

**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: Computer Science	Date of Site Visit: Dec 10 & 11 <sup>th</sup> 2009
External Reviewer One Name: Richard J Botting	Affiliation: CSU San Bernardino
External Reviewer Two Name: Barry Pasternack	Affiliation: CSU Fullerton

## 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.*

<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?	<b>3</b>
Comments: Unclear as to student preparation for graduate study.		
Recommendations: More resources needed with regard to faculty coverage.		
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?	<b>3</b>
Comments: Unsure about degree of student engagement in service learning . Internships not required. Not clear how campus international perspective dovetails with CS curriculum.		
Recommendations:		

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?	4
Comments: Excellent web site! Could do more outreach activities.		
Recommendations: Funding needed for open houses, high school and community college visitations.		

<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?	3
Comments: Why is a "C-" required rather than "C"? Some reviewed syllabi are out of compliance with university regulations.		
Recommendations: Department should review syllabi. Students need hands on lab time in courses like "Operating Systems".		
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?	1
Comments: The assessment plan does not appear to be well developed. The "IT" program does not appear well integrated.		
Recommendations: Assistance should be provided to help the dept in developing an assessment plan that measures student outcomes across individual courses. Consider replacing math coverage in BS in IT with business coverage.		
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: No evidence provided.		
Recommendations: A true assessment plan should be developed.		
D. Timeliness of Degree Attainment	Do students in the program attain the degree in a timely fashion?	2
Comments: Lack of resources delays graduation of some students		
Recommendations: Develop a multiyear schedule, and consider course sharing. The dept needs additional faculty resources.		
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: Commendable.		
Recommendations:		
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?	3
Comments: Special Workstations in labs, courses serve students with special needs. The dept attempts to make other accommodations.		
Recommendations:		
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?	3
Comments: Transfer students indicated that they felt they were treated the same as native students and not disadvantaged. It did appear, however, that some lower division computer science course work was only taken once they arrived at CSUCI.		
Recommendations:		

<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
Comments: To be sustainable more faculty must be hired.		
Recommendations:		
B. Professional Staff	Does the program employ professional staff --support coordinator, technicians, lab assistants --sufficient to support the academic program?	1
Comments: There are excellent student assistants but this is not a sustainable solution.		
Recommendations: Hire a full time support technician.		
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: Full time faculty have excellent motivation and go out of their way to provide service to students, but this could lead to faculty not having time to stay current in the field.		
Recommendations:		

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: IT is unclear how the CSU's budget situation will impact this area.		
Recommendations: More resources needed in this area.		
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?	2
Comments: Inadequate lab space, classroom size limiting. Budget limits number of classes offered.		
Recommendations: More resources needed. Look into course sharing with other campuses.		
F. Developing External Resources	Does the program seek and receive extramural support, including grants, gifts, contracts, alumni funding?	2
Comments: No advisory board. Community support is ad hoc.		
Recommendations: Set up a formal advisory board for the department.		
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?	4
Comments:		
Recommendations:		
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?	1
Comments:		
Recommendations: Department should keep in touch with alumni by developing an Email list of alumni and inviting them to talks and special events. They should have an alumni newsletter.		

<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: Some planning is going on and there have been recent curriculum changes reflecting this.		
Recommendations:		

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?	2
Comments: No student outcome data and stringent budgetary and space limitations constrain the program.		
Recommendations:		
C. Professional accreditation	If the program holds or is seeking professional accreditation, are its practices and resources consistent with that objective?	1
Comments: The department needs time and resources to prepare for accreditation.		
Recommendations:		

Summary Recommendations:

- Develop a true assessment plan and use it for continuous improvement.
- Improve in lab space (e.g. networking), class room sizes, tutoring space, and faculty coverage.
- Integrate the IT degree better – consider replacing math courses with business classes.
- Increase lab time in the Operating System course.
- Develop a publicized multiyear schedule.
- Develop an external advisory board.
- Ensure syllabi are in conformance with university recommendations.
- Hire permanent staff for system administrator’s position.
- Look into course sharing via distance learning with other campuses to make it easier for students to graduate in a timely fashion.

Submitted by:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_