



CSU Channel Islands
FINAL -August 18, 2010

Pilot Conversion Review Template for External Review Site Visit and Report

The external review of the CSU Channel Islands graduate programs will serve as a key document in the University’s request to the CSU Office of the Chancellor and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to convert the program from pilot to regular status.

The external reviewer is asked to use this template and rubric to assist in preparing for and organizing the site visit. **The completed template will constitute the reviewer’s final report.** The template parallels the organization of the program’s pilot conversion report, emphasizing the CPEC criteria for review contained in it.

The reviewer is invited to provide comments and 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. In this fashion, the review will serve the program’s goal of assessing program strengths and student learning. *The reviewer need not provide a recommendation after each item.*

Finally, at the end of the **Pilot Conversion Review Template** the reviewer will find space to provide a recommendation whether the program should be converted from pilot to regular program status and make summary comments.

CSU policy on pilot programs and their conversion are found at www.calstate.edu/app/documents/pilot_procedures.pdf and www.calstate.edu/app/documents/program_modification/pilot_conversion.pdf

External Reviewer Information:

Program Name: Master of Science in Computer Science	Date of Site Visit: Oct 22/2010
External Reviewer Name: Russell Abbott	Affiliation: Dept. of Computer Science, CSULA

RUBRIC ASSESSMENT SCALE

STAGE	DESCRIPTION
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.
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.
Developed	The program satisfies this criterion, with developed policies and practices. The program has the availability of sufficient resources available to accomplish its program goals on this dimension. Data demonstrates accomplishment of this criterion.
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.

Pilot Conversion Review Template

Instructions: Narrative responses should be made in the "Comments and Recommendations" sections below each criterion for review. Please enter responses in paragraph form. Text boxes will expand as information is entered. Recommendations are not required for every section. Reviewers may indicate an assessment state for each criterion using the rubric scale above.

I. Student Demand and Societal Need		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	Stage
A. Societal Need	Has the program established that there are sufficient employment opportunities for graduates? The program covers an area for which there is employment demand.	N/A
Comments: Yes.		
Recommendations:		
B. Student Demand	Does the program provide evidence of student interest in enrolling in the program? Yes, enrollment has been increasing steadily.	Developed
	Does the program provide a list of other CSU and/or neighboring campuses offering the program? Yes	N/A
Comments:		
Recommendations:		
C. Program Distinctiveness	Is the program distinctive from the graduate programs listed above and provide for the advancement of the field? It is geographically distinctive.	N/A
Comments:		
Recommendations:		

II. Program Purpose and University Mission		
CRITERION	INQUIRY	Stage

FOR REVIEW		
A. Program Mission and Operating Practices	Is the graduate program appropriate to and supportive of the institution and the division's mission? Yes. It has support from the institution's upper management.	Highly Developed
	Does the program have organizational structures and procedures for its key activities such as advising, scheduling, and program development? Yes. It has sufficient organizational structures although it could use additional resources.	Developed
Comments:		
Recommendations:		

III. Existing Programs in the Field		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	Stage
A. Program Distinctiveness	Is the program distinctive from the graduate programs listed above? Yes. It is geographically distinctive. In addition, it has a particularly strong collection of offerings in Artificial Intelligence—understood broadly to include agent-based modeling, biologically inspired computing and related areas. It also has strong ties to the departments of Mathematics and Physics.	N/A
Comments:		
Recommendations:		

IV. Achieving Educational Outcomes		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	Stage
A. Curriculum Requirements and Expectations for Learning	Does the program's curriculum and degree requirements reflect high expectations of students? Yes. It's curriculum provides advanced training in Computer Science.	Developed
	Is that curriculum reflective of current standards in the discipline? Yes. It is at a level comparable to other MS CS programs.	Developed
Comments:		
Recommendations:		
B. Maintenance and improvement of Quality	Does the program regularly collect course and program learning data? No. It has plans to do so.	Initial
	Is that data analyzed, available, and used for program improvement? No. It has plans to do so.	Initial
Comments:		
Recommendations:		

C. Timeliness of Degree Attainment	Do students in the program attain the degree in a timely fashion? Not yet enough history to determine. The program is making adjustments to ensure that students can be better tracked and that they will complete the degree in a timely fashion.	Emerging
Comments:		
Recommendations:		
D. Involvement of Students in Curricular Activities	Are students active participants in the learning process? Consider whether the program provides opportunities for students to participate in curricular-related activities, such as research, laboratory, and creative opportunities. The program provides many opportunities for students to work on independent projects.	Developed
	Does the program require an appropriate culminating experience for those completing the graduate program? Yes. The program requires an MS Thesis.	Highly Developed
Comments:		
Recommendations:		

V. Program Costs and Resources		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	Stage
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? The program would be well served if additional faculty were hired. This would add a breadth of expertise the program could use. Existing faculty are appropriate in rank, etc.	Emerging
Comments:		
Recommendations:		
B. Professional Staff	Does the program employ professional staff --support coordinator, technicians, lab assistants --sufficient to support the academic program? The program would be well served with additional support in this area.	Emerging
Comments:		
Recommendations:		
C. Fiscal and Physical Resources	Does the program have the budgetary resources needed to support its educational program? Yes.	Developed
	Are its facilities, including offices, labs, practice and performance spaces, adequate to support the program? Yes.	Developed,
D. Information Technology and Library	Does the program have access to information resources, technology, and expertise sufficient to deliver its academic offerings and advance the scholarship of its faculty? Yes.	Developed
Comments:		
Recommendations: As the program grows so should the lab space and other resources available to it.		
E.. Community Involvement and Liaison	If appropriate, does the program have an advisory board or other links to community members and professionals? Does the program use community professional input for program improvement. No. This is planned.	Initial

Comments:
Recommendations:

VI. Advancement of Knowledge and Program Planning		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	Stage
A. Scholarship	Does the program contribute to the growth and development of scholarship? Students do independent work on their theses. Given the pressures already placed on faculty this is a lot to ask, but it would be beneficial if faculty had time to engage in their own research that students could be recruited to support.	Emerging
Comments:		
Recommendations:		
B. Program Planning	Does the program engage in planning activities that identify its academic priorities and their alignment with the division and the University? Yes. The program has a good relationship with the University administration. The program benefits from the fact that CSUCI is a small campus, which facilitates direct contact among the relevant parties.	Highly developed.
Comments:		
Recommendations:		

VII. Recommendation Concerning Conversion from Pilot to Regular Program Status:

The program has an enthusiastic and hard working faculty; it has a sound curriculum; it has built a viable student base; and it has the support of the University administration. It should be converted to regular program status.

Submitted by:

Signature: _____  _____

Date: _____ 10/22/10 _____