

California State University, Los Angeles
DEGREE PROGRAM REVIEW
PROCEDURAL HANDBOOK

Contents

Introduction **5**
1.0 Review Process/Timeline **5**
1.1 Planning 5
1.1.1 5
1.1.2 5
1.1.3 5
1.2 Preparing the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan 6
1.3 The External Review 6
1.3.1 6
1.3.2 6
1.3.3 6
1.4 Review by the Program Review 6
1.4.1 6
1.4.2 6
1.4.3 6
1.4.4 6
1.4.5 6
1.5 Preparation of the Action Plan 7
1.5.1 7
1.5.2 7
1.5.3 7
1.6 Annual Reports 7
1.7 Summary of Timeline 7
2.0 The External Review Procedure **9**
2.1 Selection of External Reviewer 9
2.2. Coordination of the External Review 9
2.2.1 9
2.2.2 10
2.2.3 10
2.2.4 10
2.3 Itinerary for External Reviewers' Site Visit 10
2.4 External Reviewers Report 10
2.4.1 10
2.4.2 11

2.5 Budget for External Reviewers Visit....11
2.5.1 11
2.5.3 11
2.5.4 11
2.5.5 11
2.5.6 12
2.5.7 12
2.5.8 12
3.0 Program Review Subcommittee....12
3.1 Subcommittee Charge and Membership 12
3.1.1 12
3.1.2 12
3.2 The Review Process and Schedule 13
3.2.1 13
3.2.2 13
3.2.3 13
3.2.4 14
3.2.5 14
3.2.6 14
4.0 Preparation....14
4.1 Conducting the Self-Study....14
4.1.1 14
4.1.2 14
4.1.3 14
4.1.4 15
4.1.5 15
4.1.6 15
4.1.7 15
4.2 Preparation of the Self Study Report and Five-Year Plan....15
4.2.1 15
4.2.2 15
4.2.3 15
4.2.4 16
4.2.5 16
4.2.6 16
4.2.7 16

4.2.8 16
4.2.9 16
4.2.10 16
4.3 Modified Self-Study Report 17
5.0 Follow-Up Responsibilities 17
5.1 The Final Summary Report 17
5.2 Action Plan....17
5.2.1 17
5.2.2 17
5.2.3 18
5.2.4 18
5.3 Annual Reports 18
5.3.1 18
5.3.2 18
5.3.3 18
Exhibits**....19**
Exhibit A: Format and Guidelines for the Self-Study Report 19
Exhibit B: Sample Letter to External Reviewer....20
Exhibit C: Sample Itinerary for External Reviewer Visit....22
Exhibit D: Responsibilities of External Reviewers and External Reviewer Report Guidelines....24
Exhibit E: Program Review Modified Self-Study Report Matrix (MSSR) 26
Exhibit F: The Five-Year Plan....29
Exhibit G: The Annual Assessment Report 30

Introduction

The purpose of program review is to enable the University, its colleges, and its departments/divisions/schools to effectively achieve their stated program learning outcomes, and to examine on a continuing basis the quality of their academic programs.

The Academic Senate policies related to program review and assessment at California State University, Los Angeles are located in Chapter IV of the Faculty Handbook. This *Degree Program Review Handbook* contains the procedures for the review process.

Section 1.0 provides a brief overview and timeline of the review process. Section 2.0 provides the procedures for organizing and conducting the external review. Section 3.0 includes the charge to the Program Review Subcommittee and the review process. The steps a department should follow when preparing its self-study are in Section 4.0. The reports that departments complete following receipt of the Final Summary Report from the Program Review Subcommittee are included in Section 5.0. Appendix A provides an outline of, and instructions for, the Self-Study Report. Following Appendix A are attachments[1] that will help in the completion of the Self-Study Report. The unit of analysis in program review is the individual degree program. The term "department" will be used throughout to signify "department," "division," or "school."

1.0 Review Process/Timeline

A department's major task in program review is to conduct a self-study of each program in the department and then prepare a report and 5-Year Plan based on the self-study to be evaluated by external reviewers and the Program Review Subcommittee.

1.1 Planning

The planning phase usually begins in Fall Semester prior to the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan deadline in the Spring. The steps in this phase are the following:

1.1.1

The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) in consultation with the College Deans establishes the Program Review Schedule. This schedule identifies the specific departments that will be reviewed and which of these will also be evaluated by external reviewers. In general, all departments undergoing program review are also evaluated by external reviewers unless the department's program(s) have undergone an accreditation review within the last 3 years.

1.1.2

The ALO provides departments scheduled for review with informational materials on the review process.

1.1.3

The College Dean meets with the department faculty and chair to review the last program review report, discuss the self-study process, outline the requirements for the Self-Study Report, and describe what assistance he/she can provide the department in preparing for the

[1] The word "Attachment" is used rather than "Appendix" to avoid confusion when discussing portions of the Self-Study Report that itself contains several "Appendices."

review. Accredited programs wishing to complete a Modified Self-Study Report make that request at this time (see Section 4.3).

1.2 Preparing the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan

The department collects data throughout the cycle with the assessment plan providing guidance. Beginning in Fall Semester of the year the Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan are due, the department compiles the data, analyzes and interprets the data, and completes the Self-Study Report (or Modified Self-Study Report – see Section 4.3) and 5-Year Plan by the end of the following Spring Semester.

1.3 The External Review

1.3.1

Planning for the external review occurs in Year 1 while the department is conducting its self-study. Details of this planning process are discussed in Section 2.0.

1.3.2

The external review takes place in the Fall Semester of Year 2.

1.3.3

The external reviewers submit a jointly-written report on their evaluation of the program(s) within two weeks of their campus visit to ALO, the College Dean, and the Department Chair (see details in Section 2.4).

1.4 Review by the Program Review

1.4.1

In the Winter of Year 2 the Program Review Subcommittee (PRS) reviews the department's Self- Study Report**,** the 5-Year Plan, and the external reviewers' report. Questions based on its review of these reports are forwarded to the department.

1.4.2

The department prepares a written response to the questions and meets with the PRS to discuss and answer additional questions about its program(s).

1.4.3

The PRS prepares a Draft Summary Report.

1.4.4

After providing the department with the opportunity to respond to the Draft Summary Report, the PRS prepares and approves its Final Summary Report on the department's program(s) and forwards it to the ALO (during Spring of Year 2).

1.4.5

The ALO forwards the PRS's Final Summary Report to the appropriate members of the campus community, including the department under review and the College Dean.

1.5 Preparation of the Action Plan

1.5.1

In Fall of Year 3, following the receipt of the Final Summary Report, the Department Chair meets with the College Dean to discuss the report and collaboratively develop an Action Plan that will specify goals and objectives for the following four years (until the next program review). The Action Plan also specifies the actions to be taken by all participants to reach the goals and objectives.

1.5.2

The department submits the Action Plan to the Dean by the end of the Fall Semester (Year 3).

1.5.3

The Provost responds to the plan with an MOU between the Provost, College Dean, and Department Chair (by the end of the Fall Semester of Year 3).

1.6 Annual Reports

All Department Chairs submit a report to the College Dean and Director of Assessment each Spring except during years 1 and 2 of the program review cycle. These Annual Reports will include information on the assessment of student learning outcomes, and the actions taken by the program based on assessment results. In addition, the reports will describe the progress made toward the goals and objectives set forth in the last Action Plan and Program Review recommendations.

For accredited programs where the accrediting agency requires an annual report that includes the results of student learning outcomes assessment, the department may submit that annual accreditation report in lieu of the student learning outcomes section of the Annual Report.

1.7 Summary of Timeline

Program Review follows a cyclical 6 year timeline. The first year is repeated to emphasize the cyclical nature of program review. In Year 1, department faculty conduct a self-study, create a Self-Study Report and 5-Year Plan, and identify potential external reviewers. The table below provides a detailed timeline for preparing the self-study. In Year 2, external reviewers evaluate the program and submit a report, and the PRS prepares a Final Summary Report. In Year 3, the Action Plan is approved by the Provost, implementation of the Action Plan begins, and the department submits its first Annual Report to the Director of Assessment and the ALO. In Years 4 through 6, Action Plan implementation continues, along with Annual Reports to the Dean. In Year 1, department faculty begin another self-study.

Timeline for Preparing the Self Study Report

Month	*Fall Semester/ Spring Semester*
September	• Participate in Program Review Orientation and workshops • Gather and review previous self-study documents, comprehensive assessment plan, annual assessment reports • Review previous Self Study Recommendations • Determine faculty-lead for organizing self-study process and facilitating preparation of final report
October	• Participate in Program Review workshops • Convene department faculty to review self-study template, establish working groups that will address different sections of the self-study (possibly through a department working retreat) • Utilize existing standing committees (e.g., the curriculum committee addresses the curriculum section, the appropriate faculty committee addresses the faculty section, assessment committee implements assessment plan etc.,). • Develop an agreed upon timeline for drafts to be finished. • Establish coordination and communication mechanisms (e.g., time-certain presentations during regular faculty meetings)
November	• Develop and administer student and alumni surveys; or analyze data collected annually • Review PLOs/SLOs with faculty and discuss possible revisions/updates • Develop or revise/update Curriculum Map based on PLOs • Develop or update Comprehensive Assessment Plan • Identify signature assignments for assessing PLOs • Determine missing information and gather assessment data
December	• Continue to collect relevant assessment data (e.g., course-based, survey data)
January	• Continue to collect relevant assessment data (e.g., course-based, survey data)
February	• Analyze assessment data and summarize findings in the Self Study report • Faculty work groups submit their draft sections of the Self Study report to the faculty-lead to compile the first draft of the report
March	• Complete a draft of the Self Study. • The faculty should review and discuss the Self Study report and reflect on the data with a view toward developing the program self-recommendations and core goals of the Five-Year Plan for the program(s). • Convene a half-day faculty retreat to develop Program Self Recommendations and Five-Year Plan
April	• Faculty finalize the Program Self Recommendations • Faculty finalize the Five-Year Plan drafted during the faculty retreat

May	• Have faculty members sign off on Self Study Report • Submit Final Self Study Report to College Dean and Associate Dean by last day of classes—this year it will be May 11th (NOTE: Your College Dean may set an earlier due date to review Self Study report and request revisions) • Submit Recommendations for External Reviewers with expertise in your discipline

2.0 The External Review Procedure

Information regarding the selection of external reviewers, the logistical steps involved in the coordination of an external reviewers' visit, travel arrangements, and reimbursement procedures for external reviewers are included in this section.

2.1 Selection of External Reviewer

- Department nominates external reviewer candidates that meet the following criteria:
  - Demonstrated leader in the field (publications or creative works; reputation in instruction; active participation in appropriate scholarly and/or professional activities);
  - Affiliation with accredited university academic department or program or professional organization appropriate to program being reviewed;
  - No conflict-of-interest (i.e., no recent graduate of program, former employee, friend/relative of any member of the program, recent contractual arrangements with program); and
  - Familiarity with academic/professional goals of the department as well as the nature of the program being reviewed (e.g., experience with similar programs, experience with graduates of program being reviewed)
- Department submits written nominations and curriculum vitae for each nominee who indicated interest in serving as an external reviewer to the ALO. At minimum, departments are required to submit at least three CSU nominees and three non-CSU nominees for consideration by the Program Review Subcommittee.
- The Program Review Subcommittee will review the nominations submitted by the department and will make recommendations to the Provost. The Provost or Provost's designee (i.e., Dean of Graduate Studies /ALO), will approve the external reviewers and will notify the department.
- The Executive Secretary to PRS will notify the selected external reviewers and send them the External Reviewer Packet including:
  - *Self-Study Report*
  - *Responsibilities of External Reviewer & External Reviewer Report Guidelines*
- The department will contact the selected external reviewers to schedule the site visit and coordinate travel and lodging arrangements for the site visit.

2.2. Coordination of the External Review

Primary responsibility for the coordination of the external review of a department rests with the Dean of the College in which the department is located. In particular, the College Dean or designee will coordinate the following logistics of the external reviewers' campus visit:

2.2.1

A letter formally inviting the selected external reviewers to the campus for a 2 day visit is sent by the ALO (see Exhibit B). Unless there are extenuating circumstances, the campus visit will

be scheduled during a week in which classes are in session to enable the external reviewers to meet with students and observe classes. The Department Chair with support from the Office of the College Dean handles subsequent communications with the reviewers when scheduling and hosting campus site visits.

2.2.2

The area for review to be included in the itinerary for the external reviewers' visit will be established by the College Dean's office in consultation with the department and reviewers.

2.2.3

The Department Chair in consultation with the Dean will provide the reviewers with a draft of the itinerary four weeks in advance and solicit feedback.

2.2.4

At least two weeks prior to their campus visit, the Department Chair will send the external reviewers the final itinerary, and other materials that provide pertinent background information.

2.3 Itinerary for External Reviewers' Site Visit

The department will be responsible for developing the itinerary for the two-day site visit. The exact schedule will vary according to the wishes of the reviewer and the department but the following should be included:

- Initial meeting on the first morning with the ALO, College Dean and Associate Dean;
- Individual and group meetings with the Department Chair, program directors, faculty and students;
- Meetings with faculty in related departments and programs, advisory board as appropriate;
- Examination of appropriate support services and facilities, such as the university library, academic computing, laboratories, and other research facilities;
- An exit interview with the following university representatives: Provost and VP for Academic Affairs or designee, Dean of Graduate Studies /ALO, AVP & Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of the College, Associate Dean of College, Department Chair, and a member of the Program Review Subcommittee.

(See Exhibit C)

2.4 External Reviewers Report

Copies of the reviewers' final report should be submitted to the department and the ALO within two weeks of the site visit. (See Responsibilities of External Reviewer and External Reviewer Report Guidelines Exhibit D)

2.4.1

The reviewers are expected to submit a jointly written report on their evaluation of the department's program(s) to the AVP & Dean of Graduate Studies within two weeks of the campus visit. While this report does not have to conform to any specific format, the reviewers are requested to cover the major areas delineated in "Evaluation Criteria for Sections of the Self-Study Report". The reviewers should use the evaluation criteria provided to help guide their assessments.

2.4.2
The ALO will distribute the report to the appropriate members of the campus community (Department Chair, College Dean, Associate Dean, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Dean of Graduate Studies, and Program Review Subcommittee). A copy is placed in the electronic archive maintained by the ALO for Academic Affairs.

2.5 Budget for External Reviewers Visit
Funding for the External Reviewer Visit will be provided by the Provost Office as follows:

- Honorarium of $750
- Visit-related expenses (travel, per diem, and lodging as needed).

The department will manage the visitation process including travel arrangements and completion of all paperwork required for a paid consultant. All paperwork must be submitted to the College Dean's Office for review. The College Deans office will submit all expenses to the ALO/Office of Graduate Studies for reimbursement. The Office of Graduate Studies will transfer the agreed upon funds to the department/college via budget transfer once the visit has occurred and the report is received. It is recommended that payment of the honorarium not be made until the external reviewer's report is received by the department.

2.5.1
The College Dean's Office will follow established procedures in making travel and lodging arrangements for the external reviewers.

2.5.3
The reviewers will be consulted to determine dates and approximate times of departure to and from Los Angeles. This information will be obtained well in advance of the trip (no less than three weeks and preferably 4-6 weeks). The College Dean's Office will then make reservations through a travel agency and authorize a prepaid airline ticket. If a reviewer prefers to make his/her own reservations, the College Dean's Office will arrange through a travel agency to have a prepaid airline ticket authorized. In either case, arrangements will then be made either to have the prepaid ticket issued at the reviewer's airport of departure, or the Dean's Office will mail the ticket to him/her. Every effort should be made to utilize the most economical airfares available (e.g., super-saver).

2.5.4
Air travel expenses for external reviewers will be reimbursed up to $500.00. Travel costs for reviewers from within the state of California will most likely be well below this amount. Government airline rates should be secured for reviewers traveling from within the state of California. Expenditures for airline travel above $500.00 must be approved prior to the reviewer's travel in order to assure that these costs will be reimbursed and encumbered from a Central Administration account. Exceptions to this policy can be made, but must be justified and receive prior approval. Failure to follow these procedures will result in the host College assuming all airline travel costs above $500.00.

2.5.5
The reviewers will also be consulted to determine the dates on which they will need lodging. The College Dean's Office will make the hotel reservations and arrange to have the hotel bill (exclusive of meals, telephone and other expenses) charged directly to the University. The

reviewers should be reminded that they are not to charge telephone and other expenses to the hotel bill. Both reviewers should be given the opportunity to stay in a hotel, even if they live within driving distance, to provide time for interaction between the reviewers. The Travel Office can provide recommendations regarding hotels with University discount rates.

2.5.6

The College Dean's Office will complete a Request for Travel Form showing total expenses.

The expenses should not exceed the following per university policy:

- Transportation expenses other than airfare (e.g., long-distance mileage @ 54.5 cents
  per mile, car rental, airport bus, etc.)
- Lodging – Should be arranged by the Dean's office and cannot exceed $275/day
- Meals Up to $55.00/day with overnight stay
  (Eg. Breakfast $15.00; Lunch - $15.00; dinner - $25.00)
- Incidentals $7.00 per day with overnight stay

*These values are subject to change.

2.5.7

Arrangements will be made to pay each reviewer a $750 honorarium through a single, lump-sum payment. A DirectPay Requestin this amount, along with an Invoice for Payment form and Vendor Data Report, will be prepared by the Office of the College Dean. While reviewers are on campus, signatures should be obtained on the invoice for payment and returned to the same office for processing. The honorarium will be mailed approximately two weeks after receipt of the reviewers' report.

2.5.8

The only funds available for the external review are for the honorarium and the travel expenses of the external reviewers. Any other funds expended during the visit are the responsibility of the department.

3.0 Program Review Subcommittee

3.1 Subcommittee Charge and Membership

The charge and membership of the Program Review Subcommittee (PRS), as formulated by the Academic Senate and approved by the President, are as follows:

3.1.1

Charge: The Program Review Subcommittee has the following responsibilities:

- To implement Trustee policy on review of degree programs
- To report and recommend to the Educational Policy Committee any proposed polices that might be desired.

3.1.2

Membership and Term of Office

1- One tenured member from each college elected for staggered three-year terms according to procedures approved by a majority vote of the college faculty. Alternate members shall also be elected by these procedures. Members shall serve as representatives of the University, not as representatives of their respective colleges.

2- One tenured member elected annually by the Educational Policy Committee from its own membership or from the membership of its other subcommittees.
3- One tenured faculty member elected from the faculty of the college which houses the department/division/school being reviewed, excluding faculty from that department/division/school. This member serves only when programs in his or her college are being reviewed.
4- One upper division, classified graduate or post-baccalaureate credential student member selected annually by the Board of Directors of the Associated Students, Inc. The criteria for the student member are the same as those specified for student members of the Academic Senate (Constitution of the Faculty, Section h, Appendix B of the Faculty Handbook).
5- The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee who serves ex officio as executive secretary, non-voting.

Quorum. All members of the subcommittee should be present during all of the deliberations and all members must sign the final program review reports.

3.2 The Review Process and Schedule

The review of program(s) by the PRS takes place during the Spring Semesters of the academic year after the department's Self-Study Report, 5-Year Plan, and the external reviewers' report have been received. Modified program Review are scheduled for Fall Semester. Each department under review will be assigned to a member of the Subcommittee who will be responsible for drafting the Subcommittee's Draft and Final Summary Reports for that department with contributions from other PRS members. The Subcommittee's review consists of the following five-step process:

3.2.1

Initial Review: At its first meeting regarding a department, members of the Subcommittee share and discuss previously prepared questions based on their review of the department's Self-Study Report, 5-Year Plan, and external reviewers' report. The College Representative and Dean are invited to the meeting. The Subcommittee member responsible for the report consolidates the questions for the department. The Executive Secretary forwards the questions with a request that the department provide a written response prior to a time certain meeting with the Subcommittee to discuss the questions.

3.2.2

Meeting with Program: The PRS meets with the Department Chair and other representatives of the department to obtain and discuss the answers to its questions. The member of the Subcommittee who has been assigned to write the Summary Report on the program(s) takes notes on the answers and related discussions. This member may also follow-up with the department on any questions that were not answered at the meeting due to lack of time. The Associate Dean and Dean are included in the meeting.

3.2.3

Recap: Following the meeting with the department, the PRS recapitulates that meeting by discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the department's program(s). It also formulates a preliminary list of commendations and recommendations to be included in the Subcommittee's Summary Report on the department's programs(s). A first draft of the report is prepared by the responsible Subcommittee member and is submitted for distribution prior to the meeting scheduled to discuss the draft.

3.2.4

Draft Summary Discussion: The PRS discusses the first draft of the Summary Report that was distributed to the participants (Subcommittee, College Representative, and Dean) prior to the meeting. The report is revised and placed in final draft form. This final Draft Summary Report is then sent to the Department Chair noting the date that the report is on the agenda for the Subcommittee and that the Department Chair and other representatives of the department may attend that meeting if they wish to respond to the report.

3.2.5

Approval of Final Summary: After the Draft Summary Report has been discussed with the department and College representatives, the Subcommittee discusses the report on the department's program(s). Any suggestions for revisions by Subcommittee members or by the chair and other representatives of the department are considered. After the report is placed in its final form and approved by all members of the PRS, the ALO forwards it to appropriate members of the campus community (Department, College Dean and Associate Dean, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Graduate Studies, and Dean of Undergraduate Studies).

3.2.6

Meeting Schedule: To complete the five-step process described above, it is necessary for the PRS to meet weekly during the Fall and Spring Semesters and to review the programs in consecutive order. Due to the impossibility of changing the meeting time to accommodate schedules other than those of the core members of the Subcommittee, individuals who must meet with the Subcommittee are expected to make the necessary arrangements to enable them to meet with the Subcommittee at it's regularly scheduled meeting times.

4.0 Preparation

4.1 Conducting the Self-Study

The procedures followed by a department in conducting a self-study generally include the following:

4.1.1

The department organizes the self-study by defining tasks, establishing work groups, assigning tasks and resources to accomplish them, orienting the people to be involved, setting timelines, and establishing coordination and communication mechanisms. All of the department faculty should be consulted and given the opportunity to provide meaningful input to the self-study.

4.1.2

The department reviews and redefines its goals, undertakes goal achievement studies, and engages in long-range planning, which is necessary for the creation of the Five-Year Plan. Assessment data regarding student learning outcomes must be analyzed and incorporated into the department's goals and plans.

4.1.3

The department gathers information relevant to its self-study through such means as surveys of its students, faculty, alumni, and employers of alumni, and compilation of attrition/retention data,

etc. Existing information should also be compiled (the last program review report, the most recent accreditation report, the most recent Annual Report, etc.).

4.1.4

The University's Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) will provide data relevant to the review, i.e., FTES, FTEF, SFR, graduation/persistence rates, student ethnicity, and number of majors. This data is available through dashboards on the IE website. Consultation with IE should be arranged if additional information/data is needed.

4.1.5

The Office for Diversity and Inclusion will provide appropriate faculty data.

4.1.6

The department should compile the following data that cannot presently be provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness but which the Program Review Subcommittee would like to see included in the Self-Study Report:

-Evidence of Effectrive Teaching
-Discipline specific information relative to the success of graduates (example, pass rates for professional exams…)

4.1.7

The department discusses and analyzes all of the information and data gathered for the self-study. "Brainstorming" sessions involving faculty, students, and/or advisory committees may be useful for this purpose.

4.2 Preparation of the Self Study Report and Five-Year Plan

4.2.1

A department's Self-Study Report should be based on the self-study processes, (i.e., information gathering, data collection, discussion, and analysis, etc.), described in the preceding pages. If a department has several programs under review, it may, at its discretion, describe all of them in a single report rather than preparing separate reports for each of them. The report should contain factual information, analyses, conceptual rationales, frank discussions of strengths and weaknesses, and other substantive discourse that will help the Program Review Subcommittee conduct an informed and thorough evaluation of the department's program(s).

4.2.2

The department prepares its Self-Study Report in accordance with the format and guidelines developed by the Program Review Subcommittee. A draft of the report should be made available to the faculty for review and discussion at a departmental meeting. A draft should also be provided to the College Dean for review and comment.

4.2.3

The Self-Study report should be concise, should focus on the key issues without engaging in long digressions, and should provide a frank and balanced view of the department's program(s). **The narrative for Sections 1 through 7 should be no longer than 30 pages of double-spaced, printed text, using 12 point font.** Reports that cover two or more programs may be up to 60 pages in length. The entire Self-Study Report should be paginated.

4.2.4

The Five-Year Plan will describe the department's goals and objectives for the next five years and specify the actions that need to be taken to accomplish them. This plan will inform the University, the College, and the department as decisions are made for new faculty and staff positions, additional allocation of resources, and new initiatives in program development. The plan should do the following:

-be aligned with the College and University strategic plans
-address the recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study Report
-take into account what the department has learned about its student learning outcomes assessment process
-provide contextual background related to the department

The Five-Year Plan that is submitted with the Self-Study Report is considered an initial plan that may be modified after evaluation by external reviewers and the Program Review Subcommittee. The four areas to be addressed in the Plan are Curriculum, Students, Faculty, and Resources (see section "Five Year Plan" in Graduate Studies Subcommittee Agenda).

4.2.5

The final Self-Study Report contains a title page and a list of the signatures of the department's entire full-time faculty on duty indicating that they have had the opportunity to see and review the report (see Appendix A: Format and Guidelines for the Self-Study Report).

4.2.6

The Self-Study Report is signed by the College Dean to acknowledge receipt and review prior to distribution to appropriate units.

4.2.7

The department submits an electronic copy to the ALO and the College Dean's office by the last Friday of Spring Semester. Accredited programs completing a Modified Self-Study Report along with the accreditation material should be submitted electronically to the ALO. Accreditation document should be organized in chronological order.

4.2.8

A supplementary file, containing less pertinent materials, is compiled in a "Reader's File" in the College Dean's or department's office and made available for the external reviewers' perusal during their campus visit. These materials may include previous accreditation reports, budget requests, schedules of classes, syllabi, samples of comprehensive examination questions and answers, etc.

4.2.9

Samples of master's theses, projects, or dissertations completed since the last self-study should also be available for review by external reviewers.

4.2.10

Self-Study Reports are public documents. They are available in the Office of the ALO for departments that may wish to review them.

4.3 Modified Self-Study Report

If a department has undergone accreditation within the past three years with at least one external review, the documents gathered for the accreditation can be used in response to questions posed in the Self Study Report. Therefore, one year prior to the scheduled program review, the department will develop a matrix comparing the program review standards and criteria with the standards and criteria required for accreditation, and submit it to the College Dean and the ALO. Any areas that are not addressed in the accreditation document should be addressed in a Modified Self-Study Report.

A Modified Self-Study Report (MSSR) (See Exhibit E) should at least list and/or provide a matrix of all the sections and subsections required in the self-study template. If a Program Review Procedural Handbook subtopic was addressed in the specialized accreditation document, then the relevant page numbers, etc. should be given at the appropriate point and heading in the MSSR. Even if a topic was addressed in the specialized accreditation document, an overview paragraph must be provided. Also included will be the "Verification of Faculty Review" page signed by all full time faculty members. A copy of the department/College response to the accreditation report must also be included.

The department must provide the Program Review Subcommittee with electronic copies of the MSSR, the accreditation report, and a copy of the latest report from the accrediting agency.

If the external accreditation process included more than one department (e.g., review of an entire College), then each department is to undergo a separate program review. Separate documents are to be prepared and separate meeting schedules with the Program Review Subcommittee are to be implemented.

5.0 Follow-Up Responsibilities

5.1 The Final Summary Report

Following approval, the Program Review Subcommittee's Final Summary Report is sent to the Department Chair and the Dean with a cover memorandum explaining follow-up procedures. Copies of the report are also sent to University and College administrators and to the Academic Senate.

5.2 Action Plan

5.2.1

Following receipt of the Final Summary Report, the Department Chair will meet with the College Dean to discuss the report and collaboratively develop an Action Plan for program changes that are necessary to implement the recommendations in the report.

5.2.2

Subsequently, the Department Chair and the College Dean will submit the Action Plan to the PRS and Vice President for Academic Affairs specifying the goals and objectives for the following four years and the actions to be taken by all participants to reach the goals and objectives. This Action Plan will be submitted by the end of the Fall semester of the year following the review and will include:

-Plans for implementing recommendations that do not require additional resources,

-Plans for implementing recommendations that require additional resources, and
-Justification for not completing recommendations that the Department and the Dean do not feel should be implemented.

This plan should be briefly described in a **short document of no more than five pages.**

5.2.3

By the end of the next Winter semester, the PRS and the Vice President for Academic Affairs will review and approve the Action Plan and implementation will begin.

5.2.4

The department's Action Plan, together with the Final Summary Report, may be used by various committees in reviewing curricular proposals submitted by the department to insure that they are consistent with program review recommendations.

Program review recommendations have been used to determine whether a department should be allocated new faculty positions and where to locate a department in a reorganization of the Colleges. Decisions such as these will undoubtedly continue to be influenced by the recommendations of program review. The assessment plans presented in the document will be used in consideration of meeting the University assessment policies. It is expected that the program review process will be tied closely with both budget allocation and long-range planning processes of the University.

5.3 Annual Reports

5.3.1

To evaluate how effectively a department implements the program review recommendations and Action Plan, each department will provide an Annual Report to the Dean by August 1 in Years 3 though 6 that specifies the actions that have been taken toward the goals and objectives in the Action Plan. See Exhibit G for the template for annual reporting.

5.3.2

The College Dean will review the reports and give feedback to the department. The Dean will also report to the Provost on the status of all departments' programs that have submitted an annual report each year. The University Faculty Assessment Coordinator will also provide feedback to departments upon request.

5.3.3

For programs that have professional accreditation, it is still necessary to submit a report on actions taken toward the goals and objectives in the Action Plan. If the program submits an annual report to an accrediting agency that includes results of student learning outcomes, this report can be submitted as a substitute for the student learning outcomes section of the Annual Report.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Format and Guidelines for the Self-Study Report

The Program Review Self-Study Template can be found here.

Exhibit B: Sample Letter to External Reviewer

Sample Letter

June 25, 2008

Professor John L. Doe
Department of Anthropology
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94116

Dear Professor Doe:

We are pleased that you will be able to serve as one of the two external reviewers for the program review of our B.A. and M.A. programs in Anthropology. The dates of Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, November 6, 7, and 8, 2018, fit our schedule and we are pleased that they will also be convenient for you.

Flight arrangements have been made for you and your tickets and flight itinerary are enclosed. The driver for the shuttle service for the hotel will meet you at the LAX terminal outside of the baggage claim area for your airline.

Hotel reservations have been made for you at the Holiday Inn, 303 Cordova Street in Pasadena [Phone: (626) 449-4000]. We have arranged to have the hotel bill for your room charged directly to our University. During your stay at the hotel, please do not charge any other expenses, such as meals, telephone calls, etc., to this hotel bill. We will provide a single, lump-sum payment to cover these and other travel expenses. You will be required to keep receipts for these expenses and our reimbursement schedule allows for reimbursement of incidental expenses (tips, fees, etc.) during your 2½ day visit ($5.00 per 24-hour period) and up to $50 a day for meals ($10.00 - breakfast; $15.00 - lunch; $25.00 - dinner). You should receive payment approximately 30 days after the claim is filed.

While you are on campus, you will be asked to sign a service contract for the total amount of $500. A single, lump-sum payment will be mailed in this amount approximately two weeks after receipt of your report. In case you may have any questions and in order to provide you with more details concerning your arrangements, my assistant, Jane Jones will be in contact with you by telephone.

As you know, the external review will be conducted jointly by you and Dr. Eileen Martinez of the University of Arizona. If you wish to discuss the external review with Dr. Martinez prior to your campus visit, you may call her at (602) 444-2000 and we will reimburse you for your long distance charges. If you would prefer to contact Dr. Martinez by e-mail, the address is drm@mail.net. We would like you and Dr. Martinez to function as a team and to prepare a single joint report.

Your itinerary, the University Catalog, the University's Program Review Procedural Handbook, and the department's Self-Study Report are enclosed. You may find it particularly useful to read the section of the Program Review Procedural Handbook that covers the external review process. Other supplementary, less pertinent materials are being compiled in a "Reader's File" and will be available for your perusal while you are here. Also enclosed is a campus map to help you find your way around our campus.

We do have one very important request to make of both you and Dr. Martinez. Our time lines for completion of the program review are quite tight, and it would be greatly appreciated if your written report could be completed and sent to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs within two weeks of your campus visit. I apologize for the rush, and hope this will allow you sufficient preparation time.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. You may call me collect at the following number: (323) 343-0000.

Again, we want to thank you for your interest in our University. We look forward to meeting you and working with you on this important part of our program review process.

Sincerely,

Alice B. Smith
Dean, College of Learned Scholars ABS:ss
Attachments

cc: (Provost) (AVP & Dean of Graduate Studies) (Department Chair)

Exhibit C: Sample Itinerary for External Reviewer Visit

Sample Itinerary* for
Dr. John L. Doe and Dr. Eileen Martinez

Sunday, November 5**

Dr. John Doe to arrive at LAX at 3:40 p.m.
Dr. Eileen Martinez to arrive at LAX at 8:05 p.m. Accommodations at Holiday Inn Hotel
Shuttle to Hotel (Approximately 30 Minute Ride)

Monday, November 6 **

8:00 a.m. Associate Dean Donald Jones ***(or department chair depending on College preference)*** will call for Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez at the Holiday Inn Hotel.

9:00 a.m. Intake Interview with:
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee)
Dean of Graduate Studies/ALO
AVP & Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dr. Alice B. Smith, Dean, College of Learned Scholars
Dr. Donald Jones, Associate Dean, College of Learned Scholars

10:00 a.m.*** Dr. Malcolm Wheeler, Chair, Department of Anthropology

Remainder and all of the next
Department Advisory Committee members, and the
Department Liaison Librarian,
- tour of departmental facilities (if appropriate),
-time to review the materials in the Readers' File, and
-time to read the theses in the Library (2 hours).

6:00 p.m. Unless Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez have other plans, dinner arrangements should be made by mutual agreement. Dinner, if planned by the College or department, should include transportation back to the hotel at the end of the evening.

NOTES:
* A copy of this itinerary and the external reviewers' vitae should be furnished in advance to everyone with whom the reviewers are scheduled to meet.
** The times listed are for illustrative purposes only. <u>The actual dates and times must be scheduled with each administrator by the College Dean's office</u>. Locations of meetings should also be listed.
*** The Dean has the option of scheduling an additional meeting with the Associate Dean and reviewers.

Tuesday, November 7

8:00 a.m. Associate Dean Jones will call for Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez at the Holiday Inn Hotel.

8:30 a.m. Continuation of departmental activities (see previous day) with lunch included
6:00 p.m. Dinner arrangements should be made by mutual agreement.

Wednesday. November 8

8:00 a.m. Associate Dean Jones will call for Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez at the Holiday Inn Hotel.

8:30 a.m. Dr. Doe and Dr. Martinez meet to discuss their preliminary findings and to discuss the preparation of their report, including which sections each of them will write. (This may be done at the hotel prior to coming to campus.)

11:00 a.m. Exit Interview with:
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Dean of Graduate Studies/ALO
AVP & Dean of Undergraduate Studies Dean of College
Associate Dean of College Department Chair
Member, Program Review Subcommittee *

12:00 noon Lunch should be provided unless the reviewers are on a tight schedule to catch a plane. Arrangements should be made to return them to the hotel or to the airport.

*** NOTE**: A designated representative of the University Program Review Subcommittee should be invited to this exit interview. Contact Karin Elliott Brown, ALO and Dean of Graduate Studies, for the name of the member who has been assigned to the program.

Exhibit D: Responsibilities of External Reviewers and External Reviewer Report Guidelines

CAL STATE LA
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXTERNAL REVIEWER & EXTERNAL REVIEWER REPORT GUIDELINES

The Five-Year Review process is implemented through a review of the program's self-study, a visit by an external reviewer, and a final recommendation by the Review Team.

The external reviewer has the following responsibilities:

1. Understand thoroughly the mission and educational objectives of the program under review;
2. Determine the facts on which the program review is based;
3. Analyze the program's achievement of each criterion for review based on his/her determination of the facts;
4. Ascertain that the current structure and processes of the program assure continuous development and improvement;
5. Determine how the program's fulfillment of its mission and educational objectives affects achievement of overall high quality;
6. Make an overall recommendation to the Review Team;
7. Provide consultation to the program when requested.
8. Submit final report to the Dean of Graduate Studies /Accreditation Liaison Office (ALO) within two weeks of site visit.

REPORT FORMAT

Report Length and Page Format: The report should be double-spaced, using 12 point font, include page headers/footers with page numbers. Report should be

approximately 10-15 pages in length and include the following:

I. Title Page including:

- Name of Program Reviewed
- External Reviewer's Name
- External Reviewer's Institution
- Date of External Reviewer's Visit

II. Table of Contents

III. General Overview of Program

IV. Evaluation of Program Quality including:

- History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives
- Program Data : Enrollment Data & Impact of Enrollment Trends
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
- Department Faculty
- Student Engagement, Outreach and Recruitment
- Program Self Recommendation and Five Year Plan

V. Commendations of Strengths, Innovations and Unique Features

VI. Opportunities for Improvement

VII. Overall recommendation to the review:

- **Recommend Affirmation**: This recommendation implies that the program is fulfilling its mission, is maintaining overall high quality, and has processes in place that assure continuous improvement. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the External Reviewer should identify issues appropriate for further improvement prior to the next five-year review.

- **Recommend Reaffirmation, but with specific concerns for transmittal to the program**: The concerns cited may not be sufficient to preclude a favorable recommendation, but the report should reinforce the External Reviewer's recommendation that the program attend to these concerns in its Continuous Improvement Plan.

- **Recommend the program remain under Continuing Review:** The recommendation cites concerns the program must rectify before a recommendation for continuation can be contemplated. The External Reviewer's Report should provide specific information on a) actions or outcomes required to address deficiencies, b) seriousness of the deficiencies identified and the length of time anticipated to address them, and c) nature and frequency of reports and reviews that will be required.

- **Recommend Suspension**: The External Reviewer's recommendation cites deficiencies that so seriously impair overall quality that the program is asked to show cause why it should not be terminated. This recommendation is reached only when the External Reviewer has concluded that the program cannot or will not rectify the cited deficiencies.

Exhibit E: Program Review Modified Self-Study Report Matrix (MSSR)

Accreditation and MSSR Matrix

Program Review Modified Self-Study Report (MSSR)

Accreditation Self-Study/MSSR

Correspondence Matrix for Use with "Degree Program Review Procedural Handbook"

dated (Insert date of matrix)

PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY SECTIONS	ACCREDITATION SELF-STUDY SECTIONS	PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY SECTIONS	ACCREDITATION SELF-STUDY SECTIONS
1.0 History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives		3.9 Masters theses, projects and Dissertations	
1.1 Overview and history		3.10 Innovations in Curriculum	
1.2 Mission		**4.0 Assessment of PLOs**	
1.3 Goals and objectives		4.1 PLOs and Curriculum Map maintenance	
1.4 Changes in goals and objectives		4.2 Comprehensive Assessment Plan	
1.5 Recommendations from last program review		4.3 PLO Assessment methods	
1.6 Accrediting body recommendations		4.4 Faculty involvement in assessment	
2.0 Program Data		4.5 Further education of alumni	
2.1 Enrollment Data: # of degrees awarded, # of courses and sections taught, average class size, # freshmen and transfers		4.6 Student and alumni awards/achievements	
2.2 Impact of enrollment trends		4.7 Assessment of GE courses offered by Program	
3.0 Curriculum and Instruction		**5.0 Department Faculty**	
3.1 Curriculum		5.1 Trends in percent of courses taught by faculty rank	
3.2 Compliance with EO 1071		5.2 Faculty scholarly activities faculty research	
3.3 Comparison with peer institutions		5.3 Faculty service to the University	
3.4 GE courses		**6.0 Student Engagement, Outreach and Recruitment**	
3.5 Service courses		6.1 Description of activities	
3.6 Credential or certificate programs		6.2 Effectiveness of activities	
3.7 Opportunities for student RSCA		7.0 Program Recommendations	
3.8 Academic advising		Five Year Plan (see below)	
Appendix A: Reports from Previous Program Reviews		Appendix H: Masters Theses, Projects and Dissertations	
Appendix B: Students in the Major		Appendix I: Assessment plan(s)	
Appendix C: Graduation and Persistence Rates		Appendix J: Curriculum Map for Each Academic Degree Program	
Appendix D: Faculty Utilization		Appendix K: Faculty Composition	

Appendix E: Catalog Description of Each Program		Appendix L: Faculty Summary Vitae	
Appendix F: GE Assessment		Appendix M: Instructional faculty types in the Programs' courses	
Appendix G: Reviews from Departments (regarding how your programs' service courses meet their needs and outcomes)			

Exhibit F: The Five-Year Plan

One of the purposes of Program Review is to develop plans for change and improvement in order to maintain leadership in the respective fields of academia. Therefore, each Department/School/Division will develop a plan that describes what the unit intends to do during the next five years. Development of this plan should benefit those units applying for new tenure-track positions or space by providing specific data to support these requests.

The Five-Year Plan will address the recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study Report. The plan should take into account what the department has learned from its outcomes assessment process. After receiving the external reviewer's report, the department should either amend the plan to comply with the recommendations of the external reviewers or explain why no amendment is necessary. In forming this plan, the program should address the following four areas (the questions are provided as guidelines):

1. **Curriculum**. What curricular changes do you envisage during the next five years? What developments are likely to cause you to change the curriculum?

2. **Students**. Do you see the number of majors increasing or decreasing during the next five years? Will those students be similar to those currently pursuing your major, or do you expect to serve different types of students? Will career opportunities open to your graduates change during the next five years? How will your program adjust its curriculum and program practices to prepare students for those opportunities? Do you expect your total enrollment to increase or decrease during the next five years? Are changes needed in the student learning outcomes? How will you assist students in attaining those goals during the next five years? What are your specific plans in the areas of curriculum change, outreach, scheduling, and retention to increase student enrollment? If your program has inadequate resources to serve your students, what are your plans to meet their needs?

3. **Faculty**. What changes do you foresee for department faculty? What does the University need to do to maintain the current high quality of faculty? Do you anticipate that you will be requesting new regular faculty members? If so, what will be the basis for these requests?

4. **Resources**. Will your current level of resources (staff, equipment, library resources, travel funds, etc.) be adequate to permit the maintenance or improvement of program quality during the next five years? Identify needs based upon program priorities.

Each of the preceding areas addressed in the Five-Year Plan should include the following, where relevant:

a) The expected action/change to be taken (e.g., revision of curriculum, addition of faculty, purchase of equipment, request for library resources, increased use of technology, increased travel funds, etc.).
b) A specific timeline for when the task will be completed.
c) Person(s) or committee(s) responsible for carrying out the needed change.
d) Anticipated cost.

Exhibit G: The Annual Assessment Report

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES
ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: _____ **REPORT SEMESTER/YEAR:** _____

COLLEGE/SCHOOL: _____ **ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR:** _____

SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION: ❒ **NO** ❒ **YES PLEASE SPECIFY AGENCY/ORGANIZATION AND DATE** _____

DEPARTMENT MISSION:

PLEASE LIST ALL PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOS) (SEE APPENDIX F FOR A RUBRIC WITH PLO GUIDELINES):

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Alignment of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (see Appendix A for a complete description of each ILO) - Please indicate which of your PLOs best match the following ILOs.

CAL STATE LA INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES	PLO(S) WHICH MATCH THIS ILO
1. Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry	
2. Proficiency: Intellectual skills	
3. Place and Community: Urban and global mission	
4. Transformation: Integrative learning	

ASSESSMENT RESULTS - DESCRIBE ANY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED WITHIN THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR FOR EACH OUTCOME. SEE APPENDIX D-H FOR EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT MEASURES AND USE OF RESULTS, AND RUBRICS WHICH WILL BE USED TO EVALUATE YOUR ASSESSMENT PROCESSES. *PLEASE ATTACH ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS NEEDED.*

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME (LIST ACTIVITIES FOR EACH PLO. ENTER "GENERAL" FOR ACTIVITIES THAT PERTAIN TO MULTIPLE PLOS)	1. How and when was this PLO assessed? (For example, which assessments were used, which courses were examined, what were the dates of data collection?) See Appendix B for other examples	2. What were the results? (For example, how many students reached each level of proficiency on the SLOs assessed?) See Appendix C for other examples	3. Based on the results, what instructional, programmatic, or curricular improvements were made?
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

Assessment Plan - In this section, provide a description of your 5-year assessment plan that specifies assessment activities from 2017-2021.

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME	Academic year/semester when PLO is assessed	What is your tentative plan for assessing this PLO? (For example, which assessments will be used, which courses will examined?)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

General Education and Service Course Assessment

(This section is for courses not covered in the major program assessment plan)

1. List all the General Education courses offered by the department

2. List all the service courses offered by the department (do not include GE and Major program courses)

3. Describe your 5-year assessment plan for GE courses and outcomes for **2017-2021** (as applicable) (See Appendix B for a list of all GE Learning Outcomes)

GE/COURSE LEARNING OUTCOME	Academic year/semester when GELO is assessed	What is your tentative plan for assessing this GELO? (For example, which assessments will be used, which courses will examined?)
GELO1: Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry		
GELO2: Proficiency: Intellectual skills		
GELO3: Place and Community: Urban and global mission		
GELO4: Transformation: Integrative learning		

WHO CONDUCTS ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES (PLANNING, DATA COLLECTION, ETC.) FOR THIS PROGRAM? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

❒ **FACULTY WHO TEACH COURSES IN THE PROGRAM** ❒ **THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR OR DEPARTMENT CHAIR**
❒ **A DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM COMMITTEE** ❒ **PROGRAM STAFF** ❒ **STUDENTS**
❒ **OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____**

WITH WHOM DO YOU SHARE YOUR ASSESSMENT INFORMATION? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

❒ **FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT** ❒ **STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM** ❒ **CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS**
❒ **DEPARTMENT ALUMNI** ❒ **EMPLOYERS** ❒ **EXTERNAL COMMUNITY MEMBERS**
❒ **OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____**

APPENDIX A: CAL STATE LA INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES AND GOALS

Institutional Learning Goals

https://spcc.calstatela.edu/

California State University, Los Angeles students expand and deepen their interdisciplinary and general understanding of the world, enhance their critical skills, and take responsibility for a lifetime of learning, and as graduates become individuals who engage, enhance, and contribute to democratic society.

Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry

CSULA graduates have a strong knowledge base in their academic major and can use powerful processes of inquiry in a range of disciplines. They engage contemporary and enduring questions with an understanding of the complexities of human cultures and the physical and natural world and are ready to put their knowledge into action to address contemporary issues.

Proficiency: Intellectual skills

CSULA graduates are equipped to actively participate in democratic society. They are critical thinkers who make use of quantitative and qualitative reasoning. They have the ability to find, use, evaluate and process information in order to engage in complex decision-making. They read critically, speak and write clearly and thoughtfully and communicate effectively.

Place and Community: Urban and global mission

CSULA graduates are engaged individuals who have contributed to the multi-lingual and multiethnic communities that constitute Los Angeles and the world of the future. They are aware of how their actions impact society and the environment, and they strive to make socially responsible decisions. They are community builders sensitive to the needs of diverse individuals and groups and committed to renewing the communities in which they live.

Transformation: Integrative learning CSULA graduates integrate academic learning with life. They engage in community, professional, creative, research and scholarly projects that lead to changes in their sense of self and understanding of their worlds. Graduates integrate their knowledge, skills and experience to address complex and contemporary issues and act ethically as leaders for the 21st century.

Endorsed by Academic Senate 6/1/10 and approved by the President 6/8/10

APPENDIX B: CAL STATE LA'S GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES

The General Education program at Cal State LA is defined by a set of learning outcomes that are aligned with the Cal State LA Institutional Learning outcomes and the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) outcomes promoted by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and adopted by the California State University System.

1. Knowledge: Mastery of Content and Processes of Inquiry

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- demonstrate understanding of the physical and natural world.
- demonstrate understanding of contemporary events within political and historical contexts.
- demonstrate understanding of the diversity of cultures and communities in the United States and abroad.
- demonstrate understanding of constructions, institutions, and structures of power and privilege in societies as well as strategies used to challenge existing inequalities.
- demonstrate understanding of a range of disciplinary ways of knowing.
- demonstrate understanding of creative expression in the context of the relevant art form and intellectual history.
- demonstrate understanding of race, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic class

2. Proficiency: Intellectual Skills

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- demonstrate civic literacy that would enable them to participate effectively in a democratic society
- use inquiry processes, including quantitative and qualitative reasoning and critical and creative thinking, to engage with contemporary and enduring questions.
- find, use, evaluate and process information in order to engage in complex decision-making and problem solving.
- read, speak and write effectively.
- demonstrate an ability to work collaboratively.

3. Engagement: Local and Global Communities

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- demonstrate the capacity to engage meaningfully with diverse communities.
- demonstrate understanding of how individuals affect society and the environment.
- demonstrate the capacity to make well informed, ethical, and socially responsible decisions.
- demonstrate understanding of the interconnectedness of local and global communities.
- demonstrate literacy in the perspectives and needs of individuals and groups.

4. Transformation: Integrative Learning

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- integrate academic learning with life through project-based experiences.
- integrate their knowledge, skills and experience to address complex, enduring, and emerging issues.

APPENDIX C: WSCUC's Core Competencies

In the *2013 Handbook of Accreditation*, Criteria for Review 2.2a states:

> Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking.

Institutions are free to define each core competency in a way that makes sense for the institution, its mission, its values, and the needs of its student body.

Critical thinking- the ability to think in a way that is clear, reasoned, reflective, informed by evidence, and aimed at deciding what to believe or do. Dispositions supporting critical thinking include open-mindedness and motivation to seek the truth.

Quantitative Reasoning- the ability to apply mathematical concepts to the interpretation and analysis of quantitative information in order to solve a wide range of problems, from those arising in pure and applied research to everyday issues and questions. It may include such dimensions as ability to apply math skills, judge reasonableness, communicate quantitative information, and recognize the limits of mathematical or statistical methods.

Oral Communication- communication by means of spoken language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. In addition to speech, oral communication may employ visual aids, body language, intonation, and other non-verbal elements to support the conveyance of meaning and connection with the audience. Oral communication may include speeches, presentations, discussions, dialogue, and other forms of interpersonal communication, either delivered face to face or mediated technologically.

Written Communication- communication by means of written language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. Written communication may appear in many forms or genres. Successful written communication depends of mastery of conventions, faculty with culturally accepted structures for presentation and argument, awareness of audience and other situation-specific factors.

Information Literacy- according the Association of College and Research Libraries, the ability to "recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use the needed information" for a wide range of purposes. An information-literate individual is able to determine the extent of information needed, access it, evaluate it and its sources, use the information effectively, and do so ethically and legally.

APPENDIX D: EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT MEASURES

The following are common **direct measures** used to assess program learning outcomes:

- Published (Standardized) test (e.g., Major Field Test)
- Class Presentations
- Off-campus Presentations (for clients, agencies, etc.)
- Research Project Reports
- Case Studies
- Term Papers
- Portfolios
- Artistic Performances, Recitals, & Products
- Capstone Products
- Poster Presentations
- Comprehensive Exams
- Thesis, Dissertation
- Pass Rates on Certification or Licensure Exams
- Group Projects
- Oral Exams or Competency Interviews
- Simulations
- Embedded Questions in Exams

The following are common **indirect measures** used to assess program learning outcomes:

- Student Survey
- Student Interview or Focus Groups
- Alumni Survey
- Employer Survey
- Faculty Survey
- Placement Rates
- Exit (end of program) Survey or Interviews
- Reflection Essays
- Diaries or Journals
- Data from Institutional Surveys (NSSE)
- Curriculum/Syllabus Analysis

APPENDIX E: EXAMPLES OF USE OF ASSESSMENTS RESULTS

The following are some examples of **"closing the loop"** actions involving the use of assessment results:

- Improving department assessment process/methods
- Curriculum improvement
- Improving instruction
- Examining curriculum content coverage
- Examining skill development in curriculum
- Introducing new pedagogies
- Stimulating faculty discussion on student learning
- Re-examining student learning outcomes
- Engaging students in their own learning

Appendix F. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) Rubric

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
PLOs	**The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, and disorganized.** **List does not align with relevant institution-wide learning outcomes (see below).** **The list may confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real- world problems).**	**The list includes reasonable outcomes but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole.** **Some institution-wide learning outcomes and/or core competencies are missing.** **Distinctions between expectations for undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear.**	**The list is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program.** **It includes relevant institution-wide outcomes and core competencies.** **Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.**	**The list is reasonable, measureable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations.** **All relevant institution-wide outcomes and core competencies are explicitly articulated.**

APPENDIX G: Assessment Evidence Rubric

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Collection and Use of Assessment Evidence	**No direct methods are used (only indirect methods described).** **The description of the assessment method is vague and/or insufficient; more information is needed to understand how it will measure student outcomes on the PLO(s).** **Program mainly uses course grades or pass-rates as an assessment method.**	**Capstone projects, theses, or classroom based assignments are used by faculty to assess outcomes, but faculty need to systematically examine and share results at the program level.** **At least one type of program-level assessment has been conducted (e.g., program-wide evaluation of capstone projects or indirect assessments such as student surveys, etc.), but faculty have not yet systematically examined, shared, and/or used results to improve the program.**	**Direct evidence for more than one learning outcome has been collected, analyzed, and discussed by faculty to improve the program.** **One assessment which examines multiple learning outcomes has been collected, analyzed, and discussed by faculty to improve the program.** **Follow-up studies have not been conducted.** **Methods may not assess achievement of outcomes at program exit.**	**Multiple types of program-level direct evidence are collected to examine student learning.** **Data is regularly used** to plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. Outcomes are assessed on a **regular cycle and/or follow-up studies** are utilized.

Appendix H. Assessment Process Rubric

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Assessment Process	**Program does not have a process in place to discuss learning outcomes or collect and review assessment evidence.**	**There is evidence that program faculty discusses learning outcomes and how to improve teaching, but program-level assessment evidence has not been collected or discussed.** **Department does not seem to have an active assessment committee.**	**Assessment committee or assessment coordinator interprets data and shares with department. Department faculty discuss results and determine improvement actions**	**Assessment committee regularly collects data and shares with department.** **Department faculty discuss results and there is evidence that improvement actions have been taken to close the loop.** **Results are shared with relevant stakeholders such as administrators, alumni, etc.** **They may collaborate with others, such as librarians or Student Affairs professionals, to improve results.**