

**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: Environmental Science and Resource Management, CSU Channel Islands	Date of Site Visit: December 2-3, 2009
External Reviewer One Name: Lynne Trulio, Professor and Chair	Affiliation: Department of Environmental Studies, SJSU
External Reviewer Two Name: Daniel Fernandez, Professor and Chair	Affiliation: Environmental Science, Policy and Management CSU, Monterey Bay

## Rubric Scoring Scale

SCORE	STAGE	DESCRIPTION
<b>1</b>	<b>Initial</b>	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.
<b>2</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	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.
<b>3</b>	<b>Developed</b>	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.
<b>4</b>	<b>Highly Developed</b>	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.*

**NOTE from the Reviewers: The comments given here briefly address the Inquiries. Complete analyses and recommendations for all the review criteria in this template can be found in the Program Review Report by Fernandez and Trulio (January 2010).**

<b>I. Element One: Program Purpose and University Goals</b>		
<b>CRITERION FOR REVIEW</b>	<b>INQUIRY</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
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?	3
Comments: The ESRM program has a clear organizational structure for achieving key aspects of its operation, especially advising, scheduling, administration and external input from an advisory committee. The program needs a mission statement that more clearly gives the vision and goals for the program, distinct from the University mission.		
Recommendations: Revise the mission statement to more clearly fit the vision and goals of the program.		
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?	4

Comments: This program is exemplary in its implementation of the University's interdisciplinary mission and inclusion of the four university goals. ESRM is by its nature a highly interdisciplinary program; students engage in national and international travel that provides excellent cultural learning opportunities; and the program engages the community on many levels including faculty research, student internships, agreements with federal and local agencies, links to community colleges, and input from the business community through the advisory board.		
Recommendations: The University administration could provide the program more support for those activities that are clearly supportive of the University's mission, such as assistance in strengthening ties between the program and the National Park Service.		
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
Comments: The program chair has done an excellent job disseminating information about the program to local community colleges, employers and agencies. By engaging faculty from around campus as program affiliates, faculty throughout CSUCI learn about the program. The ESRM website could be upgraded to be more informative. University Advancement could assist the program in disseminating information about the program outside the local region.		
Recommendations: Provide more information on the website. Using University-level resources, promote the ESRM program outside the region.		

<b>II. Element Two: Achieving Educational Outcomes</b>		
<b>CRITERION FOR REVIEW</b>	<b>INQUIRY</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
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?	4
Comments: The Program Review Report discusses the curriculum in detail. Overall, the structure and requirements of the degree are very high quality.		
Recommendations: Recommendations for new curricular directions are discussed in the program review report. Two specific directions for curricular growth are sustainable agriculture and coastal management.		
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
Comments: The program is in the early stages of developing program assessment, including learning outcomes and evaluation tools. There are learning outcomes for many courses, but not the program as a whole.		
Recommendations: Detailed recommendations are given in the Program Review Report. Specifically, we recommend the program work with Dr. Ed Nuhfer to develop program outcomes and a cycle for assessing those outcomes.		
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?	2
Comments: The program is in the early stages of collecting assessment data.		
Recommendations: Detailed recommendations are given in the Program Review Report. Specifically, we recommend the program work with Dr. Ed Nuhfer to develop program outcomes and a cycle for assessing those outcomes. Also, tracking alumni could provide relevant information.		
D. Timeliness of Degree Attainment	Do students in the program attain the degree in a timely fashion?	3
Comments: Students felt they finished their degree in a timely fashion. Five years was fairly typical based on students we met with, some of whom need to work so take longer to graduate. There was some confusion when the program reorganized its concentrations, but student felt their needs were accommodated. Student advising is excellent and a plus for getting students through the program. Students would like more		

of the ESRM courses to be offered more often. Students also noted scheduling conflicts between required classes.		
Recommendations: Continue excellent advising. Offer a wider range of ESRM courses more often, when possible and check schedule to minimize conflicts between ESRM classes whenever possible.		
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?	4
Comments: Students in the ESRM program engage in a range of highly active learning experiences. They all take field classes, they all do research for their senior project, many undertake internships and most travel with a class to do community service and research.		
Recommendations: Continue with this excellent curriculum of active learning.		
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?	4
Comments: Students receive excellent academic advising from the ESRM faculty. Faculty, especially the chair, link students with appropriate internships and jobs. Lecturers also help with this. For example, one lecturer put on a highly successful ESRM career day. We have no evidence of support by other campus venues.		
Recommendations: To the extent appropriate, be sure ESRM students are supported by other university structures.		
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?	4
Comments: ESRM has excellent articulation with the three local community colleges. The chair facilitates this by being a member of each of the community college boards, which is certainly above and beyond what is expected of a chair. Transfer students seem to be accommodated as well in the program as native students. Data from institutional research were not adequate for determining retention rates.		
Recommendations: University Institutional Research should be sure data are collected on retention of both transfer and native students.		

<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?	2
Comments: The current faculty -- 3 tenure/tenure track and 3 lectures -- are excellent instructors but their number is just barely adequate to give the students the range of core courses and the depth in particular fields that they need for this degree. Affiliated faculty provide other key courses for the students, but additional faculty especially in the fields of sustainable agriculture and coastal resources are needed, especially as the number of majors grows and with the advent of the Professional Science Masters (PSM) program. The University should plan to grow this program to 150 majors in about 5 years.		
Recommendations: The Program Review Report provides detailed analysis and recommendations. At this time, with the likelihood of adding new faculty being so low, faculty from other programs could potentially be enlisted to help ESRM develop its curricular offerings.		

B. Professional Staff	Does the program employ professional staff --support coordinator, technicians, lab assistants --sufficient to support the academic program?	2
Comments: The University provides some media support to faculty, but there are no technicians or lab assistants. ESRM has only a quarter-time staff person to support the faculty and students. This level of support is not adequate. In addition, the chair receives only 0.1 administrative time per semester and is on only a 9-month appointment. This is not adequate compensation for the level of work needed to run the program.		
Recommendations: Increase staff support to the program. Also, increase the level of administrative time for the chair to 0.2 per semester and to a 12-month appointment.		
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
Comments: Faculty are regularly reviewed according to University procedures. However, with respect to workload, the level of university service is too high for faculty to accomplish the other aspects of their position. See the Program Review Report for more on this.		
Recommendations: Reduce faculty service on committees, especially non-tenured faculty, to only one or two committees at most per semester.		
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?	?
Comments: Faculty clearly articulate their research and curriculum goals in CVs, but it is not clear they have professional development plans, nor is it clear these are needed. We had little time to assess development opportunities, but it seemed that more University programs that give professors a 0.2 off for scholarship or curricular development would be beneficial. The university also offers professional development opportunities for faculty. Typical campus-wide attendance at these events is 10-15 faculty, due to the heavy workload that faculty carry.		
Recommendations: Provide programs that give professors a 0.2 assigned time to write grants, advance scholarship, improve assessment, or develop new teaching methods or curriculum. This can also occur as extra paid periods during summer months.		
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 budget does seem adequate to support the program at the 70-80 major level, although staff support and administrative time for the chair should be increased, which will increase budget needs. Facilities are adequate and the University has been responsive in meeting ESRM space needs such as providing a new wet lab and an office for GIS students. As the major grows and the new PSM program comes on line, additional computer lab space will be needed for both courses and research projects (see below).		
Recommendations: Previously stated.		
F. Developing External Resources	Does the program seek and receive extramural support, including grants, gifts, contracts, alumni funding?	2
Comments: The ESRM faculty, especially the chair, are seeking external funding and resources. However, their work load is too high to spend much time on this aspect of resource development.		
Recommendations: We recommend University Advancement directly assist the ESRM chair in seeking external funding and also take the lead on private funding when the chair cannot.		
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 program has access to computer labs and software, such as ArcGIS, adequate to support faculty research and student learning.		
Recommendations: The program would benefit from a dedicated computer lab that would serve as a classroom and research resource when		

ESRM classes are not in the room.		
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?	4
Comments: The program has an engaged community advisory board and is a model with respect to their level of community input. Currently, the number of alumni is small and the faculty have good connections with them.		
Recommendations: As the program continues and grows, a formal system for tracking alumni will be beneficial.		

<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?	3
Comments: ESRM faculty have met to discuss the structure and focus of the program, a process which resulted in a restructuring of some of the program. Through the many University committees at CSUCI, ESRM faculty are directly engaged in University planning, which has a direct effect on program structure and activities.		
Recommendations: Plan to have a retreat once a year to discuss program direction and learning outcomes assessment.		
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: We have little information on the first question. In general, it seems there is reasonable alignment between curricular, personnel and budget resources. There is very little student learning outcome information at this time, so it cannot inform planning goals. We have no information on the third question.		
Recommendations:		
C. Professional accreditation	If the program holds or is seeking professional accreditation, are its practices and resources consistent with that objective?	N/A
Comments:		
Recommendations:		

Summary Recommendations: Please see the Program Review Report for detailed analysis and recommendations.

Submitted by:

Signature: 

Date: January 6, 2010