

# **Academic Department Program Review Instructions (2009 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<sup>1</sup>. Some of the effects of the review process should be enhanced quality, updated programs, 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 help as needed.
3. The department provides the Chair of CECOM with a complete draft of its review. The Chair will give an initial reaction to the review and 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. The department creates ten copies of the review (reworked if necessary and signed by every member of the department; and minus appendices, which should be sent electronically) then go to CECOM members for individual reading.

---

<sup>1</sup> Programs with external accreditation normally would be reviewed in conjunction with the accreditation cycle of the external accrediting body.

6. The 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Items deemed substantive will be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the PUC Board for recommendation to the full Board for final approval.
11. An electronic version of the review, including commendations and recommendations from CECOM, is filed with the office of Academic Administration.

### **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
  - A. Relationship between the department's mission and PUC's mission, as delineated in the college mission statement.
  - B. Relationship between the department and PUC's commitments to fostering:
    1. a community of learners;
    2. a culture of service;
    3. and conversations about faith, learning and Adventist identity.
- II. Departmental Trends: Analysis of Departmental Statistics for the past eight years, with comments on any salient trends, including enrollment patterns.
- 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.
  - 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. 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 in alternate years or less frequently;

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 cover the SLOs at a basic, intermediate, and advanced expectation.
- B. A sampling of course syllabi, including at least one from each faculty member. (This sampling should show evidence of use of information and resources beyond textbooks.) All syllabi must include course-level SLOs that align with program-level SLOs, whether major or G.E.
- C. A list of the common core SLOs for multi-section classes 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; formative assessment measures students part way through their journey.*
  - 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 your 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 you expect for different levels of attainment.*

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 (i.e. staffing, student recruitment).
- VI. Student Advising
- A. Explanation of the academic advising program in the department.
  - B. Evaluation of academic advising in the department.
  - C. Evidence of effective academic advising; plan to improve.
- VII. 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.
- VIII. Outlook for Students
- A. Enrollment patterns in other institutions for these majors and degrees.
  - B. Employment outlook for graduates.
  - C. Tracking of graduates.
  - D. Recruitment efforts and projected numbers of majors.
- IX. Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: Include how the department has responded to each of CECOM's recommendations from the previous program review.
- X. Departmental Strategic Plan
- A. The department's updated strategic plan.
  - B. Include the vision for the curriculum in five to ten years.
  - C. Include an assessment of the implementation of the department's previous strategic plan.
- XI. Proposed Changes: Based on the review process, what are the changes your department would 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.
- XII. What do you think your department should be commended for?

## Appendices

*Approved by CECOM on 11/27/2007  
Presented to the Board of Trustees 12/05/2007*

### **Appendix A: Process for Adding and Eliminating Programs**

**Evaluate Current Programs** based on 3 criteria:

- Mission
- Finances
- Higher Education Norms

**Mission:** Based on PUC's published mission, as well as its historical roots and vision for the future, programs which are central to our identity will be supported in spite of financial difficulties or fringe-status in comparable comprehensive college. Conversely, programs which are more peripheral need to meet a higher standard in terms of finances and higher education norms.

**Finances:** Programs with low enrollment, low student-faculty ratios, unusually high costs for equipment, many classes with fewer than five students, or a significantly below-average productivity ratio will be called on for strong arguments involving centrality to mission and main-stream status in comparable institutions.

**Higher Education Norms:** Programs which are considered standard at benchmark private, four-year, comprehensive institutions, and SDA colleges and Universities will be given priority over programs which are more peripheral and occasional. The latter will be asked to show a higher centrality to mission and/or stronger finances than more mainstream programs.

- ***Consider eliminating programs*** which are deemed to be weak in finances and at least one other area. A probationary period, in which finances improve, could help avert elimination.
- ***Identify possible new programs*** by means of the following:
  - Student interest/requests;
  - Departmental proposals;
  - Higher education literature review;
  - Suggestions from alumni and advisory groups (i.e. BOT);
  - Monitoring of peer institutions;
  - Needs of the SDA church.
- ***Consider adding programs*** which could reasonably be expected to be high in at least two of the three areas. Financial viability would be especially important for adding majors. Adding a program will involve a full review by CECOM of all areas, including staffing, facilities, and curriculum.

## **Appendices**

*Approved by CECOM on 11/27/2007  
Presented to the Board of Trustees 12/05/2007*

### **Appendix B: Guidelines for Proposing Name Changes in Departments**

**Note:** The Academic Department Program Review Instructions were first approved by the Academic Senate in May, 2001. The instructions are updated annually by CECOM.

#### **Rationale for Name Changes:**

- Departments are merged due to budget constraints or the elimination of departments or majors.
- The name of the department does not accurately reflect current curriculum.
- The name does not reflect currently accepted terminology in the discipline.

#### **Guidelines for Proposing Names Changes**

- Ordinarily any proposed change in the name of the department will be an outgrowth of the regular Department Review. In exceptional cases, proposals can be considered in intervening years by submitting them in the context of the annual catalog revision process.
- Documentation for the proposed name change should include:
  - Research on what other institutions of higher education are doing, including North American Division colleges and universities;
  - External consultant input – when budgets allow;
  - A department statement based on the current or recommended orientation or direction of the curriculum (i.e., a statement addressing how the proposed name change reflects the department's current or proposed course of offerings and its identity;
  - Input from students currently enrolled in the department.

**Procedure for Approving Proposed Name Changes:** Departments will initiate changes which will then be reviewed by the appropriate academic and administrative bodies in the following sequence:

- Curriculum and Efficiency Committee;
- Administrative Council (for information only);
- Academic Senate;
- Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees;
- Full Board of Trustees.