Academic Department Program Review
Instructions
(Fall 2010 Revision)

Curriculum and Efficiency Committee
Pacific Union College

Introduction

As stated in the *Faculty Handbook,* "the goal of the program review is to assess all aspects of a department's strengths and weaknesses, and formulate plans for the future that would enhance its contribution to the overall mission of the College" (II-18). The review process, conducted every five years, involves the self-analysis of the department against the sounding board of the Curriculum and Efficiency Committee[1]. Some of the effects of the review process should be enhanced quality, updated programs, effective use of resources, and new ideas on how better to enhance PUC's mission. The PUC Academic Master Plan and the Strategic Planning Committee have expressed some broad curricular goals. The role of the Curriculum and Efficiency Committee in these matters may be summarized as follows:

- To explore with departments what they are trying to achieve and how their work supports the goals of the institution

- To review and revise a vision of academic quality and to explore with departments how well and efficiently they are achieving their purposes

- To examine with departments the evidence that supports or challenges their conclusions in these matters

Steps in the Process

1. The department receives academic program review instructions.

2. The department writes a review collaboratively, asking the Chair of CECom and the Academic Dean for assistance as needed.

3. The department provides the Chair of CECom with a complete draft of its review in electronic form. The Chair will give an initial reaction to the review and may recommend changes before giving clearance to move to step 4.

4. The department provides the Academic Dean with a complete draft of its review, including changes suggested by the Chair of CECom. The Dean will respond to the review and give clearance to move to step 5.

5. External review: Off-campus individual(s) (usually disciplinary experts) should be invited to evaluate the program's curriculum, learning outcomes, assessment plan, and assessment results, and provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The external review should take place at least every-other review cycle. Departments with external accreditation already meet this requirement.

---

[1] Programs with external accreditation normally would be reviewed in conjunction with the accreditation cycle of the external accrediting body.

6. The department creates ten copies of the review (reworked if necessary and signed by every member of the department, minus appendices, which should be sent electronically) to be distributed to CECom members for individual reading.

7. The department chair is invited to CECom for a discussion of the review. Following the initial discussion process, CECom drafts preliminary commendations and recommendations. The department is given a chance to respond in person or in writing. This step may be repeated as needed.

8. CECom sends a final copy of its commendations and recommendations to the department chair who, if so desired, has one week to submit a response to accompany CECom's commendations and recommendations when they are presented to the Academic Senate.

9. The Senate votes on the commendations and recommendations of CECom. The review document itself, both in hard copy and electronic form, is kept permanently on file in the dean's office and is available for review by other departments.

10. The Dean shares the Academic Senate's response to the commendations and recommendations with the Administrative Counsel for review and suggested strategies for implementing the recommendations.

11. Items deemed substantive will be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the PUC Board for recommendation to the full Board for final approval.

Components of the Review

The department is responsible for the actual program review. The review is primarily a self-evaluation and results in a document describing the department as it currently exists. The document should address at least the following areas:

I. Mission and Commitments: Comment on the ways your department supports PUC's mission as expressed in the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs)
   - PUC's ISLOs include Wholeness, Integrity, Service and Stewardship, Diversity, Our Adventist Heritage, and Maintaining Lifelong Learning, and can be summarized by the acronym WISDOM.
   - Full descriptions of the ISLOs may be found on page 20 of the 2010-2012 Catalog.
   - Departments may choose to focus on the ISLOs that are particularly salient to their programs.
   - Note that all departments are to address Diversity in section V of the Review

II. Departmental Trends: Provide an analysis of departmental statistics (distributed annually by the Academic Dean) for the past eight years, with comments on any salient trends, including enrollment patterns. Also, provide enrollment patterns in other institutions for these majors and degrees, as well as the employment outlook for graduates.

III. Academic Program
   A. Copies of the current Curriculum Guide Sheet for each major
   B. Copies of the most recent reports *from* accrediting bodies, if applicable

C. A grid showing all courses taught in the department, using the template provided by the CECom Chair
D. Curriculum comparisons with other colleges of comparable size and mission
E. Curriculum comparisons with national norms, if available
F. Explain how active learning strategies support student learning outcomes (SLOs)
G. Based on data from the Records Office, explain or justify courses that:
   1. have not been taught since the previous program review
   2. have content that overlaps with that in courses taught by other departments
   3. are listed jointly with other departments
   4. could be taught with fewer sections or in alternate years
   5. have chronically low enrollments
   6. have multiple sections per quarter/multiple offerings per year
   7. are offered online or in other non-traditional environments or timeframes
H. Comment on grading statistics for the department (available from the Records Office) and any tendencies toward grade inflation.

IV. Evidences of Academic Quality and Student Learning
   A. A matrix showing which courses and other activities are aligned with and fulfill the department's program-level SLOs. Indicate which classes address each SLO at a basic, intermediate, or advanced level (template available from CECom chair)
   B. Verify that electronic copies of the most recent syllabi for all department courses have been submitted to the Academic Dean.
   CECom will examine samples of syllabi to ensure that course-level SLOs align with program-level SLOs, and/or G.E. SLOs.
   Syllabi should also show evidence of appropriate use of information and resources beyond textbooks.
   C. A list of the common core SLOs for multi-section courses taught by different teachers
   D. An assessment plan that includes the following elements:
      • Standards of performance for each Program-level Student Learning Outcome
        Be clear about what levels of attainment you expect for each program-level SLO.
      • Multiple methods of assessment (more direct than indirect; may be both quantitative and qualitative)
        Direct assessment measures what students actually do (exams, writing, actual student work), while indirect assessment includes surveys of how students view their learning.
      • Both summative and formative assessment indicators, if appropriate
        Summative assessment includes capstone projects, the MFT, exit interviews, etc.; formative assessment measures interim student progress.
      • Regular intervals of assessment (i.e., a 5-year rotation)
        Each program-level SLO should be assessed at least once during the five-year period.
      • A clear, collaborative process involving the entire department in interpreting and using the data
        A yearly assessment retreat can be a good time to do this work.
      • A data collection, analysis, and storage system
        Normally the chair of the department ensures that data are archived properly.
      • An on-going process for using assessment results to improve pedagogies, curriculum, budgeting, and student support

> *A key element of assessment is its use in making improvements for student learning.*
- A department rubric for evaluating the work in a portfolio, if a portfolio is part of the assessment plan
  A clear rubric helps the department set levels of attainment.
- Student work that demonstrates a variety of standards of performance
  Choose work that shows CECom what is expected for different levels of attainment.

    E. A summary of assessment results for the past five years
  Results of assessment should include analysis and any plans for program improvements made in response to the results

V.   Diversity
    A. Curricular evidence of appropriate concern with diversity issues within the discipline: Diversity issues may include discussions involving race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, age, religious belief, sexual orientation, or disability. Such issues will vary from discipline to discipline, and in many cases will include a program-level SLO related to diversity.
    B. Discussion of other diversity-related issues within the department (e.g. staffing, student recruitment)

VI.   Faculty
    A. Preparation and degrees of the department's faculty
    B. Academic activities not directly related to teaching
    C. Professional development plans and activity of the faculty
    D. Plans to develop and recruit replacement faculty as needed

VII.   Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: Include how the department has responded to each of CECom's recommendations from the previous program review.

VIII.   Departmental Strategic Plan
    A. The department's updated strategic plan
    B. An assessment of the implementation of the department's previous strategic plan
    C. The department's vision for the curriculum in five to ten years

IX.   Proposed Changes: Based on the review process, what changes would your department like to make?
    A. Curricular changes: These changes should be accompanied by clearly articulated rationale, as well as syllabi for any new courses. The "Process for Adding or Eliminating Programs" should be followed for changes at that level.
    B. Staffing changes
    C. Any other changes

X.   Other items or activities not already noted for which the department should be commended