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Why We Do Program Review

- It’s a system policy (AP 71-32).
- It’s a WASC requirement (CFR 2.7).
  - WASC assures the quality of the program review process, not the programs themselves.
- It’s a part of being a “reflective practitioner.”
  - Schön would say that this is what it means to be a professional (academic).
  - Periodically, we need to take the longer and more collective view.
Why Fix It If It’s Not Broken?

• Do you wait until your car breaks down to bring it in for service?
Why We Do This Report

• AS-718-10 resolved “that the Academic Programs Office provide annual summaries on the findings of academic programs that underwent academic program review in that year, including a list of internal reviewers as part of the report.”
Program Review Cycle
Self Study Components

- **Mission**: elements of strategic/action planning
- **Capacity**: adequacy of resources — intellectual (curriculum and pedagogy), human (faculty and staff), physical (buildings and equipment), information (library, hard/software)
- **Effectiveness**: use of resources to achieve the mission — student success
Typical Findings

• Based on a consideration of both capacity and effectiveness:
  – Revise program learning objectives
  – Update the curriculum: senior project
  – Develop new programs
  – Request new faculty/staff positions
  – Improve facilities, equipment, and information resources
## Program Reviews and Internal Reviewers (AY 2014-16 Cohort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Internal Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (BS &amp; MS)</td>
<td>Ignatios Vakalis (CSC &amp; SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics (BS)</td>
<td>Brian Self (ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (MS)</td>
<td>Andrew Davol (ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Communication (BS) and Agricultural Science (BS)</td>
<td>Mary Glick (JOUR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Earth and Soil Science (BS)</td>
<td>Completed modified review due to consolidation of two programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (BA &amp; MA)</td>
<td>Matt Moelter (PHYS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (BA &amp; MA)</td>
<td>Neal MacDougall (AGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (MA)</td>
<td>Bob Detweiler, Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Communications (BA)</td>
<td>Lynn Metcalf (IT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Program Review Summary (Multiple Cohorts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self Study</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Units</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Programs</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eight in OCOB
What We’ve Done to Support the Process

• Meeting with department/program leaders at the beginning
• Supplying visualized data sets — admissions, persistence, and graduation rates
• Sharing results of the Graduate Status Report
• Sponsoring a program review learning community (11 programs in 6 departments)
• Providing general support via Amy Robbins
What We’re Doing to Improve the Process:

• Communicating that PR is a collegial process,
• Framing action planning as strategic planning,
• Meeting with a focus group to improve the template and process,
• Meeting with individual department/program leaders to scope the process and product,
• Developing a cohort of internal reviewers
Senior Project as University Theme

• First university theme in program review
• Outgrowth of last WASC self-study
• Intentions: promote campus conversation and produce institution-level assessment results,
• Indirect components: program survey, program self-assessment using WASC capstone rubric, and student survey (see EER report)
• Direct component: rubric-based assessment of writing and critical thinking in programs undergoing review
Senior Project as University Theme: Direct Assessment

• About 2/3 of non-accredited degree programs participated.

• General findings
  – Inconsistency in quality of projects
  – Need for better feedback, improved guidelines, and clearer expectations — CLOs and PLOs,
  – Seniors performing at an intermediate level in writing and critical thinking
  – Concern about adequacy of senior project as capstone experience
Senior Project as University Theme: Typical Recommendations

• Incorporating significant written component,
• Developing new guidelines and rubrics
• Enlisting help of Writing & Rhetoric Center,
• Reviewing CLOs and PLOs
• Clarifying expectations to students
• Improving scaffold up to senior project
• Improving format of senior project
• Training faculty on assessment
Senior Project as University Theme: 
Some Conclusions

• This has been a period of change — move to course-based senior projects.
• The expectation that program-level results could be aggregated at the institutional level proved to be unrealistic.
• The theme led departments to examine their senior projects and make improvements.
• Senior project policies (AS-562-01/IC, AS-594-03/IC, and AS-683-09) need to be reviewed.
Our New Theme: Diversity and Inclusion

- WASC concern as expressed in commission letter extending our accreditation
- Campus priority as expressed in Vision 2022
- Developed with OUDI using structure of Diversity Strategic Framework
- Issues: demographics, achievement gaps, department climate, and development of cultural competence, including application of DLOs at program level
For a copy of this presentation, see http://academicprograms.calpoly.edu