ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
CHARGE TO THE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Program Review Committee will carefully examine the self-study document and review it for accuracy, reliability and validity. The committee will focus its work to allow findings to be developed to address various review criteria. Commonly addressed review criteria include such things as program quality, need, demand, delivery, cost, etc. The committee assesses the extent to which a department is meeting its objectives, which activities affect its programs, what the program looks like from a variety of perspectives and the extent to which it is effective.

The Review Committee will select its chair.

REVIEWER ROLES

External Reviewer(s)

1. Provides the perspective of a senior faculty member in the discipline of the particular undergraduate/graduate program under review.

2. Makes his/her own travel arrangements. Furnishes Academic Planning with receipts necessary for expense reimbursement, as well as SSN and home address.

3. Contributes information to the Review Committee, the dean of the college/school, the dean of the Graduate School, and the provost that may be used to compare strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate/graduate programs (i.e., faculty, students, leadership, curricula, research, funding) to those of similar programs nationwide.

4. Writes a Program Review Committee report with the assistance of other members of the Review Committee. When there is more than one external reviewer, each one actively contributes to writing the report, although one member may act as lead author. Initial preparations for writing the report begin at the end of the visit.

Internal Reviewer(s)

1. Provides the perspective of senior faculty member at CSU familiar with the institution and the needs and expectations of undergraduate and graduate programs.
2. Serves as the host and facilitator during the external site visit; accompanies external reviewer to departmental and campus tours, dinners and luncheons as necessary and meetings with deans and associate deans, department chairs, faculty and students.

3. Attends designated meetings to answer the questions of the external reviewers, provide additional information as necessary and assist in the creation of the first draft while externals are onsite.

4. Receives drafts and revisions of the final report, corresponding as necessary on the completion of the final report.

5. Receives and reviews the final Review Committee report. Prepares a cover memo and the review rating sheet and submits to the Academic Program Coordinator for dissemination.

Review Committee

1. Produces a report assessing program strengths and weaknesses including recommendations for improvement based on a careful reading of the program’s Self-Study and on information gained during the on-site review.

WRITING AND FORMATTING OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

In order to submit a report that provides the greatest benefit to the program under review, the Final Report should be concise and to the point, usually 5 – 7 pages in length excluding the signed cover sheet and executive summary.

The report typically consists of three to four sections:

- Program Review Report Cover Memo
- Program Review Committee Report

1. **Program Overview.** This section may include history, background, and administration of the program, providing some context for it. Material for this section comes from the unit program’s self-study and other products.

2. **Program Strengths.** The strengths related to faculty, teaching, research/creative activity, leadership, students, curriculum, etc. may be presented in bullet or paragraph format.

3. **Areas for Improvement.** Generally, these areas for improvement are given in bullet format describing weaknesses and providing indicators of each weakness from the data the reviewers gathered during the review.

4. **Recommendations for Improvement.** These recommendations may be presented as a list in a separate section or included after appropriate areas for improvement (in
Recommendations are the most important part of the review report because they become the basis for a plan of action for the program. Therefore, recommendations should be clear and concrete in their depictions of what faculty in the program (or the college or the university) should do to improve the program. It is helpful to organize the Areas for Improvement and Recommendations into categories, such as Faculty, Students, Curriculum and Instruction, Research, and Facilities.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT WRITING PROCESS

The external reviewer will act as lead author of the Program Review Committee Report. When more than one external participates in a review, the committee will decide which one should act as lead, although all will participate actively in writing the report. The itinerary for the onsite review will provide time for the Review Committee to begin organizing the report before the external reviewer(s) depart.

The following provides a possible scenario for writing the Review Committee Report:

1. Together the committee members discuss areas for improvement and one of the members makes a preliminary list of them.

2. Together the committee members discuss recommendations for each of the areas of improvement on the preliminary list. One member makes a preliminary list of the recommendations for the graduate programs (if applicable), and another makes a list for undergraduate programs.

   Together the committee members arrange the areas for improvement and associated recommendations into appropriate categories, such as Faculty, Students, Curriculum and Instruction (includes student products), Research/Creative Activity, Service/Community Engagement, Resources, Leadership and Diversity, and University Support.

   Review Committees with more than one external reviewer may choose to divide the categories among members; each member drafts descriptions of the areas for improvement and associated recommendations for his/her assigned categories.

3. Together the committee members discuss other areas of improvement and recommendations that should be added to the list.

4. Together the committee members discuss strengths of the programs and one of the members makes a preliminary list. Together, the committee members compose the list of strengths in bullet form arranged in categories as appropriate.

5. A similar process is followed for other sections of the report.
6. After the onsite review, the lead author assembles a first draft of the report. If the sections have been divided among multiple externals, each one sends his/her portion to the lead author for incorporation in the first draft. The lead author compiles the report and sends it to other review members. He/she adds the opening Overview of the Program and revises the report for clarity, concision, and grammatical correctness. He/she sends the subsequent drafts to the other committee members.

7. The other committee members add their revisions and send them to the lead author to incorporate those changes in the draft.

8. The process of revising and circulating drafts continues until all committee members accept a final draft.

9. The lead author of the Program Review Committee will send an electronic copy and a hard copy of the final draft of the report to the Academic Program Review Coordinator, who will distribute the report to unit faculty and administrators.
APPENDIX A

Rating Sheet for Program Review Committee

EVALUATION OF______________________________________________________
(name of department, program, institute, etc.)

PROGRAM TYPE(S): check all that apply

___ Bachelor’s degree
Please specify: ___BA, ___BS, ______

___ Graduate degree
Please specify: ___Certificate ___MA, ___MS, and/or ___PhD

___ Other
Please specify:______________________

DATE_____________________________________

SECTION I.
Please rate each element I – VII below by placing an ‘X’ in the appropriate box. Indicate N/A where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review Elements</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectation Department Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectation Broader Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectation Department Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectation Broader Expectations</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectation Department Expectations</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectation Broader Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Purposes, Goals, and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Curriculum and Program Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Resource Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Support (facilities, travel, staff, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Analysis of Statistical Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Department Expectations are listed in the “Purposes, Goals and Objectives” section of the self-study.

2Broader Expectations are expectations based on the College/University mission, CSU’s location, demographics or other characteristics, and emerging opportunities in the field/discipline being reviewed.

SECTION II.
Comments: (Please attach additional paper as needed).