

**CSU Channel Islands**  
**Academic Program Review:**  
**Overview and Template for External Reviewers**  
**Fall 2009**

**Prepared by the Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC)**

## **Introduction**

The California State University system, at the direction of the Board of Trustees, has mandated a periodic review of each campus' academic programs. This mandate is implemented at CSU Channel Islands through Senate Policy 3-35. Program review is intended to allow the program to assess progress made since its prior review, to set future directions, and to identify resource needs.

Program Review involves not only self-examination by way of self study, but also a critical internal and external review of the program with a view toward how well the current program, with its curricular content, faculty expertise, and available resources, is attaining its objectives.

Program review aims to maintain and strengthen the quality of the university's curriculum and its ability to meet the challenges of the future.

Most importantly program review should allow for the determination of whether students are accomplishing the program's learning objectives. Program review should lead to informed decisions about program, faculty and student needs, curricular planning, and resource allocation and management. Through the program review process, the university is better prepared to allocate scarce resources and to plan for change.

## **The Review Process**

Each program conducting a review prepares a self-study, which should be the result of a collegial process. The self-study is reviewed by the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Planning, who distributes it to the Provost and Dean of Faculty.

Upon approval by the Provost and Dean, the AVP for Academic Programs works with the program, the Provost and Dean to identify potential external reviewers. Normally, one reviewer is invited from another CSU and one from a non-CSU campus.

The purpose of the external review is to assist the faculty to improve the quality of their program by providing a comparative and broader perspective on the program, and its plans for the next five years. To accomplish this purpose, the external reviewers jointly visit the campus for two days to meet with faculty, students, and administrators. The reviewers' schedule is arranged in advance by the program under review. The reviewers meet with the Provost, the Dean of Faculty, the program chair, program faculty, and students. The reviewers may request that the program provide additional documents or they may request to visit facilities, laboratories, the library, and other relevant campus sites and constituencies.

The Provost and the AVP for the Academic Programs and Planning maintain a fund to pay consultants. This fund pays for transportation and lodging, and also a \$750 honorarium for each reviewer. The external reviewers are asked to make their own transportation and lodging arrangements and then receive reimbursement from the University. Details of the reimbursement process will be provided during the campus visit.

The external reviewers will provide an electronic report with comments and recommendations regarding the program.

The external reviewers' report is read by the Provost, Dean of Faculty, the department chair, and Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC). PARC will take the external reviewers' comments into account when preparing their final report. PARC's final report will serve as a basis for a planning MOU that sets out the goals and expectations for the academic unit for the next five years, and identifies resources to accomplish those goals.

## External Reviewer Responsibilities

The external reviewer's primary responsibility is to provide an honest, unbiased professional judgment of program quality and student learning outcomes. The external reviewer has the following responsibilities:

1. Review the program's self-study document, including assessment results, and Data Pack information from Institutional Research.
2. Conduct selected interviews with the program chair and faculty, staff, students, the Provost and Dean, advisory groups, or other community members as appropriate to the program.
3. Conducts an exit meeting with the Provost, Dean of Faculty, program chair, and AVP.
4. Using the Program Review Template attached and working collaboratively with the second external reviewer, provide an electronic report of findings of strengths and areas of improvement. These strengths and areas of improvement relate to the student learning, assessment of student learning, curriculum, instruction, advising, faculty scholarship, diversity, quality of support from the library and academic technology, and other issues specific to the program. This review is to be forward-looking and yet realistic in terms of action that can be accomplished by the program within existing resources, as well as the actions that may require additional investment in the program. The External Review Report becomes part of the academic review process and is submitted with subsequent levels of review.

## Timeline

The site visit is conducted over a two day period, resulting in a written electronic document submitted to the AVP of Academic Programs within four weeks of the visit.

**Program Review Template for External Reviewers Site Visit and Report**

External reviewers are asked to use the template and rubric below to assist them in organizing their site visit and as the framework for their final report. The completed rubric scoring should be the collaborative result of discussion between the two reviewers and reflect their collective judgment. The template parallels the organization of the program’s self-study. Reviewers will find important statistical information in the Data Packs, which, with the self-study, will be made available to reviewers before the site visit.

In responding to each of the **Four Elements of Review** below, external reviewers should consider and assess the *Criteria for Review* within the Elements. For each *Criterion of Review*, reviewers are invited to a) score the rubric from 1 to 4, and b) to provide comments and one or more recommendations. Comments can include reference to information or conversations, observations about campus practices, and statements about program strengths, weaknesses, and areas of improvement. Recommendations should be specific suggestions for improvement, irrespective of whether that improvement should be initiated at the program, division, or university level. *Reviewers need not provide a recommendation after each Criterion.*

Finally, at the end of the **Template for External Review**, reviewers will find space to make summary comments and recommendations, expressing their general observations and key suggestions for program improvement. These summary recommendations will be particularly important as they will receive direct attention by program faculty, administrators, and members of the Program Assessment and Review Committee in the next stages of the program review process.

Program Name: B. S. Business	Date of Site Visit: November 16-17
External Reviewer One Name: Mary Wolfenbarger Celsi	Affiliation: California State University, Long Beach, College of Business Administration
External Reviewer Two Name: Myron Sheu	Affiliation: CSU Dominguez Hills, College of BA&PP

Rubric Scoring Scale		
SCORE	STAGE	DESCRIPTION
1	Initial	The program is at a preliminary stage in this practice. The program shows the need for additional policies, resources, or practices in order for it to provide the education program to which it is committed or aspires. Insufficient data is available to make determinations.
2	Emerging	The program partially satisfies the criterion. Some data is available documenting this dimension. The program has many, but not all, of the policies, practices, and resources it needs to provide the educational program to which it is committed or aspires.
3	Developed	The program satisfies this criterion, with developed policies and practices. The program has the availability of sufficient resources to accomplish its program goals on this dimension. Data demonstrates accomplishment of this criterion.
4	Highly Developed	The program fully satisfies this criterion. The program may serve as a model and reference for others on campus. The program's practices, policies, and/or its resources contribute to program excellence on this dimension.

## Template for External Review

*Instructions: External Reviewer should enter a numerical score in the Score box. Narrative responses should be made in the "Comments and Recommendations" sections below each criterion for review. Please enter responses in paragraph format. Text boxes will expand as information is entered.*

I. Element One: Program Purpose and University Goals		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	SCORE
A. Program Mission and Operating Practices	Does the program have a mission statement or statement of program goals that is appropriate? Does the program have an organizational structure and procedures for its key activities such as advising, scheduling, chair selection and review?	2
<p>Comments: The mission statement is appropriate. However, the college might consider moving the key idea of interdisciplinarity into the mission statement because this aspect of the college is central and distinctive. The mission statement (without the touchstones) would describe many colleges of business. The school of business has other distinctive qualities that they might want to consider moving into the main part of the mission statement.</p> <p>From an AACSB perspective, there are several issues that CSUCI needs to consider. AACSB standards require that schools specify the students that are served by their program in some way. That specification has to go in the mission statement or in supporting documentation. Schools must also specify the type or types of research they value – basic, applied and/or pedagogical. Again, that information can go in the mission statement or in supporting documentation.</p> <p>AACSB may look for connections in learning goals to the mission statement. For example, the word "innovative" appears in the touchstones in the mission statement. Reviewers may ask why "innovativeness" doesn't appear in the learning goals and assessment program.</p> <p>AACSB will also look for a strategic planning process. For example, how often is the strategic plan reviewed? Who reviews the process (multiple</p>		

<p>stakeholders must be consulted). How is the plan approved and how is its success evaluated? This process should be written down and codified by a faculty committee or the faculty as a whole.</p> <p>The program has a lean structure and clear procedures for most key activities. Since it is quite young, it doesn't have department chairs so chair selection doesn't apply.</p> <p>Recommendations: Its structure may need to be expanded to encourage deep faculty involvement in all key activities. As it grows, concentration coordinators, department chairs, and course coordinators may be appropriate roles for faculty to get further involved.</p>		
B. Program Relation to University Mission	Is the program supportive of the University's mission and strategic goals? Is its program integrated and supportive of the campus's four mission centers, its general education program, and Academic Affairs and University's strategic priorities?	3
<p>Comments: This relatively young program fits well with the interdisciplinary and experiential learning approaches as emphasized in the University's mission. Multicultural and global perspectives appear to be well-integrated into courses. Especially important is that students appreciate and value the multidisciplinary approach of the program and the university.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>		
C. Dissemination of Program Mission and Goals	Has the program disseminated information about itself to key constituencies, including faculty, professional colleagues, current and prospective students, and the community?	3
<p>Comments: The program communicates with the outside community and does seem to do an excellent job communicating internally. The students we interviewed heard about the program before applying and also often had positive word of mouth from other students.</p> <p>Recommendations: Establish monthly or quarterly college newsletters if financially feasible. The school of business could also use an annual report as a way to communicate with local businesses, potential donors and maybe even select alumni.</p>		

## II. Element Two: Achieving Educational Outcomes

CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	SCORE
A. Curriculum Requirements and Expectations for Learning	Do the program's curriculum and degree requirements reflect high expectations of students? Is that curriculum reflective of current standards in the discipline?	3
<p>Comments: The interdisciplinary program is challenging and requires both that students integrate knowledge across various areas and that they apply what they learn to industries and to business programs. The curriculum is distinctive, but it also meets current standards. Small classes and projects in most courses really help students use what they are learning.</p> <p>Recommendations: The school may need to develop a template to develop criteria for selecting effective multidisciplinary courses. Experimentation can be positive, but at some point the faculty should codify the attributes that made their experiments work and seek to avoid those that made them fail. Those criteria can guide future development of interdisciplinary courses.</p>		
B. Course and Program Learning Outcomes	Has the program developed assessable learning outcomes for its courses and for the program? Are course learning outcomes aligned with program outcomes?	2
<p>Comments: The school has developed an initial list of learning goals, and may add two learning goals that are relevant to their curriculum. The present learning goals as well as the new ones being discussed are assessable. The school does need to ensure that the learning goals fit with</p>		

the mission statement/strategic plan.		
<p>Recommendations: Many steps need to be taken in order to turn the learning goals into an assessment program. First, a curriculum map should be developed. A curriculum map lists required courses across and learning goals down. An "X" is placed wherever a learning goal appears. An advanced form of a curriculum map will show whether or not the learning goal is "introduced, developed, or mastered (I, D or M)" in a particular course. Right away, the faculty can see to what degree the curriculum actually addresses learning goals.</p> <p>Then faculty need to find places where they can use existing (or even new) projects or exams that can be assessed using rubrics that faculty feel are meaningful for the learning goal or goals being assessed. A schedule needs to be established showing how often and in what courses learning goals will be measured. A 3-5 year schedule is desirable.</p> <p>For each learning goal, benchmarks must be established – the benchmarks are the level of performance students must achieve to "meet expectations." Faculty can also choose what percentage of students they feel should meet those benchmarks. When students do not meet benchmarks, faculty must collectively determine how to close the identified gap. A new learning module may be added to a course. A significant assignment or assignments may be added in one or multiple courses. The curriculum may be changed. Once the change has been implemented, faculty want to show that the gap has been closed by performing the assessment again.</p> <p>The business school also needs a process so that learning goals can be regularly reviewed and updated as needed.</p>		
C. Learning Outcome Data and Analysis	Does the program regularly collect course and program learning data? Is that data analyzed, available, and used for program improvement?	1
Comments: The school has started collecting individual assessments from individual faculty.		
Recommendations: The assessment needs to move from individual faculty and courses to the program level. An assessment schedule and process needs to be adopted and implemented.		
D. Timeliness of Degree Attainment	Do students in the program attain the degree in a timely fashion?	2
Comments: It is amazing that a quite comprehensive business program has been delivered and developed by such a small faculty. You are commended. Faculty advisors like Dr. Rivera play a significant role in helping students succeed in their education at CSUCI.		
Recommendations: Students who would like to have a concentration (e.g. finance) have difficulty getting the courses they need in a timely fashion because the program is small. As the program grows, this problem may be ameliorated.		
E. Involvement of Students in Curricular Activities	Are students active participants in the learning process? Does the program provide opportunities for students to participate in curricular-related activities, such as clubs, fieldtrips, competitions, research and creative opportunities, service learning experiences, performances, and internships?	2
<p>Comments: We would have liked to meet with more students. It is difficult for us to determine how representative the students we met are of students in the program. It is clear that most students work and go to school, which can make it difficult to participate in school activities.</p> <p>Generally, students appear to be active participants in the learning process. They talked about choosing CSUCI so that they could ask questions and participate in the classroom. Their ability to engage with instructors at CSUCI was often mentioned as a reason for choosing the university. They often said that they were receiving a private education at the cost of a public education.</p>		
Recommendations: In the next review, reviewers should meet with students in the capstone course.		
F. Advising and Academic Support	Does the program provide adequate student advising? Are its students supported in other venues such as EOP, career services, and disability accommodation?	2
Comments: Students have to plan to meet with advisors long in advance because the delay is 3-4 weeks. Some students said they did not always get the correct information from university advisers. However, they appeared somewhat satisfied with the advising they received.		

Recommendations: State funding makes it difficult to hire more advisors. However, if funding pressure eases, the school may eventually hire one dedicated advisor.		
G. Articulation, Transfer and Retention	Does the program have policies and procedures that facilitate articulation with community colleges? Are transfer students accommodated and integrated into the program? Are native and transfer students in the program being retained in the major and by the University?	n/a
Comments: The review team was not provided with information to facilitate reviewing articulation, transfer and retention.		
Recommendations: The Common Management System (PSFT) should be configured and enhanced to facilitate articulation if not yet done so.		

<b>III. Element Three: Developing Resources to Ensure Sustainability</b>		
<b>CRITERION FOR REVIEW</b>	<b>INQUIRY</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
A. Faculty Resources	Does the program have faculty in sufficient number, and with appropriate rank, qualification, and diversity, to support its academic program in a manner consistent with its objectives?	1
<p>Comments: We commend the Director of the Smith School for his efforts to increase the ratio of full-time faculty and the progress in increasing faculty sufficiency has been made. In particular, three tenure-track faculty members were recruited in fall 2008. However, the current faculty sufficiency is still by far below the standards set by AACSB International. The standard requires that 75% of student credit hours (or equivalent measure) are taught by participating faculty. (Participating faculty is usually defined as full-time faculty together with any part-time faculty that are active in activities outside the classroom on a continuing basis.) Even five more faculty (as currently projected in the strategic plan) will likely not enable the Smith School to reach the appropriate ratio. That number may be closer to 8 or more full time tenured/tenure track faculty, unless the college decides to teach large sections.</p> <p>For AACSB accreditation, at least 50% of FTE faculty must be taught by academically qualified faculty (and a higher percentage in the MBA program). Full-time faculty are counted in the numbers at 100% regardless of the number of courses they teach, while part-time faculty are counting in proportion to their teaching. Hiring 5-6 more tenured faculty may be enough for the school to meet the AQ% requirements as long as those faculty remain research active. However, the school may need to hire even more T/TT faculty to meet the "participating" standard ratios.</p> <p>In order to achieve AACSB accreditation, the faculty need to approve an policy that lays out "academic qualifications" and "professional qualifications." The faculty seem to believe that the "AACSB" standard is three peer-reviewed journals, but in fact, the standard does not list a number of required peer-reviewed journals. Many schools have a standard of two PRJ's and others give points for higher quality journals, which results in a sliding standard for the number of required PRJ's. AACSB tends to have some standards that are "unwritten," and the school will have to remain engaged with AACSB to ensure that their AQ policy is and remains acceptable.</p> <p>The college will have to develop a professional qualifications (PQ) standard as well. Generally, those guidelines normally list a master's degree along with several years of experience relevant to the specific course the individual is teaching. More years of experience may be required for higher level courses.</p> <p>Recommendations: Recruit more full-time faculty who are academically qualified. Develop a written academically qualified (AQ) and professionally qualified (PQ) policy.</p>		
B. Professional Staff	Does the program employ professional staff --support coordinator, technicians, lab assistants --sufficient to support the academic program?	2
Comments: We recommend two additional staff members for their supporting services to the entire college.		

Recommendations: Benchmarks should be collected to justify additional new staff members.		
C. Faculty Workload and Evaluation	Is faculty workload aligned with the program's goals for effective teaching, scholarship, and University and community service? Are part and full-time faculty evaluated regularly and according to University policies and practices?	2
<p>Comments: Faculty workload is relatively heavy. The Smith College does assure all T/TT faculty receive assigned time for research every year, which is helpful. Still, the workload is a bit high (as in other CSU's). The faculty appear to be deeply engaged in both teaching and service and they are able to publish some quality research. But there is some pressure to publish articles in lesser quality journals just to get them published. Some faculty would have aimed higher with a bit more time and resources. Nevertheless, faculty are realistic about resources and enthusiastic about contributing in all ways – teaching, service and research.</p> <p>No faculty complained about RTP or the evaluation process. They feel that they receive a great deal of teaching support from their peers – both formally and informally. That support comes from faculty both within and outside the business school. Faculty were well aware of three PRJ's in 5 years rule which they believed came from AACSB. CSUCI may want to consider counting higher-quality publications as counting more than lower-quality publications. Some faculty members appear to be interested in getting higher quality publications, and a policy focused only on numbers (as common as these policies may be at many colleges) may discourage those faculty.</p>		
Recommendations: Your AQ policy may take into account quality, not just number of publications.		
D. Faculty Development	Do faculty have and use professional development plans (PDPs)? Does the program support faculty development opportunities sufficient to improve teaching, learning and scholarship?	2
Comments: Faculty do use PDP's and they do seem to use opportunities to improve teaching.		
Recommendations: We suggest that you standardize faculty vitas for reporting to outside reviewers (AACSB or not). T/TT vitas should include education and 5-year publication history only. Part-time faculty should include education and all work experience relevant to the courses they are teaching. They should indicate specifically that they have engaged in work activities directly relevant to the course or courses they are teaching.		
E. Fiscal and Physical Resources	Does the program have the budgetary resources needed to support its educational program? Are its facilities, including offices, labs, practice and performance spaces, adequate to support the program?	3
Comments: The facilities, office, labs and classrooms seem to meet faculty needs.		
Recommendations: None.		
F. Developing External Resources	Does the program seek and receive extramural support, including grants, gifts, contracts, alumni funding?	2
Comments: Some, but it is understandable since the program is relatively new.		
Recommendations: Continue to solicit grants and gifts, as specified in the strategic plan.		
G. Information Technology	Does the program have access to information resources, technology, and expertise sufficient to deliver its academic offerings and advance the scholarship of its faculty?	3
Comments: The Center for Integrative Decision Making is a long overdue facility that should help the program deliver an up-to-date curriculum. Finance and Economics faculty do not currently have access to the relatively expensive research databases that they need.		
Recommendations: New finance and economics faculty currently have access to databases, but that may not be true in the long run. As finances improve, CSUCI may be able to join with other CSU's to get a price break on these expensive resources.		

H. Community Involvement and Liaison	If appropriate, does the program have an advisory board or other links to community members and professionals? Does the program maintain a relationship with its alumni?	
Comments: The Program has an impressive advisory board and most board members have extensive professional experiences and represent a broad range of private industries and public services . In the future, reviewers should be able to meet with more members of the BAC.		
Recommendations: None.		

<b>IV. Element Four: Creating a Learning Centered Organization</b>		
<b>CRITERION FOR REVIEW</b>	<b>INQUIRY</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
A. Program Planning	Does the program engage in planning activities which identify its academic priorities and examine the alignment of its core functions with those of the institution?	
Comments: The school does engage in program planning, but the activities need to be formalized and regularized.		
Recommendations: As part of the strategic planning process, the school needs to regularly identify new academic priorities and ensure alignment with the institution.		
B. Integration of Planning Resources	Does program planning successfully align its curricular, personnel, and budgetary resources? Are its planning goals informed by student learning outcome data? Is program planning integrated into the Academic Affairs budgeting process?	
Comments: The program is only at the very beginning of initiating and using student learning outcomes data.		
Recommendations: The program needs to continue the process of developing learning goals and measuring them. The program should align the goals a little more clearly with the mission of the business school and CSUCI.		
C. Professional accreditation	If the program holds or is seeking professional accreditation, are its practices and resources consistent with that objective?	
Comments: AACSB accreditation includes three processes: (1) strategic planning (2) assurance of learning and (3) faculty qualifications. We have addressed all three of these issues throughout this review.		
Recommendations: The program may want to consider entering the pre-accreditation process which usually takes about five years to reach the initial accreditation process.		

### Summary Recommendations:

Overall, we are impressed by the multidisciplinary approach and the teaching enthusiasm of professors, including the T/TT faculty and the PT faculty. Faculty employ numerous projects in their courses, and require that students become actively engaged with the material. Students often describe the environment at CSUCI as "welcoming," and feel that faculty care about them. Faculty actively think about their teaching and seek to improve their teaching continuously.

CSUCI, however, does need more full-time T/TT faculty and they need to recruit for specific disciplines, such as marketing. The growth and

development of CSUCI requires this problem to be solved. In addition, several processes need to be instituted for the Smith school to be ready for initial accreditation in AACSB.

Submitted by:

Myron Sheu, California State University, Dominguez Hills  
Mary Wolfinbarger, California State University, Long Beach

Signature: Myron Sheu

Date: 12-3-2009

Signature: M. Wolfinbarger

Date: 12-3-2009