

**College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University**  
**Procedure for Programmatic Assessment of Student Success (PASS)**

**Introduction**

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University (CSB/SJU) are committed to supporting high quality academic departments and programs (hereafter referred to as "programs") that provide our students with an excellent liberal arts education. Because we--at the institutional, departmental, and individual levels--are committed to the integrity and accountability of our work and our responsibility to students and student learning, we must invest in ongoing self-evaluation and improvement. Thus, the twin purposes of this continuous and important reflective activity are to improve student learning by using student outcomes assessment (to improve pedagogy, curricula, the assessment process itself) and to demonstrate accountability and continuous quality improvement to multiple internal (e.g., students, faculty, staff, Presidents) and external stakeholders (e.g., parents, employers, institutional and professional accreditors, Boards of Trustees).

To guide our collaborative and collegial self-assessment efforts, Academic Affairs and the Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness (AAE), in collaboration with the Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC), have created this Procedure for Programmatic Assessment of Student Success (PASS). This document describes processes involved in recording, sustaining, and improving academic excellence at CSB/SJU. This document replaces the policy and procedures of the Systematic Evaluation for Academic Learning (SEAL), the policy document governing academic quality and improvement from 2013 to 2017.

**Annual Assessment and Required Reports**

There are two important, dynamic documents that will guide continuous annual quality improvement within programs:

The Action Plan

The Action Plan is essentially the guide, post program review, for departmental actions until the next program review cycle begins. First drafted by the program and formalized in collaboration with Academic Affairs, the Action Plan set the stage for continuous quality improvement within department (see pp. 15-16 of this document for details).

The Curricular Map

The Curricular Map is, in its simplicity, an assessment timeline and should clearly identify where and when the program will assess departmental, Common Curriculum, and other institutional learning goals. Primary reasons for the curricular map include identifying where learning goals are being evaluated, knowing how well students are meeting the expectations of the faculty, and what changes are being made by faculty to improve student learning.

A curricular map may help students identify the importance of each course within the major and across the curriculum and students may even select courses supported by their interest in a particular goal. We therefore ask programs to post their curricular maps on the program's website. One suggested location for the curricular map is within (or as a link) the page describing the

mission and learning goals/outcomes for the program.

#### Notification of Curriculum Map Change Form

What if the Curricular Map Changes? While an assessment plan may not change frequently, it is expected that changes to the curricular map will be made due to assessment results or for other reasons. However, because this map will provide a guide for review of assessment reports (conducted by APSAC, AAE, and AA), it is asked that programs submit a Notification of Curriculum Map Change Form (the form can be found at <http://csbsju.edu/academic-affairs/aae>). This is not necessarily for “approval” but for Academic Affairs, AAE, and APSAC to understand and keep track of changes as future reports are reviewed. The form requires a description and rationale for the change. The notification will be reviewed by the Director of AAE, Academic Affairs (commonly, the Academic Dean), and APSAC. A meeting may be called if discussion of these changes is desired by any one of the parties. Please make sure to provide a new version of the Curricular Map on the program’s website.

#### Reports required by each Department or Program

The following four reports are the foundations for documenting the process of continuous improvement in student learning. The department chair (or program director) has responsibility for ensuring that the following reports are accurate, meaningful, completed on time, and uploaded to the AAE managed web portal for these reports. However, while the program chair or director has administrative responsibility to ensure reports are completed and uploaded, it is the responsibility of every program faculty member to participate in the assessment and improvement of student learning.

The AAE managed web portal is designed (and required by federal compliance rules and accreditor policy) to provide internal and external stakeholders and other members of the public with student outcomes data linked to our institutions’ web homepages. The institutions are required by federal compliance rules and accreditor policy to disclose student outcomes data that address the broad variety of our academic programs. With regard to publicly available documents, typically only summary documents (e.g., assessment summaries) will be provided.

The due dates are meant to make this a manageable and timely process with a resulting report on the Action Plan, Program Assessment, and General Education assessment each year. Academic Affairs (including AAE) and APSAC will review these reports in a timely manner to provide feedback and support for enhancement of student learning.

Members of AAE are available to provide programs and individual faculty with the expertise and support in student learning outcomes assessment. AAE will review these reports and identify issues or concerns, notifying Academic Affairs and APSAC.

#### The Report of the Action Plan (RAP)

*Purpose:* The purpose of the RAP is to inform internal stakeholders (i.e., APSAC, Academic Affairs, AAE, students, and other institutional offices) and external stakeholders (i.e., Board of Trustees, regional and professional accreditors, employers, parents) of the program’s progress toward meeting the goals established and agreed upon in the action plan during the program review process.

*Audience:* All faculty and staff have access to the Report on the Action Plan. The reports will be submitted through the AAE website and stored on the AAE SharePoint site. APSAC, AAE, and Academic Affairs will review and provide feedback on the progress report. If action items are completed and demonstrate a step taken to enhance student learning, it will be helpful to provide a PDF summary of its completion online. This should be easily copied from this report.

*Due Dates:* It is expected that programs have discussed their progress together and have completed the report by May 31<sup>st</sup>. APSAC, AAE, and Academic Affairs will review the reports and will work together to provide a response by November 1<sup>st</sup>.

*Format of the Report on the Action Plan:* As mentioned above, this specific report depends on the creation of an Action Plan as a part of Program Review. While the Action Plan can change, it is expected that the action plan should be a guide in completing the report.

The report must include a concise summary and any evidence of steps taken to address the action plan as described and agreed upon in the program review. While this can be in paragraph form, a template similar to one below is also an option:

Action Item	Progress	Estimated Date of Completion
Action item #1	A brief summary and any available evidence that supports meeting this action plan is provided here. Evidence might include but is not limited to enrollment data, changes in resources, or assessment evidence. Please include this information.	Spring 20xx
Action item #2		
Action item #3		

If you complete an action item and it has positively influenced student learning as a result of program review, please summarize this process and the results on AAE web portal.

#### The Program Assessment Report (PAR)

*Purpose:* The purpose of the Program Assessment Report (PAR) is to use assessment evidence to identify appropriate changes and potential improvements that enhance student learning.

*Audience:* The purpose of the PAR is to inform internal stakeholders (i.e., APSAC, Academic Affairs, AAE, students, and other institutional offices) and external stakeholders (i.e., Board of Trustees, regional and professional accreditors, employers, parents) of assessment results and continuous quality improvement efforts to improve student learning. According to the Higher Learning Commission and federal compliance mandates, assessment of student learning needs to be transparent and available. Therefore, within the AAE managed web portal (which will be linked to individual homepages for all departments and programs), a summary of the Assessment Report, in addition to the mission and goals of the program, will be provided. Previous yearly

summaries will be archived by AAE. These summary reports will automatically also be available on the AAE website. The PAR, in its entirety, will be stored on the AAE SharePoint site. APSAC, AAE, and Academic Affairs will review the PAR and provide feedback (this will not be published on the website).

*Due Dates:* Program Assessment Reports describe the assessment results for the identified learning goals to be assessed during an academic year for the program (programs will follow the curricular map). Importantly, this report should also include evidence of a discussion about assessment and student learning, and furthermore, any decisions made as a result of the assessment evidence. Examples of such changes could include changes to the curriculum, pedagogy, or the assessment process. To allow for these program discussions and decisions, the PAR is due on November 15<sup>th</sup> of the following academic year. APSAC, AAE, and Academic Affairs will review the reports and will work together to provide a response (supplied with a rubric) by February 1<sup>st</sup>.

*Format of the Program Assessment Report:* To understand the program's holistic plan for assessment of student learning, the learning goals/outcomes and a curricular map must be made available. As mentioned above, the Curricular Map highlights the Assessment Plan and timeline. The learning goals/outcomes and curricular map will be posted on the program webpage. These will also be available through the AAE website.

Every goal does not need to be assessed yearly. Only those goals designated by the timeline (found on the curricular map) to be assessed for that particular year need to be reported. The report should include the following items (the rubric used to review the PAR can be found on the AAE website and may be helpful to complete this report):

- A summary of program assessment: this summary will be posted on the AAE managed web portal as a means to share our understanding of student learning and the steps we take to enhance that process. The summary should include the decisions made as a result of the evidence provided by the assessment process. This does not need to be more than a paragraph.
- Statement of the Learning Goal/Outcome assessed: please provide a copy of the learning goal in the report.
- Methods: this section should include a brief description of the assessment method(s) (e.g., how many students were assessed, what artifacts were used, was a rubric used)
- Results: this section can often be presented in the form of a table or graph. Results do not need to include raw data but should include a summary of the results (e.g., a median of class scores).
- Interpretation: please provide the program's interpretation of the results (part 3). This section should describe how students are meeting this goal and what these results may mean for the program.
- Changes and Improvements: there are three general areas of improvement that may occur as a result of assessment. Supported by discussions with faculty and staff in the program, please identify the changes and/or improvements you plan to make as a result of the interpreted evidence. We recognize that changes may not occur in all of these areas.
  - Pedagogy: do you plan on making pedagogical changes as a result of the

assessment process? Please describe your plan. If no changes are anticipated, please state “We do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices.”

- Curriculum: do you plan on making curricular changes as a result of the assessment process? Please describe your plan. If no changes are anticipated, please state “We do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices.”
- Assessment Process: do you plan on making changes to your process of assessment (e.g., modifying the goal, altering the rubric) as a result of the assessment process? Please describe your plan. If no changes are anticipated, please state “We do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices.”

### The General Education Assessment Report (GEAR)

*Purpose:* The purpose of the General Education Assessment Report is to identify changes and potential improvements to the program supported by assessment evidence as it relates to the learning goals for the Common Curriculum. Divisional (NATS, SOCI, FA, HUM) and Departmental (THEO, MATH, FYS) will be reported here by those who teach these courses.

- *Department Goals* (THEO, MATH, FYS): Faculty in these departments/programs will conduct assessment of the goals as directed by the common curriculum assessment map (on the website). These programs will report this date via the GEAR. A summary of the departmental assessment results will be posted on the AAE and Common Curriculum web page.
- *Divisional Goals* (NATS, SOCI, FA, HUM): Programs within (and outside of the division) that teach these designated courses will conduct their own assessment of the learning goals. They will work with departments to ensure that all goals are assessed within a three to four year period. Each program or department that teaches these courses will submit a GEAR detailing the assessment of these courses. AAE and Academic Affairs will work with departments within the division to combine assessment data for each division into a cohesive report. A summary of this report will be available on Sharepoint and the AAE website.
- *Non-divisional Goals* (ETHICS, EL, IL, GENDER): Assessment of these goals will be led by an assigned faculty member. Assessment will follow the common curriculum assessment map (available on the Common Curriculum webpage). The report will be completed by the faculty leading this assessment and reported at the August workshop and be available on AAE’s SharePoint site.

Summaries of assessment will be posted on the Common Curriculum home page. It is expected that those faculty teaching non-divisional designated courses will participate in that assessment process.

*Audience:* According to the Higher Learning Commission and Federal Compliance mandates, assessment of student learning needs to be transparent and available. Therefore, within the AAE managed web portal section highlighting the mission and goals of the program, a summary of the Assessment Report will be provided to inform internal stakeholders (e.g., APSAC, Academic Affairs, AAE, students, and other institutional offices) and external stakeholders (e.g., Board of

Trustees, regional and professional accreditors, employers, parents) of assessment results and continuous quality improvement efforts to improve student learning. Previous yearly summaries will be archived by AAE. These reports will automatically also be available on the AAE website. The GEAR, in its entirety, will be stored on the AAE SharePoint site. APSAC, AAE, and Academic Affairs will review the GEAR and provide feedback (this will not be published on the website).

*Due Dates:* Assessment Reports will describe the assessment results for the identified goals to be assessed during an academic year (programs will follow the Common Curriculum curricular map). Importantly, this report should also include evidence of a discussion and furthermore, any decisions made as a result of the assessment evidence. Examples of such changes that might result from this evidence include changes to the curriculum, pedagogy, or the assessment process. To allow ample time for these discussions and decisions, the GEAR will be due on February 15th of the following academic year. APSAC, AAE, and Academic Affairs will review the reports and will work together to provide a response by April 1<sup>st</sup>.

*Format of the General Education Assessment Report*

- A summary of Common Curriculum assessment: this will be combined with other program assessment evidence and posted on the Common Curriculum website as a means to share our understanding of student learning and the steps we take to enhance that process. The summary should include the decisions made as a result of the evidence provided by the assessment process. This does not need to be more than a paragraph.
- Statement of the Learning Goal/Outcome assessed: please provide a copy of the learning goal in the report. (Programs should follow the Common Curriculum map)
- Methods: this section should include a brief description of the method(s) used for assessment (e.g., how many students were assessed, what artifacts were used, was a rubric used)
- Results: this section can often be presented in the form of a table or graph. Results do not need to include raw data but should include a summary of the results (e.g., a median of class scores).
- Interpretation: please provide the program's interpretation of the results (part 3). This section should describe how students are meeting this goal and what these results may mean for the program.
- Changes and Improvements: there are three general areas of improvement that may occur as a result of assessment. Supported by discussions with faculty and staff in the program, please identify the changes and/or improvements you plan to make as a result of the interpreted evidence. We recognize that changes may not occur in all of these areas.
  - Pedagogy: do you plan on making pedagogical changes as a result of the assessment process? Please describe your plan. If no changes are anticipated, please state "We do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices."
  - Curriculum: do you plan on making curricular changes as a result of the assessment process? Please describe your plan. If no changes are anticipated, please state "we do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices."
  - Assessment Process: do you plan on making changes to your process of assessment (e.g., modifying the goal, altering the rubric) as a result of the

assessment process? Please describe your plan. If no changes are anticipated, please state “We do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices.”

### **Program Review and Required Reports**

*Purpose:* Program review is a formative endeavor, not merely an exercise in information gathering and reporting. Programs should conduct their review with a spirit of authentic self-examination. Program review provides an opportunity for the program’s faculty to evaluate the current state of its curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment practices, to take appropriate steps to assure ongoing quality, and to explain its vision for the future of the program. The results of program review serve to highlight needs and priorities of both the program and our institutions to best meet student learning needs and aid in decision-making and the effective allocation of institutional resources.

*Audience:* The Provost’s office is responsible for administering program review; programs should submit final versions of the documents produced for their review to that office. From there, as necessary, documents will be forwarded to Academic Affairs, the Director of AAE, and to the chair of APSAC. Members of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Boards read program review documents--the Boards must ultimately endorse the program review and resulting action plan. Finally, each program’s self-study, the report from their external reviewers, the program’s response, the Provost’s response, and the Action Plan will be posted on the AAE SharePoint Intranet site, where it may be reviewed by any member of the CSB/SJU faculty, staff, or academic affairs administration. The Action Plan will also be available to the general public.

*Due Dates:* In general, programs will conduct a review every ten years unless a program is externally accredited; in the latter case, program review will occur on the schedule of the accrediting body. Reviews may be undertaken more frequently at the request of the program with approval of the Provost or at the request of the Provost.

The timeline for programs not externally accredited is given below. In this timeline, the program review year is defined as the year in which the external reviewer(s) visit our campuses, and the action plan is finalized. The program review schedule is available at:

<http://www.csbsju.edu/Academic-Affairs/AAE/Program-Review-IAR-Resources.htm>. It is assumed that the program undergoing review has submitted its PAR, RAP, and GEAR (if applicable) each year.

- Two years prior to the program review year: In the spring semester of this year, the Director of AAE will remind the program’s chair, the chair of APSAC, the Provost, and Academic Dean of the upcoming program review. For example, if the program review year is the 2017-2018 academic year, then this reminder will be made in the spring semester of 2016.
- The year prior to the program review year: In the summer of this year (the summer of 2016, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), the program’s faculty members may wish to meet for one or two days to plan the program review process.

Programs may apply to the Director of AAE for funds to support this planning session if desired. This meeting might involve:

- Evaluation of the program's previous program review and the annual reports written since the previous program review;
  - Evaluation of any comments that the program received from APSAC, the Director of AAE, or members of Academic Affairs Administration since the last program review;
  - Formulation of specific questions that the program would like to address as part of its program review process;
  - Identification of one or more of the program's faculty members to coordinate the program review process. Except under extraordinary circumstances (and with approval of the Provost), program review coordinators must be tenured faculty members;
  - Identification of potential external reviewers for the upcoming program review;
  - Identification of potential peer and aspirant programs for the upcoming program review;
- By September 15<sup>th</sup> (of 2016, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), programs will submit to the Provost a list of potential external reviewers accompanied by documentation (i.e., their CV) and a brief rationale of each candidate's suitability and the program candidate(s) for program review coordinator. Except under extraordinary circumstances and with approval from the Provost, a program will have one external reviewer.
  - By October 15<sup>th</sup> (of 2016, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), the Provost's office must approve the external reviewer and program review coordinator for the program review process.
  - By October 15<sup>th</sup> (of 2016, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), programs will submit to the Provost a list of potential peer and aspirant programs with a rationale for each choice.
  - By November 15<sup>th</sup> (of 2016, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), the Provost must approve the peer and aspirant programs (typically 2–4 of each) to be used in the program review.

By June 30<sup>th</sup> (of 2017, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), programs should submit a preliminary version of their self-study report to the Provost in lieu of their Report on the Action Plan (RAP).

#### The program review year

- In the summer of the program review year (the summer of 2017, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), the program's faculty members may wish to meet to reflect upon what they have learned thus far from their self-study. Programs may apply to the Director of AAE for funds to support this reflective session if desired. This meeting might



involve:

- Reconsideration of or reflection upon any of the analyses conducted for the self-study;
  - Further informed discussion of the program's goals for the next 10 years and the plans to achieve them;
  - Discussion and revision of questions to be addressed by the external reviewers;
  - Planning for the external reviewer's visit.
- By October 1<sup>st</sup> (of 2017, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), the program review coordinator(s) will receive a critique of the preliminary version of the self-study from the chair of APSAC. They may also receive comments from the Director of AAE, the Academic Dean, or the Provost as needed.
  - Before Thanksgiving break (of 2017, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), programs should submit the final version of their self-study report to the Provost's office.
  - As soon as the self-study is complete, the program review coordinator(s) should send it to the external reviewer, who should receive a copy of the self-study at least three weeks before visiting our campuses.
  - In January or February (of 2017, if program review is in the 2017–18 academic year), the external reviewer will visit our campuses. Although, this is the typical time frame, external reviewers may be scheduled earlier with permission from the Provost's office. For example, if a program sent the final version of their self-study to the reviewers by mid-October, then they could bring in their external reviewer before Thanksgiving. Since external reviewers are allowed three weeks to deliver their evaluation report, programs should avoid scheduling their external reviewer visits after February.
  - By April 1<sup>st</sup>, the external reviewer's report is submitted to the Provost and to the program review coordinator.

After receipt of the external reviewer's report, both the program's faculty and Academic Affairs Administration will reflect upon its observations and recommendations.

- Within three weeks (excluding holidays) of receiving the external reviewer's report, the program review coordinator and/or chair should submit the program's response to that report to the Provost's office. This document should explain concisely the reaction of the program's faculty to the observations and suggestions made by the external reviewers.
- Within three weeks (excluding holidays) of receiving the external reviewer's report, the program review coordinator and/or chair should submit the program's Draft Action Plan to the Provost's office.
- Within three weeks of receiving the program's response, the Provost responds to the reviewer's report, the program's response, and the Draft Action Plan.
- Before the end of the spring semester, the Provost, Academic Dean, Director of AAE, and

the chair of APSAC will review the program's response and Draft Action Plan. The final step of the program review process is the creation of an action plan, including a timeline of at least three years. The plan may be drafted as part of the self-study, developed with insights from the outside evaluator, and revised during the post-visit meeting with the Provost, senior academic leadership, relevant faculty and administrative committee members, departmental/program chair and the program review coordinator. Interested department/program members may also attend. The action plan will identify and detail steps the department/program and academic affairs administration can take to address the findings of the program review process and help the department/program fulfill its contributions to the academic missions of these institutions.

- The results of the program review are presented to the CSB and SJU Boards of Trustees by Academic Affairs during a joint meeting that will take place in the fall of the academic year following the program review year.

### *Specific Program Review Responsibilities, Formats, and Procedures*

#### Duties of the Program Review Coordinator

The program review coordinator is responsible for overseeing the timely completion of all of the tasks associated with the program review process. Normally, programs select one individual to fulfill this responsibility; in extraordinary circumstances, the Provost may approve an additional coordinator. Except under extraordinary circumstances (and with approval of the Provost), program review coordinators must be tenured faculty members.

The program review coordinator(s) will receive compensation in the form of a stipend or release time. The program review coordinator, program chair, and Academic Dean will negotiate the type and extent of compensation.

#### *The specific duties of the program review coordinator(s) include:*

- Communicating with the Provost, Academic Dean, Director of AAE, and the chair of APSAC as necessary;
- Organizing meetings of the program's faculty as necessary to accomplish program review tasks;
- Communication with the external reviewer, ensuring that he or she is briefed on the principal tasks, impediments, or challenges facing the program that have guided and informed the self-study report, helping to arrange their transportation and lodging as needed, and organization of the visit of the external reviewers to our campuses;
- Compilation and timely submission of the self-study, the program's response, and the action plan, and confirming the complete upload of the final review portfolio;

Please note that the program review coordinator is not solely responsible for performing all of the analysis and writing associated with producing the program review documents; they must work with their colleagues and delegate duties as necessary to accomplish tasks efficiently.

#### Selection of the External Reviewer

Individuals who serve as external reviewers should have professional experience that allows

them to serve effectively as disciplinary experts and impartial evaluators of the program's academic quality. This evaluation will examine the quality and rigor of the program's curriculum and pedagogy, advising of students, student outcomes assessment, and the quality of faculty scholarship, teaching, and service. External reviewers will be expected to identify and recommend realistic opportunities for meaningful improvement in the program's curriculum, pedagogy, scholarly, and assessment practices. While such individuals would typically be senior or emeritus members of an appropriate academic discipline, under some circumstances it may be appropriate for an external reviewer to be employed outside higher education.

The program review coordinator will submit the name, qualifications, and rationale for each potential external reviewer to the Provost, Academic Dean and the Director of AAE for consideration. Candidate external reviewers should be contacted to ensure their willingness and availability before their names are submitted for consideration. If multiple candidates are submitted, the program review coordinator may wish to rank them in order of their perceived suitability. If the program believes that two external reviewers are needed, they should include a request to the Provost with a justification for this request. However, programs should be aware that one external reviewer is the norm. If there is more than one external reviewer, then they will come to campus at the same time and write a single report as a team.

#### Identification of Peer and Aspirant Programs

Each program should identify 2–4 peer and 2–4 aspirant programs for comparative purposes in the self-study. Peer programs are those that the program judges to be similar to themselves in their goals and objectives for student learning, curriculum, pedagogy, and post-graduate statistics. Aspirant programs are those that have characteristics that the program would like to emulate in these areas. Not every peer or aspirant program need be located at an institution like ours.

As part of the self-study, the program should compare itself to their peer and aspirant programs in as many ways as possible so as to identify strengths and areas for improvement. In addition to the areas identified above, comparison of the facilities, instrumentation, spaces, staffing, budgetary allocations, internship programs, or other dimensions might be fruitful depending upon the characteristics of the program.

#### Format of the Self-Study

*Executive Summary:* please summarize and evaluate the highlights of your program's self-study in three pages or fewer.

*Program's status at the time of its last review:* summarize and evaluate in three pages or less for the purpose of providing the reader with context for the analyses presented. The narrative of this section should be accompanied by Appendix 1a: Executive summary from the last program review and Appendix 1b: Action plan from the last program review.

*Program's current status and its activities since its last review:* Please explain and evaluate how your program has changed since its last program review, and present the reader with a clear and frank analysis of your program's strengths and areas where you believe improvements are needed. This section should naturally include progress made on the program's action plan

(supported by the Report on the Action Plan-RAP). Assessment Reports will also be vital in supporting the program's evaluation.

Evaluation your program's progress and status should occur in the following areas:

- Mission, goals, curriculum, pedagogy, and advising. The narrative of this section should include Appendix 2: Mission and goals for student learning and Appendix 3: Course offerings and plans of study for majors and minors. Please explain and evaluate your program's mission, goals and objectives and why your faculty believe these are appropriate for students at our institutions. This evaluation should compare your program's mission and learning goals to those of peer and aspirant institutions and also address the relationship between your program's mission and goals and those of CSB and SJU;
- Explain the rationale for the structure of your curriculum and programs of study, and evaluate how well it supports your program's mission and goals. Explain why particular pedagogies are used in your curriculum as appropriate. Explain how advising of students is conducted in your program, and evaluate how well you believe your system of advising works;
- Resources: the narrative of this section should be accompanied by:
  - Appendix 4: Curriculum Vitae of program faculty members. Include staff if appropriate (e.g., lab coordinators);
  - Appendix 5: Staffing summary. This describes the FTE of teaching faculty and other faculty responsibilities (e.g., sabbaticals, study abroad, reassigned time) over the review period;
  - Appendix 6: Enrollment summary. This describes the enrollment in the program's courses over the period covered by the program review (use a table for illustration in addition to a narrative description);
  - Appendix 7: Program-specific resources (if necessary). This describes any specific resources used by the program in its educational mission and scholarly or creative activities (e.g., laboratories, designated artistic spaces, instruments).
- Provide a clear description and evaluation of the resources available to the program and whether they are sufficient to meet the program's goals for both student learning, and faculty scholarship and creative activity. If there are specific needs (e.g., library holdings, academic technology, consistent budgetary shortfalls), then these should be documented and explained. Please discuss the current and near-term status of the program's staffing situation, noting anticipated retirements and providing a justification for the expertise of any new or replacement hires desired;
- Student learning outcomes: the narrative of this section should be accompanied by:
  - Appendix 8: Assessment plan/Curricular Map. Describes and evaluate the program's procedures for assessing its student learning outcomes. Indicate the

- timing and frequency of assessment activity and include descriptions of methods, tests, rubrics, or other scoring systems used;
- Please describe and evaluate what your assessment activities have revealed about student learning during the time since your last review. How well has your program done in addressing all aspects of its assessment plan? Make sure to address the following:
    - What changes were made (specifically related to curricula, pedagogy, and the assessment process) as a result of assessment evidence?
    - How have these changes impacted student learning? What are the results of these changes?
    - How has this evidence helped the program?
  - What sorts of post-graduation activities, education, or employment have your students pursued and how well did their education in your program prepare them for these activities?
  - Scholarship and creative activity: the narrative of this section describes and evaluates the scholarly and creative activities of your program's faculty and students during the interval since the last program review. The narrative should be accompanied by:
    - Appendix 9: Scholarly and creative activity of faculty. This appendix summarizes and evaluates the scholarship or creative activities of the program or its faculty during the period since the last program review (include staff if appropriate (e.g., lab coordinators);
    - Appendix 10: Scholarly and creative activity of students. This appendix summarizes and evaluates the scholarship or creative activities of the program's students during the period since the last program review (please acknowledge faculty mentorship of these activities.);
  - Service: the narrative of this section should be accompanied by:
    - Appendix 11: Service to other programs. List courses taught by your program's faculty that are components of the curricula of other programs (including the Common Curriculum);
    - Appendix 12: Service by individual faculty. Summarize and evaluate the institutional and professional service activities of the program and its faculty during the period since the last program review;
    - Please evaluate service performed by your program and its faculty during the time since the last program review. Discussion of service to other programs should include evaluations by those programs. Discuss areas of excellence and those in need of improvement.
  - Program's vision for the upcoming decade: In this section, the program's faculty should explain clearly the vision they have for the program's future, essentially answering the question "where would we like our program to be at our next program review, and what steps must we take to get there?" The format for this section is flexible. However, this section of the self-study is presented, it should give the reader a cogent presentation of the program's development plan, informed by its analyses and evaluations from the earlier

sections of the self-study, including comparisons with peer and aspirant programs, with an understanding of the evolution of undergraduate education within the field.

- Specific foci and questions for external reviewers: After completion of and reflection upon the previous sections of the self-study, the program's faculty should help guide the external reviewer's evaluation of their program. This guidance might take the form of specific questions the program's faculty would like the reviewers to address, or the faculty may suggest items they would like the reviewer to focus upon during the review of the self-study and the campus visit. Whatever form it takes, it is critical that the program's faculty provide the reviewer with a degree of guidance sufficient to take maximal advantage of the reviewer's effort.

### **The External Reviewer's Visit and Report**

The site visit by the external reviewer is central to the program review process. External reviewers perform two separate, though related functions. The first is to conduct a scholarly impartial evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of a specific academic program at CSB/SJU in relation to disciplinary expectations and practices appropriate for a given academic program. The second is to offer an impartial observer's recommendations concerning existing opportunities for improvement in the program's curriculum, pedagogy, assessment practices, scholarship, assessment, and advising policies and practices. The evaluation and recommendations are fundamentally concerned with both assuring and improving the quality of student learning.

### **Briefing Interview**

Immediately upon their arrival on campus, the external reviewer should meet with the program chair and the program review coordinator to discuss the program's self-study report and to review the schedule for the site visit. This should be followed by an interview with the Provost, the Academic Dean, and the Dean of the Faculty in order to review the self-study report and to reach an understanding of their reciprocal expectations for the program review process. Under some circumstances, it may be appropriate for this briefing to take place in a single meeting involving all parties. Any of the parties just named may seek to initiate such a joint meeting, but all must consent for it to go forward.

### **Meetings**

An external reviewer should have opportunities to conduct face-to-face interviews with the Academic Affairs Offices, program's faculty, support and technical staff, students, and any other appropriate personnel including the Director of AAE and the Chair of APSAC while on campus.

### **Debriefing Interview**

The external reviewer will conduct two final meetings to inform campus stakeholders of their preliminary findings and recommendations. One will be with the program chair and the program review coordinator, the other with the Provost, Academic Dean, and Dean of the Faculty. Under some circumstances, it may be appropriate for this debriefing to take place in a single meeting involving all parties. Any of the parties just named may seek to initiate such a joint meeting, but all must consent for it to go forward.

## Written Report

The external reviewer must write a formal report (or a joint report if there are two approved external reviewers) that is required four weeks after the completion of the site visit, preferably no later than April 1<sup>st</sup> of the review year. This report should be based on the program's self-study, and documents, interviews, and other evidence obtained before, during, and after the campus visit. This report is submitted to the program chair and the Provost.

At a minimum, the report must address the following:

- **Departmental Overview:** An evaluation of the coherence and appropriateness of the department's current mission and learning goals; its contribution to the missions of the institutions; its assessment practices and level of faculty participation in assessment of and improvement in student learning; its specific contributions to the Common Curriculum; its contribution to the greater educational effort and intellectual life of the institutions; the effectiveness of the department vis-à-vis the number and quality of faculty, students, staff, and resources; and the department's response to its previous program review;
- **Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment:** An evaluation of the appropriateness of the department's curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment practices in relation to accepted disciplinary expectations and national trends; changes to the curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices since the previous program review; the role and responsibilities of the department;
- **Students:** An overall evaluation of the quality of the education received by students; the richness and suitability of the department's evidence of student learning; student diversity (including people of color and women); admission standards and practices; appropriateness and success of advising procedures; the use of students in research or as teaching assistants; availability of appropriate student internships; completion rates of students in the department; job placement of students after graduation; student enrollment in graduate school; the role of students in departmental decision-making; and student morale;
- **Faculty:** An evaluation of the appropriateness of faculty training and credentials for achieving the mission of the department; its policies and practices for evaluating and improving the quality of faculty instruction; faculty diversity (including people of color and women); hiring policies, practices, and opportunities; faculty attrition, retention, retirement; promotion policies; the extent of faculty service; the balance of teaching, scholarship, and service achieved by the department's faculty; the quality and quantity of faculty scholarship in light of its teaching and service obligations; faculty mentoring practices; and faculty morale;
- **Resources:** An evaluation of the adequacy of the budget available to the department; adequacy and appropriateness of educational infrastructure (e.g., classrooms, laboratories, technologies, study areas, libraries); any centers, institutes, or other organizations or individuals affiliated with the department; any other interdisciplinary or extra-disciplinary agreements and endeavors affiliated with the department; and the

adequacy of staff, student worker, and student researcher support for the department;

- Recommendations: An evaluation of the particular strengths and weaknesses of the academic department; its alignment with the missions of the institutions; ways the department can improve its academic program; and ways the institutions can better support the department in fulfilling its academic mission.

### **The Action Plan**

As a final step of Program Review and reflection of student learning and success, programs, in conjunction with Academic Affairs leadership, create an Action Plan. This plan is a result of this deliberate reflective process and is meant to guide decisions for the program over the upcoming years. It is expected that numerous challenges will be identified during the Program Review process. The external reviewer and conversations with stakeholders on campus may help to identify potential solutions and/or next steps in meeting these challenges and most importantly, the needs of students. The Action Plan will identify a timeline for completing a list of items to meet these needs. Items can include changes to curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, capital, scholarship and grant opportunities, staffing, marketing, external and internal constituent relationships, and other activities. The Provost's office must agree to the Action Plan moving forward. For the purposes of transparency and requirements by the Higher Learning Commission, the Action Plan will be placed online within the page describing the mission and learning goals/outcomes for the department/program.

What if the Action Plan Changes? Ten years can be a long time between program reviews and Action Plans may change as a result of many circumstances. If a program intends to change its Action Plan between program review cycles, the program must submit a Notification of Action Plan Change Form (the form can be found at <http://csbsju.edu/academic-affairs/aae>). This is not necessarily for "approval" but for Academic Affairs and APSAC to understand and keep track of the change as future reports are reviewed. The form requires a description and rationale for the change. The notification will be reviewed by the Director of AAE and Academic Affairs (commonly, the Academic Dean). A meeting may be called if discussion of these changes is desired by any one of the parties. Programs must make sure to provide a new version of the Action Plan on the program's website.

The RAP (Report on the Action Plan) is meant to report to Academic Affairs, APSAC, and the CSB/SJU community (they are available on SharePoint) progress towards the Action Plan.

Where is the Action Plan maintained?

It is expected that the Action Plan will be posted on the program website under the tab that describes the missions and goals/outcomes. This is important to provide transparent steps that are being taken to improve student learning on campus. As action items are completed, a brief summary of the results will be reported online as well.