

# HOW TO PREPARE A WINNING SELF- STUDY

FEBRUARY 9, 2018

UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE WORKSHOP

DRS. KEGLEY (CHAIR), ANDERSON-FACILE, THOMAS, TALAMANTES  
SOLANO, ZHOU, LEON, KOHLI (EX-OFFICIO)

EVANGELINA MEDINA: ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

# Progress toward a MOUAP

External reviewer's report is received.

The Dean(s) have the option to provide their written comments and recommendations

The UPRC reviews the program review documents, writes a report, and submits it to the Chair of the Academic Senate, with a copy to Program Chair and the Provost.

The Provost, in negotiation with the program faculty, the appropriate Chair, and School Dean develop a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP) for the allocation of academic affairs resources to academic programs summarizing the recommendations regarding the program, a plan of action for the next seven years, and allocation of resources to facilitate the development of that action plan.

The Dean and program faculty present a draft MOUAP to the Provost and UPRC Chair for discussion. The finalized MOUAP is signed by the Chair, Dean, and Provost then forwarded to the UPRC and AVPAP.

# Program Timeline for Development of Self-Study and Program Plan

## January-February

- Programs appoint committee and Chair to carry out review. Chair meets with Associate Vice President for Academic Programs (AVPAP) or designee to review policies and procedures.

## March

- Departments check in with UPRC Chair apprising of progress toward completion of the Self-Study and Program Plan

## August/September

Program Committee completes Self-Study and Program Plan. Send electronically; and deliver ten complete hard copies (including all appendices) all double-sided and spiral bound, to the AVPAP or designee.

## November

- External reviewer conducts an on-site visit to examine program and assess the Self-Study and Program Plan. The visit culminates with an exit interview with the Program Coordinator, faculty, School Dean, Chair of the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), the AVPAP, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

- Chair and Dean make recommendation to AVPAP or designee on an external reviewer at the time of submission. The office of Academic Programs, in consultation with the Provost, Dean, and Program sets a time for the campus visit and exit interview. The program coordinates a schedule that includes meeting with the Dean, faculty, students, and all other interested parties.

# Recommendations for completion of the Self-Study and Program Plan

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

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

The UPRC would appreciate a double-sided format that includes sequentially numbered pages and spiral binding, if size is extensive. Electronic copies and ten complete hard copies (including all appendices) and should be delivered to the Office of Academic Programs.

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

# Introduction (1 page maximum)

- ▶ Purpose of the self-study text is to describe the mission, role, and function of the program within the context of the larger University educational experience. Briefly describe the role of the program within the university context. Include any noteworthy differences in scope or approach when compared to similarly named programs at other institutions

# What has changed since the Previous Review? (2-3 pages maximum)

1. How were other recommendations from previous External Reviewer, UPRC, and Provost addressed by the Program?
2. Other relevant changes may be included here if not discussed elsewhere.

# Program's Role in Relationship to the University (2 pages maximum)

1. Relate the Program mission, goals, and objectives to those of the University

2. Describe the relationship between program objectives and the university learning outcomes (ULOs).

[http://www.csub.edu/q2s/\\_files/fac-staff/prgmlInfo/NSME/CHEM/BCHEM\\_BS\\_map.pdf](http://www.csub.edu/q2s/_files/fac-staff/prgmlInfo/NSME/CHEM/BCHEM_BS_map.pdf)

3. Describe how curriculum design serves the program objectives and intended outcomes

4. Briefly describe the relationship of your program to other associated programs.

# Evidence of Program Quality: Student Learning

- ❑ Use SLO data to demonstrate program quality as it relates to the degree curriculum and other impacted programs (e.g. general education or service)
  - Disaggregate and compare data by mode of delivery (online, remote, ITV, face-to-face) and other significant populations
- ❑ Changes in the curriculum brought about by assessment of student learning outcomes
- ❑ Placement of students in careers, graduate/professional programs
- ❑ Measure of student involvement in scholarship or creative activities
- ❑ Other evidence (e.g., alumni satisfaction surveys, employer satisfaction surveys)

# Evidence of Program Quality: Faculty and Program Effectiveness

Measures of successful degree completion

- Analyze student retention and graduation measures (graduation rates time-to-time degree, units at degree) describing efforts to improve such measures.

Describe how the CSUB Program compares to similar programs at other universities

Record of peer-reviewed scholarships for each faculty member (e.g., grants, professional presentation, journal manuscripts, exhibitions, performances, and creative works).

- Do not include scholarship prior to the last review
- Provide indicators of quality that may not be apparent outside the discipline (e.g., indicate peer-review status and impact factor, where applicable)
- Describe how the scholarship has enhanced the degree program.

# Evidence of Program Quality: Service to the Community

Describe Program activities for applied learning

- Field placements, internships, practice-based learning opportunities, grant partnerships, etc.

Efforts to recruit students who reflect the diversity of the community

Efforts to recruit faculty who reflect the diversity of the community

# Evidence of Program Viability and Sustainability: Demand & Need (10 pages maximum)

## Analyze trends for demand and need for the Program

Number of student majors, applications, and admits in the case of post baccalaureate programs, enrollments, and degrees granted since the previous review

Trends within the profession, local community of society generally that identifies an anticipated need, or lack of thereof, for the program in the future (including, if available, market research)

# Faculty Resources

Proportions of faculty ranks, SFR, cost/TFES, class size and FTES by category

Trends since the previous review

Faculty workload (i.e., direct WTU teaching assignments and reassigned time by faculty member) disaggregated by course category (GE, major, service, developmental)

Professional and Leadership Development

Mentoring

Retention and Succession planning



# Financial Resources



- ❑ Analyze the operational budget (revenues and expenditures)
- ❑ Percentage of external funding in relationship to operational costs
- ❑ Assessment of administrative support services

# Supplies, Equipment; Oversight and Management of Required Resources

- ❑ Information and Technology Resources
- ❑ Equipment
- ❑ Facilities

# Summary Reflections

The following questions should be addressed:

- How are the curriculum, practices, processes and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program?
- How are department/programs goals aligned with the goals of constituents that the program serves (e.g., the students, the university as a whole, the service community)?
- How is the level of the program quality aligned with the college/university's acceptable level of program quality? Aligned with the constituents' acceptable level of quality?
- How well are program goals being achieved?
- What student learning outcomes are achieved at the expected level?
- What are the challenges to the Program quality?

# Questions?



# Program Plan (15 pages maximum)

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

This section might address such questions as:

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

# Curriculum Planning:

1. Changing the sequence of courses in the major curriculum
2. Adding or deleting courses
3. Refinement or articulation of pre-requisite or disciplinary requirements
4. Re-design of the content or pedagogy of specific courses

Obviously, the primary questions driving such changes would be:

- Are our students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program?
- If not, what elements of the curriculum could be changed to improve learning?

# Resource Utilization

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

# Guiding Questions:

- ❑ 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 a case to the Dean and to the University Program Review Committee for specific additional resources as indicated

For example, the program may request:

- ❑ Additional or reduction of faculty or support staff
- ❑ Additional funds to support faculty professional travel or research
- ❑ Release time for program assessment activities, curriculum development or research-related activities
- ❑ A reduction or increase in program enrollment target

# Important



# Appendices

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

Academic Program Data Profile (provided by IRPA)

Up-to-date catalog copy

Roadmaps to graduation

Faculty Abbreviated Vitae (2 pages each)