

Policy for Integrated Reporting Procedures

I. Introduction

The College of St. Benedict and St. John's University (CSB|SJU) are committed to supporting high quality academic departments and programs that will provide our students with an excellent liberal arts education. As we seek wider national recognition for the education we offer at CSB|SJU, our institutions, departments, and programs must invest in ongoing self-evaluation with the goal of improving and reinvigorating both the focused learning offered by our departments and programs as well as our overall education in the liberal arts.

To this end, the Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC), in coordination with the Provost, Associate Provost, Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement, Director of the Common Curriculum, and the Faculty Governance Committee, has drafted this *Policy for Integrated Reporting Procedures* (PIRP) to provide structure for the processes involved in documenting, sustaining, and improving academic excellence at CSB|SJU. We believe that this PIRP will improve upon past attempts to engage Academic Affairs administration, faculty, and students in a mutual, collaborative, and collegial enterprise that enhances educational quality. For clarity, departments and programs at CSB|SJU will be referred to collectively in this policy document with the designation *department [program]*.

There are three basic long-term goals served by systematically collecting, analyzing, and reporting descriptions of scholarly and creative activities and evidence of student learning in departments [programs]:

1. Departments [programs] will be able to evaluate the effectiveness of their educational activities and formulate strategies for improvement based upon the analysis and interpretation of appropriate information.
2. Our institutions will gain better guidance both for allocating current resources and for targeting advancement efforts to seek new resources.
3. Those engaged in advancement of the academic enterprise at CSB|SJU will have better information available to publicize our achievements to a broader national or international audience.

Departments [programs] are currently expected to provide reports to a variety of institutional audiences:

- An annual report submitted to the Academic Dean's office;
- An annual report describing assessment of student learning in the department [program]'s curriculum, directed to the Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee (APSAC);
- An annual report describing assessment of student learning in Common Curriculum courses offered by the department [program], first sent from the department [program] to the Head of its Division, and then from the Division Heads to the Director of Common Curriculum. *Note: There are no longer any Division Heads, and external consultants are*

currently helping CSB/SJU revise its procedures for assessing the Common Curriculum. Anticipate modifications in this area in the future.

- A Self-Study Report compiled as part of the department [program]'s periodic Program Review.

To date the mutual interdependence of these information streams has not been sufficiently specified. This Policy for Integrated Reporting Procedures attempts to correct this institutional weakness by providing clear and detailed descriptions of the following:

- The information to be included in *Integrated Annual Reports*, to be provided by departments [programs] on June 30 at the end of every academic year. The Integrated Annual Report should place particular emphasis upon the department [program]'s yearly academic assessment activities, as well as on progress made that year toward achieving goals set as part of the department [program]'s last Program Review.
- Institutional expectations and procedures for periodic *Program Review*, with particular emphasis upon the place of the department [program]'s academic assessment activities in carrying out Program Review, and the role of the Integrated Annual Report in tracking programmatic initiatives undertaken as a result of Program Review.

II. Integrated Annual Report

Overview

The Integrated Annual Report (IAR) is meant to ensure the coordination of currently disparate processes of review and reporting.

- A. The IAR is to be a vehicle by which APSAC and Academic Officers are kept apprised of a department [program]'s progress toward meeting goals for improvement established as a result of its most recent Program Review;
- B. The IAR is to be a vehicle by which departments [programs] keep APSAC and Academic Officers apprised of their ongoing program for the assessment of student learning;
- C. The reporting requirements of the IAR are intended to foster integration of these two procedures of review and reporting. Departments [programs] will be expected to report how curriculum, pedagogy, and learning goals have been shaped and revised in light of both assessment results as well as goals established through Program Review;
- D. The IAR is to be a vehicle by which Academic Officers are kept apprised of whether resources available to departments [programs] are sufficient to enable them to carry out the goals for improvement established through the process of Program Review;
- E. It is anticipated that the IAR will in time eliminate some of the redundancy in program reporting requirements that currently burdens department [program] chairs;
- F. Finally, by coordinating reporting on Program Review goals, assessment results and resource requirements, IAR could prove to be a tool useful to departments [programs] in their efforts to justify requests for resources.

The IAR is to cover the department [program]'s activities during the preceding academic year (July 1 – June 30) and is due to be delivered to the Academic Dean's office and Chair of

APSAC on the final business day of that academic year (June 30). Externally accredited departments [programs] that are required to provide annual updates to their accreditation boards may substitute the documentation required for such updates in lieu of the IAR described below.

Contents of the Integrated Annual Report

- A. A description of progress that the department [program] has made in:
 - 1. Sustaining or building on strengths and achievements identified as a result of the self-study and external evaluation carried out during its most recent Program Review;
 - 2. Addressing challenges, weaknesses or shortcomings identified during its most recent Program Review.
- B. If a department [program] has undergone Program Review in the past 4 years, but has not been systematically and intentionally seeking either to build on strengths and achievements or to address challenges, weaknesses or shortcomings identified by the self-study or the external evaluators, then the department [program] chair should:
 - 1. Locate and review the self-study and evaluators' reports;
 - 2. Identify the principle strengths and weaknesses revealed through this Program Review process;
 - 3. Meet with members of the department [program] as appropriate to decide on a course of action intended to build on the department [program]'s strengths and remedy its weaknesses in preparation for the next Program Review;
 - 4. Describe in the IAR the goals the department [program], has set, how the department [program] plans to achieve them, and what the Academic Affairs administration can do to be of assistance in this endeavor.
 - 5. Consult with the Academic Dean as well as the Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement as needed for guidance in developing these goals
- C. The IAR should include a focused description of the department [program]'s assessment activities over the past year. This description should include:
 - 1. The specific learning goals and objectives in the department [program]'s curriculum that were assessed;
 - a. A department [program] need not address *all* of its learning goals or objectives each year;
 - b. A fully developed department [program] assessment plan will address all of its learning goals and objectives over a period of 3 to 4 years; members of APSAC recognize, however, that during the formative period of a department [program]'s assessment practice it may not be possible to meet this goal.
 - 2. The assessment methods and tools used to evaluate whether and to what extent these learning goals have been met;
 - a. Departments [programs] should strive to use multiple measures to document and assess student learning;

- b. “Multiple measures” is defined to include both direct and indirect measures of student learning as well as both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis;
 - i. “Direct measures” require students to demonstrate that they have acquired certain competences through examinations, essays, performances, or other kinds of projects. Such measures depend on explicit criteria by which such performances are evaluated.
 - ii. “Indirect measures” ask students to reflect on their learning experience and report on it, rather than demonstrate that they have acquired specific competences, and usually consist of surveys and interviews.
 - iii. “Quantitative methods” are distinguished by the use of numeric measurement, experimental design, and statistical analysis. Emphasis is typically placed on a relatively small number of predetermined response categories designed to capture specific competences or experiences. Examples would include surveys, questions embedded in course examinations, or rubrics used to evaluate written work. (Note that quantitative methods can be used with both direct and indirect measures of student learning.)
 - iv. “Qualitative methods” focus on specific statements, descriptions, and written excerpts taken from open-ended interviews, observations of action and conversation, and close analysis of written documents or transcripts. (Note that qualitative methods can also be used with both direct and indirect measures of student learning.)
 - c. While both direct and indirect measures of student learning are acceptable, direct measures are to be preferred; an assessment plan lacking direct measures of student learning would be judged inadequate;
 - d. Both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis are acceptable. A department [program] may rely exclusively on just one method of analysis if in its judgment the other method is inappropriate for or inapplicable to the learning to be assessed. However, regardless of the method used, it is vital that the evidence gathered clearly indicate whether or not there are areas (curriculum, pedagogy, advising, etc.) in need of revision or improvement.
3. A summary analysis and interpretation of the department [program]’s assessment results;
 4. A review of any changes in curriculum, pedagogy, or student learning goals planned on the basis of these results;
 5. A brief review of the department [program]’s ongoing assessment program to provide context for that year’s assessment activities. This review of the ongoing program should indicate:
 - a. The variety of measures currently in use;
 - b. The assessment activities carried out the previous year and planned for the next year; and
 - c. The relation, if any, between the department [program]’s assessment activities and the strengths and weaknesses identified as a result of its most recent Program Review.
 6. A description of any curricular or pedagogical changes undertaken during the past year, accompanied with a rationale for the changes. It will be particularly significant to note whether these changes were undertaken because of either the most recent

Program Review or the evidence obtained through the department [program]'s assessment activities.

- D. A description of the staffing (including student workers) and resource status of the department [program]. This description should include:
1. A comparison of staffing and resource needs of the current fiscal year with the budgetary allocations for the current year. Shortfalls and surpluses should be clearly identified.
 2. A comparison of staffing and resource needs anticipated in the upcoming fiscal year with the anticipated budgetary allocations for the upcoming year. Shortfalls and surpluses should be clearly identified.
 3. Enrollment data for the current academic year (to provide further context for resource and staffing requirements).
 4. A summary of discussion items and decisions made during meeting(s) between the department [program] chair and the Director of the Academic Budget arranged to evaluate the concordance between resource demands and budgetary supply. At least one of these meetings should be scheduled each fiscal year.

The following information (items E – G) has traditionally been included as part of the annual program report to the Academic Dean's office. This policy hereby stipulates that a department [program] *may choose* to include any of these kinds of information *if* they are relevant for a specific issue or purpose discussed in the report, but that ordinarily these kinds of information are *not* required for the Integrated Annual Report.

- E. A description of scholarly or creative activities (including grant applications and successes) of the department [program]'s faculty members over the past year;
- F. A description of scholarly or creative activities of the department [program]'s majors over the past year;
- G. A description of service or outreach activities undertaken by the department [program] or its faculty members;

A note on Assessment of the Common Curriculum:

At present, the IAR does not include results from the assessment of student learning in Common Curriculum courses offered by each department [program]. These results are still to be sent, first, from the department [program] to the Head of its Division, and then from the Division Heads to the Director of Common Curriculum. Members of APSAC as well as the Director of Common Curriculum believe it is desirable to find a way to integrate reporting results from the assessment of student learning in Common Curriculum courses with some future version of the IAR. However, in the interest of providing guidance to department [program] chairs concerning Program Review procedures sooner rather than later, this next step in the revision of academic reporting procedures will be postponed for the moment. *Please see comments from pages 1 & 2 related to the Common Curriculum.*

III. Program Review

Overview

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University are committed to supporting quality academic departments [programs] that provide students with an excellent Catholic, Benedictine, residential liberal arts education. Program Review is a formal activity designed to assure faculty, staff, students, parents, alumni, employers, external accrediting agencies and all other stakeholders of the quality of existing academic programs, to ensure ongoing quality improvement, and to provide opportunities for academic renewal in individual academic department [programs]. Periodic review of all academic departments [programs] is intended to:

- A. Provide departments [programs] with an opportunity to review the current state of their curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practices, to reflect on steps that may be appropriate to ensure ongoing quality, and to identify opportunities for departmental [program] improvements;
- B. Provide transparent and scholarly assurance to our stakeholders that CSB|SJU are supporting quality academic departments [programs];
- C. Identify departmental, program, and institutional needs and priorities;
- D. Enable the effective allocation and alignment of departmental, divisional, and institutional resources;
- E. Provide information useful for departments' [programs'] curricular planning and professional development;
- F. Allow CSB|SJU's Mission, Vision, and Values statements to serve as a framework for the evaluation of individual academic departments [programs].

Program Review must answer the following fundamental questions:

1. What are the current strengths and weaknesses of the department [program]'s curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practices?
2. What evidence has been used to identify these strengths and weaknesses?
3. What steps can the department [program] take to sustain and build upon its current levels of success?
4. What opportunities for improvement can the department [program] identify?
5. How can the institutions better support the department [program]'s efforts to fulfill its mission?

Program review should be understood as a formative endeavor. It should not merely be an exercise in information gathering and reporting, but should rather be undertaken in a spirit of authentic self-examination and professional discernment.

Reviews of departments [programs] will be required every seven years or as outside accreditation demands. Reviews may be undertaken in intervals fewer than seven years at the request of the department [program] or upon the request of Academic Affairs administration to enhance scheduled reviews of related academic departments [programs]. Departments [programs] may request a review earlier than required. Responsibility for administering Program Review will lie with the Provost and Vice Provost.

Departments [programs] wishing to reschedule their review must present a formal request, including a rationale for the request, to the Chair of the Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee, who will in turn consult with the Director of Academic Budget and Planning. These representatives will consider the request and make appropriate recommendation to the Vice Provost. The final decision shall rest with the Provost.

Program Review Tasks

Program Review requires the department [program] undergoing review to undertake the following tasks:

1. Selection of a departmental Program Review Coordinator (see section A.1 below);
2. A formal self-study by the department [program]. The self-study is intended to be a reflective and scholarly analysis of the achievements and challenges facing the department [program] under review (see section A.2 below);
3. Selection of external reviewer(s) (see section A.3 below);
4. Campus visit by external reviewer(s) (see section A.4 below);
5. A formal response by the department [program] to the external reviewer report (see section A.5 below);
6. A formal response by the Vice Provost and the Provost to the department [program]'s Self-Study Report and the external reviewers' report (see section A.6 below);
7. Development of a final action plan in collaboration with the Vice Provost and the Provost (see section A.7 below). In this plan:
 - a. The department [program] will articulate specific measures, identified through the self-study process and the external reviewer report, to be undertaken in an effort to sustain its current levels of success; and to take advantage of opportunities for improvements in its curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practices.
 - b. The academic officers will stipulate specific measures that their offices can undertake to support any efforts for self-improvement a department [program] may undertake.
8. Development of a Final Review Portfolio to be submitted to the chair of APSAC and the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement (see section A.8 below).

Recommended timeline for the Program Review process

Except where external accrediting requirements differ, academic departments [programs] at the College of St. Benedict and St. John's University should undergo review every seven years.

1. At the beginning of fall semester of the academic year prior to the review year the chair of APSAC will remind the chair of the department [program], the Academic Dean, Vice Provost, and the Provost that the department [program] is due for self-study and external review in the following year.
2. Departments [programs] are responsible for designating a Program Review Coordinator (see selection criteria and duties in section A.1. below) at a time and in a manner that best satisfies their scheduling needs. Departments [programs] are advised to make such appointments no later than the beginning of Spring Semester prior to the review year.
3. During the academic year prior to the review year the department [program] should:

- a. Convene a meeting of all members of the department [program] for the purpose of identifying the principle tasks, impediments or challenges that face the department [program]'s aspirations for success or improvement. Members of the department [program] may decide to engage in these discussions during a one or two day retreat devoted to the program review process. Funds for such retreats may be available through application to APSAC (see item 3.f. below).
 - b. Identify external reviewers and determine any special information they might require;
 - c. Identify appropriate peer or aspirant departments [programs] and gather necessary information from them for the self-study:
 - 1) In recognition of the autonomy of academic departments [programs] and the disciplinary expertise of their faculty, the identification of peer and aspirant department [programs] will be the responsibility of the department [program] undergoing review;
 - 2) Final decisions concerning appropriate peer and aspirant departments [programs] are to be worked out in consultation with the Vice Provost.
 - d. Prepare and conduct surveys of current students, alumnae/i and any other external information-gathering necessary for an effective review. (The Provost, Vice Provost, and Academic Dean recognize that Academic Affairs administration has a responsibility to provide chairs of departments [programs] with guidance and support in the development and administration of such surveys as well as with the analysis and interpretation of survey results. Unfortunately, current staffing levels severely constrain the ability of Academic Affairs to provide this assistance. The Provost, Vice Provost, and Academic Dean understand that this current [as of September 2008] state of affairs cannot be allowed to persist and are searching for a long term and sustainable solution to this shortcoming.)
 - e. Gather internal information required for self-study (see section A.2 for a description of the information required for the self-study);
 - f. The department [program] chair and the Program Review Coordinator may wish to apply to APSAC for a department level Curriculum and Program Development Grant to fund a summer workshop devoted to preparations for Program Review. At the beginning of each Spring Semester the Chair of APSAC will send notice to chairs of departments [programs] undergoing program review of the application deadline. This notice will also contain application guidelines & evaluation criteria.
4. Departments [programs] are encouraged to submit a preliminary draft of their Self-Study Report in lieu of the regular Integrated Annual Report on June 30 prior to the review year.
 - a. This schedule would offer departments [programs] the following advantages:
 - (1) a separate annual report would be eliminated,
 - (2) the need for work during summer months on the Self-Study Report would be reduced or eliminated, and
 - (3) the Academic Dean, Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement and APSAC would have an opportunity to review the draft of the Self-Study Report and provide suggestions.

- b. In recognition that a wide variety of factors affect the schedule a department [program] can actually follow, departments [programs] should understand this draft deadline to be a recommendation, not a requirement.
5. The department [program] should plan to complete its Self-Study Report by the beginning of Thanksgiving recess of the review year. (See section A.2 for a description of this report.)
6. Upon completion, the Self-Study Report should be forwarded to the Academic Dean, Vice Provost, and the Provost, and the external reviewers. The Self-Study Report should in any case be in the hands of the external reviewers at least three weeks prior to their campus visit.
7. In January or February of the review year the external reviewers should visit CSB|SJU. (See sections A.3 through A.4 for the selection criteria and duties of the external reviewers.)
8. Four weeks following the site visit, the reviewers' reports should be received by the department [program], preferably no later than April 1 of the review year.
9. Between April 1 and June 30, both the department [program] and Academic Affairs will write and share their responses to the self-study/external review, work together to produce an action plan, and have the action plan signed by the appropriate individuals. (See sections A.5. through A.7. below.)
10. By June 30 of the review year the Final Review Portfolio should be completed. (See section A.8 for a description of this document.)
11. The results of the Program Review will be presented to the CSB Board of Trustees and the SJU Board of Regents during a joint board meeting taking place in the academic year following completion of the review.

Description of Program Review Tasks

A.1. Selection of the Program Review Coordinator

The Program Review Coordinator will coordinate the review process and take responsibility for timely filing of reports. The department [program] chair, in consultation with the appropriate division head, will designate a member of the department [program] to serve as the Program Review Coordinator. Except under extraordinary circumstances, this coordinator must be a tenured faculty member and not the department [program] chair.

The Program Review Coordinator, in consultation with the department [program] chair and faculty, is responsible for general oversight for the self-study process. These responsibilities include:

- a. Preparation and timely submission of the Self-Study Report.

The Program Review Coordinator *need not* be sole author of the department's [program's] Self-Study Report. Depending on what best serves the needs and preferences of members of the department [program] undergoing review, responsibilities for drafting different portions of the Self-Study Report may be delegated to different members of the department [program]. Alternatively, if producing a quality self-study document is best served by having the Program Review Coordinator serve as sole author, this course may also be followed. The procedure for drafting the department's

[program's] Self-Study Report is to be negotiated between the Program Review Coordinator and the other members of the department undergoing review.

- b. Ensuring that each external reviewer receives a copy of the following documents at least three weeks prior to the campus visit:
 - 1) The report submitted by external reviewer(s) for the preceding Program Review;
 - 2) The department [program]'s response to the self-study and the external reviewer report from the prior Program Review;
 - 3) The Provost's response to the self-study and the external reviewer report from the prior Program Review;
 - 4) The department [program]'s current Self-Study Report.
- c. Ensuring that the external reviewers are briefed on the principal tasks, impediments or challenges facing the department that have guided and informed the Self-Study Report;
- d. Providing the external reviewers with relevant data and reports (e.g., assessment, departmental, divisional, Institutional Planning and Research reports);
- e. Assisting external reviewers with transportation, accommodations, and meal options;
- f. Scheduling the initial briefing and the final debriefing meetings with the reviewer(s);
- g. Scheduling all meetings with faculty, staff, students, and others;
- h. Confirming a completion date of the external reviewers' final report no more than four weeks after the site visit, and preferably no later than April 1 of the review year.

A.2. The Self-Study Report

Overview

The Self-Study Report is meant to provide a comprehensive description and evaluation of the current capacity of a department [program] to effectively fulfill its institutional and disciplinary missions, as well as to identify genuine opportunities for improvement. This process of self-study should be undertaken in a spirit of authentic self-examination and professional discernment.

An effective Self-Study Report will identify not only the current status and achievements of the department [program] under review, but also any obstacles impeding its capacity to fulfill its missions as well as opportunities for future improvement. These issues should provide the background in relation to which descriptions and evaluations of the department [program]'s curriculum, pedagogy, scholarly & creative activities, advising, service, and resources will be formulated.

The Self-Study Report should minimally cover the period from July 1 following completion of the previous Program Review to June 30 of the academic year immediately prior to the review year. In normal circumstances, this should be a seven-year interval, but there may be exceptions. In some cases, consideration of department [program] history prior to this review period may be appropriate. Externally accredited departments [programs] will have timetables established by their accrediting bodies.

The Chair of the department [program] under review should send a complete draft of the Self-Study Report to the Academic Dean, Vice Provost, the Provost, the Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement, the Chair of the Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee, and the external reviewer(s) by the end of the first semester of the review year, preferably by the end of Thanksgiving recess.

Contents of the Self-Study Report

1. A review of the department [program]'s **mission** and the **learning goals** it has set for its students. This review should include:
 - a. a statement of the department [program]'s **current mission and learning goals**;
 - b. the department [program]'s **assessment plan**, which enables it to determine how well its mission and learning goals are being attained;
 - c. a description of any **changes** to the department [program]'s mission and learning goals or to its assessment plan since the last Program Review;
 - d. a discussion of the **reasons** for these changes, especially in regard to action items developed during the last Program Review and to evidence gathered through assessment since the last Program Review;
 - e. an evaluation of the **appropriateness** of the department [program]'s current mission and learning goals in light of the Coordinate Mission and Learning Goals of CSB/SJU, and in comparison to the missions and learning goals of peer and aspirational programs.
2. A review of the **teaching, scholarship, advising and service** by which the department carries out its mission. This review should describe the current status of affairs, along with changes that have taken place since the last Program Review. Where appropriate, comparisons should be made with peer and aspirational programs. Analysis and evaluation should reflect on these changes and comparisons, as well as any discussions that have taken place within the department [program] concerning these endeavors. This review should include:
 - a. a review of the department [program]'s **curriculum**, which includes:
 - i. a description of the current curriculum for majors and/or minors in the department [program];
 - ii. an overview of changes to the curriculum since last program review and a discussion of the reasons for these changes;
 - iii. an analysis of the evidence gathered through assessment regarding the effectiveness of the department's curriculum.
 - b. a review of **curricular relationships** with other departments [programs] and with the Common Curriculum, which includes:
 - i. a description of the department [program]'s contribution to the Common Curriculum;
 - ii. a description of the department [program]'s curricular contribution to other departments [programs] that require or highly recommend courses offered by the department [program] under review;

- iii. a description of the curricular contributions by which other departments [programs] provide required or highly recommended courses to the curriculum of the department [program] under review;
 - iv. an evaluation of the effectiveness of these curricular relationships, including an analysis of evidence gathered through assessment regarding the effectiveness of the courses for which the department [program] is responsible.
- c. a review of the **pedagogy** practiced within the department [program], which includes:
- i. a description of current pedagogical practices used by those teaching courses for the department;
 - ii. an overview of changes in pedagogy since last program review and a discussion of the reasons for these changes;
 - iii. an evaluation of the effectiveness of the department's pedagogical practices in accomplishing its learning goals, including an analysis of evidence gathered through assessment.
- d. a review of **scholarly or creative activities** that takes place within the department [program], which includes:
- i. the statement of the criteria for assessing scholarly or creative activities drawn up by the department [program] for the Committee on Rank and Tenure;
 - ii. a description of scholarly or creative activities carried out by the department [program]'s faculty members during the review period (including grant applications and awards);
 - iii. a description of scholarly or creative activities carried out by the department [program]'s majors during the review period;
 - iv. an evaluation of the contributions that scholarly or creative activities carried within the department [program] makes to the fulfillment of the department [program]'s mission.
- e. a review of the department [program]'s **advising** policies and procedures, which includes:
- i. a statement explaining how the department[program] understands, organizes, and fulfills its advising responsibilities, including a description of any extraordinary advising commitments of the members of the department [program] (e.g., advising for specialized pre-professional programs);
 - ii. an overview of changes in advising policies and practices since last program review and a discussion of the reasons for these changes;
 - iii. an analysis of evidence gathered through assessment regarding the effectiveness of advising by the department.
- f. a review of the department [program]'s **service and outreach** activities, which includes:
- i. a description of service or outreach activities undertaken by the department [program], its faculty members and its students during the review period;
 - ii. an evaluation of the contribution of service and outreach to the fulfillment of the department [program]'s mission.

3. A review of the **resources** available to the department [program] to carry out its mission, including staffing, physical and monetary resources and services. This review should describe the resources currently available and the changes that have taken place since the last Program Review, along with reasons for these changes. Where appropriate, comparisons should be made with peer and aspirational programs. Analysis and evaluation should reflect on these changes and comparisons, as well as any discussions that have taken place within the department [program] on these issues. This review should include:
 - a. a review of the department [program]'s faculty;
 - b. a review of support staff assigned to or available to the department [program];
 - c. a review of the department [program]'s budget;
 - d. a comprehensive inventory of the facilities and services available to the department [program] for teaching and scholarship. This should include:
 - i. a review of the physical space and equipment available for teaching, scholarship or other important department [program] activities;
 - ii. a review of library resources available to students of the department [program], and of student use of these resources;
 - iii. a review of support by IT Services to teaching and scholarship within the department [program];
 - iv. a review of any other pertinent support given by the institutions for the promotion teaching and scholarship within the department [program] (e.g., grant writing).
 - e. an evaluation of the adequacy of the resources available to the department [program] for it to carry out its mission.
4. A review of the **contribution** made by the department [program] to the academic development of students at CSB/SJU. This review should include:
 - a. student enrollment in the department [program]'s major and/or minor programs during the review period;
 - b. student enrollment in courses taught by the department [program] during the review period;
 - c. a review of comments provided by current students regarding the department [program]'s curriculum and its delivery, and a comparison of these comments with those from the last Program Review;
 - d. a review of comments obtained from surveys of department [program] alumnae/i regarding the department [program]'s curriculum and its delivery, and a comparison of these comments with those from the last Program Review.

Information for these analyses may come from a wide variety of sources, including the chair of the department [program] under review, the director of the division to which the department [program] belongs, the Director of the Common Curriculum, the chairs of other departments [programs] with which the department [program] under review has curricular relationships, the Director of Advising, the Offices of Institutional Advancement, the Registrar, the Vice President for Communication and Marketing Services, the Director of the Library and representatives from Information Technology Services.

A.3. Selection of External Reviewers

- a. External reviewers should possess (1) professional experience sufficient to allow them to serve effectively as impartial evaluators of the quality of, and (2) a disciplinary perspective that will enable them to identify and recommend realistic opportunities for meaningful improvement in the department's [program's] curriculum, pedagogy & assessment practices. While such individuals would typically be senior or emeritus members of an appropriate academic department, under some circumstances it may be appropriate for an external reviewer to be employed outside higher education.
- b. Each academic department [program] undergoing Program Review, in consultation with the Vice Provost, selects one or two external Program Reviewers, depending on what available institutional resources will allow.
- c. If there is more than one external reviewer, they will come to campus at the same time and function as a team.
- d. At least three weeks prior to their campus visit, each external reviewer will require a copy of the following documents:
 - 1) The report submitted by external reviewers for the preceding Program Review;
 - 2) The department [program]'s response to the self-study and the external reviewer's report from the prior Program Review;
 - 3) The Provost's response to the self-study and the external reviewer's report from the prior Program Review;
 - 4) A copy of the department [program]'s current Self-Study Report.
- e. The external reviewer(s) report should be submitted no more than four weeks subsequent to the campus visit, preferably no later than April 1 of the review year.

A.4. Campus Visit by External Reviewers

The site visit by external reviewers is central to the Program Review process. External reviewers perform two separate, though related functions. The first is to conduct an impartial evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of a specific academic department [program] at CSB|SJU in relation to disciplinary expectations and practices appropriate for a given academic department [program]. The second is to offer an impartial observer's recommendations concerning existing opportunities for improvement in the department's [program's] curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practices. The evaluation and recommendations are fundamentally concerned with both ensuring and improving the quality of student learning.

Steps in the campus visit:

a. Briefing Interview

The external reviewers, immediately upon their arrival on campus, should meet with the department [program] chair, and the Program Review Coordinator to discuss the department's [program's] Self Study Report and to review the schedule for the site visit. This should be followed by an interview with the Provost, Vice Provost, and Academic

Dean again to review the Self-Study Report as well as to reach an understanding of their reciprocal expectations for the program review process. Under some circumstances it may be appropriate for this briefing to take place in a single meeting involving all parties. Any of the parties just named may seek to initiate such a joint meeting, but all must consent for it to go forward.

b. Meetings

External reviewers should have opportunities to conduct face-to-face interviews with department [program] faculty, support and technical staff, students, as well as any other appropriate personnel while on campus. Every effort should be made to ensure that the reviewers meet with the Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement and the Chair of the Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee.

c. Debriefing Interview

The external reviewers will conduct two final meetings to inform campus stakeholders of their preliminary findings and recommendations. One will be with the department [program] chair and the Program Review Coordinator, the other with the Academic Dean, Vice Provost, and the Provost. Under some circumstances it may be appropriate for this debriefing to take place in a single meeting involving all parties. Any of the parties just named may seek to initiate such a joint meeting, but all must consent for it to go forward.

d. Written Report

One report, written by one or both external reviewers, is required four weeks after the completion of the site visit – preferably no later than April 1 of the review year. This report should be based on the department [program]’s self-study, and documents, interviews, and other evidence obtained before, during, and after the campus visit. This report is submitted to the department [program] chair, the Office of the Provost, and to the Chair of the Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee.

The written report should address the following Program Review issues:

1) Department [program] Overview:

An evaluation of: the coherence and appropriateness of the department [program]’s current mission and learning goals; its contribution to the coordinate mission of the institutions; its assessment practices and level of faculty participation in assessment of student learning; its contribution to the greater educational effort and intellectual life of the institutions; the effectiveness of the department [program] vis-à-vis the number and quality of faculty, students, staff, and resources; and the department [program]’s response to its previous Program Review.

2) Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment:

An evaluation of the appropriateness of the department’s [program’s] curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practices in relation to accepted disciplinary expectations and national trends; changes to the curriculum, pedagogy or assessment practices since the previous Program Review; the role and responsibilities of the department

[program] faculty in improving the department's [program's] curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practices; the effectiveness of the curriculum and pedagogy for preparing 21st Century students to become successful participants in a diverse and rapidly changing society.

3) Faculty:

An evaluation of the appropriateness of faculty training and credentials for achieving the mission of the department [program]; its policies and practices for evaluating and improving the quality of faculty instruction; faculty diversity (including people of color and women); hiring policies, practices, and opportunities; faculty attrition, retention, retirement; promotion policies; the extent of faculty service; the balance of teaching, scholarship, and service achieved by the department [program]'s faculty; the quality and quantity of faculty scholarship in light of its teaching and service obligations; faculty mentoring practices; and faculty morale.

4) Resources:

An evaluation of the adequacy of the budget available to the department [program]; adequacy and appropriateness of educational infrastructure (e.g., classrooms, laboratories, technologies, study areas, libraries); any centers, institutes, or other organizations or individuals affiliated with the department [program]; any other interdisciplinary or extra-disciplinary agreements and endeavors affiliated with the department [program]; and the adequacy of staff, student worker, and student researcher support for the department [program].

5) Students:

An overall evaluation of the quality of the education received by students; the richness and suitability of the department [program]'s evidence of student learning; student diversity (including people of color and women); admission standards and practices; appropriateness and success of advising procedures; the use of students in research or as teaching assistants; availability of appropriate student internships; completion rates of students in the department [program]; job placement of students after graduation; student enrollment in graduate school; the role of students in departmental [program] decision-making; and student morale.

6) Recommendations:

An evaluation of the particular strengths and weaknesses of the academic department [program]; its alignment with the mission, vision, and values of the institutions; ways the department [program] can improve its academic program; and ways the institutions can better support the department [program] in fulfilling its academic mission.

A.5. Formal response by the department [program] to the external reviewer report.

This document should provide a thoughtful and reflective response by members of the program under review both to what they have learned through the self-study process as well as to the evaluation and recommendations contained in the external reviewer report. Emphasis should be placed upon department [program] members' evaluation of the

department [program]'s capacity to sustain or build on its current strengths and achievements, and to effectively respond to the challenges, weaknesses or shortcomings identified through the Program Review process. In this response department [program] members are free to endorse or reject any of the recommendations made by the external reviewers, to propose alternative explanations or interpretations of contested circumstances or events, and to offer initial proposals for future action.

The department [program]'s formal response should be submitted to the Office of the Provost by May 15 of the review year. This response will be included in the Final Review Portfolio (see section A.8. below) submitted by the chair of the department [program] under review to the Chair of APSAC and to the Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement.

A.6. Formal response by the Office of the Provost to the external reviewer report.

This document should provide a thoughtful and reflective response by the Provost and other Academic Affairs officers to both the department [program]'s Self-Study Report as well as to the external reviewer report. The response should emphasize academic officers' evaluation of the department [program]'s capacity to sustain or build on its current strengths and achievements, and to effectively respond to the challenges, weaknesses or shortcomings identified through the Program Review process. Academic officers are free to endorse or reject any of the recommendations made by the external reviewers, to propose alternative explanations or interpretations of contested circumstances or events, and to offer initial proposals for future action. Particular emphasis should be placed upon the measures that Academic Affairs will be able to take in support of the department [program]'s ongoing effort for self-improvement.

The formal response by the Office of the Provost should be submitted to the chair of the department [program] under review no later than June 1 of the review year. This response will be included in the Final Review Portfolio (see item A.8. below) submitted by the chair of the department [program] under review to the Chair of APSAC and to the Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement.

A.7. Action plan.

Upon completion of the two formal responses to the external reviewer report, a meeting will be convened between the chair of the department [program] under review, the Vice Provost, the Provost, and any other members of the department [program] who may wish to participate, to reach agreement upon a plan of action for program improvement during the next review cycle. This plan should minimally include:

- a. A description of actions to be undertaken by the department [program], aimed at sustaining or building on strengths and achievements, and responding to challenges, weaknesses or shortcomings identified through the Program Review process.
- b. A description of actions to be implemented by Academic Affairs administration in support of the department [program]'s efforts to improve its performance in anticipation of the next Program Review.

The meeting attendees will include an official scribe (either invited for that purpose or an attendee so designated) who will take minutes. The draft minutes shall be distributed to all attendees within one week of the meeting. A standard review and comment period will

follow, allowing all attendees to comment upon and suggest correction to the minutes. The amended minutes will become the formal action plan. Copies of this action plan are to be included in the Final Review Portfolio submitted by the chair of the department [program] to the Chair of APSAC and to the Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement.

A.8. Final Review Portfolio

The Final Review Portfolio is intended to ensure that key documents from the Program Review process are archived with faculty governance bodies and institutional offices responsible for oversight of Program Review.

The Final Review Portfolio should include:

- a. The external reviewer report;
- b. The department [program]'s response to the external reviewer report;
- c. The response from the Office of the Provost to the department [program]'s self-study and the external reviewer report;
- d. The signed and dated action plan.

The chair of the department [program] undergoing review will submit the Final Review Portfolio to the Chair of APSAC and to the Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement by June 30 of the review year. Departments [programs] are strongly encouraged to keep their own copies as well.

The Final Review Portfolio will replace the Integrated Annual Report ordinarily due on June 30 of the academic year.

Institutional involvement and support of the Program Review process.

Our institutions shall provide adequate funds and other support to departments [programs] engaged in Program Review. Specifically, the institutions will provide:

- a. Compensation for the Program Review Coordinator, in the form of release time or financial remuneration, to be negotiated between the Associate Dean, the chair of the department [program] undergoing review and the coordinator;
- b. Assistance from the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement, the Institutional Planning & Research Office, Office of Admissions, the Registrar, and Office of Alumnae/i Relations in the collection and provision of data (admissions, enrollment, alumni, test, comparative, etc.) required for the review process;
- c. Funds for student workers to provide necessary and appropriate assistance to the department's [program's] work (e.g. to gather required information about programs at peer and aspirant institutions);
- d. Funds to bring in one or two external evaluators;
- e. Curriculum and Program Development grants made available through APSAC to support summer workshops devoted (a) to preparation for Program Review and (b) to planning for post review changes in curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices.

Final Considerations

1. If the department [program] proposes revisions in majors, minors, or programs, the report shall be available, upon request, to the Academic Planning and Budget Committee as well as the Curriculum Committee.
2. Minutes of meetings and working papers generated during the Program Review process remain the property of the department [program].
3. Curricular changes that require significant new institutional investments or that identify a new strategic direction must be referred to the Academic Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Dean for timely comment prior to consideration by the Curriculum Committee.
4. The department [program] will also make the Final Review Portfolio of its Program Review available to all other departments [programs] via Joint Faculty Assembly electronic posting.

IV. Evaluation of this policy

This Policy for Integrated Reporting Procedures shall be revisited *at least* every 5 years and, where appropriate, revised by the Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee.

Approved by the Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee May 4, 2010.

Table 1. Summary of requirements for Integrated Annual Reports, Self-Study Reports and Final Review Portfolios.

No	Assessment Item	IAR	SSR	FRP
1	Scholarly and creative activity — Faculty		×	
2	Scholarly and creative activity — Students		×	
3	Departmental [program] service or outreach activity		×	
4	Course enrollment data (provided by registrar)	×	×	
5	Description of annual assessment activity (placed in context of 3-year moving window)	×		
6	Description of curricular changes with rationale	×		
7	Description of steps taken during past year in response to departmental action plan	×		
8	Description of staffing and resource status	×		
9	Description of advising policies and procedures		×	
10	Comments on curriculum by current students		×	
11	Surveys of recent graduates		×	
12	Departmental [program] mission statement with learning goals and objectives		×	
13	Comprehensive review of curriculum		×	
14	Comprehensive review of staffing and resources		×	
15	Comprehensive review of assessment results and steps taken since the last FRP action plan		×	
16	Inventory of facilities and services		×	
17	Contribution to the greater academic activity of the institutions		×	
18	External reviewers' report			×
19	Departmental [program] response to SSR and external reviewers' report			×
20	Administrative response to SSR and external reviewers' report			×
21	Action items for department [program] and administration, mutually agreed upon			×

Key: IAR = Integrated Annual Report
SSR = Self-Study Report
FRP = Final Review Portfolio

Table 2. Timeline for Program Review.

<p>Academic year prior to Program Review</p> <p>1. Chair of APSSAC informs chair by beginning of Fall Semester</p> <p>2. The department [program] designates Program Review Coordinator prior to start of Spring Semester</p> <p>3. The department [program]:</p> <p>a. Identifies external reviewers</p> <p>b. Identifies appropriate peer or aspirant programs</p> <p>c. Prepares and conducts surveys of alumnae/i</p> <p>d. Gathers required information</p> <p>e. Applies for Faculty Development Grants if needed (deadlines in October and February)</p>	<p>Summer prior to Program Review</p> <p>4. Submission of early draft of Self-Study Report to APSSAC by June 30 (recommended, but optional).</p>	Academic year of Program Review						<p>Year following Program Review</p> <p>Fall semester</p>
		<p>Fall semester</p> <p>By the beginning of Thanksgiving recess</p>	<p>Fall or spring</p> <p>By three weeks prior to visit of external reviewers</p>	<p>January or February</p>	<p>Spring semester</p> <p>Four weeks after site visit (no later than April 1)</p>	<p>Between April 1 and June 30</p>	<p>By June 30</p>	
		<p>5. Recommended date for completing the Self-Study Report. Upon completion to be forwarded to Provost, Vice Provost, Academic Dean, & external reviewers.</p>	<p>6. Final dead-line by which Self-Study Report must be in the hands of the external reviewers.</p>	<p>7. Recommended time frame for External reviewers visit.</p>	<p>8. Department [program] receives reviewers' report. Reviewers should be informed of this expectation.</p>	<p>9. Academic Affairs writes formal response to self-study and external review; department [program] writes response to external review; meeting to develop department [program] action plan.</p>	<p>10. Final Review Portfolio completed & forwarded to APSSAC and Office of Academic Assessment</p>	

Revision Control History

Original approved version of this policy: 4 May 2010

The Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee approved a revision of this policy on 9 September 2011. This revision made the following changes:

1. Section III A.7. regarding the development of the action plan was modified.
2. References in the prior version to Provost and Associate Provost/Academic Dean were replaced with Provost, Vice Provost, and Academic Dean to match the new administrative structure that went into effect on 1 July 2011.
3. A note was inserted on pages 1 & 2 to indicate that the status of Common Curriculum Assessment Procedures is in a state of revision.