor@biola.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dione Taylor</td>
<td>Point Loma Nazarene University</td>
<td>Professor of Education</td>
<td>dionetaylor@ pointloma.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Thompson</td>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>GLS Assistant Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sithompson@pacific.edu">sithompson@pacific.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Totah</td>
<td>Kaiser School of Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>David.x.totah@ kp.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Vestergaard</td>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alice.vestergaard@ashford.edu">alice.vestergaard@ashford.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Wallace</td>
<td>CSU Channel Islands</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for the Library</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy.wallace@ccsul.edu">amy.wallace@ccsul.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John William Washatka</td>
<td>Azusa Pacific Oline University</td>
<td>Director of Academic Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwashatka@apou.net">jwashatka@apou.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event#</td>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Record Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973290</td>
<td>WASC Workshop: Outcomes-Based Program Review (Long Beach, CA)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name (First Middle Last)</th>
<th>Company/Organization</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria N. Wayman</td>
<td>Simpson University</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mwayman@simpsonu.edu">mwayman@simpsonu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Wheeler</td>
<td>Kaiser School of Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>Director of Academic Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gregory.wheeler@kp.org">gregory.wheeler@kp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Whitney</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith.whitney@pepperdine.edu">keith.whitney@pepperdine.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Wilder</td>
<td>Point Loma Nazarene University</td>
<td>Chair, Family Consumer Sciences Dept.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaywilder@poinloma.edu">kaywilder@poinloma.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Barbara Wilson</td>
<td>Pacific States University</td>
<td>EVP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanbwilson@psuca.edu">joanbwilson@psuca.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Yoo</td>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Student Services of School of Biomedical Science</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dyoo@auhs.edu">dyoo@auhs.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OUTCOMES-BASED, EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAM REVIEW: PURPOSES & DESIGN

Cyd Jenefsky, Ph.D
Prof & Assoc VP Academic Affairs
JFK University
jenefsky@jfku.edu
WASC Program Review Workshop
November 10, 2011

Today's Session:
- Setting Foundation for workshop:
  - Conceptual Framework
  - Program Assessment: Program Review
  - Major Components
  - Key Qualities
  - Use of Results
- Designing for Purpose

Basics: What is It?
- Cyclical process for evaluating programs to make decisions about improvements
- Comprehensive audit, inquiry, reflection & analysis
  - quality, effectiveness, currency, assets, risks, sustainability/viability, mission alignment
- Can be standardized, theme-based, customized or combination
- Uses evidence from multiple sources as basis of inquiry, evaluation, and follow-up planning and budgeting

Conceptual Frame-Shift
- From audit to inquiry
- From traditional input-based, process-focused model to outcomes-based model
- From description & advocacy to evidence-based analyses and planning
- Heightened attention to improving the quality of student learning
- From focus on conducting effective program review to using the results effectively

Comprehensive
Learning Ecosystem
- Inputs Resources
- Processes
- Outputs Outcomes
- Student Learning Results (multiple years)

Program Review
Main components of PR process:
- Self-Study
- External Review
- Internal Review
- Recommendations for Improvement
  - Program Response
  - MOU = Final Results
  - Action Plan – Implementation

- Self-Study
- External Review
- Internal Review

Analysis of Evidence of Program Quality and Viability

What data/evidence do you need to see to understand program quality?

Evidence of Quality and Effectiveness:
- Curriculum (content, sequencing, currency, depth, rigor, breadth, scheduling, syllabi, delivery modalities, etc.)
- Student learning and success
- Co-curricular integration
- Assessment practices
- Learning environment & support
- Student profile
- Faculty credentials & performance
- Research, grants, recognition, awards

Clear identification of evidence you want programs to analyze

Use guiding questions
- for analysis of evidence
- to structure self-study inquiry and report
- to structure feedback reports from internal and external reviewers

• Self-Study
• External Review
• Internal Review

Retention & Graduation Rates
Student Satisfaction
Research
Advising
Curriculum Design/Currency
Student Learning Results
Grants
Licensure Rates
Admission Requirements
Faculty
Enrollment Trends
Evidence of Viability/Sustainability
(inc. administrative cost effectiveness)

- Demand for program - enrollment
- Student support services
- Faculty
- Staff
- Information & technology resources
- Facilities
- Financial resources
- Other assets

Sample results to analyze

- Student learning results (academic, co-curricular)
- Retention/graduation rates
- Licensure, placement rates
- Enrollment trends
- Student satisfaction with support services
- Alumni achievements
- Faculty grants, research, scholarship, awards
- Feedback from external constituencies
  - (e.g., employers, peer reviewers, community agencies, specialized accreditors, professional organizations)

What are the KEY QUESTIONS to ask about the quality of your program(s)?

Main components of PR process:

- Self-Study
- External Review
- Internal Review
- Recommendations for Improvement
  - MOU
  - Action Plan

Recommendations for Improvement

- Significant actions
- Evidence-based
- Feasible
- Aligned with priorities
- Include improvements in student learning

MOU

- Agreement between program/division and institution (or dept & division)
  - Clear expectations
  - Time line
  - Resources committed
- Used for planning & budgeting at multiple levels in institution
- Accountability for implementation
Sample MOUs from SFSU

Action Plan - Implementation
- Concrete actions
- Persons responsible
- Timeline
- Resources procurement
- Tracking progress and impact

Action Plan Template and Sample Action Plan from CSU Fresno

MOU + Action Plan = PR RESULTS
Used for follow-up planning, budgeting, tracking progress

Clearly Identify All Players’ Roles
- IUPUI: http://planning.iupui.edu/39.html
- SFSU Guide: http://air.sfsu.edu/prog_review/sixth.html
- CSUN Program Review Distribution of Tasks: www.csun.edu/assessment/docs/ProgramReview
- USD Guidelines for PR
- JFKU PR Guide

Coordinate with specialized accreditation cycles
Overview of 7 Key Qualities of Outcomes-Based Evidence-Based Program Review

1. Meaningful collective inquiry
   - Research questions that matter
   - Appropriate methodologies
   - Thematic, customized, uniform
   - Open to surprise
   - Multiple stakeholders involved
     - Including students!

2. Stakeholder engagement
   - Faculty, support staff, students, peer reviewers, employers, community, external experts
   - Inquiry, evaluation and decisions for improvement

3. Outcomes-based
   - Focused on results
   - Quality, effectiveness determined by evidence of outcomes achieved

4. Evidence-based
   - All evaluative claims about strengths, weaknesses, proposed improvements supported by relevant qualitative and/or quantitative evidence
     - Evidence cited throughout
   - PR results used as evidence for follow-up planning, budgeting

5. Meaningful analysis
   - Reasoned analysis of evidence (v. advocacy)
   - Significance for future program planning, inc. improving student learning
   - Responsive to changes in external environment
### 6. Usable results

- Yields info relevant and pertinent to program improvement, inc. student learning
  - Avoid busy-work unlikely to be used
- Informs evidence-based action plan (with timeline) for improving program/student performance

### 7. Results Used

- Planning and budgeting at various levels throughout institution
  - Program
  - Department
  - Division/College
  - University-wide
- Intentional capacity-building for constituencies to use results effectively

---

### Program-Level USE of Results - examples

- Refine learning or service outcomes
- Refocus curricula to reflect changes in discipline or profession
- Cut redundant classes & redesign other courses to align better with program learning outcomes
- Re-sequence courses for better scaffolding
- Coordinate course assignments in the major
- Develop undergraduate research initiative

### Program-Level USE of Results (cont’d)

- Strengthen or streamline assessment practices
- Enable a digital learning community for students
- Reassign faculty/staff or request new lines
- Design professional development program to improve online teaching, learning, assessment
- Develop applied learning initiative with employers, community

---

### USE of Results Beyond the Program - examples

- Identify and respond to trends across programs
  - Coordinate developmental courses
  - Writing across the curriculum
  - Clear flow-charts & paths to completion
- Enhance intra-institutional synergies to promote student success:
  - E.g., collaborate with student services & general education to improve student retention and performance
  - Create college-wide first-year program
  - Reallocate resources to academic support services

### USE of Results Beyond the Program (cont’d)

- Create professional development programs across units
- Better align department, college, institutional goals
- Develop cross-disciplinary service-learning collaborations
- Grant resources university-wide to integrate adjunct faculty into program assessment
- Reallocate resources to growing programs
- Allocate resources to undergrad research initiative
- Improve e-Portfolio software
- Revise program review process to produce more usable results
Design with purpose

How do you want to use program review in your program, department institution?

Purposes you want it to serve.

PURPOSES:

- improve student learning
- improve curriculum, pedagogy, learning environment, program administration, advising, etc.
- identify trends across program/dept units
- set program/division/institutional goals
- inform program/division/institutional planning
- inform decision-making, resource re/allocation at multiple levels
- re/align programs with strategic priorities and plans
- respond to environmental changes
- report program performance to stakeholders

General PURPOSE:

To generate useful, usable results to inform planning and budgeting at various levels of the institution in order to improve quality, effectiveness and sustainability of programs.

Evaluation of Program Review Process

- Is it effective?
  - Achieving intended purposes?
  - Criteria for evaluation
    - Your intended purposes
    - WASC Sr. and ACCJC rubrics
    - Criteria for evaluating PR design (last session Friday)
  - Feedback from multiple users/stakeholders
- Plan for improvement
- Accountability for implementation

Reflection Questions

- Are purposes of your PR process clear? Articulated in the guidelines?
- What are the gaps or adjustments needed in your current design in order to achieve purposes, including using results more effectively?
- In what parts of your program review process could you integrate a focus on student learning and assessment?
  - What kinds of professional development are needed to support this focus?
- What kind of professional development is needed to improve evidence-based decision-making and use of results to inform planning?
Breakout Session:
Integrating Outcomes-Based Assessment and Evidence-Based Decision-Making into Program Review

C. Jenefsky
WASC Program Review Workshop
Long Beach, CA - November 10, 2011

Integrating Outcomes-Based Assessment & Evidence-Based Decision-Making into Program Review
Cyd Jenefsky
JFK University

Evidence-Based
Outcomes-Based
Inquiry-Based

Key Features of Outcomes/Evidence-Based Program Review
- Evaluate evidence
  - Student learning
  - Program quality more broadly
- Use results
  - to inform planning & budgeting for improvements
- Track impact
  - Have changes led to program improvement?

Factors to consider:
- Status of assessment & evidence-based practices
- Status of program review
  - Adapting existing guidelines
  - Creating new ones
- Training & acculturation
  - Other?

Context for integration
- Maturity of assessment/evidence culture
- Capacity-building needs
- Annual assessment of outcomes
- Governance culture and structure
- Resources allocated
- Leadership support
- Interconnection:
  - program review, assessment, planning, budgeting, accountability

Components of Integration
- Self-Study Reports
- External Review
- Internal Review
- Recommendations
- MOU & Action Plan
- Follow-up planning/budgeting
- Tracking Improvements
Use of Outcomes Assessment in Program Review

- Integrated into self-study report
- Considered in external & internal review
- Improvement of outcomes incorporated into follow-up plans, resource allocations & tracking processes

What data/evidence do you need to see to understand program quality, currency, effectiveness, sustainability?

Quality & Effectiveness: [Institution-Specific]

- Curriculum (content, sequencing, currency, depth, rigor, breadth, scheduling, syllabi, delivery modalities, etc.)
- Student learning and success
- Co-curricular integration
- Assessment practices
- Learning environment & support
- Student profile
- Faculty performance
- Research, grants, recognition, awards

Student Learning

Includes: review of variety of elements about program assessment of student learning:

- Program outcomes
- Assessment methods
- Multiple years’ learning results
- Stakeholder feedback on learning results
- Use of results for ongoing program improvements
- Tracking improvement

5 Powerful Questions for Assessing Student Learning

- What do we want our students to learn by the time they complete our program? (Intended student learning outcomes)
- How well are they learning? (Actual student learning results & levels of achievement - standards)
- How do we know? (Evidence)

5 Powerful Questions for Assessing Student Learning

Closing the loop:

- How are we using the results to guide decisions for improvement?
- Do the improvements we make work?
What do you want to know about multiple years’ worth of learning-outcomes results (& other indicators of student success)?

Identify Key Questions

Sample results to analyze
- Student learning results (academic, co-curricular)
- Retention/graduation rates
- Licensure, placement rates
- Enrollment trends
- Student satisfaction with support services
- Alumni achievements
- Faculty grants, research, scholarship, awards
- Feedback from external constituencies
  - (e.g., employers, peer reviewers, community agencies, specialized accreditors, professional organizations)

External & Internal Review
- Reviewers enter with own frames & expectations
- Clarify expectations
  - questions/template to incorporate student learning as well as other institutional priorities
- Evidence-based review
  - Series of on-site meetings – one type of evidence
  - What other types important to you?
    - Actual review of student work?
    - Evidence of curricular quality, currency, design
    - Other evidence of faculty quality & student success
    - Other indicators of effective learning

Recommendations for Improvement
- Require citing evidence to support subsequent decision-making about the proposed plan
  - From UCLA PR: Prioritized Recommendations:
    - “Referenced with the external and internal reviewers’ reports and page numbers that support the recommendation.
    - Followed by one-paragraph explanation of the Review Team’s reasoning for the recommendation.”

- Require inclusion of commendations and recommendations to improve student learning

Viability/Sustainability
(inc. administrative cost effectiveness)
- Demand for program - enrollment
- Student support services
- Faculty
- Staff
- Information & technology resources
- Facilities
- Financial resources
- Other assets

MOU & Action Plan
- Context for plan: academic/strategic priorities of program, department, college, university
- What do you need to do to improve the student learning that matters most to you?
- Tie proposed improvements to evidence
  - Results discovered during self-study data analysis
  - External/Internal Review
  - Intervening developments, etc.
Follow-Up Planning & Budgeting

Integrate improvement of student learning:
- Annual & multi-year planning
- Budgeting & reallocation
- Communication of PR results with appropriate stakeholders
- Structures of accountability for using results

Use of Results: WASC Senior

- "Faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, benchmarking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies."
- "Campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes."
- "Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support."

Use of Results: ACCJC

- "Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement."
- "Results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning."

How do we make the change?

- *The Answer to How is Yes* (Peter Block)
- **Focus** on the result you want to achieve: integration into guidelines & practices
  - Be flexible on how you get there
  - Start with champions & stakeholders
  - Create structures, incentives & requirements
  - Hold programs accountable
- **Process:** faculty-focused, peer-mentored, inquiry-based, iterative, developmental, administratively supported, collaborative, stakeholder engagement

Powerful Questions

- Structure for inquiry
  - Integration
  - Re/design
  - Implementation
  - Use
- Focus on what matters
- Means for engagement
- Guide self-reflection, evaluation, feedback

“Human systems grow toward what they persistently ask questions about.”

D. Cooperrider & D. Whitney (2005), *Appreciative Inquiry: A Positive Revolution in Change*
Resources

WASC Senior:
- WASC Rubric on Integration of Student Learning into Program Review
  (http://www.wasc senior.org/findit/files/forms/ProgramReviewRubric4_08.pdf)
  (http://www.wasc senior.org/findit/files/forms/WASC_Program_Review

ACCJC:
- ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I:
  Program Review:
  accreditation.fullcoll.edu/ACCJCRubricTableSept2007.pdf
- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges:
  asccc.org/events/sessions/spring2008/materials.htm
  Appendix H – Program Review
Self-Study: Assessing Program Quality (Part A)
Drafted by the program chair and Self-Study Group.

1. Student Learning Results
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix A: Academic and Professional Standards and Appendix B: Annual Learning Results Reports
a) How well do your program learning outcomes (PLOs) represent the scope and depth of learning appropriate to:
   • the degree/certificate program offered?
   • to the standards of your discipline/ profession?
   How do you know?
b) Based on your annual learning results did your program achieve its standards for success? (Yes/No, explain) How well are students learning in comparison to your standards for success?
c) From the above answers, what did you learn about your students’ learning? And what changes do you want to make to improve student learning?

2. Student Learning Assessment Process
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix B: Annual Learning Results Report and Appendix C: Assessment Plans
a) Are your annual learning results giving you useful information for guiding ongoing program improvements? Explain. How does your program routinely utilize its annual learning results for program planning/improvement? In what ways have your program improvements impacted student learning? How do you know?
b) How effective are your current methods/procedures for assessing student achievement of your program learning outcomes? What is working well, and how do you know? What needs improvement and why? Explain.
c) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your student learning assessment process?

3. Academic Curriculum
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix D: Curriculum Alignment Matrix and Appendix E: Curriculum Flow Chart
a) How well does your program offer sufficient opportunities for students to learn relevant disciplinary and professional knowledge, skills, competencies, etc. (at relevant beginning, intermediate and advanced levels) for the type and level of degree/certificate conferred? Explain.
   Include in your discussion:
   • alignment between courses and program learning outcomes (PLOs)
   • scaffolding (how all the parts build on each other in a progressive, intentional way) and scheduling of courses so students can follow the best sequence (e.g. examine your program's flow chart)
   • whether students take courses in the recommended sequence (whether required to do so or not)
b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s curriculum?
4. Faculty Quality
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix F: Faculty CVs, Appendix G: Criteria for “Quality” Faculty, Appendix H: Faculty Profile, and Appendix I: Core Faculty Work/Teach Load.

a) Based on the data from your: 1) faculty CVs; 2) your criteria for ‘quality’ faculty, 3) active adjunct and core faculty profiles; and 4) core faculty work/teach load, how well does your overall faculty meet the needs of your program (e.g., in terms of teaching experience, areas of expertise, academic qualifications, committee and advising needs, etc.)? How do you know? What are the particular strengths and areas for improvement in your program’s faculty composition?

b) Explain your standards/processes for faculty hiring, professional development, and evaluation. How well are you cultivating a high quality faculty? Explain.

c) Using the core faculty workload data above is your faculty workload well distributed: 1) between the faculty? 2) well distributed to accomplish all faculty responsibilities within the program/school/university?

d) Describe how well adjunct faculty are integrated into the life of your program beyond the courses they teach (e.g. meeting with students, student learning assessment, service on committees and professional development, mentoring and coaching).

e) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s faculty quality?

5. Student Satisfaction
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix J: Student Satisfaction Survey Results.

a) Based on student satisfaction survey results and any other evidence you have (e.g. focus groups with students), how satisfied are students with your program’s curriculum, faculty, program administration, general learning environment, campus facilities and student services? Do their answers meet your expectations? How proud are they of your program and JFKU?

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s student satisfaction?

6. Graduates’ Success
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix K: Graduate Success Defined and Appendix L: Graduate Survey Results.

a) To what extent are graduates of your program succeeding in relevant careers, graduate programs, community service, creative endeavors, ways of living, or other indicators of graduate success? How do you know? (Include evidence in Appendix K)

In your discussion, include the following:
- student perceptions about attaining their personal and professional goals
- information from employers, graduate schools, licensure exams or other external sources to assess graduates’ degree of success
- other kinds of achievements and/or outcomes used to measure graduate success

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your program’s graduates’ success?
Self-Study: Assessing Program Sustainability (Part B)

Drafted collaboratively by the program chair and Dean.

7. Student Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix M: Student Retention, Attrition, and Graduation Data and Appendix N: Student Demographics

a) Is your program attracting, retaining, and graduating the mix of students you seek in your program (target markets, demographic mix, qualifications, etc.)? How effective are your recruitment and admission processes? How do you know?

b) What does your program do to improve retention, attrition, and graduation rates?

c) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program's student enrollment, retention, and graduation rates?

8. Contributions to the University
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix O: Missions and Appendix P: Your Program's Assets to the University

a) In what ways does your program contribute to the University (mission alignment, external accreditation, contributions to the community or profession, etc.)? Also include a discussion (and evidence) of any external recognition your program has received.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program's contributions to the University?

9. Societal and Professional Demand
To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix O: Missions, Appendix Q: Societal/Market Trends and Appendix R: Program Competition

a) How does this program meet/address societal and professional needs (including partnerships with organizations, community involvement, specialized accreditation, etc.)? How do you know?

   In your discussion, include the following:
   • how this program meets current and potential future trends within the labor market and society
   • how this program differentiates itself from its competition
   • any foreseen modifications that may be needed in order to stay competitive.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your academic curriculum?

OPTIONAL: Future Data Needs
In hindsight, did you learn that there were data needs (new and/or improved) which could have better assisted you with this report? Please describe what your data needs would be for your next self-study.
**Self-Study: Overview of Proposed Changes (Part C)**

*Drafted collaboratively by the Program chair and Dean.*

10. **Program Vision & Goals**

c) **Vision**—In light of the mission of JFKU, your school and your program, state the five-year vision for your program.

d) **Goals**—Identify the key goals that need to be achieved in 1, 3 & 5 years to fulfill your vision.
Self-Study Report Part C
11. Overview of Proposed Changes

(This document is online at: http://inside.jfsu.edu/programreview)

Review and reflect on all parts of your self-study and provide below proposed changes that will significantly improve the quality of your program:
(Space is provided for up to ten proposed changes, if you have more add to the list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Brief description of significant proposed changes to improve your program:</th>
<th>b) Rationale and evidence from your self-study report (review “Discoveries and Proposed Actions” in Parts A &amp;B) that support this change:</th>
<th>c) Rationale and evidence from outside sources beyond your self-study findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deans review all reports prior to submitting them on July 6, 2009 to programreview@jfk.edu.

Consult your Dean to find out when you need to submit this report to the dean’s office.

The 2008-2009 Learning Results Forum is scheduled for Monday, August 3, 2009. Details TBA.
1. **CLOSED THE LOOP** (Status of Proposed Action Items from 2007-2008 “Next Steps”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Step #1</th>
<th>Next Step #2</th>
<th>Next Step #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) “Next Steps” (Proposed Changes): Write a brief description of each proposed change (your “next steps” from your 2007-2008 presentations).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Status of “Next Steps” (Proposed Changes): Write whether each proposed change has been “completed,” is still “in-progress,” or has “not started.” Include when (quarter/semester) each change was or will be completed/effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **WHAT DO WE WANT STUDENTS TO LEARN? (PLOS 2008-2009)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 2007-2008 Program Learning Outcome(s): List your PLOs (the cognitive/knowledge, behavioral/skills and/or affective/values -- you expect your students to achieve).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Learning Criteria: List the criteria (specific qualities desired in student work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Standards For Your Program’s Success: State percentage of students you expect will achieve this PLO (&amp; at what levels) by the end of your program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **WHAT EVIDENCE DO WE USE TO ASSESS THEIR LEARNING?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence #1</th>
<th>Evidence #2</th>
<th>Evidence #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Evidence: Describe summative evidence you analyze (minimum of 2 lines of evidence) &amp; the size of the sample.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Assessment Tool/Method: List the assessment tool/method you use to analyze each line of evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Assessment Process: Describe assessment process used to analyze each line of evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Participants: List participants who assessed evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What do we want students to learn? How well are they learning? How do we know?*
4. HOW WELL ARE THEY LEARNING? (and SO WHAT?)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Results of Student Learning: List the results of each line of evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Achieving Standards: Based on the results from all lines of evidence, did your program achieve its standards for success? (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Discussion of Results for Program Improvement: Based on discussions with your faculty about your compiled results, list what you’ve discovered about student learning (what did your findings show you?) and the significance of these findings for your program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Participants in Discussing/Reviewing Results: List all who participated in discussing learning results and implications (indicate core/adjunct for all faculty).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. NOW WHAT? (PLAN TO IMPROVE OUR PROGRAM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed Change #1</th>
<th>Proposed Change #2</th>
<th>Proposed Change #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Proposed Changes: Describe the proposed change to improve your program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Rationale for proposed changes: Explain how the proposed change explicitly ties to the results from this year’s assessment of student learning &amp; how this change will contribute to the improvement of the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Proposed completion/effective dates: the quarter/semester of when the proposed change will be complete and/or effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reflection #1</th>
<th>Reflection #2</th>
<th>Reflection #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Strengths: List strengths of assessment practices for this PLO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Modifications: List what you would like to improve in your existing assessment process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. WHAT DO WE WANT STUDENTS TO LEARN? (PLOS 2009-2010)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Program Learning Outcome/s: List your PLOs (the cognitive/knowledge, behavioral/skills and/or affective/values - you expect your students to achieve).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do we want students to learn? How well are they learning? How do we know?
APPENDIX

A. Assessment tools/methods used to assess evidence

B. Sign-off from dean and program chair that all core faculty have participated and reviewed the content of this report.
Analytic Rubric for Assessing JFKU Annual Learning Results – January 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable Outcomes (PLOs</strong> &amp; Criteria</td>
<td>PLO statements exist but do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. (Statements such as &quot;Students understand major theories* do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.)</td>
<td>Some of the outcomes (PLOs) indicate how students can demonstrate their learning. Action verbs may be general and some PLOs may not be observable/measurable. Criteria for assessing each outcome are not identified, are incomplete, are vague, or are not observable/measurable.</td>
<td>The PLOs describe how students can demonstrate learning, identifying observable/measurable results (e.g., &quot;Graduates can describe and compare psychosocial theories &amp; techniques&quot; or &quot;Students can establish, maintain, evaluate and utilize the therapeutic relationship to serve the mental health needs of the client&quot;). Criteria are articulated for each PLO, though some may need refining to be clear and measurable.</td>
<td>The PLOs clearly describe how students can demonstrate learning; this includes clearly distinguishing between what the program wants students to know (cognitive), ways students think (affective/attitudinal), or what students should be able to do (behavioral, performance, psychomotor). Criteria for assessing each PLO are clearly articulated, capture the most important dimensions of student learning for each PLO, and include descriptions of student performance at varying levels of mastery for each criterion (e.g., rubric).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid Evidence &amp; Results</strong></td>
<td>It is not clear that potentially valid evidence for each relevant outcome is collected and/or individual faculty use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work or performances.</td>
<td>Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for each outcome; they may not have aligned the evidence with relevant or clearly articulated criteria.</td>
<td>Faculty collect relevant &amp; sufficient evidence for each outcome, including at least one line of direct evidence. Instruments used (e.g., rubrics) assess the level of student attainment of each outcome. Results are compiled and analyzed annually.</td>
<td>Assessment criteria, such as rubrics, have been pilot-tested and refined over time; they usually are shared with students. Self-assessment and feedback from external reviewers has led to refinements in the assessment process, and the department uses external benchmarking data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliable Results</strong></td>
<td>Those who review student work are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way; there are no checks for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and/or faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated, and faculty routinely find assessment data have high inter-rater reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation &amp; Analysis of Results</strong></td>
<td>Results (data table or other means) are not included in report. Report identifies some conclusions or implications of results, but no explanation of how these claims are derived from results. No reasoning offered in support of claims. Follow-up improvements may or may not be identified.</td>
<td>Results (data table or other means) are included but unclear or missing key data. Report identifies some conclusions and implications of results, but the claims are vague or questionably related to results. Some albeit insufficient reasoning offered in support of claims. Questions of validity or reliability of results are not discussed. Follow-up improvements identified but connection to results is unclear.</td>
<td>Results (data table or other means) are clearly delineated for each line of evidence, indicating both the raw numbers and percentages of student achievement. Report clearly articulates conclusions and implications which could be drawn from results, including a consideration of reliability and validity of results. May offer vague or insufficient reasons/explanations to support some of the claims. Explicitly connects suggested improvements to relevant results.</td>
<td>Results (data table or other means) are clearly delineated for each line of evidence, indicating both the raw numbers and percentages of student achievement at various levels of mastery. Report articulates a well-reasoned critique of probable conclusions and implications which could be drawn from the results. Results are analyzed in relation to levels of mastery. Includes a well-reasoned discussion of validity and reliability of results. Identifies improvements for student learning and/or program assessment practices. Explicitly connects suggested improvements to relevant results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results Are Used</strong></td>
<td>Results for each outcome may or may not be collected. They are not discussed among faculty.</td>
<td>Results for each outcome are collected and may be discussed by the faculty, but results have not been used to improve the program or proposed changes do not clearly follow from results.</td>
<td>Results for each outcome are collected, discussed by faculty, analyzed, and used for program planning and improvement. Proposed changes follow directly from results.</td>
<td>Faculty routinely discuss results, plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others, such as librarians or student affairs professionals, to improve results. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With permission and proper attribution, you are welcome to use these materials at your institution. Contact Cyd Jenefsky (jenefsky@jfk.edu; 925/969-3580).

* PLOs = Program Learning Outcomes

What do want students to learn?  How well are they learning it?  How do we know?
Breakout Session:

Working with Faculty to Implement Program Review

M. Webber
**WORKING WITH FACULTY ON IMPLEMENTING PROGRAM REVIEW**

WASC Educational Seminar on Outcomes-Based Program Review

Long Beach
November 10-11, 2011.

---

**Program Review – what is it?**

- Cyclical process for evaluating programs in order to make decisions about improvements.
- Comprehensive audit, inquiry, reflection and analysis regarding quality, effectiveness, mission alignment and sustainability.
- Most importantly, it should also contain the program’s vision for the future.

**Program Review – why do it?**

- Continuous program improvement.
- Goal setting and program planning.
- Identifying trends across units.
- Aligning programs with institutional mission, priorities and plans.
- Informing decision making and resource allocation.
- Reporting performance to stakeholders.

---

**External Pressures for Program Review**

- Federal government - are educators doing what they say they are doing?
- State government – is the public getting value for money?
- Regional accreditors - WASC.
- Prospective students and parents – are colleges and universities adding value?
- General public – are schools and colleges educating students and how do we know?

**WASC Requirements:**
(Standard 2.7)

- All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review.
- Analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes.
- Program retention and completion.
- Results of licensing examinations and placement.
- Evidence from external constituencies.
Questions that WASC accreditors ask

- Is there a regular cycle of program review that includes assessment and retention?
- Is program review conducted on schedule and as intended?
- Does it include the results of licensing and placement?
- Where are completed program reviews maintained?
- How is program review used to improve academic effectiveness?
- Is program review used to align resources with needs?

Components of Program Review

1. Self-study from the department or program.
2. Site visit by the external review team.
3. Action plan (based on the self-study, reviewers report and discussion between department/program and administration).

Self-Study

- Candid look at a program’s past and current effort as well as a vision of its future development.
- Covers such areas as mission, goals, history, curriculum, assessment, faculty, governance, students, staff, diversity, internationalization, technology and facilities, and plans for the future.
- Self-study is written by the entire department/program.

External Review Site Visit

- Visit by outside experts in the field.
- Read self-study and all relevant department/program data.
- Spend time on campus talking with faculty, staff and students.
- Within two months, the team submit a written report on their findings and recommendations.

Action Plan

- Reviewers report circulated to department/program faculty.
- Executive summary of main findings and recommendations prepared for University community (and posted on University website together with self-studies).
- Meetings between the Dean and department to consider findings and recommendations.
- Action plan formulated.
- Follow-up with chairs/directors each year.

Lessons and Insights

- Planning
- Inclusion
- Transparency
- Action
- Data
**Planning**

- **Start early** - a full year out is good.
- **Vision** should be the main focus - where would the program like to be in seven years time?
- **Teamwork** should be encouraged and even demanded in planning and writing the self-study.
- **Outcomes** should be stressed – the goal is to improve academic quality and student learning.
- **Integrity** is crucial - the self study should be honest and sincere.

**Inclusion**

- Ensure the self-study is a **collective** effort of all the faculty.
- Consult with chair and department members.
- **Listen and respond** to complaints and criticisms.
- Make sure that all faculty members talk to the external review team.
- Communicate any mishaps, delays, and changes immediately.

**Transparency**

- **Consistency** is important when discussing program review (faculty and administrators).
- **Confer** with the department on the choice of external reviewers (and have reasons for these people who have been selected).
- Circulate the reviewers report to everyone immediately it is received. Post the self studies and summaries where the community can see them.
- **Discuss** findings fully with the department and recognize that it may not be appropriate or practical to implement every recommendation.

**Action**

- **Reviews** must complete the feedback loop - faculty must see concrete action.
- **Start changes** immediately.
- Recommendations may have different time lines for implementation.
- **Follow-up** - check in with department about changes every year until next review.
- **Reviews** educate administrators too.

**Data**

*(Thanks to my colleague Linda Buckley of San Francisco State for these tips)*

- What are the questions?
- Who will collect the data?
- Who will analyze the data?
- How can the data be linked together?
- Who will discuss the data?
- Who will develop the action plan around the results?

**Is the department growing, shrinking or maintaining its current size?**

- Enrollment over five years.
- Retention over five years.
- Degrees awarded over five years.
Are students able to move through the program in a timely manner?

- Time to degree.
- Courses with high failure rates.
- Course rotation schedule.
- Availability of required courses.

Is the program reputable?

- Number of applicants, accepted and enrolled.
- Number or percentage of undergraduate students going on to graduate programs.
- Number or percentage of students employed in the field after graduation.

Is there an appropriate balance of lower division, upper division and graduate resources?

- Graduate courses/credits as a percentage of the total.
- Undergraduate courses/credits a percentage of the total.
- Lower division courses/credits as a percentage of the total.

Is the program rigorous?

- Grade distribution as compared with the college/school.
- Samples of student work.
- Rubrics used for assessment.

Are students learning what is expected?

**Direct Data**
- Results from program assessment.
- Reports from employers.
- ePortfolios.

**Indirect Data**
- Student exit surveys.
- National survey data e.g., NSSE.
- Alumni surveys.

Is the department diverse?

- Enrollment data disaggregated by race, ethnicity and gender.
- Faculty data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, and age/rank.
What are the indirect measures of program quality?

- How are students advised?
- How effective is faculty advising and how is it evaluated?
- What are the sources, amounts and patterns of distribution of financial assistance to graduate students?
- How frequent are guest speaker presentations or brown-bag lunches?
- Are there social gatherings for faculty, staff and students?

What is the faculty profile?

- Workloads
  - Distribution by rank.
  - Distribution by race, ethnicity and gender.
  - Honors, grants and awards.
  - Participation in advising and orientation.

Case Study: Theology and Religious Studies (2004)

- Merge separate degree programs into one.
- Work to bridge the divide between T&RS.
- Revise and condense student learning outcomes.
- Start long term planning around new curriculum.
- Introduce more dynamic courses.
- Review sustainability of the graduate program.
- Greater mentorship of junior faculty.
- Co-chairs and department sub-committees.


- Better lab and office space.
- More grants
- Move offices closer to Sports Management.
- Faculty retreat to discuss goals.
- Hire a sports psychologist.
- Increase gender and racial/ethnic diversity.
- Prioritize health promotion.
- Reduce the number of upper division electives.
- Encourage community outreach.
- Increase collaboration with other departments and programs.

Are faculty current and active in the discipline?

- Scholarship and creative work.
- Community involvement.
- Professional development.
- Involvement with industry or business.
- Interdisciplinary collaboration.
- Involvement in the scholarship of teaching.

Flashpoints and Dangers

- Workload in writing the self study.
- Choice of external reviewers.
- Controversial recommendations.
- Department disagreements about report.
- Following through on making changes.
- Administrative continuity.
Case Study: Media Studies (2008)

- Review what constitutes faculty work.
- More long term workload and curricular planning.
- Established more rigorous procedures for faculty searches.
- Improve relations with the Dean’s Office.
- Greater student input into department.

Initial Faculty Reactions

- Now really Mike, off the record, who is making us do this?
- Isn’t this really just a waste of time?
- Don’t we do this already?
- Aren’t we just setting ourselves up to get knocked down?
- Why bother? There is so little possibility of changing things.

Faculty Perceptions

- Program review is a surreptitious way to judge faculty performance.
- Our department is working well and the students are learning - so why bother?
- Program review is time consuming, complex and does not benefit students.
- Administrators will use the results of program review to eliminate programs.

Faculty Unease

Learn to answer the following questions:

- What is program review?
- Why do we have to do it?
- Will there really be any change?
- Now really Mike, off the record, who is making us do this?

Engaging Faculty

- Passionate about their fields.
- Care about their students.
- Intelligent and curious people.
- Want strong, widely respected programs.
- Work very hard.

Advantages of Program Review

- Work together, building collegiality.
- Better departments, better morale.
- Efficient departments take less work.
- Improved student learning.
### Administrative Responsibilities

- Offer consistent leadership and commitment to process over time.
- Be attentive to complaints, questions, and suggestions.
- Communicate with faculty.
- Ensure there is real change and regular follow-up after reviews take place.
- Link program review to resources.

### Conclusions

- Program review does lead to improvement.
- Link review to resources.
- Programs cannot change direction on a dime, but they can change in major ways without losing their fundamental character.
- Paradox: your weakest areas can be the areas with the largest potential for improvement and growth, while your strongest areas may not permit much change or development.
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Framing Questions

- What has been the role of Student Affairs/Services
  - in outcomes-based assessment, program review, Institutional research, and strategic planning?
- What is the emerging role?
- What may be shaping the future role?

A Walk Through History
(Bresciani, Moore-Gardner, & Hickmott, 2009)

1063 - University of Bologna
  - Juried reviews (Plato, Aristotle)
1930's and 1940's - Educational and Development Psychology
  - Traditional student motivation and performance
1970's - Introduction of Relationship with, Value Added, Impact on...

A Walk Through History, Cont.
(Bresciani, Moore-Gardner, & Hickmott, 2009)

1970's – Scientific Management Theories (Taylor, 1911) – systems thinking into program review, budgeting, strategic planning
1975 – Tinto – academic and social integration and correlation with learning
1977 – Bowen's Public Good
1979 – Pace's impact of college on student behavior

A Walk Through History, Cont.
(Bresciani, Moore-Gardner, & Hickmott, 2009)

- 1990's – TOM/CQI
- 1993 – Astin I-E-O – value-added
- NSSE, social identity development theories, Bensimon - equity-minded deficit thinking, marginalization theories

A Walk Through History, Cont.
(Bresciani, Moore-Gardner, & Hickmott, 2009)

- 1985 – SLOs in the accreditation process, AAHE first conference
- 1999-2002 - Student Affairs began to pay attention to SLOs
- Struggle between differences between research and assessment
- … and accountability and assessment
With this rich history…

Why has so little evidence of student learning been generated?

Reasons Include

- The usual ones
  - Lack of understanding of the process
  - Lack of resources to implement the process
  - No follow-through with use of data to inform decisions
  - Fear of change

Reasons Include, Cont.

- Thinking that “more doing” will fix everything
- Increased silos and increased specialization
- Decreased collaboration

Reasons Include, Cont.

- Disconnect from the holistic student learning approach
- Increased emphasis on crisis management
- Lack of education/orientation in grad prep programs
- Lack of professional development/inquiry mentoring

Reasons Include, Cont.

- Lack of prioritization on inquiry/reflection
- Simply not paying attention to what is being asked of us
  - isolated point of view
  - disconnect with constituents
  - ego

What other reasons exist?

And where do we go from here?
Some Key Reminders

Importance of Assessing Student Learning
- Demonstrates contributions to institutional mission and goals
- And contributions to institutional priorities
- Assists in informing prioritization of your time as well as other resources

Outcomes-Based Assessment can be Implemented at Multiple Levels

Decisions are made at multiple levels - some decisions reside only at one level

Alignment is Important
- Alignment of outcomes to goals
- Alignment of evaluation methods/criteria to outcomes
- Alignment of results to outcomes
- Alignment of decisions to outcomes

Which purposes would best resonate with and therefore motivate your colleagues to engage?

The Focus on Assessing Student Learning
“The concepts of learning, personal development, and student development are inextricably intertwined and inseparable.”
- The Student Learning Imperative
Some More Questions
(Bresciani, Moore Gardner, & Hickmott, 2009)

How do I influence student learning?
◦ Is it through the education of my colleagues?
◦ Of faculty?
◦ Of parents?
◦ Of community participants?

Reflection Questions
(Bresciani, Moore Gardner, & Hickmott, 2009)

• How are you directly or indirectly contributing to student learning?
• How are you directly or indirectly supporting student learning?
• How are you directly or indirectly interfering with student learning?

The Ideal for Student Learning

Establish collaborations between academic and student affairs to
• facilitate student learning
• facilitate student engagement and socio-academic integration
• evaluate professional development for faculty and staff about effective learning environments
Bresciani, Zelna, & Anderson, 2004

Where is the most appropriate place for you to contribute to student learning in your program?

What outcomes would best represent that learning?

Constructing Learning Outcomes

• Outcomes use active verbs such as articulate, illustrate, conduct, synthesize, analyze, construct, etc.
• Depending on what level of learning you expect from your learning delivery method.
http://www.coun.uvic.ca/learn/program/handouts/bloom.html

Outcomes

You may want to start with articulating outcomes that are more manageable.
◦ For instance, articulate outcomes for your outreach programs first;
◦ then later, move to your individual consultations;
◦ than your information pieces, if at all.
Another Take on Bloom
1. Knowledge = workshops
2. Skills = opportunities to apply
3. Attitudes/Values Clarification = facilitated reflection
4. Behavior Change = facilitated interventions

Outcomes, Cont.
• Make a conscious decision to articulate outcomes that infer pre- and post-tests
• Make a conscious decision to be held responsible for behavior
• Remember that your outcomes may look different for your various constituents -- you may want to start with your more manageable population first, such as your Para-professionals

Outcomes, Cont.
• Regardless of whether your goals are top down – the outcome is where you operationalize the goal.
• Therefore, the outcome or end result of the doing allows you to “personalize” the goal to your own program.

Ideas for Learning Outcomes
• NASPA/ACPA Learning Reconsidered and Learning Reconsidered II
• CAS Outcomes
• AAC&U General Learning
• Your Prof. Assoc. Outcomes
• Your College’s General Education Outcomes

So, now that you have identified the role of student learning in your program - How do you know you are contributing to student learning?
Key Things to Remember
(King, 2003; Komives & Assoc., 2003; Mentkowski & Assoc, 2000; Kuh et al., 2005; Astin, 1996; Bresciani et. al., 2009)

- Student learning must be intentionally designed
- Activities to support intentional student learning must be planned and made systematic
- Learning must be facilitated

Key Things to Remember, Cont.
(King, 2003; Komives & Assoc., 2003; Mentkowski & Assoc, 2000; Kuh et al., 2005; Astin, 1996; Bresciani et. al., 2009)

- In order to systematically improve learning, we must systematically design and evaluate the opportunities to improve student learning
- Outcomes-based assessment is not research

Emerging Role
- SLOs emphasized in regional accreditation process
  - Higher Ed Re-Authorizations of 2002 and 2006
  - Spellings Commission, 2006
  - Expectations from regional accreditors
- Incorporating SLOs into transparent program review and strategic planning processes
  - Regional accreditation
  - Professional associations
Emerging Role, Cont.
- Expectations of resource reallocations based on outcomes results
  - Regional accreditors
- State of the Economy
  - Prioritization is required
- State Mandates
  - Impact of student success in community
  - Comparisons with peer institutions

Emerging Role, Cont.
- Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile
- and Expected Levels of Learning
  - What is/are foundational knowledge, skills, and dispositions?
  - How will we organize ourselves to deliver this across the lifetime of a student’s learning opportunities?
  - How will we evaluate this learning and improve it?
  - How will we resource this?

Emerging Role, Cont.
- AACU Essential Outcomes and VALUE rubrics
- Professional Association Standards and Outcomes
- NILOA
- New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability - http://www.newleadershipalliance.org/

Emerging Role, Cont.
- Emerging research on
  - transferability of learning
  - role of intuition in decision-making
  - role of self-authorship in learning
  - sequencing of learning
  - Closing the gap
  - person-environment fit
    - Institution’s response to creating environments that engage certain types of learners

The Point is…
- That student affairs professionals have more opportunities now than ever before to assist their academic colleagues in designing general student learning opportunities and evaluating the application of general student learning outside of the classroom.
  - For some, that means they need to change the way they think about how they do their job.

Questions to Consider as we Prepare for the Future…
Preparation for the Future

- Are we clear about what we value?
- Are we clear on how to prioritize those values?
- Do we have the integrity to act on that which we value?
- Do we have the integrity to empower others to implement that which we value?

Preparation for the Future, Cont.

- Can we listen from the point of view of those asking us for what they want to know?
- Can we act on what we hear?
- Can we lose the “concern for looking good”?
- Can we be authentic in our discovery of how to become a genuine learning organization?

Preparation for the Future, Cont.

- Can we source value into inquiry and reflection that improves our productivity?
  - Hiring
  - Personnel evaluation
  - Allocation of workloads and resources
- Can we be clear about what success means, what it looks like, and the steps in the process toward creating that success?

Future

- What is the role of academic and student support services in …
  - contributing to common student learning?
  - contributing to expected levels of learning?
  - promoting inquiry/research?
  - creating alternative funding sources for student learning and development?
- How can the necessary collaborations be built into the fabric of the organization systematically?

Future, Cont.

- How can we empower ourselves and others to use evidence to make decisions?
- How can we better account for expenditures to promote student learning and development?
  - and then align those expenditures to SLOs?
- How can we use evidence to refine those resource re-allocations?

Next Steps

- What ideas from this discussion can you implement as soon as you return to your campus?
  - … in 3 months?
  - … in 6 months?
  - … in 12 months?
  - … in 3 years?
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Breakout Session:

Comparing Programs: Multiple Sites, Multiple Modalities

J. Hoey
Multiple Sites, Multiple Modalities

- How do we assure quality and fidelity of a program across multiple iterations in differing locations?
- How can we assure comparable quality of student learning outcomes in online, on-ground, and blended environments?
- To be successful, we need to be aware of good practices, processes, and potential pitfalls

Presentation overview

- Definitions
- Salient principles
- Criteria
- Elements: constant and variable
- Logistics
- Engaging and communicating
- Case Study: Dreistadt State University
- Debriefing and summary

Program Review Is...

- A major opportunity to develop a strategic roadmap to attain/retain departmental preeminence in student learning, in community outreach, and in the production of knowledge.
- A peer reviewed self-regulation process
- A mechanism for the initiation of programmatic, departmental and institutional change, and
- An important vehicle for strategic academic planning, alignment, and resource reallocation

Purposes for Multi-Site Reviews

- To provide a baseline measurement across all programs
- As an integral element of systematic improvement processes
- To address accreditation requirements – both regional and specialized
- When resource reallocation must take place
- As part of a periodic review of a program chair
- When there are overriding political or public relations concerns at an institution
- To address federal program evaluation and audit requirements

Simultaneous or Separate?

- When to do a simultaneous, unified multi-site program review: Most of the time.
  - Time
  - Money
  - Effort
  - Comparability
- When to do a separate review for each site: Seldom.
  - Political considerations
  - Site-based professional accreditation
  - Reviewer fatigue
Salient Principles

- Maintain clear, persistent communication across all sites and modalities
- Ensuring inclusive involvement and representation across all sites and modalities
- Ensure consensus-building across all sites
- Uniformity of curriculum structure, learning outcomes across all sites
- Using similar review criteria and data elements across all sites

What Elements Stay Constant?

- Common elements to share with all locations and modalities
  - Formal charge concerning purposes, involvement, expectations, outcomes, and follow-up
  - Criteria to be used
  - Outline of process and timeline
  - Assigning responsibility
  - Template or guidelines to be used
  - Data elements to be used

What Criteria Remain Constant?

- Criteria and Standards for the review must be the same regardless of modality or location, such as:
  - Description and history of the program
  - Purposes and strategic direction of the program
  - Curriculum and methods that facilitate program learning outcomes
  - Evidence of student performance
  - Use of assessment results for improvement
  - Facilities, equipment and resources dedicated to the program
  - Faculty credentials, accomplishments and professional development
  - Alumni accomplishments

Common Standards, Different Implementation

- Program may be the same design, but will be implemented differently, probably the courses taught somewhat differently.
- How to get to basic comparability?
  - Common program SLOs
  - Common course SLOs
  - Common online assessment methods increasingly being used through leveraging technology-based assessment tracking systems.

What Might Be Different?

- Program elements that may vary should be broken out separately by location and/or modality

Elements that may vary

- Student trends and response to professional trends
- Summary of assessment results for the past three years
- Summary of improvements in response to assessment findings
- Career placement and success of graduates
- Budgeted faculty FTE
- Faculty workload and productivity
- Faculty vitae
- Faculty development
- Notable achievements/unique features
- Interdisciplinary connections
- Facilities, equipment and resources
- Library resources targeted to program
- Structure, role and scope of advisory boards
- Community programming and outreach
- Professional service and outreach
Logistics: Assigning Responsibility

- A program/department head or chair should have ultimate responsibility to compile the information from all locations or modalities and to create a unified program review self-study document that reflects the current state of the program/department.
- Administrators, program heads, chairs or associate chairs at other locations or assigned to other modalities should be in part responsible for completion of the program review self-study when degrees are granted at more than one location.
- Locations where the program has been in operation for at least three years should be included in the review; less than three years is still considered start-up mode.

Logistics: Writing the Self-Study

- Question: Multiple self-studies or single self-study?
- Clear roles, assignments, guidelines, timelines and posted
- Sharepoint or other collaborative document creation and management system
- Track changes or other document control mechanism
- Backup system that dates and saves all versions

Logistics: Data Collection

- Collecting multi-site curriculum data
- Collecting multi-site faculty data
- Collecting multi-site student data
- Collecting multi-site assessment data
- Developing benchmarking opportunities
- Consideration of data collection tools, online program review system

Logistics: Collaboration is Key

- Program chairs/directors should collaborate with their colleagues at other locations throughout the program review process, including
  - Writing the self-study, including data interpretation
  - Developing recommendations within the self-study
  - Nominating, selecting and scheduling external reviewers
  - Developing plans of action following the external review report
  - Creating follow-up and monitoring reports
- Program chairs/directors should involve the faculty members in the program review process, otherwise it’s an empty exercise.

Logistics: External Reviewers

- Multi-site reviewers?
  - Advantages: can see some program from multiple perspectives; can make comparisons; less personality issues to deal with.
  - Disadvantages: wear on the reviewers; takes longer; more complex logistics; additional stipends for multi-site reviewers.
- Single site reviewers?
  - Advantages: quicker, less travel, less logistics.
  - Disadvantages: loss of multiple perspectives on same program; more reviewers and differing opinions to reconcile in the final report.

Considerations: External Reviewers

- Develop and critique recommendations for reviewer nominations collaboratively
- Remember: friends don’t let friends hire each other as reviewers
- Consider the outcomes: Will the reviewers you have in mind be objective? Will they aid the reputation of the program?
- Take into account travel schedules and reviewer fatigue
- Have backup reviewers in case of sickness, etc.
Logistics: Ensuring Communication and Engagement

- How to communicate and engage all parties to the review
  - Engaging the faculty
  - Involving and engaging the students
  - Contacting and engaging other constituencies

Engaging the Faculty

- Everybody wants to have a voice, but nobody wants to put in the time on the review. How do you get past that?
  - Talking about the review at faculty meetings
  - Sending out quick, short surveys to get direction and validation
  - Providing a course release to write part of the review
  - Using summarized assessment results as a tool for discussion about direction and needs for adjustment
  - Using a curriculum map as a tool for talking about where students are actually engaging with the program learning outcomes

Involving and Engaging the Students

- It’s often difficult to get the students involved and engaged. What works?
  - Student advisory committee
  - Using social media to reach out and create a discussion area
  - Threaded discussion boards and blogs
  - Focused interviews, especially with graduating students
  - Debriefing and evaluations of internships, co-ops, undergraduate research experiences

Engaging Other Constituencies

- Internal:
  - Interview other faculty from cognate programs
- External
  - Program advisory groups
  - Alumni
  - Employers of graduates
  - Co-op, internship, undergraduate research supervisors

Establishing Clear Communication

- Email listserv and/or newsletters
- Website (set up a course shell in your CMS)
- Using collaborative software, like Sharepoint
- Blogs, asynchronous discussion boards
- On-campus: group meetings

Case Study: MPA at Dreistadt State

- Institution: Dreistadt State University
  - Ostburg (main campus)
  - Westhalle
  - Nordheim
  - Online MPA through DSU Online
- Deep state budget cuts; mandated program reviews to determine resource reallocation means one elimination.
- Assignment: get into groups with your colleagues, and actively consider for each location: should the program be enhanced, maintained, downsized, or eliminated — and why?
### Case Study Debriefing

- Only three of the programs are going to be preserved. Which ones?
- What led you to the decision?
- Upon what evidence did your group support its recommendations?

### Summary

- Remember the foundational requirement: provide evidence of comparable student learning in the program regardless of modality or location
- With multiple site reviews, use common criteria
- Some elements of the review will remain constant across locations/modalities
- Logistics: plan ahead to avoid derailment
- Engagement and communication will define the success or the downfall of the review

### Thank You!

- Please fill out evaluation form
- Further questions? Contact me: joseph.hoey@bridgepointeducation.com
Program Review Case Study:
Dreistadt State University Master of Public Administration Program

Case:
Dreistadt State University (DSU) is a comprehensive, primarily master’s level, multiple-campus institution of 35,000 total enrollments, with campus locations in Ostburg (main campus) and Westhalle, two cities about 100 miles apart, and one about 200 miles away in Nordheim. All three campuses serve primarily regional population bases with developed urban infrastructure. A Master of Public Administration program exists at all campuses, as well as online through DSU Online.

Lately, state cuts in funding have hit DSU hard, and the institution is actively considering how best to respond. The State System Office has mandated the use of academic program reviews at DSU and other state institutions to address prioritization and resource reallocation based on known, standardized criteria. Given the resource constraints, it is widely expected that further cuts are on the way and one location of the program may be targeted for phase-out.

Your task:
Your assignment: get into groups with your colleagues, and actively consider for each location of the MPA program going through program review: Should the program be enhanced, maintained, downsized, or eliminated – and if so, at which location or modality? Upon what bases does your group support its recommendations?

Program Purpose:
The Master of Public Administration Program at Dreistadt State University is committed to the advanced professional preparation of new and in-service students from the metropolitan areas of Ostburg, Westhalle, and Nordheim, and through online study. The program prepares students for managerial roles in state and local government, health services organizations, and in environmental management areas.

Program Description:
Students take a common core curriculum the first year in the principles and practice of public administration. A comprehensive exam is attempted and must be passed prior to beginning the second year of study. Students participate in a monthly seminar meeting. Faculty critique the performance of MPA students who present in those seminars using a rubric-based form developed for this purpose. For degree completion, the creation of a thesis under the direction of one of the faculty members in the program is expected. A proposal must be written and presented. Then a final master’s thesis must be written and defended in public.

Departmental Objectives:
Departmental faculty are dedicated to the provision of an MPA program that will:
- Inculcate generalist managerial skills
- Provide competence in current and cutting edge managerial technologies
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• Establish the ability to function effectively in complex, culturally diverse organizational structures
• Provide research-based program of study to develop evidence-based professional practice
• Expand and evolve to meet changing regional and environmental needs
• Promote student commitment to ethical standards of managerial practice.

Learning Outcomes for Students:
The faculty in Public Administration at all locations of DSU derived a set of basic student learning outcomes for graduates of the MPA program. While individual campuses may have varied emphases and specializations, faculty at all locations agreed on these basic program-level learning outcomes:

1. Demonstrate professional competence in general management skills appropriate to public and non-profit administration (general management skills).
2. Effectively use appropriate research methods, software and statistical techniques to analyze public policy issues (research methods).
3. Be able to formulate a public policy at the city, state, or national level, including developing an implementation plan (formulate and implement policy).
4. Apply theory and analytical skills in solving real world problems in public administration (problem solving).
5. Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing (oral and written communication).
## Data for Program Review Case Study:
### Dreistadt State University Master of Public Administration Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Ostburg Campus</th>
<th>Westhalle Campus</th>
<th>Nordheim Campus</th>
<th>DSU Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year MPA Program Started</strong></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends in total program enrollment, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Declined from 38 to 32.</td>
<td>Stable at 25.</td>
<td>Declined from 27 to 20.</td>
<td>Increased from 4 to 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program application trends, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Increased from 20 to 24 per year.</td>
<td>Varies from 18-25 per year.</td>
<td>Declined from 20 to 10 for three years, but Fall 2011 applications increased to 15 with average age of applicants decreasing.</td>
<td>Increased from 8 to 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program acceptance trends, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Slight increase from 50% to 55%.</td>
<td>Stable at 60%.</td>
<td>Increased from 50% to 65%.</td>
<td>Decreased from 90% to 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program enrollment yield trends, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Decreased from 73% to 66%</td>
<td>Stable at 80%</td>
<td>Declined from 65% to 50%.</td>
<td>Increased from 30% to 90%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entering student GRE scores, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Verbal increased from 590 to 640; quantitative stable at 550; analytical stable at 580.</td>
<td>Verbal stable at 590; quantitative stable at 580; analytical stable at 600.</td>
<td>Verbal decreased from 640 to 550; quantitative decreased from 600 to 550; analytical decreased from 590 to 550.</td>
<td>Verbal increased from 530 to 640; quantitative increased from 530 to 620; analytical increased from 590 to 640.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First year retention trends, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Decreased slightly from 90% to 87%.</td>
<td>Stable at around 88%.</td>
<td>Decreased from 90% to 75%.</td>
<td>Increased from 40% to 85%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends in graduation rate (150% of normal time)</strong></td>
<td>Decreased slightly from 83% to 78%.</td>
<td>Stable at around 76%.</td>
<td>Decreased from 75% to 60%.</td>
<td>Increased from 35% to 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends in program costs per FTE student enrolled, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Increase from $15,679 to $17,940.</td>
<td>Increase from $9,777 to $11,129.</td>
<td>Increase from $9,654 to $14,049.</td>
<td>Decrease from $13,794 to $7,897.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends in student scores on qualifying exams, keyed to learning outcomes, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Increasing pass rates in written communication skills from 80 to 100%; others stable at 80% to 85% first-time pass rates.</td>
<td>Student first-time pass rates are stable around 85% to 90% in all areas.</td>
<td>Decreasing pass rates in research methods from 80% to 70% on first attempt; decreasing pass rates in formulating and implementing policy from 85% to 75% first time pass rates; written communication decreasing from 80% to 70% first time</td>
<td>Increasing pass rates in research methods from 70% to 90% on first attempt; increasing pass rates in formulating and implementing policy from 65% to 85% first time pass rates; written communication stable at 80% first time pass rate;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Multi-Site Program Review Case Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Ostburg Campus</th>
<th>Westhalle Campus</th>
<th>Nordheim Campus</th>
<th>DSU Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends in student ratings on seminar presentations, keyed to learning outcomes, 5 yrs.</strong></td>
<td>Oral and graphic communication skills are outstanding in the presentations, as is student competence in research methods. Students are clearly able to articulate research problems, methods, and project solutions. Generalist management skill ratings have been lower.</td>
<td>Student seminar ratings are high, and especially high as it concerns generalist management skills and the ability to formulate policy.</td>
<td>Overall, decreasing ratings in research methods have been observed in the seminars; formulating and implementing policy, management skills, and problem solving have also seen declines. Students just do not seem to be able to formulate and articulate their research projects as well as they used to.</td>
<td>Areas of formulating/implementing policy, problem solving, and generalist management skills have increased markedly over the last five years, as has research methods. Oral communication presentations are done through video-taping, and faculty are seeing a better solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of updates over past five years in response to assessment findings</strong></td>
<td>Faculty have gradually instituted draft paper submission process in all courses and are considering ways to more closely involve students in professional and managerial practice.</td>
<td>Faculty have reached out to the local professional community to involve students in professional mentorships.</td>
<td>Senior faculty are reluctant to act on assessment findings without further stable and more conclusive evidence.</td>
<td>Program has required frequent participation in threaded discussions from the beginning, as well as group online projects. Faculty have instituted draft paper submission process in all courses, instituted an online MPA resource center, and have begun a webinar series with external professionals on topics of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career placement and success of graduates</strong></td>
<td>Stable rate: 100% of graduates are employed within 1 year of graduation.</td>
<td>Placement rate has improved from 80% to 90% employed in field 1 year after graduation.</td>
<td>Placement rate was high at 90% but has softened to 68% placement within one year after graduation. Employers are complaining about oral and written communication skills of</td>
<td>Placement rate has increased markedly from 50% to 90% employed in field within one year after graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Element</td>
<td>Ostburg Campus</td>
<td>Westhalle Campus</td>
<td>Nordheim Campus</td>
<td>DSU Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty FTE</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5 increased to 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty distribution by rank</td>
<td>2 full, 1 associate, 1 assistant.</td>
<td>1 full, 2 associate.</td>
<td>1 full, 1 associate increased to 2 full. One additional new assistant professor hired 2010 to lead the new (Fall 2011) track in Environmental Practice in Public Administration.</td>
<td>1 associate and 0.5 adjunct increased to 1 associate and 1 assistant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in faculty scholarly and professional productivity</td>
<td>Stable at 3.0 works and 2.0 presentations per faculty.</td>
<td>Stable at 2.0 works and 2.0 presentations per faculty.</td>
<td>Increased from 2.0 to 4.0 works per faculty.</td>
<td>Increased from 3.0 to 5.0 works and from 2.0 to 4.0 presentations per faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary connections</td>
<td>Program has always had a strong relationship with Ed. Leadership and Community College Leadership programs, has recently sought to build connections with others.</td>
<td>Program continues strong relationship with MBA program and has solidified relationship with Ed. Leadership program.</td>
<td>A tradition of cross-listed research courses with Ed. Leadership program continues.</td>
<td>Program has sought to build relationships with online programs in Ed. Leadership, Organizational Psychology, and MBA programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, equipment and resources</td>
<td>Classrooms have been renovated and updated.</td>
<td>Classrooms have been renovated; one smart classroom provided.</td>
<td>DSU Nordheim was the recipient of a $100 million grant two years ago from the environmentally forward-thinking George Grunewelt Foundation and has relocated the MPA program in a newly constructed LEED-Certified facility with smart classrooms.</td>
<td>Start-up studio, software, server and technical costs incurred in 2006 but have stabilized to a three-year replacement cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources targeted to program</td>
<td>Resources available meet ACRL standards; available to students in MPA program statewide.</td>
<td>Resources available meet ACRL standards; available to students in MPA program statewide.</td>
<td>Resources available meet ACRL standards; available to students in MPA program statewide.</td>
<td>Resources available meet ACRL standards for online programs; available to students in MPA program statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community programming and outreach</td>
<td>Evening short courses have been offered and popular for years in the community.</td>
<td>Evening short courses have been offered and popular for years in the community.</td>
<td>The program offers a lecture series to the public that had been declining in popularity</td>
<td>The program is using social media to reach out to professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© J. Joseph Hoey, 2011  Multi-Site Program Review Case Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Ostburg Campus</th>
<th>Westhalle Campus</th>
<th>Nordheim Campus</th>
<th>DSU Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional service and outreach</td>
<td>Community. Strong tradition of faculty involvement with community development projects.</td>
<td>but has just begun to regain interest (and garnered positive publicity for the University) with the advent of the new focus on Environmental Practice in Administration.</td>
<td>Faculty are active and well-regarded professionally.</td>
<td>The program is using social media to reach out to professional communities and has provided free webinars to in-state nonprofit organizations and local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other interesting features</td>
<td>Faculty are active and well-regarded professionally.</td>
<td>Faculty are active and well-regarded professionally.</td>
<td>The two tenured faculty are not highly engaged in professional service, however the new Assistant Professor has made a point of speaking to and developing associations with environmental and conservation groups.</td>
<td>The online program just won a Sloan Consortium award for excellence in program design and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates have traditionally been and continue to be sought for state government positions.</td>
<td>Strong tradition of well-placed and powerful program advisory board.</td>
<td>In response to the Grunewelt Foundation grant to DSU Nordheim, and after winning an internal funding competition for developing environmentally-focused curricula, faculty have developed and had approved a new specialization, Environmental Practice in Public Administration. With this new track offering (new effective Fall 2011), program faculty are hoping to see an upswing in enrollment and student quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plenary:

Evidence to Support Purposes: Types and Sources of Data for Program Review

L. Buckley
Types and Sources of Data for Program Review

Linda C. Buckley, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President
Academic Planning and Development
San Francisco State University

Question 1: Who is the Audience?
- The audience drives the questions
- The questions drive the data

Audiences
- The department itself
- The dean
- The external consultants
- Central administration
- Accreditors
- The GAO and other governmental agencies

Sections of the Self-Study
1. Executive Summary
2. Profile of the Program
3. Admission Requirements
4. Curriculum
5. Required data sets
6. Program Planning & Quality Assurance
7. Student Experience
8. Faculty
9. Resources Support
10. Recommendations

Question 2: Is the department growing, shrinking, or maintaining its current size?
- Enrollment over 5 years
- FTES over 5 years
- Retention rates over 5 years
- Degrees awarded over 5 years

Question 3: Are students able to move through the program in a timely manner?
- Time-to-degree
- Courses with high failure rates
- Failure rates in gateway courses
- Course rotation schedule
- Graduation, completion, and retention rates
Question 4: Is the program diverse?
- Enrollment data disaggregated by ethnicity/gender
- Graduation rates by disaggregated ethnicity/gender
- Faculty data disaggregated by ethnicity, gender and age/rank
- Percentage of student on Pell Grants
- Percentage of Pell Grant students who graduate.

Question 5: Is the program reputable?
- Applicants, accepted, enrolled ( % and #s)
- # or % of undergraduates going on to graduate school
- # or % of students employed in the field after graduation

Question 6: Is the program rigorous?
- Grade distribution compared with the college
- Samples of student work
- Rubrics used for assessing the culminating experiences.
- Licensure rates.

Question 7: Are students learning what is expected?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Data</th>
<th>Indirect Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results from program assessment</td>
<td>Student Exit Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from employers</td>
<td>NSSE data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePortfolios</td>
<td>Alumni surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8: What are the indirect measures of program quality
- How are disqualified students advised/reviewed?
- How is the culminating experience evaluated?
- Are faculty compensated for advising?
- Number of students who go on to doctoral or other terminal degree programs.
- Number of publications in which students are listed as co-authors.
- Number of students employed in the field after graduating.
- Sources, amounts, and patterns of distribution of financial assistance to graduate students.
- Frequency of presentations by guest speakers or lunch-time gatherings for students
- Social gatherings for faculty and students (e.g., pot-luck dinners, sports)

Question 9: Are faculty current and active in the discipline?
- Faculty scholarship and creative activities
- Faculty community involvement
- Faculty professional development
- Faculty involvement with industry
- Faculty collaboration with other faculty
- Faculty involvement in the scholarship of teaching
Question 10: What is the collective profile of your faculty?
- Faculty workload matrix
- Faculty distribution by rank and gender
- Faculty distribution by age
- Faculty distribution by ethnicity
- Faculty honors, grants, awards
- Faculty publications, etc.
- Faculty participation in advising and orientation

Question 11. Do faculty have enough resources to adequately serve students?
- Balance in teaching load among faculty tenure status and rank
- Change in part-time and adjunct faculty over the past five years
- Availability of computers, clickers, smart classrooms, academic tech training
- Student faculty ratio by activity mode (lecture, seminar, lab, etc.)

Question 12: How to align program review with resource allocation?

Creating the Story
- Intentional Analysis of Data and Goal Setting
- Milestone Study: How much is good enough
- Internal Longitudinal Comparison of Data
- External Longitudinal Comparison of Data
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Session Overview

- Context for Accountability of the Quality of General Learning within the United States and within the Institution
- Exploring Comparability of Quality of General Learning for Program Evaluation
- Positing Questions for Consideration

Framing Questions

- What do you know about the quality of general learning at your institution?
- How does the quality of general learning at your institution compare to the quality of learning at other institutions?

REPORT OUT

Context for Accountability

- To improve the underperforming student
- Competency Movement in Business and Industry
  - International Trade Agreements
- Bologna Declaration of 1999

Context for Accountability, Cont.

- Government Conversation, 1985
  - The Higher Education Re-authorization Act Testimonies in USA, 2002 and 2006
  - Government Conversation, 1985
    - The Higher Education Re-authorization Act Testimonies in USA, 2002 and 2006
    - Response to NCLB Legislation
    - Regional Accreditation – flexibility
      - CRAC – 2003, 2004
      - Both documents focus on student learning
National Commission on the Future of Higher Education
- Demand for Public Information about Performance
- Transparency of outcomes and results
- Comparable measures of quality
- Demonstration of value-added of the entire educational experience

Context for Accountability, Cont.
(Bresciani, et al, 2009)
- Accountability requirements handed back to states
  - Performance indicators
  - Increased desire for transparency, comparability, and value-added
- Discipline Standards still expected to be addressed by disciplines
- Lumina Foundation Degree Profile

In other words...
(Bresciani, et al, 2009)
- We are being held accountable for general learning expectations by the public.
- The disciplines are “taking care” of accountability via professional accreditation/certification.

So, the Questions Remain...
(Bresciani, et al, 2009)
- So, how effective is our design and delivery of general learning?
- How well equipped are we to evaluate that learning?
- How well can we compare our quality of general learning with another institution?

Tips from Good Practice Institutions
(Bresciani, 2007)
- They clearly communicate the purpose of the programs that deliver their general learning
- There is cross institutional buy-in to the purpose
- There is cross institutional buy-in to the outcomes and in some cases assessment methods, if appropriate
Tips from Good Practice Institutions
(Bresciani, 2007)

- They clearly define their expected learning through learning outcomes
- They align the process for creating the expected learning with the manner in which they evaluate the learning
- They “advertise” the variances in their processes
- They advertise the “success” of their general learning with evidence; they improve where they are not successful

Tips, Cont.
(Bresciani, 2007)

- They invite peer critiques, internal to their organization and external to their organization
- They use testimonials to demonstrate their effectiveness
- Some articulate expectations of and investments in to students and faculty
- Some are mindful of their “inputs”

Second Set of Questions
(Bresciani, et al, 2009)

- Who claims ownership for the design, delivery, and evaluation of your general learning?
- How well does the assessment data inform improvements?
- How well coordinated is the evaluation and decision-making process?

Outcomes-Based Assessment can be Implemented at Multiple Levels

Decisions are made at multiple levels - some decisions reside only at one level

WHAT IS APPROPRIATE FOR YOUR INSTITUTION TO EXPLORE AS ITS NEXT STEPS?
AT WHICH LEVEL WOULD YOU “DO” GE ASSESSMENT?

HOW WOULD YOU STRUCTURE THE COMPARABILITY OF THE DATA?

Summary of Pros and Cons of Comparable Data

Standardized Tests
- Commercially designed
- Ability to update is limited
- May be able to align with learning outcomes
- Generates validity and reliability statistics
- Less subjective

Rubrics
- Faculty designed
- Ability to update is dynamic
- May be able to align with learning outcomes
- Generates inter-rater reliability statistics
- Subjective

Considerations for Using rubrics for Comparability

- Can you answer the previously posited questions?
- Can your faculty collaborate on the design of rubrics or can your faculty adapt those developed by the AAC&U VALUES project?
- Can you collaborate with other institutions to share rubric results and run inter-rater reliability data?

Who will “own” the GE assessment process?
- Who will be responsible for the entire process?
- Who will determine what level of learning is good enough?
- How will results be reported and to whom?
- How will decisions be made and communicated?
- What role will students have in this process?

QUESTIONS?

Marilee.Bresciani@mail.sdsu.edu
Session Citation

- Bresciani, M.J. (October 4, 2010). What do We know About the Quality of Higher Learning in the United States? EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative Webinar
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Chapter 1

The Challenges of Assessing General Education: Questions to Consider

Marilee J. Bresciani

The Context

Our nation has turned its eye toward conversations that concern the quality of higher education. There appears to be public confusion about what constitutes a discipline or a major and how the learning demonstrated in a degree may differ from that which is obtained through general education. Does satisfying general education requirements mean that every student, regardless of type of degree, is able to demonstrate certain skills and/or abilities? Or does it mean that every student will graduate with fundamental knowledge in broad areas? How does the learning obtained in general education differ from that gained through the discipline courses?

In addition, the question of how the out-of-classroom experience plays into this conversation causes further confusion. Does being engaged in the cocurricular mean that a student will be more liberally educated? Does the institution have to intentionally articulate the connection of the out-of-classroom learning to the in-classroom learning? Who is responsible for making the connections of learning from the curricular to the cocurricular and vice versa? How does the cocurricular contribute to general education learning goals or the institutional student learning principles?

Although these questions are not new, it seems that our ability to identify what students are learning from our general education efforts has still not been fully developed.
As regional reaccreditation agencies and national professional associations such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) continue to focus on the assessment of student learning and the evaluation of core institutional learning principles, institutions desire assistance in understanding effective ways in which to evaluate student learning in general education. Furthermore, faculty need to understand how the investment in such evaluation can provide them with data to inform discussions about core learning principles in a manner that allows them to make decisions on how to improve general education offerings. While many resources exist on implementing general education, faculty need additional resources to help them discern how general education can be evaluated. This book provides faculty and administrators with needed examples of good practices in assessment for varying types of delivery of general education.

The Challenges

While many recognize the value of assessment of student learning in general education, the challenges posed by evaluating general education may still keep those who see its importance from engaging in the evaluation of it. In 1991, Hutchings, Marchese, and Wright articulated these challenges. Over a decade and a half later, these challenges remain, yet some institutions have been successful in addressing most or all of these barriers. However, apart from our learning about these success stories at conferences, many of these triumphs go untold or unnoticed by the majority of faculty and administrators seeking solutions. This book details some of these institutions' stories and outlines some of their struggles as well.

The following challenges taken from Hutchings, Marchese, and Wright (1991) are introduced with a brief explanation of each challenge and a few questions for the reader's consideration. The purpose of proposing these challenges and corresponding questions is to assist the reader with his or her own review of each case. These questions are intended to help the reader discern the application of ideas presented in each case study to his or her own institution.

In addition, specific suggestions and strategies for implementing outcomes-based assessment of general education are introduced in each case study, and overall items to consider when implementing outcomes-based assessment of general education are summarized in the final chapter.

1) Lack of Perceived Priority to Improve General Education

In an environment with increasing constraints on the economy, many ask the question of whether time spent on certain "activities" is time well invested. Leaving for just a moment the question of whether there are resources available to commit to general education assessment and/or its refinement, many faculty would rather spend time on their discipline. Therefore, investing time to improve student learning requires added incentive and understanding of its value, particularly in general education where many faculty are not at home in their own discipline expertise (Hutchings et al., 1991).

Outcomes-based assessment can help communicate the value of general education if the purpose of general education and the resulting design of the delivery of general education is well thought through and purposefully executed prior to evaluation (see number 3). In addition, the financing of general education must be clearly identified and articulated to the faculty so they can consider this in both the purpose of general education and the strategies to implement it. Furthermore, providing incentives for faculty and administrators to examine the purpose and learning value of general education is needed.

Determining the reasons for the ability of faculty and administrators to value the evaluation and refinement of student learning in general education is indeed a complex task. In order to seek clarification on your own institution, it may be helpful to answer the following questions. Many of the questions that may precede these questions are posed in item number 3; thus, for some institutions, it may be helpful to start with the questions posed there. For others, however, funding conversations drive purpose questions and it may be wise for them to begin the conversation here:

- How much is general education integrated into the requirements to achieve the discipline and integrated in the need to demonstrate competencies within the discipline?
• How much is general education integrated into the cocurricular or out-of-classroom experience?

• How is the delivery of general education funded? Is it a one-to-one student credit hour generation? If so, does the department providing the general education SCHs actually receive the money for generating the student learning in general education? If so, how do those contributing to the learning receive funding? In other words, how are dollars allocated if the learning is genuinely integrated learning? What is the funding motivation, for example, for those involved in writing across the curriculum initiatives or ethical leadership? Do they have to split one line of funding with their collaborative colleagues or do they receive equal shares as one would if one discipline was designing the learning by themselves?

• How are collaborations among faculty and across divisions and colleges funded or rewarded?

• How are faculty provided with opportunities to engage in conversation about improving general education learning, particularly since many of them are reviewed and promoted for their work within their own discipline?

• How are these faculty provided with opportunities to engage in collaborative learning with the cocurricular experts?

• Are the faculty given professional development opportunities to consider what general education should be about, how it can best be delivered within the institutional culture and context, and how it can best be evaluated so that improvements in student learning can be made?

• If faculty are provided with these professional development opportunities, how are they encouraged to allocate time to participate? How are faculty rewarded or recognized for doing so?

• Does the state or other governing body have financial expectations that compete with genuine conversations that faculty may desire to have in regard to general education? Such potentially competing expectations could be in regard to articulation agreements, progress toward degree, or limited number of credit hours within a degree. While these state or governing body requirements have their value, the requirements are often made with very little information about their contributions toward student learning. Faculty recognize this and may see these types of requirements to be in conflict with genuine learning outcomes conversations.

• Are faculty made aware of the results of outcomes-based assessment so that they can see that the results have been used to inform decisions or recommendations to improve student learning?

• Are the results and recommendations examined and/or reviewed by the faculty and administrative leadership signifying the importance of the findings and the resulting decisions?

• Are resources allocated for dissemination based on the results and recommendations or decisions of the outcomes-based assessment process?

2) Debate Over Ownership of General Education Offerings

Systematic evaluation of general education can be challenging if the ownership and delivery of general education spans varying departments (Hutchings et al., 1991). These very real turf issues, often associated with academic freedom, must be addressed in order for systematic, comprehensive assessment to occur.

When academic freedom is raised as a concern, it may be helpful to refer to the American Association of University Professors’ 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This resource makes clear that it is not a violation of academic freedom for faculty to be held accountable for students’ ability to achieve particular standards or principles of education, nor is it a violation for faculty to be held accountable for particular quality of student learning. Academic autonomy does not equate to academic freedom. Therefore, faculty are encouraged to break down barriers and join in the conversations that design the educational standards and learning principles for all students.

Once academic freedom concerns are addressed, what becomes a challenge, as illustrated in some of the cases within this book, is that faculty are not able to fully understand who is responsible for the delivery of general education. While faculty governing bodies may be responsible for approving what constitutes a general education course, it is sometimes confusing to faculty to know who is responsible for general education when the learning that was intended is not
realized. Thus, it is extremely important for institutions to address the following questions when examining their general education:

- Who is responsible for articulating the purpose of general education?
- How does that body (the responsible body identified in bullet 1) interact with the body that articulates the overarching institutional learning principles?
- How do those bodies (the responsible body identified in bullets 1 and 2, if not the same body) interact with those who identify learning principles within the disciplines?
- How do those bodies (the responsible body identified in bullets 1, 2, and 3, if not the same bodies) interact with the body that identifies learning opportunities and outcomes in the cocurricular?
- How does each body engage with those who are responsible for delivering general education?
- How does each body engage with those who are responsible for evaluating general education?
- How do those who gather the results of student learning in general education interact with those who can make the improvements for student learning? Or inform conversations about financing general education? Or inform ideas for collaborations across departments, colleges, and divisions?
- Who is the keeper of the general education assessment plans and reports? How is that data integrated with institutional learning principles conversations and across the curriculum types of abilities and skills?
- Who is responsible for creating these opportunities for interaction and discourse around the:
  - Articulation of various outcomes
  - Design of the assessment processes
  - Gathering of evidence and interpreting of results
  - Review of results and making recommendations for improvement
  - Follow-up to ensure improvements have been made and to examine whether those improvements contributed to refined student learning

- If there are state or governing board requirements for general education attributes, do faculty feel empowered enough to have conversations about what those attributes could look like for their own students and how they would be delivered?
- Who facilitates the interaction and conversation when the state values appear to be in conflict with the faculty values for student learning within general education?

3) Clarifying the Goals of General Education

With faculty tied to discipline content and with the frequency of somewhat trendy conversations about institutional student learning principles and employers' vocal articulation of what they want every graduate to be able to know and do regardless of discipline, the purpose of general education can often be difficult to articulate (Ratcliff, Johnson, La Nasa, & Gaff, 2001). Establishment of an assessment plan can be seriously hindered if an institution is unclear about what it wants general education to accomplish.

It is important to first identify what the purpose of general education is, what the goals of it are intended to be, and then design the process for which those goals can be delivered. After the articulation of learning outcomes for general education, and the plan to deliver these outcomes, then and only then can come the ability to design the evaluation of whether those learning outcomes have been met.

In addition, it may be challenging to get faculty to consider a change in how they perceive general education. Some faculty may need to shift from focusing on the purpose of general education as students simply needing to meet specific requisites for general education—such as completing a certain number of courses or a certain number of student credit hours—to that of student learning. For example, historically in some institutions, general education may have been designed to “expose” students to other ways of thinking outside of their discipline. This kind of purpose for general education keeps faculty focused only on the delivery of general education, not on what students may be learning. Shifting the thinking from a purpose of requiring a certain number of credit hours to identifying student learning that is expected as a result of taking those credit hours may be needed before being able to evaluate student learning.
Given these challenges, some pertinent questions to consider include the following:

- What is the purpose of general education on your campus?
- How does your institutional culture contribute to the purpose of general education?
- How does your institutional mission contribute to the purpose of general education?
- How does your institutional context contribute to the purpose of general education?
- Is the purpose for general education clearly understood by all faculty, administrators, and students?
- Is the purpose for general education in the present different from how general education came into being? In other words, has the purpose of general education shifted, for example, from a faculty desire to "expose" students to various topics to that of desiring students to demonstrate competencies within their discipline via the spoken and written word? If the purpose of general education is now different from what it historically was, have you been able to engage all the necessary players in the conversations around the revised purpose? Have you planned time to build consensus?
- Are faculty and administrators in agreement as to the purpose of general education?
- Are faculty in agreement with the state or governing board as to the purpose of general education?
- How do across-the-curriculum-competency conversations play into the conversations regarding the purpose of general education?
- How do the overarching institutional student learning principles contribute to the purpose of general education?
- How does the governing board's or state's perspective of the purpose of general education contribute to the institutional faculty and administration's understanding?
- Are student learning expectations in general education only for the native students of the institution or do they also apply to transfer students?

4) Faculty and Student Disconnect Regarding Expectations for General Education

Even if an institution's faculty is clear on what they want general education to accomplish, it often remains a mystery to students (AAC&U, 2001). Students can be very helpful at evaluating their general education experience if they understand what they are supposed to learn from such an experience or if they can contribute to what that learning may look like (Mentkowski & Associates, 2000). There are multiple ways to involve students in the articulation of the purpose of general education and in the evaluation of it, and this involvement can be mutually beneficial for both faculty and students.

Sometimes, students desire different outcomes than faculty intend. Negotiating those value differences can be tricky and can therefore negatively affect the assessment process. However, in most cases, the misunderstanding may be based on unclear communication of student learning outcomes for general education, unclear connection of the general education learning outcomes to those of the institution and/or the discipline, or unclear connection of the outcomes to the way in which the learning is being delivered.

Questions to aid in the connection of expectations include the following:

- How clearly posted are the student learning outcomes for general education?
- Do students have a role in the articulation of general education student learning outcomes?
- Do students understand how that student learning is delivered and evaluated?
- Is the role of the student in the learning evaluation process made clear?
- How well articulated is the connection of general education learning outcomes to the core institutional learning principles?
- How well articulated is the connection of general education learning outcomes to the discipline outcomes?
- How well articulated is the connection of general education learning outcomes to the learning that occurs in the cocurricular?
5) Delivery or Organization of General Education and the Occasional Disconnect With General Education Goals

Many times, faculty and/or administrators expect that the general education experience will result in outcomes that are not embedded in the delivery of the general education process (Hutchings et al., 1991). For example, if administrators want students to graduate with global citizenship but deliver their general education in a course-based menu framework with no courses identified as teaching global citizenship outcomes, then a change in delivery, course design, or goals must occur prior to any assessment being implemented.

Discovering this disconnect and working toward its resolution is imperative prior to engagement in effective assessment. Often, simply mapping the delivery of your general education to the outcomes may provide you with a clear understanding of the disconnect (Maki, 2004).

Questions to aid in this self-examination include the following:

- Is the purpose for your general education clearly articulated?
- Do you have goals and outcomes that align with the purpose of general education?
- Is the way in which you deliver general education aligned with your goals and outcomes?
- Do you need different goals for different populations? For example, if you have a two-year general education program that prepares students to transfer into a four-year program, do the goals of that general education program need to differ from a general education that is based within the discipline or one that is pursued by lifelong learners?
- Can you map the delivery of your general education to your goals?
- Do you have courses, cocurricular experiences, and discipline courses mapped to the general education goals and outcomes?
- How does that mapping look when you consider transfer students?
- How does it look when you take into account articulation agreements?

6) Debate Over Knowledge Acquisition and Demonstration of Skill Within General Education or the Discipline

Similar to the previous point, some general education values can be delivered in general education as well as the discipline or cocurricul-
Results gathered in a manner that does not allow for areas of improvement to be made in the delivery of general education may be meaningful to some; however, it may also result in frustration to faculty when they are unable to identify opportunities to improve student learning based on the assessment results.

Furthermore, faculty may be hesitant to engage in general education assessment, particularly course-embedded assessment, if they believe that poor results will be factored into their teaching evaluations. Rather, poor results of student learning, if gathered with enough detail, may help provide professional development opportunities to faculty or help faculty better align evaluation materials to course planning and to intended learning outcomes.

Questions to consider include:

- How do administrators plan to use the results of general education assessment?
- How do faculty plan to use the results?
- Will faculty be assured that the results will not be used for personnel evaluations? Rather, will the results inform professional development opportunities?
- Who will see the results?
- Who will interpret them?
- Who will be involved in making recommendations or decisions based on the results?
- Is there a commitment to continuous improvement? Or is the institution only interested in gathering results for some sort of compliance initiative?
- What kind of requirements for comparability of data are there? How can those requirements be factored into the faculty and administrators’ desires to improve student learning?
- What conversations need to take place to determine which results will be most meaningful to whom?
- How transparent will the results be to the public?

8) Debate Over General Education’s Role in the Establishment of Institutional Undergraduate Learning Principles

Does general education contribute to the establishment of core institutional learning values? Can those core principles be delivered entirely within the discipline or will it be a combination of the discipline and general education (AACcU, 2002)? Effective planning of curriculum and implementation of outcomes-based assessment can help address these questions and provide evidence for future decisions.

Some faculty and administrators are simply not clear about how their general education contributes to their core student learning principles. In other words, when institutions want their students to be able to demonstrate certain skills and competencies regardless of the students’ major, are these skills and competencies to be delivered and evaluated in the general education, the discipline, the cocurricular, or a combination of all of these areas?

Building on the previously posed category questions, additional questions include the following:

- If your institution has goals for general education, but has not considered establishing student learning outcomes for the entire institution, how can they proceed to do so?
- How then will those conversations or the results of those conversations be coordinated?
- How will the results of the conversation affect the design of general education and its evaluation?
• How will the results of the conversation contribute to informing statewide conversation or governing board conversations where expectations may be in conflict?

9) Identifying and Clarifying the Role of Co-curricular in the Delivery and Evaluation of General Education

Many posit that learning occurs outside the classroom as well as within (American College Personnel Association, 1996; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 2005; Mentkowski & Associates, 2000). The type of learning that transcends the classroom may very well be contributing to general education goals but without assessment, these types of conversations cannot be verified.

Furthermore, without an acknowledgment or commitment to have the co-curricular world brought into this conversation, opportunities to create and evaluate learning may be lost. Collaborations are imperative in order for these types of integration to occur.

Again, building on previously posed questions, the following may also be helpful to those seeking to engage in these types of integrated learning opportunities:

• How do co-curricular and curricular conversations occur on your campus?

• How are opportunities to promote these conversations introduced? Enhanced? Leveraged?

• Are there opportunities for integrated and collaborative learning?

• Do all departments (administrative and academic) understand how they contribute to the general education student learning outcomes?

• Are they evaluating how well they do?
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Program Review is...
- An important vehicle for strategic academic planning and alignment
- A mechanism for the initiation of departmental and institutional change
- A peer reviewed self-regulation process
- A major opportunity to develop a strategic roadmap to attain/retain departmental preeminence in student learning, in community outreach, and in the production of knowledge.

Benchmarking is...
- A continuous process, not a one-time event
- A process that provides valuable information rather than simple answers
- A process of learning from others rather than mere copying of ideas or practice
- A time-consuming and labor-intensive process, not a quick fix
- A viable tool for improving virtually any educational business activity, not a buzzword or fad.

Even the Rally to Restore Sanity Supports Program Review...

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education

Why Program Review?
- Quick individual/group brainstorm:
  - What are your top reasons for doing program review?
  - What comparative data will be most useful to your programs?


Why Conduct Program Review?
- Facilitate program-level student learning
- Understand how to achieve ongoing competitive advantage for the program
  - Strengths
  - Needs for improvement
  - Opportunities to move to the next level
- Understand and mitigate threats
  - Understand and improve market saliency
- Avoid duplication of resources
- Meet accreditation requirements
External Benchmarking at the Discipline Level: Common Areas

- Competitive environment
- Curriculum structure
- Program demand
- Student learning and success
- Placement / further education of grads
- Faculty / student ratios
- Course credit-hour production
- Facilities and learning resources
- Graduate programs: student awards, prizes, fellowships, publications

External Benchmarking Challenges

- Mostly institutional level, not discipline level
- More available on program inputs (facilities, technology), less on outcomes
- Getting meaningful benchmarking data at the discipline level is time consuming and necessitates creation of agreements
- Comparisons at the discipline level are difficult due to variance in data definitions
- Most data exchange consortia are very closely guarded

Internal Benchmarking Data Sources

- What gets measured gets managed!
- Same areas as external benchmarking
- Might also include:
  - Achievement of general education competencies by program
  - Program enrollment/attractiveness
  - Retention and progression rates by program
  - Graduation rate by program and time to graduate from junior level
  - Career satisfaction, advancement
  - Professional society participation

Benchmarking and Assessment

- Licensure test results, usually available broken out by competency area
  - NCLEX for Nursing
  - Fundamentals of Engineering
  - Others
- Major Field Achievement Test results from ETS, see http://www.ets.org/mft/about
- Area Concentration Achievement Tests, see http://www.collegeoutcomes.com
  - Caveat: do they match your SLOs and curriculum?

Environmental Scanning: Trends in Demand for Program

- Labor Market
  - National Bureau of Labor Statistics
  - Occupational outlook handbook
  - Career Guide to Industries
  - California Employment Development Department
  - Labor market info overview, workforce projections
  - Local area profile
- National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE)
  - Job outlook
  - National salary surveys
- Professional Societies
Benchmarking Data Sources: Program Graduates

- Other national surveys: CIRP, NSSE, ACT
- Program-level outcomes benchmarking through Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (http://www.webebi.com/) for:
  - Management Education
  - Teacher Education
  - Engineering Education
  - Nursing Education

Other Commercial Benchmarking Firms

- Economic Modeling Specialists, Inc. (Targeted labor market projections, customized analyses)
- CHEBA: Consortium for Higher Education Benchmarking Analysis (55 institutional members including NCSU, U of Md., McGill U.
- Primary Research Group (benchmarking studies and surveys)
- BearingPoint (Research mgmt., Student Affairs, Financial, HÐ)

Benchmarking Data Source: Retention

- Consortium on Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE): http://csrde.ou.edu/web/index.html
  - Customized peer group retention reports
  - STEM Program Retention Report
  - Community College Transfer Student Report
Benchmarking Data Source: Instructional Costs/Productivity
- National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity: http://www.udel.edu/IR/cost/
- Generally acknowledged as the "tool of choice" for comparative analysis of faculty teaching loads, direct instructional cost, and separately budgeted scholarly activity, all at the level of the academic discipline.

Benchmarking Data Sources: Research and STEM Disciplines
- Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) Data Warehouse
  - See http://aaude.org/home
  - Wide range of content
  - Users can relate data by institution, year, and, in some cases, discipline.
- NSF WebCASPAR Integrated Sciences and Engineering Data Resources Center: https://webcaspar.nsf.gov/

National University Benchmarking and Performance Indicators Study
- Developed by Julie Carpenter-Hubin at The Ohio State University in 1998
- Most comprehensive study to date
- But: No information on student learning

National Community College Benchmarking Project
- Website: http://www.nccbp.org/
- Origin: JCCC worked with other colleges from across the US to develop the NCCBP.
- Process: Benchmarks and reporting processes were defined, pilot tested, and revised in 2003, implemented in 2004.
- Scope: 268 community colleges from across the United States participated in NCCBP in 2010.
Peer Comparison Websites, from the AIR Website (www.airweb.org)
- Academic Libraries (NCES)
- Academic Library Peer Comparison Tool
- Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education
- Classification System for 2-Year Postsecondary Institutions, A
- College Opportunities On-Line (COOL)
- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS homepage)
- IPEDS Interactive Database Search
- John Minter Associates, Inc.
- NRC Doctorate Rankings
- SREB Fact Book on Higher Education
- Top American Research Universities, The

Other Benchmarking Resources
- IPEDS Data Center: http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/

Benchmarking and Scanning Resource: External Reviewers
- External Reviewers are the lens in program review through which the program is viewed
- Reviewer selection is a critical part of the review: stretch to obtain best in class reviewers
- Selection Process
  - Making the case: Candidates presented and justified to CAO and peers in a review meeting for all departments going through review in a given year
  - Use standard format for presentation of reviewer candidates
  - Avoid having “friends” as reviewers
  - Select several candidates in case of cancellations

Best in Class Approach: Using Student Awards
- Keep the focus on student outcomes: Motivate faculty and student participation in program review through competitive award process for outstanding student work
- Use external reviewers to judge finalists based on best-in-class criteria
- Recognize award winners at departmental graduation ceremonies

Questions
- Benchmarking process?
- Creating a peer group?
- Creating a consortium?
- Setting benchmark performance levels?
- Using external reviewers?
- Challenges encountered?
- Link to budgeting and planning?
- Using student awards as part of the process?
Thank You!

- Please fill out the evaluation form
- Further questions? Contact me: joseph.hoey@bridgepointeducation.com
Breakout Session:

Interpreting Data for Program Review – Case Studies

L. Buckley
Interpreting Data for Program Review

Case Studies

Linda C. Buckley, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President
Academic Planning and Development
San Francisco State University
Three Cases Studies

- A Changing Psychology Department
- A Milestone Study
- Demonstrating Public Good to Government Agencies
Look at the data in Table 1.0 and do the following:

1. Examine the total enrollment (FTES) from 2004 - 2009
2. Examine the undergraduate enrollment 2004-2009
3. Examine the graduate enrollment 2004-2009
4. Look at the use of faculty resources (in both the graduate and undergraduate levels)
5. Look at the ratio of students to faculty across all levels.
6. What conclusions can you draw from this data?
## Data Table 1.0

### Table 1.0 Distribution of Courses - Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Total</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>930.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>964.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>971.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>153.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>178.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>176.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>698.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>666.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>719.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>702.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Total</td>
<td>852.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>845.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>895.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>881.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduation Rates

1. Examine the tables on graduation rates on the following slide.

2. At what point do FTF appear to succeed?

3. At what point do transfer students appear to succeed?

4. How do FTFs compare with transfers with regard to success?

5. Why are there some cases with 0%? What does this tell you about the data?
Graduation Rates

### Table 2.0 6-Yr. Graduation Rates by Eligibility Index, First-Time Freshmen Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37.80%</td>
<td>51.90%</td>
<td>54.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,900 to 2,999</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>29.20%</td>
<td>30.80%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 to 3,199</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
<td>47.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,200 to 3,501</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>58.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,502 and higher</td>
<td>47.80%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.1 2-3 Yr. Graduation Rates by Transfer GPA, New Transfers-Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.30%</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>62.20%</td>
<td>65.30%</td>
<td>58.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.29</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30-2.49</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-2.79</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>60.60%</td>
<td>65.20%</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
<td>58.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80 and higher</td>
<td>62.20%</td>
<td>74.20%</td>
<td>67.20%</td>
<td>67.60%</td>
<td>60.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Degrees Awarded

## Table 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded in Psychology</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,900 to 2,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 to 3,199</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,200 to 3,501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,502 and higher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded in Psychology</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30-2.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-2.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80 and higher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing “Take Rate”

Look at the data on the following slide and answer the following questions:

• What can you say about the number of applicants for the varying graduate programs in the Psychology?

• Compare the number of applicants with the % of admits across the programs. What can you say?

• Compare the % of admits to the % of enrolled. What has happened over time?
## How Selective Is The Program?
### Applied/Admitted/Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSYCHOLOGY</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (Clinical)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (Developmental)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (Industrial)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (Research)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (School)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (Social)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>827</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Applies** to the number of applicants.
- **Admits** to the number of applicants accepted.
- **Enrolled** to the number of applicants who enrolled.
What is the Story?

Given all the data we’ve examined, what can we say about the Psychology Department:

• What does this department value?
• What kind of academic model does this department use?
• Can the department sustain this model?
• What data might we use to determine whether this is the “right” model for the department?
#### Milestone Study

**What is good enough?**

- Set benchmarks for student achievement.
- Track student success in reaching these goals.
- Make adjustments when goals are not achieved.
- Increase expectations when goals are consistently met.
Milestones for First time Freshmen

**Milestone Y1**
- Complete 24 units
- Maintain 2.0+ GPA
- Completed Remediation or not need it.

**Milestone Y2**
- Complete 48 units
- Maintain 2.0+ GPA
- Declare a major

**Milestone Y3-6**
- Complete 120 units
- Maintain 2.0+ GPA

**Final Step**
- Apply for graduation
Milestone Study Results

1st term
Entry Cohort #: 4,032
- Need remediation = 61.1%
- Avg. GPA end of term = 2.8
  Avg. Total units = 11.3
- Good standing = 85%

2nd term
2nd term = 3,769
- Cum. Retention % = 93.5%
- Avg. GPA end of term = 2.8
  Avg. Total units = 23.3
- Good standing = 87%

1st Year Milestone
- Met Y1 milestone = 53%
- 24 units = 54%
- 24 units & GPA>2.0 = 53%
- Completed remediation = 85%

3rd term
3rd term = 3,046
- Cum. Retention % = 75%
- Avg. GPA end of term = 2.9
  Avg. Total units = 37.9
- Good standing = 93.6%

4th term
4th term = 2,911
- Cum. Retention % = 72%
- Avg. GPA end of term = 2.93
  Avg. Total units = 51.1
- Good standing = 94.6%

2nd Year Milestone
- Met Y2 milestone = 50%
- Completed 48 units = 50%
- Declared a major = 83%
Set your Own Criteria for Milestones for a Program

• Choose several milestones for an academic program.

• What would be the rationale for those milestones?

• How would you use this data?

• How might the milestones change over time?
How to be prepared for an audit from a government agency

• The kinds of questions that the GAO will ask.

• How to create transparency

• The use of the College Portrait
  http://collegeportraits.org/CA/SF-State
Interview Protocols

Institution:
Interview date:
Interview time:
Interview location:
List of attendees:

Overview of School

1. Briefly describe your role and responsibilities within the institution.
2. Please briefly describe the mission of this school and its history.
3. What is the size of the school? Number of campuses/locations?
4. How many students are enrolled in your school? What are the characteristics (age, race, sex, family income, part-time/full-time status, educational background) of those enrolled?
   a. What percentage of your students is out-of-state, in-state, foreign/international?
5. What does it cost students to go to this school in terms of sticker prices? Net tuition?
   a. What percentage of students receive financial aid and what is the average aid package?
6. Please describe the programs offered (type of training or degree and length of program) at your institution?
   (For community colleges) Do you offer remedial programs? Please provide us with the number and types of remedial programs offered. Can you estimate what percentage of the student body is enrolled in remedial programs in any given year?
7. What types of support services do you provide to students?
8. What types of employment services do you provide to students?

Trends in Expenditures

9. What is the institution’s annual cost per student of providing instruction? How has this changed over the last 10 years? What factors affected this expenditure?
10. What percentage of the operating budget is spent on non-instructional activities? What activities are included in this category (e.g., registration, financial aid counseling, academic advising, recruitment, operations and maintenance, etc.)?
   a. Has this changed over the last 10 years? If so, how?
   b. What are the reasons for such changes?
c. What has been the impact of such expense changes on the institution?

d. To your knowledge, what are the major differences among public and private nonprofit schools regarding these issues?

e. What procedures do you use to classify expenditures on instructional versus non-instructional activities? Is it possible to get a copy of your procedures?

11. What percentage of the operating budget is spent on activities and resources specifically devoted to student recruitment?

   a. Has this changed over the last 10 years? If so, how?
   b. What are the reasons for such changes?
   c. What has been the impact of such expense changes on the student population and the institution?
   d. To your knowledge, what are the major differences among public and private nonprofit schools regarding these issues?
   e. What procedures do you use to classify expenditures on recruitment-related activities? Is it possible to get a copy of your procedures?

12. What information is available on spending on academic versus non-academic facilities?

   a. To what extent has spending on these types of facilities changed over the last 20 years (e.g., type of building and how they are financed)?
   b. What are some of the reasons for increasing or decreasing spending on academic facilities? On nonacademic facilities?
   c. How much of your school’s spending on facilities is related to research conducted for federal grants/contracts?
   d. To your knowledge, what are the major differences, if any, among public and private nonprofit schools regarding these issues?
   e. What procedures do you use to classify expenditures on academic versus non-academic facilities? Is it possible to get a copy of your procedures?

**Staffing Levels and Compensation for Faculty and Non-Teaching Staff**

13. What is the number of faculty and non-teaching employees at the school? *(please describe the number or percentage of full-time, part-time, tenure, non-tenure, adjunct faculty, instructors or lecturers, and non-teaching personnel including administrators)*

14. To what extent have your hiring patterns for tenured and non-tenured faculty changed over the last 10 years? (i.e., hiring more or less staff; changing the ratio of tenured vs. non-tenured faculty; hiring more or less part-time staff)

   a. What are the reasons for this trend?

15. What is the compensation (salary, benefits, bonuses) for tenured and non-tenured faculty? Non-teaching staff, including administrators?
a. To what extent has compensation (including benefits) changed during the last 10 years for tenured and non-tenured faculty? Non-teaching staff?

b. What are the reasons for changes in compensation over the last 10 years?

16. To what extent do faculty receive allowances for non-academic work or compensation for time off such as sabbaticals?

a. How, if at all, has this practice changed over past 10 years?

b. Do you maintain data on compensated time off for sabbaticals? If so, is it possible to get a copy of this information?

17. What are the typical faculty course loads for tenured professors at this school? Non-tenured? Full-time? Part-time?

a. To what extent have course loads for tenured professors changed over the past 10 years?

b. What are the reasons for such changes?

c. What information or data do you have available on faculty course loads? Is this something you could provide a copy of?

18. What are the publication rates for tenured faculty at this school?

a. To what extent have publication rates changed over the past 10 years?

b. What are the reasons for such changes?

c. What information or data do you have available on publication requirements or rates? Is this something you could provide us a copy of?

Indirect Cost Rates

19. What federal government grants and contracts does your institution receive for conducting research?

a. How many grants or contracts for research do you typically get in one year?

b. What type of research has been funded through such grants/contracts?

c. Who sets the reimbursement rate? What is the administrative cap on reimbursement?

20. What percentage of your indirect costs are reimbursed?

a. Is it just for this campus or all campuses?

b. Are there indirect costs for which you were not fully reimbursed? If so, please describe those cost categories.

21. How has the reimbursement rate changed for you over the last 10 years?

22. Please describe any challenges you face with reimbursement of indirect costs.

23. How do you internally track information related to research funding and reimbursements for indirect costs? Is it possible to get a copy of your procedures?
Trends in Revenues

24. Please provide an overview of the revenue derived from federal student aid, broken down by source (e.g., grants and loans).

25. To what extent have revenue streams for your school changed over the past 10 years in the following categories:
   a. state and local subsidies
   b. federal student aid
   c. private endowments
   d. tuition and fees
   e. government grants and contracts
   f. other indirect support

26. Please describe how changes in revenue streams have impacted your school and the students.

27. How do state and local subsidies, private endowments, government grants and contracts and other indirect support impact the cost of providing instruction to students?
   a. What steps has your school taken to adjust to these changes?
   b. To your knowledge, what are the major differences among public and private nonprofit schools regarding these issues?

28. To what extent do you use tuition discounting to increase or maximize tuition revenue?
   a. What is the average discount rate at your school?
   b. For approximately what percentage of the student population do you provide tuition discounts?
   c. What other revenue sources are used to provide tuition discounting?
   d. Do you use tuition discounting to attract certain types of students? Please explain how this works.
   e. How has the tuition discount rate changed over the last 10 years and why? How has the current economic climate impacted the rate?

Changes in Admissions Policies

29. What is your school’s admissions policy (e.g., open/selective admissions)?

30. What changes, if any, have occurred over the last 10 years in your admissions policy? (e.g.- increasing out-of-state student and foreign student enrollments, other)
   a. When did these changes in admissions policy begin?
   b. What were the reason(s) for such changes?
c. What impact have these changes had on revenue? Net tuition?

31. Are there any state or other restrictions placed on your school regarding the number of out-of-state/foreign students that can be enrolled? If so, please explain.

Completion/Graduation Rates

32. How do you define your completion rate? What is your school’s completion rate?
   a. How has it changed in the last 10 years?
   b. How does it differ from what’s reported in IPEDS?
   c. Is this information disclosed anywhere?

33. What is included in your calculation of graduation rates? For example, how do you define the cohort of students? How do you define the time period?
   a. How does this differ, if at all, from the official metrics used by the Department of Education and reported in IPEDS?
   b. Is there any difference between calculating graduation rates versus completion rates? If so, please explain.

34. Is the graduation rate an appropriate measure or indicator of success at your school? If not, what is an alternative measure? What other factors should be considered?

Information Disclosures to Current and Prospective Students

35. Please describe the information you provide to current and prospective students regarding cost of attendance, graduation rates, and future employment information (e.g., salaries, placement rates). Does your school disclose any other information along these lines?

36. Please provide us with a general overview of the typical methods you use to collect and disclose such information (e.g., publications, mailings, electronic media.)

37. What components are included in the cost of attendance calculation?

38. What types of jobs do your graduating students obtain? Please provide us with some examples?

39. If job placement rate information is provided, please describe what is included in your calculation of placement rates? How do you collect/track this data? Do you take any steps to validate the data?

40. Do you provide information about future salaries to students? If so, how is this information tracked and collected? Do you take any steps to validate the data?

41. What challenges, if any, do you face in meeting the federal requirements to disclose cost of attendance, graduation rates, and employment information to students?

42. Has your office received any complaints from current/prospective students/parents regarding disclosure of consumer information? If so, what was the nature of the complaint? What was the school’s response?
43. Does your school survey students/parents to determine their level of satisfaction with what information is disclosed and how it is disclosed?

**Verification of Information on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)**

44. Please describe the processes you use to verify the integrity of information provided on the FAFSA application.

45. How often do you identify problems with information provided on the FAFSA application? Please describe the types of problems you encounter.

46. Generally, what are the reasons for such problems?

47. How do you correct the problems and report the corrections to the Department of Education?

48. How often have you had to repay liabilities to Education as a result of overawards?

49. What challenges do you face with meeting federal FAFSA verification requirements?

50. What is your impression of the Department of Education’s oversight of school compliance with disclosure and/or verification of FAFSA requirements?
   a. What type of guidance does the Department of Education provide to you on disclosure and FAFSA verification requirements? Have you found this guidance to be helpful?

**Questions for Students**

51. How long have you been attending this school? Are you a freshman, sophomore, junior, senior? First year, second year student?

52. Are you attending part-time? Full-time?

53. Are you a transfer student?

54. Are you an in-state, out-of-state, foreign student?

55. What information was provided to you regarding cost of attendance, graduation rates, and future employment (e.g., salaries, placement rates.)

56. How was this information provided to you (e.g., brochure, letter from school, online?)
   a. At what stage of the process was this information provided to you (e.g., during recruitment, after enrollment, upon graduation, other?)
   b. Did you find this information to be easily attainable? Readily available upon request?

57. Did you have any challenges finding the information? If so, in what ways do you think information disclosure could be improved?
SF State offers many opportunities, both inside and outside the classroom, to be involved with diverse ideas, people, and experiences.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

Find out more about student learning in critical thinking, writing, and other important subjects at SF State.

**Public Good**

**Public Good**

**Contributions to the Public Good**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Granted 2009-10</th>
<th>San Francisco State</th>
<th>% of CSU</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>% of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Degree Awards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>75,418</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19,507</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>95,070</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bachelor's Degree Awards by Racial and Ethnic Background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Francisco State</th>
<th>% of CSU</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>% of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Latino</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity/Unknown</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>75,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In High Demand Fields**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Francisco State</th>
<th>% of CSU</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>% of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and Tourism</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/Culture/Design</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Professional Services</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSU Chancellor's Office, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES)

**Economic Diversity: Access & Completion**
Undergraduate Pell Grant Recipients (2008-09)

San Francisco State Undergraduates 24,378
San Francisco State Undergraduate Pell Grant Recipients 7,931
San Francisco State Pell Percentage of Undergraduates 33%
System Pell Percentage of Undergraduates 34%
National Pell Percentage of Public 4-year Undergraduates 26%
National Pell Percentage of Private 4-year (Not-for-Profit) Undergraduates 26%

Bachelor's Degree Pell Grant Recipients (2009-10)

San Francisco State Bachelor's Degrees 5,562
San Francisco State Pell Grant Bachelor's Degree Recipients 2,312
San Francisco State Pell Percentage of Bachelor's Degrees 42%
System Pell Percentage of Bachelor's Degrees 41%

Source: CSU Chancellor's Office, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES)

Sticker and "Net" Tuition & Fees

Average tuition and fee "sticker" charged to private four-year full-time undergraduates in AY 2009-10 $23,210
Average tuition and fee "sticker" charged to public four-year full-time instate undergraduates in AY 2009-10 $6,695
San Francisco State average tuition and fee "sticker" charged to all full-time undergraduates in AY 2009-10 $4,740
San Francisco State average tuition and fee "net" paid by full-time undergraduates in AY 2009-10 $1,981
San Francisco State "Net" percent of "Sticker" Tuition & Fees for full-time undergraduates in AY 2009-10 42%

Sources: CSU Chancellor's Office, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), and http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_346.asp

Loan Debt of Baccalaureate Recipients

Percent of 2008-09 Baccalaureate Recipients who Started as Freshmen and Assumed Loans
San Francisco State Percentage 40%
State Percentage 48%
National Percentage 59%

Average Loan Debt of 2008-09 Baccalaureate Recipients who Started as Freshmen and Assumed Loans
San Francisco State Average $15,898
State Average $17,326
National Average $24,000


Salaries of Baccalaureate Recipients — Payscale (2010)

National average starting median salary of graduates from public universities $41,525
San Francisco State graduates' median starting salary $46,400
National average mid-career median salary of graduates from public universities $71,478
San Francisco State graduates' mid-career median salary $82,600

Source: "Top State Universities by Salary Potential", PayScale Inc.
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Breakout Session:

WASC and Program Review

Jill Ferguson
Suggested Approaches for Evaluating Program Review on Educational Effectiveness Review Visits

WASC has placed a great deal of emphasis on program review as a key element of institutional quality assurance and improvement and a vehicle for assessing achievement of institutional and program learning outcomes. Beginning fall 2009, all institutions are required to include in their EER reports an analysis of the effectiveness of their program review process. As stated in the Handbook of Accreditation:

Institutions are expected to analyze the effectiveness of the program review process, including its emphasis on the achievement of the program’s learning outcomes. The process should be sufficiently embedded for the institution and the team to sample current program review reports (self-studies and external review reports) in order to assess the impact of the program review process and its alignment with the institution’s quality improvement efforts and academic planning and budgeting. (Also see CFRs 2.7 and 4.4.)

The following approach has been developed to assist teams in evaluating program review by providing a common and systematic method, which should be adapted by the team as needed to maximize its value and effectiveness during the visit.

The approach suggests a systematic way to:

1) review a sample of recent program reviews. The number of program reviews may vary according to the size of the institution and number of programs it has. For example, in a small institution with two programs, the team may examine both reviews. In a large institution with many programs, the team may select three to five recent programs in a variety of areas.

2) evaluate the effectiveness of the program review process under the relevant CFRs (2.7, 4.4), using applicable WASC rubrics for guidance on good practice.

3) study one or two program reviews in depth, including meeting with faculty and appropriate administrators from the program(s) to learn more about how program review worked, what was learned, and how follow up was undertaken.

4) learn how program review results were incorporated into planning and the institution’s quality assurance system.

The team, working with Commission staff, should discuss ways to implement this process along with the themes that institution has studied in its EER review.
SUGGESTED PROCEDURES

Prior to the visit

1: On team pre-visit conference call:

- Identify a sample of programs for review by the team. Using the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, identify programs that have recently undergone program reviews. The number of program reviews will vary by institutional size and number of programs offered and recently reviewed. In smaller institutions, one or two may be adequate; in larger institutions, a sampling of three to five is suggested.
  - In selecting the program reviews, consider the size and importance of the programs within the institution. Avoid selecting only programs that have specialized/programmatic accreditation. Choose disciplines from different schools or colleges if the institution is large enough to have this kind of structure.

- Select one or two programs for an in-depth analysis by the team. A meeting with faculty will be held for each program reviewed in depth (described below).

- Assign at least two team members to the program review work, with one team member assigned primary responsibility for writing about the findings from the process described below, and one with secondary responsibility.

- Decide on the method to be used in the meeting with faculty and relevant administrators. A fishbowl exercise, described in the footnote, is one approach.

2: Following the pre-visit team conference call:

- The Assistant Chair arranges logistics with the ALO.
  - Request that program review documents for each selected program be provided in advance of the visit, or in the team room if they are too voluminous to send in advance. These materials would typically include the program’s self-review, appendices with supporting documents, external evaluators’ reports, and follow-up agreements and memoranda.
  - Ask that relevant assessment plans be included with the program review(s), if they are not integrated into the program reviews or included in the institutional report or data portfolio.

---

* An effective method of evaluating faculty work in assessment is through a fishbowl exercise in which faculty members are asked to discuss the results of the program review and/or program-level assessment results among themselves while the team observes. Another effective way to learn about assessment practices and findings through the fishbowl is to ask the faculty to assess some samples of actual student work using a faculty-developed rubric. The team usually follows this exercise with questions about what they observed and prepared lines of inquiry created from the rubrics and Expectations for Two Reviews.
Ask the ALO to schedule a meeting with program faculty and leadership of the selected program(s). Provide information to the ALO about any special technique to be used at this meeting, such as a fishbowl, so that the faculty can prepare. Depending on the size of the program or department, a broad representative sample might be selected.

- Assigned team members prepare questions/lines of inquiry for the faculty and program leadership and plan for use of special techniques such as a fishbowl.

On the visit

3. Early on the first day of the visit, the assigned team members examine the program reviews for the programs identified in advance of the visit, using the following process. Where program reviews are provided in advance, the team members can spend this time conferring on their findings.

- Identify the program learning outcomes for the program. Consider the quality of the outcomes using the Rubric for Assessing the Quality of PLOs.

- Read the program review. Assess how well assessment is covered in the program review using the Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Review.

- Examine the assessment plan:
  - Have standards of performance been established by the faculty?
  - Does the assessment process include:
    - multiple methods of assessment?
    - direct and indirect assessment?
    - summative and formative assessment, e.g., focusing on a piece of culminating student work?
  - Are the assessments done at regular intervals?
  - Who does the assessment and how? Are collaboratively developed tools or rubrics used?
  - Who keeps the data collected? How are data analyzed and utilized?
  - What mechanisms are in place to ensure/support use of findings for improvement?
  - What incentives are available to faculty who carry out assessment?

(CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 3.3, 4.3-4.8)

- If the assessment plan includes the use of CAPSTONES or PORTFOLIOS, use the relevant rubrics to evaluate good practice: Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes and Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstones for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes

- If other methods of conducting program-level assessment are utilized, what are they? What kinds of data about student achievement do they produce? Are the data used in meaningful ways?

(CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4)
- Examine the findings of program-level assessment of student learning that are reported and discussed in the program review and ascertain:
  - What do the latest findings show? Are students achieving at expected levels?
  - What is done with the results?
  - What is being done to address any gaps in student achievement?

  (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.7)

- Determine what was done with the program review.
  - What did the faculty do to address findings?
  - Was the program review provided to the top academic leadership? What was done at that level?
  - Were the results of the program review linked to planning and budgeting? What evidence is there that changes or improvements were made as a result of the program review?

  (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7)

4: On the first or second day of the visit, the assigned team members hold a meeting with program faculty and administrators of the selected program. Team members should consider questions such as those listed above and on page two of WASC’s *Expectations for Two Reviews*.

5: On the second or third day of the visit, the assigned team members share observations and findings with the team, and use the evidence from this process to help the team determine where the institution falls on the *Educational Effectiveness Framework*. The *Framework* is filled out and submitted as part of the team’s confidential recommendation.

6: By the last day of the visit, the assigned team members complete their sections of the draft EER report, including a section that contains their assessment of the program review process, and submit them to the Assistant Chair for inclusion in the team report.
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Data Exhibit 7—Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Why is WASC Interested in Data of This Kind? For an institution to be committed to educational effectiveness, it must have in place a system for collecting and using evidence in a variety of ways to improve student learning. The indicators asked for in this exhibit reflect how an institution can approach quality assurance and improvement of student learning systematically. This exhibit is required for the Institutional Proposal; it should be updated at the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review and again for the Educational Effectiveness Review. The exhibit should be viewed as a developmental document: the institution can indicate what activities it already engages in and what remains to be done; successive updates will then show the institution’s progress.

WASC expects institutions to have educational objectives for degree programs and the institution as a whole (CFR 1.1, 1.2, and 2.4). To ensure that educational objectives are met, learning outcomes are to be reflected in academic programs and policies (CFR 2.3); outcomes should also be published and widely shared, e.g., across programs, with students, and among other stakeholders (CFR 2.4). The faculty is expected to take collective responsibility for reviewing and demonstrating the attainment of those outcomes (CFR 2.4). Ongoing collection of data and other evidence, regular analysis, and use of findings all help to assure that students are learning at an appropriate level for the degree or certificate awarded (CFR 2.2 and 2.6), and that programs are engaged in continuous improvement (CFR 2.7, 4.4). The indicators listed in this exhibit collectively demonstrate an institution’s commitment to quality assurance and improvement of educational results over time (CFR 4.1 and 4.5).

Issues and Challenges. Not all institutions have yet established learning outcomes and approaches to assessment of learning for all degree programs. This exhibit may be used to assist an institution in determining the extent to which such systems are in place, and what additional components or processes it may need to develop in the course of the WASC review. It is critical for an institution to be explicit about its expectations and to assure that every degree program has or will have in place a quality assurance system for assessing, tracking and improving the learning of its graduates. Some measures and indicators are embedded in the curriculum and may be difficult to list individually in a exhibit format. As a result, institutions may wish to supplement this data exhibit with a narrative. Institutions should contact their WASC staff liaison if they have questions; they should also alert staff to any major departure from the format of this data exhibit. The evaluation team may sample from the institution’s list of indicators to understand how comprehensively and successfully the institution addresses the quality of its learning infrastructure.

Description. This data exhibit requests brief narrative information for each degree program, for general education, and for the institution as a whole: 1) whether formal learning outcomes have been developed (may be answered yes/no); 2) where the learning outcomes for the degree are listed (include course syllabi, catalogs, and other publications as applicable); 3) approaches used to assess student learning (e.g., capstone courses; comprehensive assessment examinations; student, alumni, and employer surveys; portfolio review; licensure examination; etc.); 4) processes and persons involved in analyzing/interpreting findings; 5) use made of findings for improvement of curriculum, pedagogy, or other aspects of the educational experience; and 6) date of the last program review for the program (presumably this program review will have produced a report that the team may review).

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.
## Sample Format 7.1
### Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>(1) Have formal learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>(2) Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>(3) Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</th>
<th>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</th>
<th>(5) How are the findings used?</th>
<th>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the institutional level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For general education if an undergraduate institution:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List each degree program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES
Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive List</strong></td>
<td>The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, disorganized. It may include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring relevant institution-wide learning. The list may confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems).</td>
<td>The list includes reasonable outcomes but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes and/or national disciplinary standards may be ignored. Distinctions between expectations for undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear.</td>
<td>The list is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. It includes relevant institution-wide outcomes (e.g., communication or critical thinking skills). Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.</td>
<td>The list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations, if applicable. National disciplinary standards have been considered. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria for assessing students' level of mastery of each outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Outcome statements do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. Statements such as “Students understand scientific method” do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.</td>
<td>Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.</td>
<td>Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning, e.g., “Graduates can write reports in APA style” or “Graduates can make original contributions to biological knowledge.”</td>
<td>Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements, such as rubrics, and have identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td>There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience.</td>
<td>Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the outcomes in the required curriculum.</td>
<td>The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design may be summarized in a curriculum map.</td>
<td>Pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, relevant student support services, and co-curriculum are explicitly and intentionally aligned with each outcome. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Planning</strong></td>
<td>There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome.</td>
<td>The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in the current year.</td>
<td>The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements.</td>
<td>The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Student Experience</strong></td>
<td>Students know little or nothing about the overall outcomes of the program. Communication of outcomes to students, e.g. in syllabi or catalog, is spotty or nonexistent.</td>
<td>Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors.</td>
<td>Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the web page, and elsewhere.</td>
<td>Students are well-acquainted with program outcomes and may participate in creation and use of rubrics. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcomes and levels of performance. Program policy calls for inclusion of outcomes in all course syllabi, and they are readily available in other program documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Learning Outcomes Rubric

Conclusions should be based on a review of learning outcomes and assessment plans. Although you can make some preliminary judgments about alignment based on examining the curriculum or a curriculum map, you will have to interview key departmental representatives, such as department chairs, faculty, and students, to fully evaluate the alignment of the learning environment with the outcomes.

The rubric has five major dimensions:

1. **Comprehensive List.** The set of program learning outcomes should be a short but comprehensive list of the most important knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program, including relevant institution-wide outcomes such as those dealing with communication skills, critical thinking, or information literacy. Faculty generally should expect higher levels of sophistication for graduate programs than for undergraduate programs, and they should consider national disciplinary standards when developing and refining their outcomes, if available. There is no strict rule concerning the optimum number of outcomes, but quality is more important than quantity. Faculty should not confuse learning processes (e.g., completing an internship) with learning outcomes (what is learned in the internship, such as application of theory to real-world practice).

   **Questions.** Is the list reasonable, appropriate and well-organized? Are relevant institution-wide outcomes, such as information literacy, included? Are distinctions between undergraduate and graduate outcomes clear? Have national disciplinary standards been considered when developing and refining the outcomes? Are explicit criteria – as defined in a rubric, for example – available for each outcome?

2. **Assessable Outcomes.** Outcome statements should specify what students can do to demonstrate their learning. For example, an outcome might state that “Graduates of our program can collaborate effectively to reach a common goal” or that “Graduates of our program can design research studies to test theories and examine issues relevant to our discipline.” These outcomes are assessable because faculty can observe the quality of collaboration in teams, and they can review the quality of student-created research designs. Criteria for assessing student products or behaviors usually are specified in rubrics, and the department should develop examples of varying levels of student performance (i.e., work that does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations) to illustrate levels.

   **Questions.** Do the outcomes clarify how students can demonstrate learning? Have the faculty agreed on explicit criteria, such as rubrics, for assessing each outcome? Do they have examples of work representing different levels of mastery for each outcome?

3. **Alignment.** Students cannot be held responsible for mastering learning outcomes unless they have participated in a program that systematically supports their development. The curriculum should be explicitly designed to provide opportunities for students to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design often is summarized in a curriculum map—a matrix that shows the relationship between courses in the required curriculum and the program’s learning outcomes. Pedagogy and grading should be aligned with outcomes to foster and encourage student growth and to provide students helpful feedback on their development. Since learning occurs within and outside the classroom, relevant student services (e.g., advising and tutoring centers) and co-curriculum (e.g., student clubs and campus events) should be designed to support the outcomes.

   **Questions.** Is the curriculum explicitly aligned with the program outcomes? Do faculty select effective pedagogy and use grading to promote learning? Are student support services and the co-curriculum explicitly aligned to promote student development of the learning outcomes?

4. **Assessment Planning.** Faculty should develop explicit plans for assessing each outcome. Programs need not assess every outcome every year, but faculty should have a plan to cycle through the outcomes over a reasonable period of time, such as the period for program review cycles.

   **Questions.** Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time? Is the plan sustainable, in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Are assessment plans revised, as needed?

5. **The Student Experience.** At a minimum, students should be aware of the learning outcomes of the program(s) in which they are enrolled; ideally, they should be included as partners in defining and applying the outcomes and the criteria for levels of sophistication. Thus it is essential to communicate learning outcomes to students consistently and meaningfully.

   **Questions.** Are the outcomes communicated to students? Do students understand what the outcomes mean and how they can further their own learning? Do students use the outcomes and criteria to self-assess? Do they participate in reviews of outcomes, criteria, curriculum design, or related activities?
# PROGRAM REVIEW

Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Elements of the Self-Study</td>
<td>Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, benchmarking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Review</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts; departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Budgeting</td>
<td>The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes.</td>
<td>The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success.</td>
<td>The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process.</td>
<td>The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</td>
<td>No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, impact, etc.</td>
<td>An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Experience</td>
<td>Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review.</td>
<td>Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys</td>
<td>The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it.</td>
<td>Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Program Review Rubric

Conclusions should be based on a review of program-review documents and discussion with relevant campus representatives, such as department chairs, deans, and program review committees.

The rubric has five major dimensions:

1. **Self-Study Requirements.** The campus should have explicit requirements for the program’s self-study, including an analysis of the program’s learning outcomes and a review of the annual assessment studies conducted since the last program review. Faculty preparing the self-study should reflect on the accumulating results and their impact; and they should plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. As much as possible, programs should benchmark findings against similar programs on other campuses. **Questions:** Does the campus require self-studies that include an analysis of the program’s learning outcomes, assessment studies, assessment results, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, including the impact of changes made in response to earlier studies? Does the campus require an updated assessment plan for the subsequent years before the next program review?

2. **Self-Study Review.** Internal reviewers (on-campus individuals, such as deans and program review committee members) and external reviewers (off-campus individuals, usually disciplinary experts) should evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact; and they should provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. **Questions:** Who reviews the self-studies? Do they have the training or expertise to provide effective feedback? Do they routinely evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do they provide suggestions for improvement? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

3. **Planning and Budgeting.** Program reviews should not be *pro forma* exercises; they should be tied to planning and budgeting processes, with expectations that increased support will lead to increased effectiveness, such as improving student learning and retention rates. **Questions:** Does the campus systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes? Are expectations established for the impact of planned changes?

4. **Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts.** Campuses moving into the culture of evidence often find considerable variation in the quality of assessment efforts across programs, and waiting for years to provide feedback to improve the assessment process is unlikely to lead to effective campus practices. While program reviews encourage departments to reflect on multi-year assessment results, some programs are likely to require more immediate feedback, usually based on a required, annual assessment report. This feedback might be provided by an Assessment Director or Committee, relevant Dean or Associate Dean, or others; and whoever has this responsibility should have the expertise to provide quality feedback. **Questions:** Does someone have the responsibility for providing annual feedback on the assessment process? Does this person or team have the expertise to provide effective feedback? Does this person or team routinely provide feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

5. **The Student Experience.** Students have a unique perspective on a given program of study: they know better than anyone what it means to go through it as a student. Program review should take advantage of that perspective and build it into the review. **Questions:** Are students aware of the purpose and value of program review? Are they involved in preparations and the self-study? Do they have an opportunity to interact with internal or external reviewers, demonstrate and interpret their learning, and provide evaluative feedback?
## PORTFOLIOS

**Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of Students’ Task</td>
<td>Instructions to students for portfolio development provide insufficient detail for them to know what faculty expect. Instructions may not identify outcomes to be addressed in the portfolio.</td>
<td>Students receive some written instructions for their portfolios, but they still have problems determining what is required of them and/or why they are compiling a portfolio.</td>
<td>Students receive written instructions that describe faculty expectations in detail and include the purpose of the portfolio, types of evidence to include, role of the reflective essay (if required), and format of the finished product.</td>
<td>Students in the program understand the portfolio requirement and the rationale for it, and they view the portfolio as helping them develop self-assessment skills. Faculty may monitor the developing portfolio to provide formative feedback and/or advise individual students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Results</td>
<td>It is not clear that valid evidence for each relevant outcome is collected and/or individual reviewers use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work.</td>
<td>Appropriate evidence is collected for each outcome, and faculty have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each outcome.</td>
<td>Appropriate evidence is collected for each outcome; faculty use explicit criteria, such as agreed-upon rubrics, to assess student attainment of each outcome. Rubrics are usually shared with students.</td>
<td>Assessment criteria, e.g., in the form of rubrics, have been pilot-tested and refined over time; they are shared with students, and student may have helped develop them. Feedback from external reviewers has led to refinements in the assessment process. The department also uses external benchmarking data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Results</td>
<td>Those who review student work are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and there are no checks for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way or faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated; faculty routinely find that assessment data have high inter-rater reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Are Used</td>
<td>Results for each outcome are collected, but they are not discussed among the faculty.</td>
<td>Results for each outcome are collected and discussed by the faculty, but results have not been used to improve the program.</td>
<td>Results for each outcome are collected, discussed by faculty, and used to improve the program.</td>
<td>Faculty routinely discuss results, plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others, such as librarians or Student Affairs professionals, to improve student learning. Students may also participate in discussions and/or receive feedback, either individual or in the aggregate. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If e-Portfolios Are Used</td>
<td>There is no technical support for students or faculty to learn the software or to deal with problems.</td>
<td>There is informal or minimal formal support for students and faculty.</td>
<td>Formal technical support is readily available and proactively assists in learning the software and solving problems.</td>
<td>Support is readily available, proactive, and effective. Tech support personnel may also participate in refining the overall portfolio process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Portfolio Rubric

Portfolios can serve many purposes besides assessment; in fact, these other purposes are actually much more common. Portfolios may be compiled so students can share their work with family and friends. They may be designed to build students’ confidence by showing development over time or by displaying best work. They may be used for advising and career counseling, or so students can show their work during a job interview. The first thing a team needs to do is determine that the portfolios are used for assessment, and not for another purpose.

Conclusions about the quality of the assessment process should be based on discussion with relevant department members (e.g., chair, assessment coordinator, faculty, students) and a review of the program’s written portfolio assignment. Two common types of portfolios are:

- Showcase portfolios—collections of each student’s best work
- Developmental portfolios—collections of work from early, middle, and late stages in the student’s academic career that demonstrate growth

Faculty generally require students to include a reflective essay that describes how the evidence in the portfolio demonstrates their achievement of program learning outcomes. Sometimes faculty monitor developing portfolios to provide formative feedback and/or advising to students, and sometimes they collect portfolios only as students near graduation. Portfolio assignments should clarify the purpose of the portfolio, what kinds of evidence should be included, and the format (e.g., paper vs. e-portfolios); and students should view the portfolio as contributing to their personal development.

The rubric has five major dimensions and a fifth dimension limited to e-portfolios:

1. **Clarification of Students’ Task.** Most students have never created a portfolio, and they need explicit guidance. Questions: Does the portfolio assignment provide sufficient detail so students understand the purpose, the types of evidence to include, the learning outcomes to address, the role of the reflective essay (if any), and the required format? Do students view the portfolio as contributing to their ability to self-assess? Do faculty use the developing portfolios to assist individual students?

2. **Valid Results.** Sometimes portfolios lack valid evidence for assessing particular outcomes. For example, portfolios may not allow faculty to assess how well students can deliver oral presentations. Judgments about that evidence need to be based on well-established, agreed-upon criteria that specify (usually in rubrics) how to identify work that meets or exceeds expectations. Questions: Do the portfolios systematically include valid evidence for each targeted outcome? Are faculty using well-established, agreed-upon criteria, such as rubrics, to assess the evidence for each outcome? Have faculty pilot tested and refined their process? Are criteria shared with students? Are they collaborating with colleagues at other institutions to secure benchmarking (comparison) data?

3. **Reliable Results.** Well-qualified judges should reach the same conclusions about a student’s achievement of a learning outcome, demonstrating inter-rater reliability. If two judges independently assess a set of materials, their ratings can be correlated. Sometimes a discrepancy index is used. How often do the two raters give identical ratings, ratings one point apart, ratings two points apart, etc.? Data are reliable if the correlation is high and/or if discrepancies are small. Raters generally are calibrated (“normed”) to increase reliability. Calibration usually involves a training session in which raters apply rubrics to pre-selected examples of student work that vary in quality, then reach consensus about the rating each example should receive. The purpose is to ensure that all raters apply the criteria in the same way so that each student’s product would receive the same score, regardless of rater. Questions: Are reviewers calibrated? Are checks for inter-rater reliability made? Is there evidence of high inter-rater reliability?

4. **Results Are Used.** Assessment is a process designed to monitor and improve learning, so assessment findings should have an impact. Faculty should reflect on results for each outcome and decide if they are acceptable or disappointing. If results do not meet their standards, faculty should determine what changes should be made, e.g., in pedagogy, curriculum, student support, or faculty support. Questions: Do faculty collect assessment results, discuss them, and reach conclusions about student achievement? Do they develop explicit plans to improve student learning? Do they implement those plans? Do they have a history of securing necessary resources to support this implementation? Do they collaborate with other campus professionals to improve student learning? Do follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning?

5. **If e-Portfolios Are Used.** Faculty and students alike require support, especially when a new software program is introduced. Lack of support can lead to frustration and failure of the process. Support personnel may also have useful insights into how the portfolio assessment process can be refined. Questions: What is the quality and extent of technical support? Of inclusion in review and refinement of the portfolio process? What is the overall level of faculty and student satisfaction with the technology and support services?
## CAPSTONES
Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experiences for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Outcomes and Lines of Evidence Identified</td>
<td>It is not clear which program outcomes will be assessed in the capstone course.</td>
<td>The relevant outcomes are identified, e.g., ability to integrate knowledge to solve complex problems; however, concrete plans for collecting evidence for each outcome have not been developed.</td>
<td>Relevant outcomes are identified. Concrete plans for collecting evidence for each outcome are agreed upon and used routinely by faculty who staff the capstone course.</td>
<td>Relevant evidence is collected; faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements, e.g., rubrics, and have identified examples of student performance at varying levels of mastery for each relevant outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Results</td>
<td>It is not clear that potentially valid evidence for each relevant outcome is collected and/or individual faculty use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work or performances.</td>
<td>Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for each outcome; they have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each outcome but these are not yet fully defined.</td>
<td>Faculty have agreed on concrete plans for collecting relevant evidence for each outcome. Explicit criteria, e.g., rubrics, have been developed to assess the level of student attainment of each outcome.</td>
<td>Assessment criteria, such as rubrics, have been pilot-tested and refined over time; they usually are shared with students. Feedback from external reviewers has led to refinements in the assessment process, and the department uses external benchmarking data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Results</td>
<td>Those who review student work are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way; there are no checks for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way or faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Reviewers are calibrated, and faculty routinely find assessment data have high inter-rater reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Are Used</td>
<td>Results for each outcome may or may not be are collected. They are not discussed among faculty.</td>
<td>Results for each outcome are collected and may be discussed by the faculty, but results have not been used to improve the program.</td>
<td>Results for each outcome are collected, discussed by faculty, analyzed, and used to improve the program.</td>
<td>Faculty routinely discuss results, plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others, such as librarians or Student Affairs professionals, to improve results. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Experience</td>
<td>Students know little or nothing about the purpose of the capstone or outcomes to be assessed. It is just another course or requirement.</td>
<td>Students have some knowledge of the purpose and outcomes of the capstone. Communication is occasional, informal, left to individual faculty or advisors.</td>
<td>Students have a good grasp of purpose and outcomes of the capstone and embrace it as a learning opportunity. Information is readily available in advising guides, etc.</td>
<td>Students are well-acquainted with purpose and outcomes of the capstone and embrace it. They may participate in refining the experience, outcomes, and rubrics. Information is readily available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Capstone Rubric

Conclusions should be based on discussion with relevant department members (e.g., chair, assessment coordinator, faculty). A variety of capstone experiences can be used to collect assessment data, such as:

- courses, such as senior seminars, in which advanced students are required to consider the discipline broadly and integrate what they have learned in the curriculum
- specialized, advanced courses
- advanced-level projects conducted under the guidance of a faculty member or committee, such as research projects, theses, or dissertations
- advanced-level internships or practica, e.g., at the end of an MBA program

Assessment data for a variety of outcomes can be collected in such courses, particularly outcomes related to integrating and applying the discipline, information literacy, critical thinking, and research and communication skills.

The rubric has five major dimensions:

1. **Relevant Outcomes and Evidence Identified.** It is likely that not all program learning outcomes can be assessed within a single capstone course or experience. **Questions:** Have faculty explicitly determined which program outcomes will be assessed in the capstone? Have they agreed on concrete plans for collecting evidence relevant to each targeted outcome? Have they agreed on explicit criteria, such as rubrics, for assessing the evidence? Have they identified examples of student performance for each outcome at varying performance levels (e.g., below expectations, meeting, exceeding expectations for graduation)?

2. **Valid Results.** A valid assessment of a particular outcome leads to accurate conclusions concerning students’ achievement of that outcome. Sometimes faculty collect evidence that does not have the potential to provide valid conclusions. For example, a multiple-choice test will not provide evidence of students’ ability to deliver effective oral presentations. Assessment requires the collection of valid evidence and judgments about that evidence that are based on well-established, agreed-upon criteria that specify how to identify low, medium, or high-quality work. **Questions:** Are faculty collecting valid evidence for each targeted outcome? Are they using well-established, agreed-upon criteria, such as rubrics, for assessing the evidence for each outcome? Have faculty pilot tested and refined their process based on experience and feedback from external reviewers? Are they sharing the criteria with their students? Are they using benchmarking (comparison) data?

3. **Reliable Results.** Well-qualified judges should reach the same conclusions about individual student’s achievement of a learning outcome, demonstrating inter-rater reliability. If two judges independently assess a set of materials, their ratings can be correlated. Sometimes a discrepancy index is used. How often do the two raters give identical ratings, ratings one point apart, ratings two points apart, etc.? Data are reliable if the correlation is high and/or if the discrepancies are small. Raters generally are calibrated (“normed”) to increase reliability. Calibration usually involves a training session in which raters apply rubrics to pre-selected examples of student work that vary in quality, then reach consensus about the rating each example should receive. The purpose is to ensure that all raters apply the criteria in the same way so that each student’s product receives the same score, regardless of rater. **Questions:** Are reviewers calibrated? Are checks for inter-rater reliability made? Is there evidence of high inter-rater reliability?

4. **Results Are Used.** Assessment is a process designed to monitor and improve learning, so assessment findings should have an impact. Faculty should reflect on results for each outcome and decide if they are acceptable or disappointing. If results do not meet faculty standards, faculty should determine which changes should be made, e.g., in pedagogy, curriculum, student support, or faculty support. **Questions:** Do faculty collect assessment results, discuss them, and reach conclusions about student achievement? Do they develop explicit plans to improve student learning? Do they implement those plans? Do they have a history of securing necessary resources to support this implementation? Do they collaborate with other campus professionals to improve student learning? Do follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning?

The Student Experience. Students should understand the purposes different educational experiences serve in promoting their learning and development and know how to take advantage of them; ideally they should also participate in shaping those experiences. Thus it is essential to communicate to students consistently and include them meaningfully. **Questions:** Are purposes and outcomes communicated to students? Do they understand how capstones support learning? Do they participate in reviews of the capstone experience, its outcomes, criteria, or related activities?
Expectations for Two Reviews: Clarifying the Focus

The WASC Standards for Accreditation apply to both the Capacity and Preparatory and the Educational Effectiveness Reviews. At the same time, there are important distinctions in focus for each review, as highlighted in the first table. The second table focuses more specifically on expectations for student learning at the time of each review.

NOTE: This table is intended to be illustrative of the differences between the two reviews and does not cover all aspects of each Standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Focus of Each Review:</th>
<th>Capacity and Preparatory Review</th>
<th>Educational Effectiveness Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standard 1:** Defining Institutional Purpose and Ensuring Educational Objectives | Capacity: Institutional purposes, integrity, stability, resources, structures, processes, and policies including capacity to assess student learning  
Preparatory: Focus on issues in preparation for a successful Educational Effectiveness Review | Student Learning: Evidence of educational achievement  
Institutional Learning: Evidence and actions for improving performance; results of review processes |
| **Standard 2:** Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions | Infrastructure to support learning*:  
- Clear sense of institutional purpose  
- Integrity and good business policies and practices  
- Institutional and program objectives  
- Public accountability and transparency  
- Diversity plans and policies | Educational results*:  
- Completed program reviews  
- Assessment results at the course, program and institutional levels  
- Results of assessment of student services and support  
- Use of these results to plan for and make improvements |
| **Standard 3:** Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Assure Sustainability | Adequate resources including:  
- Faculty and staff  
- Policies and practices re: faculty and staff  
- Financial sustainability  
- Library and information technology  
- Sound organizational structures and decision-making processes  
- Qualified and adequate administration, board and faculty governance | Appropriate alignment, commitment, and use of resources to support learning  
- Effective governance and decision making |
| **Standard 4:** Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement | Planning processes that involve constituents and are aligned with goals  
- Adequate institutional research  
- Quality improvement systems designed in alignment with mission  
- Wide use of evidence in planning | Engagement of leadership at all levels in learning processes  
- Quality improvement system results  
- Evidence of a learning organization |

* Please see page 2 for a more detailed statement of expectations about assessment of student learning for the two reviews.
## Expectations about Student Learning

Institutions and teams should see evidence of the following, related to student learning, at the time of the designated review. Each cell below includes references to the related Criteria for Review (CFR).

**Note:** Not all foci in the CPR have a direct parallel in the EER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity and Preparatory Review</th>
<th>Educational Effectiveness Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are student learning outcomes set and published at the program and course levels? (1.2, 2.3)</td>
<td>Are students learning what they are expected to learn? At expected levels? Are these results good enough? (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have expectations for levels of student achievement been determined and published? (2.4)</td>
<td>How does the institution respond if assessment shows that not all students are achieving at expected levels? (4.1, 4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are student learning outcomes expressed in course syllabi? (2.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are student learning outcomes for programs mapped to courses (such as through curriculum maps)? (2.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have assessment plans been developed and implemented?* (4.1)</td>
<td>Is assessment being implemented as planned? Is it effective? How does the institution know? (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program review process developed and systematically deployed? Does it include both assessment of student learning and evaluation of student success indicators? (2.7, 4.4)</td>
<td>Is program review conducted as planned? What has each program learned from the reviews? Are patterns evident when reviews are compared? Are reviews linked to the resource allocation process, to provide for needed improvements? (4.4, 4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are co-curricular programs regularly reviewed with reference to stated outcomes? (2.11, 4.6)</td>
<td>What are the findings from co-curricular assessment? To what extent do co-curricular programs support learning? How does the institution respond to gaps in alignment of curricular and co-curricular efforts? (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does institutional research support assessment of student learning and student success? (2.10, 4.5)</td>
<td>What do data on retention/completion show overall, and for various student groups? How do results compare with peer or aspirant institutions? What is being done to address gaps that are discovered? (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do faculty have resources and support to assess and improve student learning and success? (2.4, 4.6, 4.7)</td>
<td>How do the faculty demonstrate responsibility for assessment and improvement of learning? (4.6, 4.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assessment plans should be:
- Developed by faculty, who are engaged in their design and responsible for their implementation
- Include multiple tools for assessing student work
- Include both formative and summative strategies
- Use multiple assessment measures, beyond GPA
- Incorporate and weigh both direct and indirect measures
### The Educational Effectiveness Framework: Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Descriptive Terms</th>
<th>INITIAL</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>HIGHLY DEVELOPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Student learning outcomes established; communicated in syllabi and publications, cited and used by faculty, student affairs, advisors, others (CFRs 2.2, 2.4):</td>
<td>For only a few programs and units; only vaguely (if at all) for GE; not communicated in syllabi, or publications such as catalogues, viewbooks, guides to the major; only a few faculty know and use for designing curriculum, assignments, or assessment</td>
<td>For many programs and units, most aspects of GE; beginning to be communicated in basic documents; beginning to be used by some faculty for design of curriculum, assignments, assessments</td>
<td>For all units (academic &amp; co-curricular), and for all aspects of GE; cited widely by faculty and advisors; used routinely by faculty, student affairs, other staff in design of curricula, assignments, co-curriculum, and assessment</td>
<td>For all units (academic and co-curricular), and for all aspects of GE cited widely by faculty and advisors; used routinely by faculty, student affairs, other staff in design of curricula, assignments, co-curriculum, and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Expectations are established for how well (i.e., proficiency or level) students achieve outcomes (CFRs 2.1, 2.4, 2.5):</td>
<td>Expectations for student learning have not been set beyond course completion and GPA; level of learning expected relative to outcomes unclear</td>
<td>Expectations for level of learning explicit in a few programs; heavy reliance on course completion and GPA</td>
<td>Expectations for student learning explicit in most programs</td>
<td>Expectations for student learning are explicit in all programs, widely known and embraced by faculty, staff, and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Assessment plans are in place; curricular and co-curricular outcomes are systematically assessed, improvements documented (CFRs 2.4, 2.7):</td>
<td>No comprehensive assessment plans. Outcomes assessed occasionally using surveys and self-reports; seldom using direct assessment; rarely lead to revision of curriculum pedagogy, co-curriculum, or other aspects of educational experience</td>
<td>Some planning in place. Outcomes assessed occasionally, principally using surveys; beginning to move toward some direct assessment; occasionally leads to improvements in educational experience; improvements sporadically documented, e.g., in units' annual reports</td>
<td>Plans mostly in place. Assessment occurs periodically, using direct methods supplemented by indirect methods and descriptive data; educational experience is frequently improved based on evidence and findings; improvements are routinely documented, e.g. in units' annual reports</td>
<td>Assessment plans throughout institution. Assessment occurs on regular schedule using multiple methods; strong reliance on direct methods, performance-based; educational experience systematically reviewed and improved based on evidence and findings; documentation widespread and easy to locate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Desired kind and level of learning is achieved (CFR 2.6):</td>
<td>Possible that learning is not up to expectations, and/or expectations set by institution are too low for degree(s) offered by the institution</td>
<td>Most students appear to achieve at levels set by the institution; faculty and other educators beginning to discuss expectations and assessment findings</td>
<td>Nearly all students achieve at or above levels set by institution; assessment findings discussed periodically by most faculty and other campus educators</td>
<td>All students achieve at or above levels set by institution; findings are discussed regularly and acted upon by all or nearly all faculty and other campus educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching/Learning Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Curricula, pedagogy, co-curriculum, other aspects of educational experience are aligned with outcomes (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 4.6):</td>
<td>Conceived exclusively or largely in terms of inputs (e.g. library holdings, lab space), curricular requirements (e.g., for majors, GE) and availability of co-curricular programs; not visibly aligned with outcomes or expectations for level of student achievement; evidence of alignment processes lacking</td>
<td>Educational experience beginning to be aligned with learning outcomes and expectations for student achievement; evidence of alignment efforts available in some academic and co-curricular programs</td>
<td>Educational experience generally aligned with learning outcomes, expectations for student achievement; alignment becoming intentional, systematic, supported by tools (e.g. curriculum maps) and processes. Evidence of alignment efforts generally available</td>
<td>Educational experience fully aligned with learning outcomes, expectations; alignment is systematic, supported by tools and processes as well as broader institutional infrastructure. Evidence of alignment efforts readily available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Curricular and co-curricular processes (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.11, 2.13) are:</td>
<td>Rarely informed by good learning practices as defined by the wider higher education community; few curricular or co-curricular activities reviewed, mostly without reference to outcomes or evidence of student learning</td>
<td>Informed in some instances by good learning practices; curriculum and co-curricular activities occasionally reviewed and improved but with little reference to outcomes or assessment findings</td>
<td>Informed in many cases by good learning practices; reviewed and improved by relevant faculty and other campus educators; often based on outcomes and assessment findings</td>
<td>Regularly informed by good learning practices; improvements consistently result from scholarly reflection on outcomes and assessment findings by relevant faculty and other campus educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Educational Effectiveness Framework:
Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning

### C. Professional development, rewards (CFRs 2.8, 2.9):
- Little or no support for faculty, other campus educators to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; work to assess, improve student learning plays no positive role in reward system, may be viewed as a negative
- Some support for faculty, other campus educators on campus to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; modest, implicit positive role in reward structure
- Some support for faculty, other campus educators to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; explicit, positive role in reward structure
- Significant support for faculty, other campus educators to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; explicit, prominent role in reward structure

### Organizational Learning

#### A. Indicators of educational effectiveness are (CFRs 1.2, 4.3, 4.4):
- Notable by their absence or considered only sporadically in decision-making
- Found in some areas; dissemination of results just beginning; no reference to comparative data
- Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated, collectively analyzed; some comparative data used. Some indicators used to inform planning, budgeting, other decision making on occasional basis
- Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated widely, collectively analyzed; comparative data used, as appropriate, in all programs. Indicators consistently used to inform planning, budgeting, other decision making at all levels of the institution

#### B. Formal program review (CFRs 2.7, 4.4) is:
- Rare, if it occurs at all, with little or no useful data generated. Assessment findings on student learning not available and/or not used
- Occasional, in some departments or units; heavy reliance on traditional inputs as indicators of quality; findings occasionally used to suggest improvements in educational effectiveness; weak linkage to institution-level planning, budgeting
- Frequent, affecting most academic and co-curricular units, with growing inclusion of findings about student learning; unit uses findings to collectively reflect on, improve effectiveness; some linkage to institution-level planning, budgeting
- Systematic and institution-wide, with learning assessment findings a major component; units use findings to improve student learning, program effectiveness, and supporting processes; close linkage to institution-level planning, budgeting

#### C. Performance data, evidence, and analyses (CFRs 4.3, 4.5, 4.6) are:
- Not collected, disseminated, disaggregated, or accessible for wide use. Not evident in decision-making processes; do not appear to be used for improvement in any programs
- Limited collection, dissemination, disaggregation, or access. Campus at beginning stages of use for decisions to improve educational effectiveness at program, unit, and/or institutional level
- Systematic collection and dissemination, wide access; sometimes disaggregated, usually considered by decision-making bodies at all levels, but documentation and/or linkage to educational effectiveness may be weak
- Systematic collection and dissemination, and access, purposeful disaggregation; consistently used by decision-making bodies for program improvement at all levels, with processes fully documented

#### D. Culture of inquiry and evidence (CFRs 4.5, 4.6, 4.7):
- Faculty, other educators, staff, institutional leaders, governing board not visibly committed to a culture of inquiry and evidence except in isolated cases; not knowledgeable about learner-centeredness, assessment, etc.
- Campus knowledge is minimal; support at top levels and/or grass roots – for development of a culture of inquiry and evidence is sporadic and uneven
- Campus knowledge and support for a culture of inquiry and evidence fairly consistent across administration, faculty, professional staff but may not be uniformly deep
- Consistent, knowledgeable, deep commitment to creating and sustaining a culture of inquiry and evidence in all appropriate functions at all levels

#### E. Communication and transparency (CFR 1.2, 1.7):
- Little or no data, findings, analyses from assessment of student learning available within the institution or to external audiences
- Some data, findings, analyses from assessment of student learning available but may be incomplete, difficult to access or understand for internal or external audiences
- Data, findings, analyses from assessment of student learning generally available, easily accessible; chosen for relevance to multiple audiences
- Data, findings, analyses from learning assessment are widely available and skillfully framed to be understandable, useful to multiple audiences

### Overall: The institution can best be described as:
- Committed to isolated aspects of educational effectiveness; if other areas are not addressed, continuing reaffirmation of accreditation is threatened
- Committed to educational effectiveness in some areas; significant number of areas require attention, improvement
- Mostly well-established commitment to educational effectiveness; a few areas require attention, improvement
- Fully committed to and going beyond WASC recommendations; operates at an exemplary level in addressing its Core Commitments to capacity as it relates to learning and to educational effectiveness

Program Review Task Force Members:
Chair: Cyd Jenefsky, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, John F. Kennedy University
Marilee Bresciani, Professor, Postsecondary Education, San Diego State University
Linda Buckley, Associate Vice President, Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness, San Francisco State University
David Fairris, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, University of California, Riverside
Margaret Kasimatis, Vice President for Academic Planning and Effectiveness, Loyola Marymount University

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS GUIDE

In July 2008, WASC issued its revised Handbook of Accreditation. Among the changes in the new Handbook are updated requirements for institutions’ program review processes. These new requirements focus on incorporating an outcomes-based analysis of student learning into program review and integrating the results of program review into an institution’s budgeting, planning and overall quality assurance processes.

This good-practice guide is designed to assist colleges and universities with meeting the new program review expectations within WASC’s revised accreditation standards. While it is useful for meeting the revised standards, the guide is framed in terms of ‘good practices’ for academic program review processes rather than accreditation compliance.

This ‘good practice’ guide is not designed as a comprehensive instruction manual for how to implement outcomes-based program review. There are many existing resources which serve this purpose (Allen, 2004; Angelo & Cross, 1993; Bresciani, 2006; Bresciani, Zelna & Anderson, 2004; Huba & Freed, 2000; Maki, 2004; Suskie, 2004; Palomba & Banta, 1999; Walvoord, 1998; Walvoord, 2004). Nor is this an instruction manual for how to integrate program review into broader institutional quality assurance, budgeting and planning processes. Instead, it describes some of the key concepts and good practices implicit in an outcomes-based program review process in an effort to assist institutions with understanding the new WASC expectations.1

1 The following criteria (CFR = criteria for review) from the 2008 WASC Handbook (Standards 2 and 4) address program review and place it within the larger context of the need for each institution to develop an ongoing, comprehensive quality assurance and improvement system:

All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations (CFR 2.7).
WASC’s program review requirement applies to academic AND co-curricular programs (CFR 2.11). This guide focuses on academic program review (primarily undergraduate although also including graduate) as a starting point and will be expanded at a later time to cover co-curricular program review, as well as review of administrative support units.

There are three main sections to this guide:

I. Framing concepts for a program review process that meets the new expectations
II. Overview of components and steps for conducting an outcomes-based program review process
III. Strategies for using program review results to inform planning and budgeting processes

In addition, colleges and universities are encouraged to submit samples of their own outcomes-based program review guidelines so WASC institutions have a variety of models from which to customize their program review processes. If you have a sample to share, please submit it electronically to: http://wascsenior.ning.com/forum/topics/good-practices-in-academic

Highlighted throughout this guide are three features of program review processes which are expected under the revised WASC standards:

- outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development
- evidence-based claims and decision-making, and
- use of program review results to inform planning and budgeting.

Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution (CFR 4.2).

Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning (CFR 4.3).

The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including periodic program review. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy (CFR 4.4).

Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning. (CFR 4.6)

The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology. (CFR 4.7)

Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs. (CFR 4.8)

See also: Table B, Addressing New Requirements in the Institutional Review Process (WASC, 2008)
The three highlighted features are explained in Section I. The last feature—use of results to inform planning and budgeting—is probably the most challenging to achieve, yet the most important component for a review process to be effective and sustainable. For this reason, we have devoted all of Section III to addressing this issue. We recognize that this is still a nascent conversation within higher education. We anticipate that this guide gradually will link to good practices from colleges and universities as they develop effective strategies for systematically using program review results for continuous improvement.

Please note that this guide is not intended to be prescriptive; it provides guidelines only, since program review processes need to fit organically within an institution’s existing structural processes and values. Moreover, this guide does not presume to offer a definitive explanation of the new requirements; rather, it is designed merely as a helpful resource toward implementing the new WASC standards.

I. FRAMING CONCEPTS

This section provides a general overview of what a program review is and its relationship to accreditation reviews. It also explains the three key features of the revised program review process addressed in this guide: outcomes-based assessment of student learning, evidence-based claims and decision-making, and integration with planning and budgeting. Combined, these three features shift program review from a traditional input-based model to an outcomes-based model, heighten attention to improving the quality of student learning, shift the focus from conducting an effective program review to using the results effectively, and facilitate integrating the results of program-level evaluations into larger institutional processes.

A. Definition and Purpose of Program Review

A program review is a cyclical process for evaluating and continuously enhancing the quality and currency of programs. The evaluation is conducted through a combination of self-evaluation, followed by peer-evaluation by reviewers external to the program or department and, usually, also external to the organization. It is a comprehensive analysis of program quality, analyzing a wide variety of data about the program. The results of this evaluation process are then used to inform follow-up planning and budgeting processes at various levels in the institution—program, department, college, university—and incorporated into the institution’s overall quality assurance system. An institution’s program review process typically occurs on a regular cycle of five to eight years, meaning that each program/department is reviewed every five-eight years.

Program review is a required element in the WASC accreditation process. While accreditation attests to the institution’s capacity and effectiveness, it is not possible for WASC to review and evaluate every degree program in the course of an accreditation review. Instead, WASC expects institutions to have processes that assure program currency, quality and effectiveness. When implemented effectively and followed up deliberately, program review is a powerful means of engaging faculty in evaluating and improving programs in the organization.

Even though required by WASC, the primary utility of program review is internal to an institution. It provides a structure to foster continuous program improvement that is aligned with departmental, college and institutional goals. Such improvements may include:

- Developing or refining program learning outcomes and identifying appropriate means for assessing their achievement
- Better aligning department, college and institutional goals
Refining departmental access and other interventions to improve retention/attrition, and graduation rates
Making curricular and other changes to improve student learning and retention
Refining, reorganizing or refocusing curricula to reflect changes in the discipline or profession
Reorganizing or improving student support systems, including advising, library services, and student development initiatives to improve the academic success of students in the program
Designing needed professional development programs, including programs to help faculty learn how to develop and assess learning outcomes, to improve pedagogy, and to improve curricular cohesion
Reorganizing or refocusing resources to advance student learning or specific research agendas
Re-assigning faculty/staff or requesting new lines
Illuminating potential intra-institutional synergies
Developing specific action plans for modifications and improvements
Informing decision making, planning and budgeting, including resource re/allocation
Linking and, as appropriate, aggregating program review results to the institution’s broader quality assurance/improvement efforts

B. Distinction between Types of Accreditation Review and an Institution’s Program Review Process

Colleges and universities engage in a variety of review processes, including:
- WASC Regional Accreditation
- Specialized Program Accreditation and State Licensure
- Institutional Program Review

Each region of the U.S. has an institutional accrediting agency for colleges and universities. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (there is a separate Commission for community and junior colleges) is the accrediting body for the western region of the U.S. and several international institutions that have ties to the western region.

WASC’s regional accreditation review evaluates whether the institution as a whole meets WASC standards. This institution-wide review focuses on the capacity (personnel, curricula, student learning, finances, infrastructure, organizational processes, etc.) and effectiveness of the college or university to meet its particular mission and its documented results in fulfilling its educational goals and outcomes. WASC expects each institution to have its own ongoing system of quality assurance and improvement: program review and assessment of student achievement are key components of this system. The forms of external review described below are part of such a system, not a series of separate, disconnected activities.

Specialized accreditation reviews are conducted by outside agencies which certify the professional quality of particular programs. Specialized accreditors evaluate whether or not a program meets the standards set by the disciplinary or professional body or a State licensing agency. Examples of this type of accrediting body include the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the American Bar Association (ABA), the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the California Commission of Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

The WASC form, “Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation” calls for institutions to identify the results of specialized and professional accreditation as well as key indicators being used to address outcomes in
each review. This form is useful to institutions, apart from WASC reviews, for aggregating information on issues arising from the multiple accreditation reviews conducted at an institution.

**An institutional academic program review** evaluates degree programs in a department or cross-disciplinary/school program (such as General Education) within the institution. This type of review is usually conducted as a formative assessment to assist with ongoing planning and improvement of programs. Such institutional program review is required by WASC standards (CFR 2.7) and is the type of review addressed in this resource guide. The program review process must include an assessment of student learning outcomes, an external review of the program (of which a specialized accreditation is one form), and the use of program review results for continuous program improvement.

Universities and colleges are encouraged to coordinate the specialized program accreditation process (e.g., ABET, NCATE, AACSB, etc.) with the institutional program review process to avoid duplication of labor. This is sometimes accomplished by substituting the specialized accreditation review for an institution’s internal program review process. If the specialized accreditation review does not include assessment of student learning outcomes and/or other required elements of an institution’s internal program review process, then these additional elements are sometimes reviewed immediately prior to or following the specialized accreditation review (and then appended to the specialized accreditation review documents).

Institutions might wish to consider adapting the WASC form “Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation” for program review results across the institution to identify common issues and connect the program review process to broader institutional issues and concerns.

**C. Distinguishing Features of this Resource Guide**

Below is a brief definition of the three essential features embedded in the program review model discussed in this guide. These elements are consistent with the revised WASC standards and may be new to institutions’ program review processes:

- **Evidence-Based Claims and Decision-Making**
  Any conclusions drawn within a self-study report or decisions made as a result of a program review are to be informed by evidence. That is, all claims within a self-study report about a program’s strengths, weaknesses, and proposed improvement plans are to be supported by relevant qualitative and/or quantitative evidence (cf., *WASC Evidence Guide*). This contrasts, for instance, with program review self-studies that are largely descriptive and based on advocacy. Hence, the section of this guide describing the components of a self-study report (IIC below) identifies types of evidence useful for answering questions about various aspects of a program’s quality or viability.

- **Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**
  Evidence-based program review includes the ongoing evaluation of how well a program’s student body (in the aggregate) is achieving the stated learning outcomes (or objectives) for that program. While such assessment of student learning outcomes is independent of program review and part of ongoing faculty processes for program improvement, program reviews need to incorporate an analysis of a program’s assessment of student learning. This includes: a review of program learning outcomes; evaluation of the methods employed to assess achievement of these outcomes; and analysis and reflection on learning results.

---

2 “External” can mean external to the program/department or external to the institution; this choice is left to the discretion of individual colleges and universities.
retention/graduation rates and other outcomes data (qualitative as well as quantitative) over a multiple-year period.

- **Integration of Results with Planning, Budgeting, and Institutional Quality Assurance Systems**
  The results of program review are to be used for follow-up planning and budgeting at various decision-making levels within the organization (program, department, college and institution). In addition, program review is to be incorporated into the institution’s broader quality assurance/improvement efforts. For example, problems found across several program reviews might be addressed institutionally as well as within individual programs.

## II. CONDUCTING A PROGRAM REVIEW

This section provides an overview of each step of the program review process. It starts with general principles and steps in the governance of a program review process, then addresses key components of a program review in the sequence in which they occur: the self-study inquiry and report, followed by the external review, then a formal Findings and Recommendations report, and culminating with a Memorandum of Understanding that may involve commitments from senior administrators regarding resources.

### A. Governance of the Process – Guiding Principles

The guiding principles governing the process are:

- Academic program review is a faculty-driven process; that is, the program review process is usually codified by Academic Senate policy and implemented by a committee that includes faculty and may involve administration.
- Formative assessment “by faculty, for use by faculty” is preferable and more effective in improving student learning and other program aspects than is assessment by administration.
- Collaborative involvement of administration in various steps of the program review process (e.g., meeting with the external team of evaluators) helps to secure buy-in for change and improvement, as well as to ensure alignment with institutional goals and resources.
- It occurs on a regularly scheduled timeline, which is determined by the institution.
- It includes a program or departmental self-study process, where departmental faculty and administrators collectively engage in inquiry and analysis.
- The self-study process and report include, as one element in the comprehensive review of the program, an analysis of the ongoing assessment of student learning.
- The program review process includes an external review and written report, including recommendations for improvement.
- Agreed-upon recommendations emanating from program review are the result of deliberations between the department, the academic program review committee, and senior administrators (e.g., deans and provosts) with decision-making power regarding priority setting and resource allocation.
- Program review results are integrated into college and institutional planning and budgeting.

### B. Governance of the Process – Steps and Responsibilities

Different constituencies within a college or university are responsible for carrying out different steps in the program review process. The following steps are broad outlines of the various constituencies’
responsibilities. Considerable variation in these steps occurs across institutions. Typically, the governance process for program review is organized in the following manner:

- The Faculty Senate or Academic Senate usually defines the program review process through a formal written program review policy.
- Administration usually maintains a timeline for all academic program reviews and assists departments with the steps involved in the process. (In some institutions, the Academic Senate assumes these responsibilities.)
- While faculty usually oversee the evaluative aspects of program review, the process is typically implemented in collaboration with administrative leaders.
- The body tasked with carrying out program reviews on campus—the program review committee—notify the department of an upcoming review in accordance with the established timeline for review. This communication should be sent well in advance of the formal review itself. Special issues for the review are also identified in advance and agreed upon, such as alignment with specific school or institutional goals, or special issues relating to a particular program or department.
- Program review committee members are typically appointed by the major academic divisions within the college/university (to represent that division, such as school, department, etc., depending on size of the institution), but may include members of the administration as well.

- Office for Institutional Research provides the department with a program review data packet that contains relevant/available program data that will be analyzed in the self-study (e.g., enrollment and retention data, alumni and student satisfaction survey results, NSSE data, market research, etc.).
- Department faculty conduct a departmental self-study within guidelines provided in the established program review policy. It is important that these guidelines include very specific requirements for program level assessment. Some institutions combine self-studies of both graduate and undergraduate programs while other institutions separate these reviews.
- The self-study identifies program strengths and limitations and suggests solutions to identified problems.
- After completing the self-study, some institutions have the department chair/head submit that document to the dean and/or administration for review (and sometimes approval); others omit this step.
- The institutional program review policy should describe how to secure qualified, objective external reviewers, including those with understanding and experience in addressing student learning outcomes assessment. Once the self-study is completed (and approved, if relevant), the visit from external reviewers is organized. Institutions typically bring in one or two reviewers for one-two days.
- The external reviewers read all relevant documentation, including for example: the self-study report; relevant data from institutional research; survey results of faculty and students in the program; course syllabi; course evaluations; examples of student work, such as senior papers and theses; reports on annual assessment of student learning outcomes; curricular flow charts; faculty CVs; and examples of faculty research.
- External reviewers typically prepare a written report of the review, which may include recommendations not cited in the program faculty’s own self-study process.
- The program review committee examines all reports and writes a final Findings and Recommendations report that is submitted to the department and to senior campus administrators (e.g., the dean and provost).
The final product of the program review—a Memorandum of Understanding—places the Findings and Recommendations in the context of resource allocation decisions by mandating the participation of senior campus administrators with authority over campus resources.

A formal Improvement Plan is usually required, especially for departments/programs that receive a conditional approval (see pages 12-13) given the results of program evaluation. Follow-up plans are established for tracking progress.

C. Components in the Self-Study Report
The self-study consists of evidence-based inquiry and analyses which are documented in a comprehensive self-study report. The specific format and content of a self-study report varies across institutions, but they usually share some core elements.

1. Introduction/Context
Most reviews begin with a section that provides a context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study report, this portion is primarily descriptive and may include:
- The internal context – In what department does it reside? In which school or college? What degrees does it grant? What concentrations are available?
- The external context – How is the program responsive to the needs of the region or area in which it serves?
- It may also include a brief history of the program or a description of changes made in the program since the last review (if relevant).

A key component in providing the context for the review is a description of the program’s mission, goals, and outcomes.
- A mission statement is a general explanation of why your program exists and what it hopes to achieve in the future. It articulates the program’s essential nature, its values and its work.
- Goals are general statements of what your program wants to achieve.
- Outcomes are the specific results that should be observed if the goals are being met.
Note that goals typically flow from the mission statement, and outcomes are aligned with goals. In addition, the program’s mission, goals and outcomes should relate to the mission and goals of the college and institution.

2. Analysis of Evidence About Program Quality & Viability
The bulk of a self-study report consists of a presentation and analysis of evidence about the quality and viability/sustainability of a program. This major portion of the report addresses the extent to which program goals are being met by using evidence to answer key questions related to those goals. It is important for an institution’s program review guidelines to identify the precise evidence to be analyzed in the self-study and for Institutional Research to provide a packet of relevant institutional data available on the program.

To facilitate meaningful analysis of the evidence, it is helpful to provide guiding questions to structure the self-study inquiry and report. These questions often produce deep discussions among faculty and are considered the most important aspect of the self-study process. Hence, a set of sample questions is embedded below within each of the core elements typically analyzed in a self-study report.
Program evidence falls into two categories:

- Evidence that addresses questions about program quality
- Evidence that addresses issues of program viability and sustainability

2a. **Evidence of program quality** typically addresses questions about:

- **Students** – What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the mission and goals of the program?
  - Data in this category might include students’ gender, ethnicity, age, GPA from previous institution, standardized test scores, type of previous institution, and employment status.
  - Note that the specific list of indicators in this category will depend on the goals of the program.

- **The Curriculum and Learning Environment** – How current is the program curriculum? Does it offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular degree? How well does it align with learning outcomes? Are the courses well sequenced and reliably available in sequence? Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar programs?
  - Evidence in this category might include:
    - A curriculum flow chart and description of how the curriculum addresses the learning outcomes of the program (curriculum map)
    - A comparison of the program’s curriculum with curricula at selected other institutions and with disciplinary/professional standards
    - Measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, faculty scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty)
    - A description of other learning experiences that are relevant to program goals (e.g., internships, research experiences, study abroad or other international experiences, community-based learning, etc), as well as how many students participate in those experiences
    - A narrative that describes how the faculty’s pedagogy responds to various learning modalities and student learning preferences.

- **Student Learning and Success** – Are students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program? Are they achieving those outcomes at the expected level of learning, and how is the expected level determined? Are they being retained and graduating in a timely fashion? Are they prepared for advanced study or the world of work?
  - Evidence in this category might include:
    - Annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning in the program (could be combination of quantitative and qualitative measures), including the degree to which students achieve the program’s desired standards
    - Ongoing efforts by the department to “close the loop” by responding to assessment results
    - Student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories)
    - Placement of graduates into graduate schools or post-doctoral experiences
    - Job placements
    - Graduating student satisfaction surveys (and/or alumni satisfaction surveys)
    - Employer critiques of student performance or employer survey satisfaction results
    - Disciplinary ratings of the program
- Student/Alumni achievements (e.g., community service, research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments, etc.)

- **Faculty** – What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty in the program in relation to the program mission and goals? How do faculty members’ background, expertise, research and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?
  - Evidence in this category might include:
    - Proportion of faculty with terminal degree
    - Institutions from which faculty earned terminal degrees
    - List of faculty specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)
    - Teaching quality (e.g., peer evaluations, faculty self-review)
    - Record of scholarship for each faculty member
    - Faculty participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning and/or assessment
    - External funding awarded to faculty
    - Record of professional practice for each faculty member
    - Service for each faculty member
    - Distribution of faculty across ranks (or years at institution)
    - Diversity of faculty
    - Awards and recognition

  [Note that the specific list of indicators in this category will depend on the goals of a particular program/department/college.]

2b. Evidence of program viability and sustainability typically addresses questions about the level of student demand for the program and the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately and are sufficient in amount to maintain program quality:

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

- **Allocation of Resources**:
  - **Faculty** – Are there sufficient numbers of faculty to maintain program quality? Do program faculty have the support they need to do their work?
    - Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)
    - Student-faculty ratio
    - Faculty workload
    - Faculty review and evaluation processes
    - Mentoring processes/program
    - Professional development opportunities/resources (including travel and research funds)
    - Sufficient time for course development, research, etc

  - **Student support**
    - Academic and career advising programs and resources
    - Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and T.A. training
    - Basic skill remediation
- Support for connecting general learning requirements to discipline requirements
- Orientation and transition programs
- Financial support (scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc)
- Support for engagement in the campus community.
- Support for non-cognitive variables of success, including emotional, psychological, and physical interventions if necessary
- Support for research or for engagement in the community beyond campus, such as fieldwork or internships

  o Information and technology resources
    - Library print and electronic holdings in the teaching and research areas of the program
    - Information literacy outcomes for graduates
    - Technology resources available to support the pedagogy and research in the program
    - Technology resources available to support students’ needs

  o Facilities
    - Classroom space
    - Instructional laboratories
    - Research laboratories
    - Office space
    - Student study spaces
    - Access to classrooms suited for instructional technology
    - Access to classrooms designed for alternative learning styles/universal design

  o Staff
    - Clerical and technical staff FTE supporting program/departamental operations

  o Financial resources
    - Operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period

3. Summary Reflections

This portion of the self-study report typically interprets the significance of the findings in the above analysis of program evidence. Its purpose is to determine a program’s strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.

It is helpful to have questions that guide the interpretation of the findings, such as:

- Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program?
- Are department/program goals aligned with the goals of the constituents that the program serves?
- Is the level of program quality aligned with the college/university’s acceptable level of program quality? Aligned with the constituents’ acceptable level of quality?
- Are program goals being achieved?
- Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the expected level?

It is also helpful to have evaluation criteria in mind; that is, what guidelines will be used to determine what the evidence suggests about the program’s strengths and weaknesses? In some cases, an absolute standard may be used. For example, it may be decided that a student-faculty ratio of 20 to one is
necessary to ensure program quality, and any ratio higher than that is unacceptable. In other cases, a norm-referenced criterion may be more appropriate. For example, if a national student survey was used to assess student satisfaction with the program, the evaluation criterion might be that your students’ satisfaction is at least as high as students at other similar institutions.

4. Future Goals and Planning for Improvement

Self-study reports conclude with a section devoted to future planning and improvement. Findings from all prior sections of the report serve as a foundation for building an evidence-based plan for strengthening the program.

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

D. The External Review

The external review typically occurs a month or two after a program or department submits its self-study report.

1. Choosing Reviewers

The size and composition of the review team vary considerably, depending on the size of the department/program under review. Usually, the team ranges from 2-4 people. At the time a department or program is notified that it will be conducting a program review, departmental leadership usually are asked to submit to administration or the campus program review committee (depending on the institution) a list of names of possible reviewers. Depending on the institution’s program review policy, these reviewers may be external to a department/program but it is more typical (and highly recommended) for them to be external to the college/university.

External reviewers should be distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field and, if external to the institution, be chosen from campuses that are similar to the campus of the department undergoing review. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration. With the inclusion of student learning results in program review, it will be important for at least one of the reviewers to understand and be experienced with student learning outcomes assessment and have the ability to review and analyze the program’s assessment processes and results; one way to include such expertise is to have a campus expert/coordinator on outcomes-assessment join the other external reviewers as part of the external review team.

Some institutions also include local campus faculty on a review team (from departments external to the program under review). Campus faculty serving as reviewers should have some familiarity with the department undergoing review. The department undergoing review is typically asked to assure the program review committee that the list of proposed reviewers is capable of carrying out a neutral review. The program review committee (or, at some institutions, the administration) may add names to the list of reviewers proposed by the department. The department/program is typically asked to comment on any
additional names proposed by the program review committee (or administration). The program review committee (or administration) decides on the final list of possible reviewers, contacts proposed reviewers for their availability, and typically designates one reviewer to serve as Chair of the review team. Many universities have departments sign a conflict of interest form to help ensure that reviewers are acceptably unbiased in their association with the department under review.

2. Instructions and Materials for the External Review Team

About thirty days prior to the scheduled department visit, the information from the program self-study and perhaps additional materials are sent to each member of the external review team, along with a charge by the campus program review committee. An identical information package is provided to the members of the campus review committee and other designated administrators (e.g., dean, provost, chancellor).

3. External Review Team Visit and Report

The review team visit typically lasts for two days (sometimes one day for small campuses/programs), during which time the review committee members meet with department faculty, academic advisors, students, the campus program review committee, and select administrators. The review team typically takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding its departmental visit and is expected to submit its written evaluation to the campus program review committee within several weeks of the visit. Upon submission of the report, off-campus reviewers generally receive a stipend and travel expense reimbursement.

E. Post External Review Process

As soon as the campus program review committee receives the report from the external review team, it is distributed to the department and select administrators. The department is typically asked to review the report (within a brief time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. The department summary of factual corrections and misperceptions becomes part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the campus review committee.

1. Findings and Recommendations Report

The campus program review committee reviews all relevant documentation (self-study report, external review report, departmental response, if relevant) and, based on the evidence reviewed, writes a report detailing the major findings and recommendations resulting from the evaluation process. The findings and recommendations report presents a cohesive plan of action for program improvement based on the program review documents.

These findings and recommendations are conveyed to the department by the campus program review committee. The chair of the department undergoing review distributes the findings and recommendations report to the program faculty, staff and, in some cases, students. The department/program collects input from all constituents and prepares a detailed response, either outlining plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so.

This response is submitted to the campus program review committee within a reasonable time frame for consideration in drawing up the final Findings and Recommendations. The campus review committee distributes its approved final report to the department/program for action and to designated administrators.
2. **Responding to Findings and Recommendations Report**

The campus review committee and designated administrators (e.g., dean and provost) meet with department/program representatives to discuss the action steps to be taken as a result of the review. A timeline is set and resources needed to accomplish the plan’s goals are identified. At this stage, it is imperative that senior campus administrators with authority over resource allocation decisions be involved in the process. Some university program review guidelines call for a written response to the Findings and Recommendations Report from the dean. This requirement focuses the dean’s attention on the review and increases the potential for change. Unless program review has the involvement and attention of deans and the provost and is in accordance with their priorities, findings from the reviews are not likely to be included in budget decisions.

In some cases, an MOU (memorandum of understanding) is written and signed by the department chair, dean, and provost. The MOU may contain recommendations that the department is expected to fulfill by the next review, including a timeline with progress milestones. The MOU may also contain recommendations for resource allocation.

Regarding the contents of the MOU recommendations, planning that emanates from the program review should not be confused with solely a demand for additional resources, but rather should enable institutions and programs to focus on effective ways to achieve their program goals. In fact, many recommendations do not require resource allocation or redistribution. A reorganization of curriculum, the addition of new courses, or partnerships with other departments are examples of changes which might require no (or few) resources. On the other hand, an MOU might also suggest changes that do require substantial resource allocation, such as additional faculty or staff hires or the purchase of lab equipment. In those cases, the recommendation usually occurs in a section of the MOU directed to the dean or the provost.

In some institutions, based on the final report, the department is given full or conditional approval. If the department is granted a full approval, it will not be required to submit any further reports or documentation until the next program review. If there are serious issues that require immediate attention the department might be granted conditional approval and given a plan for improvement. In this case, it will be given a timeline for reporting on the specific issues of concern before the next program review cycle. Typically, administration is responsible for follow-up on conditional approvals.

3. **Sharing Results and Tracking Improvement Plan**

To maximize the effectiveness of program review, it is important to share the findings and resulting decisions with stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the program’s and/or institution’s goals and creates an opportunity for all stakeholders to review the program review results.

To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, each year the campus review committee or relevant administrator reviews the progress of programs reviewed in previous years. If the department/program was not successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, the campus review committee or administrator may recommend follow-up actions to the department/program and appropriate campus administrators.
4. Distribution and Archiving of Program Review Documents

Copies of the unedited program review documents (self-study report, external review report, responses, findings and recommendations report, improvement plan, MOU) are sent to relevant parties, such as the chancellor, provost, dean, and Academic Senate. File copies are archived in an appropriate location for future reference. Deans and other administrators need to retain copies of program reviews and the decisions that resulted from them (including MOUs) and refer to them in their planning and budgeting.

III. USING PROGRAM REVIEW RESULTS IN PLANNING & BUDGETING

Program review provides one way for institutions to link evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and budgeting. That is, the findings in the self-study, recommendations in the external review, Findings and Recommendations Report, and MOU can be used as evidence to inform decision-making processes at various levels in the institution (i.e., from the program-level through the university-level, depending on the nature of the recommendations). The mechanism for facilitating such integration will vary greatly from one organization to the next, but there are some processes and guiding questions that facilitate the use of the results from program review flow in planning and budgeting processes at each decision-making level.

Many recommendations involving program improvement can be met with very little resource reallocation (e.g., re-sequencing of courses, refinements in the criteria for student evaluation, re-organization of instructional or workshop material). However, other recommendations can point to a larger reallocation of resources ranging from faculty development for assessment to hiring more staff or faculty members to fill current unmet needs.

What follows are examples of the types of decisions that might be made based on the results of program review at three levels of an organization—the department/program level, the college level, and the institution level—and questions that might guide decision making.

A. Department Level

At the department and/or program level, results from program review can be used to:

- Inform curriculum planning, such as:
  - Changing the sequence of courses in the major curriculum
  - Adding or deleting courses
  - Refinement or articulation of pre-requisite or disciplinary requirements
  - Re-design of the content or pedagogy of specific courses

  The primary questions driving such changes would be:
  - Are our students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program?
  - If not, what elements of the curriculum could be changed to improve learning?

- Inform changes in how resources are used within the department/program, such as
o Assignment of faculty to teach specific courses or sections
o Changing the scheduling of certain courses or the frequency with which they are offered
o Changing the number of students required in course sections so that student learning and effectiveness of teaching are maximized
o Implementing improved advising and support services to increase learning, retention, and/or graduation rates
o Adjusting the allocation of faculty resources across General Education, the major, and the graduate program
o Providing additional professional development or research resources for faculty
o Adjusting faculty teaching loads and assigned/release time

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

- Make recommendations for how resources outside the department/program should be used. For example, the department may suggest that
  - Library collections be enhanced
  - Additional tutors be added to the learning resource center
  - Instructional technology support be improved
  - The university explore writing/speaking across the curriculum initiatives
  - Career placement services be improved

- Make a case to the dean for specific additional resources. For example, the department may ask for
  - An additional faculty line or support staff
  - Additional funds to support faculty professional travel or research
  - Release time for curriculum development or research-related activities
  - A reduction or increase in program enrollment

B. College Level:

At the dean/college level, program reviews can be used to decide how to allocate resources across departments. For example, by looking across the results of several departments’ program reviews, the dean may decide to

- Add resources, such as faculty lines, travel money, equipment, space, to certain departments, based on needs identified in the reviews
- Enhance support to programs with the potential to grow or to establish research distinction in the field
- Combine or phase out certain programs
- Re-tool and reassign faculty or academic support staff
In making such decisions, a dean may consider:

- **How do these recommendations fit into the overall department mission and goals?**
- **How do these recommendations fit into the College mission and goals?**
- **At what point in the prioritization of both sets of goals do these recommendations fall?**
- **What are the costs of each recommendation (both the direct monetary cost and the opportunity cost in the form of lost resources for other programs)?**
- **What is the extent of resources available and where might the dean turn to for eternal funding?**

In addition, deans may use resource allocation decisions to ensure that departments include outcomes-based assessment and evidence-based decision making in the program review process to ensure that the process is a meaningful tool for quality enhancement. This can be encouraged by withholding resources if these two elements are absent from the self-study or granting additional resources for those programs engaged in meaningful assessment of student learning and which demonstrate evidence-based decision-making within program review. Program review will be viewed as more meaningful and departments will take the process more seriously if there are a) consequences for departments not meeting new program review and assessment standards and b) strategic funding by deans and provosts of evidence-based proposals for improving student learning and other dimensions of program quality.

### C. Institutional Level:

At the institution level, program reviews can be used in a variety of ways in planning and budgeting, among them:

- By deans bringing forward requests during the budgeting process that are informed by the results of program reviews
  - In this case, many of the guiding questions listed under the dean/college level may also be questions that are discussed at this level, depending on institutional culture and the institution’s business model.
- By aggregating program review results across departments and Colleges, the institution can get a sense of whether university goals (or strategic planning goals) are being met or being modified.
  - If the overall pattern of results suggests that there is an area for improvement then university leadership may decide to allocate additional resources, typically to Colleges, to address that area.
- By institutional leadership articulating its primary strategic initiatives and allocating funds or resources to Colleges or programs in order to strengthen efforts in those areas.
  - If this approach is adapted, many of the guiding questions listed under the dean/college level may also be questions that are discussed at this level, depending on institutional culture and the institution’s business model.
  - The idea here is that the institution controls all allocation of resources and can influence directly the decisions to improve specific aspects of desired strategic initiatives.
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Introduction

The San Francisco State University Department of Hospitality Management is an interdisciplinary program housed in the College of Business. It offers a BS degree with concentrations in Commercial Recreation and Resort Management, Hotel Management, and Restaurant and Institutional Foodservice Management. In addition, the Department also offers a minor and a certificate in Hospitality Management.

The program began as a three-department interdisciplinary program in 1989 and served as model for the development of similar programs at San Jose State University and San Diego State University. While the program has experienced great success among students with steadily increasing enrollments and a positive reputation in the San Francisco community, the Department has struggled with divergent faculty perspectives on the appropriate curricular design for its program. The balance of coursework required in the participating departments and the cross-listing of courses have been the dominant issues of discussion in recent months. Since the external visit for this review in November of 2005, the faculty has engaged in protracted discussions regarding the structure and future of their interdisciplinary program. As a result of these discussions, the faculty has proposed curricular revisions, which are presented in this MOU. Bridging the gap between faculty in two colleges requires great effort. However, both sides appear to agree that the benefits of this effort are great and worth the time and energy expended in collaborating. Academic Affairs believes that a revised governance structure for the Department is a natural evolution at this point and would improve its ability to reach consensus more readily. Absent such an agreement, the divergent faculty may need to move independently in directions that fulfill separate academic visions.
Commendations:

- Professors Nancy Rabolt and Janet Sim are commended for their efforts in managing the Vista Room restaurant and raising the profile of the program in the community.
- The Department is commended for continuing its work on program revision, for coming to a consensus on difficult issues, and for moving ahead on some curricular changes as a result of their discussions.
- The Associate Deans of Health and Human Services and Business are commended for assisting the faculty in reaching a resolution on their curricular issues.
- The Department is commended for hiring two new Hospitality Management tenure track faculty members within the College of Business as recommended by the Department’s self-study.

Action Plan:
Based on the outcome of the academic program review and on the discussions resulting from this review, the Department of Hospitality Management will take the following actions:

Curriculum and Pedagogy

- Leisure Travel and Tourism (currently REC 260) will be renumbered as a REC/HM 300-level course and added to the core.
- REC 605, Ecotourism Facilities and Services, will replace REC 260, Leisure Travel and Tourism, in the International Tourism Management emphasis.
- ISYS 263, Introduction to Information Systems, will be removed as a prerequisite to the Hospitality Management core and to HM 364, Hospitality Management Information Systems. The content of ISYS 263 will be
incorporated into HM 364. This change will require a course change for review by CRC. It should be noted that this change is currently pending approval by the College of Business Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC). If the UCC does not approve this change, the emphases will be reduced to 9 units and students will select 2 of the 3 courses listed in each emphasis and an elective upon advisement.

- The Department will develop student learning outcomes regarding critical thinking and problem solving and will design and implement an appropriate senior level assessment of these competencies. The Department will submit a plan for this assessment to the Director of Assessment by the end of the Spring 2008 semester.

- The Department will move REC 677, Advanced Conference/Event Planning Management, from experimental to full course status by the end of the Spring 2008 semester. HMPC will determine by that time whether or not to cross-list the course with HM.

Faculty

- In the AY 2007-2008, the Hospitality Management Program Committee, in consultation with all program faculty will review the governance structure of the program and will submit to the Deans of Health and Human Services and Business and the Associate Vice President of Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness a revised governance structure approved by the HMPC and the faculty.

- The faculty should continue to work collaboratively across departmental and faculty lines.

- The faculty should continue to maintain strong interactions with the hospitality industry and the community at large.

Students

- The Department should create a plan to help international students cope with the language and cultural differences that they encounter in their coursework.
and internships. The American Language Institute could be a helpful resource in creating special tutorials or classes for this group of students.

Resources

- The Department should continue to work with the Development Office to attract external funding from the hospitality industry to support and enhance the program.

Provost’s Statement
The following statement from John Gemello is intended to provide a context for addressing resource-related issues in all Memoranda of Understanding: “Student demand is growing in many areas of the curriculum. Furthermore, given the current fiscal setting, we do not expect that overall funding for programs will increase appreciably (if at all) beyond current levels. Therefore, all academic units are being asked to examine the depth and breadth of offerings in their programs and to assess the extent to which they can be sustained. Accordingly, as with all academic units in the University, the Colleges of Business and Health and Human Services and the Department of Hospitality Management must look at their ability to continue to offer the full array of current programs and emphases over the next several years.”
Authorization

We hereby approve this Memorandum of Understanding:

_______________________      ________________
John Gemello, Provost and      Date
Vice president, Academic Affairs

_______________________      ________________
Don Taylor, Dean               Date
College of Health and Human Services

_______________________      ________________
Nancy Hayes, Dean              Date
College of Business

_______________________      ________________
Janet Sim, Chair               Date
Department of Hospitality Management
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Spring 2008

Introduction

The San Francisco State University Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, housed in the College of Humanities, offers B.A. and M.A. degrees in Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish. It also offers minors in these language areas and Russian. The Department undertook a self-study of this program in 2006-2007, which was followed by an external review conducted Edith Benkov, San Diego State University; Marjorie Gelus, Sacramento State University; and Michelle Yeh, University of California, Davis. The external review was, in turn, followed by an internal review from the Academic Program Review Committee of the Academic Senate (APRC), which examined all documentation from the Department and the external review team and interviewed the department chair and the dean.

The Department of Foreign Languages at San Francisco State University provides the administrative structure for seven different language programs. Coordinating the needs and prioritizing the work of these programs is complicated and requires diplomacy and considerable organization. With new leadership in place and a revision of some of its governing procedures, the Department is beginning to revitalize the faculty’s involvement in departmental governance. The following action plan is intended to help the Department focus those efforts.
Commendations

- The Department is commended for delivering its curricula in the original language. As the external consultants note, this aspect of the program is unusual and an indicator of academic quality.
- The Department is commended for working with Humtech to increase the number of computer stations in the departmental language lab.
- Academic Affairs notes and appreciates that the Department has attempted to work across language boundaries through its linguistics course (i.e., FL 325) and through its pedagogical courses (i.e., FL 750 and FL 751) and thereby maximizing departmental resources.
- Academic Affairs further acknowledges and appreciates the many years of service that Professor Midori McKeon has dedicated to the University as Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages.

Action Plan

Based on the outcome of the academic program review and on the discussions resulting from the review, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures should act on the following recommendations.

Curriculum

1. The Department should immediately develop an assessment plan and process that encompasses all language programs. The plan should be implemented from the department level rather than from the specific language areas and should include clearly articulated objectives, student learning outcomes for the degrees, and a set of matrices that show the courses in which the outcomes are taught. The department chair and the language program assessment coordinators should meet with Associate Vice President Linda Buckley during the Spring 2008 semester for consultation regarding the assessment efforts.
Academic Affairs appreciates the department’s current discussions regarding the issue of assessment, and urges the Department to move forward immediately to take action on these matters.

2. Within the next academic year, the Department should review and reduce the number of paired courses offered in all language programs. In addition, the Department should reduce the number of paired courses in the German curriculum.

3. The Department should develop two tracks for the Chinese program—one for true beginners and one for heritage speakers. The Department has already designed a heritage course for Spanish. The course has been approved by the Humanities Council and is scheduled to be offered in Fall 2008. Based on the results of these changes, other language programs may wish to introduce parallel courses.

Faculty

1. Shared governance within the Department is the most likely change that will bring the seven language areas to work in a more concerted manner toward the greater good of the whole. Since the APRC program review report was finalized, the Department has already responded to a number of its recommendations with regard to governance. Academic Affairs is aware that the Department has already made proposals to develop a more open and transparent governance structure. In addition, the Department has recently finalized its criteria for electing Program Coordinators. Moreover, the Spanish Program just elected a new coordinator for the next three academic years, and the remaining six language programs will hold their elections by the end of the 2008 spring semester. In addition, the Department has begun to hold monthly department coordinator meetings that are open to all faculty. With the new governance structure in place, Academic Affairs is hopeful that the work will be divided more equitably among the faculty and departmental committees.
2. As new faculty positions become available, the Department should seek to hire faculty who can teach across language areas.

Students

1. The Department should consider developing co-curricular activities and events that would create a sense of community among majors.

Resources

1. The Department should work with University Advancement to develop patron relationships among Bay Area cultural groups who may support the efforts of the seven language areas represented in the Department.

Conclusion

Based on the information and reports considered in this review, it is clear that the Department has sound curricula and devoted faculty members. Going forward, the Department should focus its energy on working together as a united whole. It appears that progress has already been made through faculty discussions and actions on some of the issues in this memorandum. The next step will be the full implementation of this action plan.
**Provost’s Statement**

The following statement from Provost John Gemello is intended to provide a context for addressing resource-related issues in all Memoranda of Understanding: “Student demand is growing in many areas of the curriculum. Furthermore, given the current fiscal setting, we do not expect that overall funding for programs will increase appreciably (if at all) beyond current levels. Therefore, all academic units are being asked to examine the depth and breadth of offerings in their programs and to assess the extent to which they can be sustained. Accordingly, as with all academic units in the University, the College of Humanities and the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures must look at their ability to continue to offer the full array of current programs and emphases over the next several years.”

**Authorization**

We hereby approve this Memorandum of Understanding:

______________________  ______________  
John Gemello, Provost and Date  
Vice President, Academic Affairs

______________________  ______________  
Paul Sherwin, Dean  Date  
College of Humanities

______________________  ______________  
Elisabetta Nelsen, Chair  Date  
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
I. Vision for the Program

Provide a program of study that will allow students to meet or exceed the level of academic preparedness necessary for successful professional employment and for graduate study through curricula and instruction based upon a rigorous theoretical foundation and practical applications.

II. Specific actions to be taken to achieve the vision

1. Incorporate additional direct measures of student learning. These are as follows:
   - Degree of project success in capstone course, as determined by the sponsoring companies
   - Number of ME students who enter graduate programs of study
   - Scores on Senior Exit Exam, similar to Fundamentals of Engineering test (under consideration)
   - Degree of success in collegiate competitions such as SAE Formula Racing Car

Other direct measure that were used in the last self-study, and will continue to be used, are:
   - Pass rate for ME students taking the Fundamentals-of-Engineering examination
   - Number of ME students employed in ME field at graduation and within one year of graduation
   - Valley Industry Partnership program feedback on performance of ME interns

   a. The expected outcome is identification of weaknesses (and strong points) in the ME program that can be strengthened (and used as templates) to improve the ME program. Data collected by the direct methods listed above and other indirect measures will be used to measure the degree to which the Department achieves its vision.

   b. There are no additional costs to this action item; the additional effort can be handled by the existing faculty and staff.

   c. No additional funds are needed.

   d. Assessment tools for these measures are in place. Measurements will be done and evaluated every two years.

2. Faculty to increase involvement in research and scholarly activities

   a. More faculty proposals and more grants and contracts. This may require seed funds for proposal activity and will lead to the need to modernize or expand laboratories.

   b. The cost of this action item is estimated to be in the range of $100,000-$250,000 and possibly more.

   c. Some of the funds necessary for research and labs will be obtained through grants and contracts. To obtain additional funds, the Department has undertaken, with the help of the ME Industry Advisory Council, to raise more than $200,000 to be matched by the Lyles gift.

   d. This is a requirement that is part of the new tenure-track faculty members’ probationary plan. It is expected that at least $300,000 in grants and contracts will be brought in within three years.
3. Use assessment results for program improvement

   a. Expected outcomes include 1) a more rapid action with respect to improving the curriculum in response to changes in technology and in industry needs, and 2) more information that may be used in hiring faculty to meet the changes in needs.

   b. The cost of any curriculum changes, including improving laboratories, will be in excess of $100,000.

   c. The source of funds for major changes in the ME program will be funds raised by the program through gifts and the matching funds from the Lyles gift.

   d. The ME curriculum is currently under review by the ME Curriculum Committee. Initial changes in the program will be in place by end of the Spring 2010 semester. However, this is a continuing process and improvements will be made to the program systematically.

4. Upgrade laboratory equipment

   a. ME laboratories, with some exceptions, are in severe need of upgrading and expanding to include new systems and technologies being used in industry. There is also a need to improve the facilities in order to bring them up to a condition at which it will not be embarrassing to give a tour of the laboratories to prospective students and industry visitors.

   b. It was estimated by the ME faculty members that the cost of the desired improvements will be nearly $1,000,000. This is far beyond what can be expected from the University and other resources will be sought.

   c. The ME Department has put together a plan to raise nearly $1,000,000 and get additional matching funds from the Lyles gift. The ME Industry Advisory Council has endorsed the plan and is taking a lead in raising the necessary funds by agreeing to lead the effort in contacting industry members and alumni.

   d. The fundraising efforts have begun, starting with meetings of Industry Advisory Board with the Lyles College of Engineering Development Officer, preparation of brochures and working on a strategy that includes involving managers and administrative officers of companies related to mechanical engineering in the fund raising efforts. This effort has a time frame of four years.

5. Have ME faculty members study pedagogy

   a. The ME faculty members are committed to quality and up-to-date teaching methods. Their focus is on scholarship of teaching that includes study of pedagogy and how they can improve presentation, modify course materials, use advanced course instruments, and upgrade the curriculum.
b. It is estimated that about $25,000 will be required, over a period of three years, to enable the faculty members to attend conferences and workshops on scholarship of pedagogy and to implement what was learned. This may include release time in some circumstances.

c. Funds to put this effort into effect will be raised by the Department with the assistance of the ME Advisory Council, which has committed itself to this effort as part of its general effort to improve the Department. Matching Lyles Gift funds will be used to supplement needed monies.

d. This effort will begin during the Fall 2010 semester and will become a fixed element of the ME program.

III. Comments on Self-Study

The self-study done by the Department is dictated by the published guidelines and requirements established by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). A program review by ABET takes place once every six years and is performed by an experienced Accreditation Team. Nearly all of the direct measures of student learning are made every year; industry surveys are made every six years. Results of the measures and surveys are evaluated by the ME faculty and discussed with the ME Industry Advisory Council. The Council has been very active in the operations of the Department and in providing suggestions as to how the students may be served better in accordance with the vision of the Department. Surveys, such as the Senior Exit Survey, are included in the discussions. In most cases, recommendations deemed critical by the faculty, industry members or students are acted on as quickly as administratively possible. Comments and recommendations made by the ABET Accreditation Team are acted on immediately. It should be noted that, in spite of budget difficulties encountered during the past 16 years, the Department has received full accreditation for the last three reviews, with positive evaluations and only minor comments on insufficiencies. Furthermore, the passing rate for ME students taking the Fundamentals of Engineering examination has been above 80%, matching passing rates of institutions such as UC Berkeley and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.
# ACTION PLAN

## I. Vision for the Program

Enter Vision Here

*What changes in direction or new initiatives do you anticipate as a result of the review?*

## II. Specific actions to be taken to achieve the vision

1. Enter Action 1
   
   a. Enter Expected Outcome
   
   b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   
   c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   
   d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action

2. Enter Action 2
   
   a. Enter Expected Outcome
   
   b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   
   c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   
   d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action
**ACTION PLAN**

### II. Specific actions to be taken to achieve the vision (continued)

3. Enter Action 3
   - a. Enter Expected Outcome
   - b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   - c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   - d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action

4. Enter Action 4
   - a. Enter Expected Outcome
   - b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   - c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   - d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action

5. Enter Action 5
   - a. Enter Expected Outcome
   - b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   - c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   - d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action

*This template provides space for five action items, but programs may add more items by adding rows. Simply copy the five rows above and paste them into the template after item 5d above. You can then renumber the items as 6, 7, 8, 9, etc.*

### III. Additional information the department may wish to include

1. Enter additional information
Evaluation & Refinement of Team Plans
Criteria for Evaluating Program Review DESIGN\(^1\)

(These criteria were developed to assist you in self-evaluating your program review process. This list is not exhaustive; rather the purpose is for you to reflectively adapt this list to meet your institutional needs as you design, refine, and evaluate your program review process so that it meets your needs for evidence-based decision making. Please see resources at end for accreditation requirements.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes of Program Review Process</th>
<th>The purposes (which are clearly articulated and known by users) are to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluate quality, effectiveness, currency, viability/sustainability, alignment with mission and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• use formative evaluation for continuous improvement and goal-setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• identify and respond to trends across units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inform evidence-based planning and decision-making at multiple levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inform evidence-based resource re-allocation at multiple levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• report on program performance to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• affirm alignment with priorities and strategic plan or inform refinements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of the Overall Process</th>
<th>The components of program review include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an inquiry-based self-study, which includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o intended outcomes for appropriate programs and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o interpretation &amp; analysis of evidence of educational quality and effectiveness (curriculum, student learning &amp; success, co-curricular integration, assessment practices (inc. use of results and internal feedback on quality of practices), learning environment &amp; support, student profile, faculty, research, recognition, awards, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o interpretation &amp; analysis of evidence of viability/sustainability (demand, student support, faculty, staff, IT resources, facilities, administration of program, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o summary of evidence-based findings (strengths and challenges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o proposed improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an external review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an internal review &amp; recommendations (by a program review committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a memorandum of understanding (MOU) detailing the agreement of what action will be taken as a result of the program review findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an action plan/implementation plan, including resource re/allocations, for improvements agreed upon in the MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualities in Overall Process</td>
<td>Effective, efficient, and enduring program review consists of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clearly articulated purpose for program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a comprehensive evaluation that addresses capacity, quality,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effectiveness, currency, sustainability, cost efficiency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advancement of mission, affirmation of priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• stakeholder engagement, including students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• collaboration between faculty and administration; a balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of faculty-driven design with administrative support and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clearly articulated roles and responsibilities, including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for follow-up actions, for all those involved in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• meaningful inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• use of outcomes data, including student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evidence-based analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• usable results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evidence of use of results at appropriate levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provision of professional development opportunities for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faculty and staff to learn OBPR and improve programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• well-qualified internal and external reviewers to evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benchmarking results, and assessment impact and who also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide appropriate evaluative feedback and suggestions for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clear determination of how acceptable level of quality was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified and by whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective coordination across units and levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clear communication across units and levels on how results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are to be used and how they are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• institutional support for using assessment results (&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feedback on quality of assessment practices) to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• systematic integration of program review results into planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and budgeting processes (e.g., through negotiating formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• manageable documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• appropriate alignment with professional accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• clearly communicated deadlines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Specific criteria for evaluating your design will vary according to institutional needs. For information about REQUIRED elements for accreditation purposes, consult the following WASC resources:

**ACCJC:**
- **ACCJC Rubric** for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review: [accreditation.fullcoll.edu/ACCJCRubricTableSept2007.pdf](http://accreditation.fullcoll.edu/ACCJCRubricTableSept2007.pdf)
- **Academic Senate for California Community Colleges:** [asccc.org/events/sessions/spring2009/materials.htm](http://asccc.org/events/sessions/spring2009/materials.htm) (Appendix H – Program Review)

**WASC Senior:**
- **WASC Rubric** on Integration of Student Learning into Program Review ([http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/ProgramReviewRubric4_08.pdf](http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/ProgramReviewRubric4_08.pdf))

Jenefsky and Bresciani (2010)
OUTLINE OF ELECTRONIC RESOURCES
DOCUMENTS & USEFUL WEB LINKS

- Program Review Guidelines and Self-Study Guidelines/Templates
  a. University of San Diego Program Review guide
  b. University of San Diego Program Review Team (PRT): Internal Member Guidelines
  c. JFK University Program Review Guide
  d. JFK University Annual Learning Results
  e. Analytic Rubric for Assessing JFKU Annual Learning Results
  f. CSU, Fresno external reviewer invite

  Web links/resources
  • IUPUI – http://www.planning.iupui.edu/39.html; additional program review resources: http://www.planning.iupui.edu/assessment/
  • University of Central Florida - http://oeas.ucf.edu/

- General Education Resources
  a. How Should Colleges Assess And Improve Student Learning?
  b. Raising The Bar - Employers’ Views On College Learning In The Wake Of The Economic Downturn
  c. Learning and Assessment: Trends in Undergraduate Education
  d. Trends and Emerging Practices in General Education
  e. College Learning for the New Global Century

  Web links/resources
    - Learning and Assessment: Trends in Undergraduate Education http://www.aacu.org/resources/assessment/index.cfm
• Co-Curricular Review
  Case Studies in Co-Curricular Assessment
  a. Texas A&M University - The Student Leader learning Outcomes Project
  b. Colorado State University - Student Affairs/Services Assessment Case Study Outline for Good Practice Book
  c. North Carolina State University - Institutional Culture at NC State University

Web links/resources
  • U Central Florida:

• Criteria for Evaluating Programs:

Web links/resources
  • IUPUI indicators of program quality: http://www.planning.iupui.edu/39.html
  • UCLA Criteria for academic quality: Excellence in Graduate Education: http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/documents/ExcellenceInGraduateEducation.pdf
  • UCLA Criteria for academic quality: Excellence in Undergraduate Education: http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/documents/ExcellenceInUndergraduateEducation.pdf
• Reporting and Interpreting Results
  a. Components of an Effective Outcomes-Based Assessment Plan and Report
  b. Data-Driven Planning: Using Outcomes-Based Assessment Program Review
  c. Types and Sources of Data for Program Review
  d. Summary report - College of Behavioral and Social Sciences Graduate Programs in the 6th Cycle of Program Review

Web links/resources
• UCLA program review committee template: http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/documents/GuideReportTemplate.pdf
• Sacramento State University-sample program review committee report: http://www.csus.edu/acaf/progReview/Prog%20Rev%20Rpt/History%20Program%20Review%20Report,%20FINAL%20DRAFT.pdf

• Action Plans
  a. USF – excerpt from Academic Program Review Guide
  b. CSU, Fresno General Education Program Action Plan Nov 2009
  c. CSU, Fresno Dept of Mechanical engineering Sample Action Plan 2009
  d. CSU, Fresno Sample Action Plan 1
  e. CSU, Fresno – Action Plan Template
  f. CSU, Fresno Sample Action Plan 2

• WASC Resources for evaluating program review process
  b. WASC ACSCU rubrics
  c. WASC ACCJC rubrics
  d. Suggested Approaches for Evaluating Program Review on EER Visits
Upcoming Workshops

Outcomes-based Program Review Workshop

Marriott Waikiki Beach Resort
Honolulu, HI
February 2-3, 2012

Workshop facilitators Cyd Jefesky and Linda Buckley will lead this two-day workshop to support institutions in developing or improving their program review process.

The format blends brief presentations with interactive team exercises and individual team mentoring. There will be plenty of team time to work on campus-specific projects. Participants will be guided through a sequence of topics and exercises that can be applied to their particular institution's program review needs.

Topics include:
- purposes of program review process
- methods for incorporating outcomes-based assessment and evidence-based decision-making into program review
- typical steps and elements in a program review process
- roles and issues for various participants in program review
- types and sources of data used in program
- criteria for effective self-studies and external reviews
- ways to share and use results of program review
- strategies to work through challenges of implementation, including identifying resources for the process
- managing documentation for program review
- coordinating specialized accreditation review with institutional program review

Workshop activities utilize adult learning theory and focus on applied learning. The workshop is designed for senior colleges and universities, and will address academic as well as administrative/student affairs program reviews.

Institutional teams will focus on a project they define in advance to suit their campus program review needs. After registering, teams will be asked to submit a brief description of the current status of their program review process and what specifically they want to improve. This will help teams to get the most benefit from the retreat and help mentors to facilitate their progress.

Teams will attend a variety of plenary and break-out sessions where they can gather information and share examples as well as experiences with other campus participants. They'll also receive one-on-one mentoring, get peer feedback on their own work, and - best of all - they will return home with an implementation plan for developing or improving their institution's program review process.

To register visit www.wascsenior.org/seminars
Upcoming Workshops

Assessment 101: The Assessment Cycle, Clear and Simple
Marriott Waikiki Beach Resort
Honolulu, HI
February 1, 2012
8:30 am - 5:00 pm

Workshop facilitators Mary Allen and Amy Driscoll, joined by Seri Luangphinth (UH Hilo) and Kristine Korey-Smith (Kapiolani Community College), lead this workshop designed to acquaint you with the basics of assessment and the assessment cycle. The workshop will offer an intensive introduction to the vocabulary and concepts of student learning outcomes assessment, as well as the rationale behind the process. You’ll go step by step through the assessment cycle, from developing outcomes, mapping your curriculum, and choosing methods for gathering evidence to analyzing findings and closing the loop. At each step of the cycle, you’ll learn about best practices, benefits, common misunderstandings, and pitfalls you’ll want to avoid.

Topics to be covered are equally applicable to general education, liberal arts majors, and professional programs.

They include:

- Developing learning outcomes at the course, program, and institution level
- Aligning courses and curricula with outcomes
- Developing sustainable, multi-year assessment plans
- Choosing the right direct and indirect assessment methods
- Defining and collecting evidence of learning
- Developing and using rubrics to analyze evidence
- Reaching conclusions about the evidence
- Closing the loop with changes that improve learning

Assessment 101 is a practical introduction to assessment for any individual on a campus – administrator, faculty, student affairs professional or other educator – who wants to get up to speed quickly. The workshop will be constructivist and learner-centered; blending brief presentations with interactive exercises, the facilitators will guide you as you apply what you’re learning. However, there are no teams and no projects involved, and the one-day format means that the workshop cannot explore individual topics in the same depth as WASC’s two- and three-day assessment retreats do. By attending one of those retreats, you can build on what you learn at this workshop. Assessment 101 is also an excellent way to prepare for the program review workshop, since WASC expects every program review to include assessment findings and documentation of how findings have been used for improvement.

To register visit www.wasc senior.org/seminars
An Opportunity for Your Campus to Develop Assessment Expertise and Leadership
March 2012-January 2013

Application Deadline: February 15, 2012

Purpose of the Academy
The WASC Assessment Leadership Academy (ALA) prepares campus professionals who can provide leadership in the form of workshops, consultation, and guidance, and who can support the scholarship of assessment at their own institution and beyond. The Academy curriculum includes both common assignments and learning opportunities tailored to the participants’ institutional needs. The history of the learning assessment movement and national issues related to educational quality assurance, accreditation, and accountability are also addressed.

Who Should Participate in the Academy?
Potential participants should have a commitment to:
- Develop assessment expertise
- Serve in an on-going assessment leadership role on their campus

Assessment Leadership Academy Faculty
ALA participants learn from eminent higher education leaders in interactive class sessions and one-on-one consultations.

Faculty and Co-Facilitators of the ALA:
- Mary J. Allen, Former Director of the CA State University Institute for Teaching & Learning
- Amy Driscoll, Former Director of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, CSU Monterey Bay

Guest Faculty Have Included:
- Trudy Banta, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Academic Planning and Evaluation, IUPUI
- Marilee Bresciani, Professor of Postsecondary Education Leadership, San Diego State University
- Peter Ewell, Vice President, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
- Adrianna Kezar, Associate Professor for Higher Education, University of Southern California
- Jillian Kinzie, Associate Director, Center for Postsecondary Research & NSSE Institute
- John Tagg, Retired Professor of English, Palomar College
- Katie Busby, Director of Institutional Assessment, Tulane University
- Kathleen Yancey, Kellogg W. Hunt Professor of English, Florida State University

Learning Goals
Participants who complete Academy requirements develop expertise in assessment foundations, training and consultation, campus leadership, and the scholarship of assessment. The course of study culminates in a project that allows each participant to apply what has been learned in a way that directly benefits his/her institution.

Application Process and Deadline
About 25 participants are admitted to the Academy each year. The application includes an essay and a letter of support from the institution. The selection process is competitive, with about 50% of applicants admitted each year. The application deadline for 2012-13 is February 15, 2012.

More Information For more information and application materials, please see Assessment Leadership Academy in the document library on the WASC website http://www.wascsenior.org/ala/overview
WHAT'S NEXT?
Scenarios for Higher Education

April 18-20, 2012
Hilton Orange County
Costa Mesa, CA