College of Saint Benedict | Saint John’s University

Procedure for Systematic Evaluation of Academic Learning (SEAL)

Introduction

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University (CSB/SJU) are committed to supporting high quality academic departments and programs (collectively referred to as “programs”) that provide our students with an excellent liberal arts education. Because we, at both institutional and individual levels, are committed to the integrity of our work and our responsibility to those whom we serve, we must invest in ongoing self-evaluation. The goal of this reflective activity is both to improve the focused learning offered by our departments and to reinvigorate our overall education in the liberal arts. In addition, this reporting is necessary to ensure continued accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission.

To guide our self-assessment, the Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC), in coordination with the Provost, Vice Provost, Director of the Office of Academic Review and Curricular Advancement (OARCA), Director of the Common Curriculum, and the Faculty Senate, has created this Procedure for Systematic Evaluation of Academic Learning (SEAL). This document describes processes involved in recording, sustaining, and improving academic excellence at CSB/SJU.

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

- Programs will be able to analyze the effectiveness of their educational activities and formulate strategies for improvement based upon the analysis and interpretation of appropriate information. This is the purview of APSAC and Academic Affairs.
- Our institutions will gain better guidance both for allocating current resources and for targeting advancement efforts to seek new resources. This is the purview of APBC and Academic Affairs.
- Those engaged in the advancement of the academic enterprise at CSB/SJU will have better information available to publicize achievement to a national or international audience. This is the purview of Academic Affairs, Admissions, Communication and Marketing, and Institutional Advancement.

Three regular reports produced by programs form the foundation for the process of continuous improvement:

- The Annual Report (see page 2);
- The Self-Study Report, which is part of the process of Program Review that occurs every 10 years (see page 12);
- The Final Program Review Portfolio, which is also part of the process of Program Review (see page 10).

The remainder of this document describes the content of these three reports.
The Annual Report

Audience: Each program should submit its annual report to the Academic Dean. Each program’s annual report will be posted on the OARCA SharePoint Intranet site, where it may be reviewed by any member of the CSBSJU faculty, staff, and academic affairs administration. Questions about sections 1-3 of the annual report should be directed to a member of APSAC; questions about sections 4-7 should be directed to the Academic Dean.

Timing: The annual report is due no later than June 30 unless there is a request for a new hire, in which case the annual report must be submitted by June 10. If there are reportable activities occurring between June 11 and June 30, they may be reported in the following year. APSAC will return a formal response to department chairs and program directors on sections 2-4 by November 1, with copies submitted to Academic Affairs and OARCA.

Purpose: The annual report will keep APSAC, academic officers, and other institutional offices apprised of a) the program’s progress toward meeting goals established during the program review process, b) the results of ongoing assessment of student learning, c) whether available resources are appropriate to carry out its activities and meet its goals for improvement, and d) faculty and student achievements. In addition, carefully written annual reports can serve as a useful framework for preparation of future program reviews.

Format of the Annual Report

A template for writing the annual report can be found here: http://www.csbsju.edu/academic-affairs/oarca/program-review-annual-report-resources. Successful reports follow the template. Reports that deviate from this template are much more difficult for APSAC and others to read efficiently.

Respond to the information requested by each section within that section—i.e., if at all possible, do not reference other sections or appendices except to assist the reader in locating a full report or additional information that may be useful. For example, if you have a memo or other document which you believe addresses the information requested in a specific section of the annual report, please copy and paste the applicable information in the appropriate section of the annual report or make clear which specific section(s) of the memo address the information requested by the annual report. Please then attach the memo or other document as an appendix after the required appendices (A-F).

1. Executive Summary — Here the program has one page to summarize the highlights of its annual report.

2. Responses to program review and other prior evaluations — This section of the annual report is dedicated to describing progress the program has made toward addressing action plan items from the last program review and to explaining any changes the program made this year based upon evaluations prior to this year.

The narrative of this section should be accompanied by Appendix A: List of all action plan items from the latest program review. In this appendix, please indicate which action plan...
items have already been addressed or completed in a previous year.

2.1. Please list the action plan items the program has addressed this year, and please summarize the progress made this year towards their completion. If no action plan items were addressed this year, please state “No action plan items were addressed this year.”

2.2. Please describe actions that were not a result of program review action items. Please provide a clear rationale for any changes described in this section. If there were no such actions, please state “No such actions were addressed this year.”

3. **Program Assessment** — This section of the annual report should describe the program’s assessment activities for this year and what these activities have revealed about the program’s success at meeting its student learning goals or outcomes. Each program must have an assessment plan (to be described in Appendix B). IMPORTANT: Programs are not expected to assess each goal and objective every year, but instead should plan to assess all their goals and objectives over a period of 3 – 5 years.

The narrative of this section should be accompanied by **Appendix B: Goals, objectives, and assessment of student learning outcomes**. This appendix should include:

- The program’s goals and objectives for student learning;
- Brief descriptions of the direct or indirect measures the program uses to assess its goals and objectives;
- An assessment schedule listing the year each goal or objective will be (or has last been) assessed. This schedule should show a full cycle of assessment, covering each and every goal or objective.

3.1. Please follow the format described below for presenting the narrative of this section, and repeat the format as needed to accommodate all items the program assessed this year. Please keep in mind that raw data or unanalyzed results are generally not helpful to include in the annual report.

**Item assessed** — State the specific learning goal or objective being evaluated.

**Summary of assessment results** — Briefly describe the results obtained from the assessment activity related to this item. Please highlight the major findings in a cogent narrative, and include any tables or figures needed to understand and provide a context for the findings (e.g., illustrate how this year’s results compare to those obtained other times when the item was assessed).

**Analysis** — Please evaluate the assessment results for those reading the annual report.

Do the results meet your program’s expectations? Why or why not? How do you explain any trends (or lack thereof)? Did any idiosyncratic factors affect your results?

**Recommendations** — After the program has presented its evaluation of the assessment items above, it should describe any adjustments to its curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices that it anticipates making based upon its analyses. Please explain clearly how any anticipated changes will address the issues raised in your evaluations. If no changes are anticipated, please state “We do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices.”
3.2. If your program has altered its assessment plan since its last annual report, please explain how and why it was changed. If no changes were made, please state “No changes have been made to our assessment plan since our last annual report.”

4. **Common Curriculum Assessment** — This section of the annual report should describe the program’s Common Curriculum assessment activities for this year and what these activities have revealed about the program’s success at meeting the Common Curriculum learning goals. Each program is responsible for assessing its contributions to divisional goals of the Common Curriculum, i.e., HM, NS, SS, FA, MT, GL, TH, and TU. Because Gender, Intercultural Competence, and Experiential Learning designations normally adhere to individual instructor rather than program courses, those faculty ordinarily submit materials to the offices performing the assessment review, currently the Director of the Common Curriculum. APSAC, CCC, JFS and Academic Affairs will discuss how best to assess the GN, IC, and EL during the 2015-2016 academic year, which will be a time of transition and revision within Academic Affairs.

The narrative of this section should be accompanied by **Appendix C: Common Curriculum courses and credits taught by the program’s faculty members**. This information will be provided each spring semester by the Registrar’s Office to the chair of each program in a standard format.

In addition, the narrative of this section should be accompanied by **Appendix D: Goals, objectives, and assessment of student learning outcomes for the Common Curriculum**. This appendix should include:

- The specific Common Curriculum learning goals assessed by the program (available at [http://www.csbsju.edu/Common-Curriculum/Common-Curriculum-Learning-Goals.htm](http://www.csbsju.edu/Common-Curriculum/Common-Curriculum-Learning-Goals.htm));
- Brief descriptions of the direct or indirect measures the program uses to assess the Common Curriculum learning goals;
- An assessment schedule listing the year each Common Curriculum learning goal will be (or has last been) assessed. This schedule should show a full cycle of assessment, covering each and every goal or objective.

4.1. Please follow the format described below for presenting the narrative of this section, and repeat the format as needed to accommodate all items the program assessed this year. Please keep in mind that raw data or unanalyzed results are generally not helpful to include in the annual report.

- **Item assessed** — State the specific learning goal or objective being evaluated.
- **Summary of assessment results** — Briefly describe the results obtained from the assessment activity related to this item. Please highlight the major findings in a cogent narrative, and include any tables or figures needed to understand and provide a context for the findings (e.g., illustrate how this year’s results compare to those obtained other times when the item was assessed).
- **Analysis** — Please evaluate the assessment results for those reading the annual report.
Do the results meet your program’s expectations? Why or why not? How do you explain any trends (or lack thereof)? Did any idiosyncratic factors affect your results?

Recommendations - After the program has presented its evaluation of the assessment items above, it should describe any adjustments to its curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices that it anticipates making based upon its analyses. Please explain clearly how any anticipated changes will address the issues raised in your evaluations. If no changes are anticipated, please state “We do not currently anticipate any adjustments to our curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment practices.”

4.2. If your program has altered its assessment plan for the Common Curriculum since its last annual report, then please explain how and why it was changed. If no changes were made, please state “No changes have been made to our assessment plan for the Common Curriculum since our last annual report.”

5. Resources — This section of the annual report is used to document the resources available to the program and whether the availability of resources is sufficient for the program to carry out its educational mission.

The narrative of this section should be accompanied by Appendix E: Enrollment and FTE data. This will indicate the course-by-course enrollment for the program and fall, spring, and summer (if applicable) FTEs. This information will be provided each spring semester by the Registrar’s Office to the chair of each program in a standard format.

In addition, the narrative of this section should be accompanied by Appendix F: Budget allocations and final balances. This will indicate the total funds allocated to the program for budget lines not associated with faculty or staff salaries, and the remaining balance for each of those lines.

5.1. Please discuss briefly any staffing challenges that your program experienced this year. In your discussion, please be sure to indicate whether these challenges were acute or chronic. In addition, if you anticipate any changes affecting your program that you believe will impact your future staffing status, then please explain them.

5.2. Please discuss briefly any budgetary challenges that your program experienced this year. In your discussion, please be sure to indicate whether these challenges were acute or chronic. In addition, please explain any anticipated changes affecting your program that you believe will impact your future budgetary status.

5.3. Please discuss briefly any other resource-related concerns that impacted your program this year. Examples of such concerns might be a) the quantity or quality of space for classes, labs, or other activities; b) the quantity or quality of equipment, instrumentation, or technology; c) concerns with safety equipment or protocols; d) number of student workers; etc. In your discussion, please be sure to indicate whether these concerns were acute or chronic. In addition, please explain any anticipated changes affecting your program that you believe will impact its future resource status.
6. **Mentoring of faculty** — Our faculty is our institutions’ greatest resource. All faculty members have a responsibility to assist their colleagues to deliver the finest education possible and to help each other to develop as educators. This responsibility is especially strong for those members of our faculty who are probationary or employed on a term-contract basis. We want our untenured faculty members to succeed in their endeavors and earn tenure, and we also want those who are on term contracts to develop professionally so as to enhance their chances of long-term employment. This section of the annual report should discuss the steps that a program has taken to develop its faculty, particularly those who are untenured or term-contract hires.

6.1. Discuss briefly how the program’s chair or other faculty members have assisted in the mentorship of their colleagues, particularly those who are untenured or on term-contract hires. Please discuss the types of faculty development activities in which the program or its faculty engaged. **Please do not include any discussion of the evaluations of individual members of your program’s faculty.**

7. **Scholarship, creative activity, and service** — This section of the annual report should list or summarize the scholarship, creative activities, and service performed by the program, members of the program’s faculty, or the program’s students during the last year. Program chairs are strongly encouraged to have their faculty members use the online faculty CV database <https://apps.csbsju.edu/faculty/data/> to record these activities and those of their students. Using this resource will allow program chairs or faculty members to easily retrieve a list of their activities for the current year for inclusion in this report.

7.1. List or summarize the scholarship or creative activities of the program or its faculty members this year.

7.2. List or summarize the scholarship or creative activities of the program’s students this year. When doing so, please acknowledge faculty mentorship of these activities.

7.3. List or summarize the service performed by the program or its faculty members this year.

7.4. List the grant applications made by the program’s faculty and grant awards received this year.
Program Review

*Audience:* The Provost’s office is responsible for administering program review; programs should submit final versions of the documents produced for their review to that office. From there, as necessary, documents will be forwarded to the Vice Provost, Academic Dean, the Director of OARCA, and to the chair of APSAC. Members of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Boards will read program review documents; the Boards must ultimately endorse the program review and resulting action plan. Finally, each program’s self study, the report from their external reviewers, the program’s response, and the Provost’s response will be posted on the OARCA SharePoint Intranet site, where it may be reviewed by any member of the CSB|SJU faculty, staff, or academic affairs administration.

*Timing:* In general, programs will conduct a review every ten years unless a program is externally accredited; in the latter case review will occur on the schedule of the accrediting body. Reviews may be undertaken more frequently at the request of the department or the Provost. The detailed timeline for the program review process is presented below.

*Purpose:* Program review is a formative endeavor, not merely an exercise in information gathering and reporting. Programs should conduct their review with a spirit of authentic self-examination. Program review provides an opportunity for the program’s faculty to evaluate the current state of its curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment practices, to take appropriate steps to assure ongoing quality, and to explain its vision for the future of the program. The results of program review serve to highlight needs and priorities of both the program and our institutions and aid in the effective allocation of institutional resources.

**Timeline for the program review process**

A recommended timeline for the programs that are not externally accredited is given below. The details for each step in the timeline are available by clicking the appropriate hyperlinks within that step. In this timeline, the program review year is defined as the year in which the external reviewer(s) visit our campuses, the action plan is agreed upon, and the final program review report is submitted. The program review schedule is available at [http://www.csbsju.edu/Academic-Affairs/OARCA/Program-Review-IAR-Resources.htm](http://www.csbsju.edu/Academic-Affairs/OARCA/Program-Review-IAR-Resources.htm). It is assumed that the program undergoing review has submitted its annual reports each year.

**Two years prior to the program review year**

In the spring semester of this year, the Director of OARCA will remind the program’s chair, the chair of APSAC, the Provost, Vice Provost, and Academic Dean of the upcoming program review. For example, if the program review year is the 2014–15 academic year, then this reminder will be made in the spring semester of 2013.
The year prior to the program review year

1. In the summer of this year (the summer of 2013, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), the program’s faculty members may wish to meet for one or two days to plan the program review process. Programs may apply to the Director of OARCA for funds to support this planning session if desired. This meeting might involve:
   1.1. Evaluation of the program’s previous program review and the annual reports written since then;
   1.2. Evaluation of any comments that the program received from APSAC, the Director of OARCA, the Director of the Common Curriculum, or members of Academic Affairs Administration since the last program review;
   1.3. Formulation of specific questions that the program would like to address as part of its program review process;
   1.4. Identification of one or more of the program’s faculty members to coordinate the program review process. Except under extraordinary circumstances (and with approval of the Provost), program review coordinators must be tenured faculty members.
   1.5. Identification of potential external reviewers for the upcoming program review;
   1.6. Identification of potential peer and aspirant programs for the upcoming program review;

2. By 15 September (of 2013, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), programs should submit to the Provost a) a list of potential external reviewers accompanied by documentation of each candidate’s suitability and b) the candidate(s) for program review coordinator. Except under extraordinary circumstances and with approval from the Provost, a program will have one external reviewer.

3. By 15 October (of 2013, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), the Provost’s office must approve the external reviewer and program review coordinator for the program review process.

4. By 15 October (of 2013, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), programs should submit to the Provost a list of potential peer and aspirant programs with a rationale for each choice.

5. By 15 November (of 2013, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), the Provost must approve the peer and aspirant programs (2–4 of each) to be used in the program review.

6. By 30 June (of 2014, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), programs should submit a preliminary version of their self-study report to the Provost in lieu of their annual report.
The program review year

7. In the summer of the program review year (the summer of 2014, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), the program’s faculty members may wish to meet to reflect upon what they have learned thus far from their self-study. Programs may apply to the Director of OARCA for funds to support this reflective session if desired. This meeting might involve:
   7.1. Reconsideration of or reflection upon any of the analyses conducted for the self-study;
   7.2. Further informed discussion of the program’s goals for the next 10 years and the plans to achieve them;
   7.3. Discussion and revision of questions to be addressed by the external reviewers.
   7.4. Planning for the external reviewer’s visit.

8. By 1 October (of 2014, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), the program review coordinator(s) will receive a critique of the preliminary version of the self-study from the chair of APSAC. They may also receive comments from the Director of OARCA, the Academic Dean, the Provost, or Vice Provost as needed.

9. Before Thanksgiving break (of 2014, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), programs should submit the final version of their self-study report to the Provost’s office. As soon as the self-study is complete, the program review coordinator(s) should send it to the external reviewer, who should receive a copy of the self-study at least three weeks before visiting our campuses.

10. In January or February (of 2015, if program review is in the 2014–15 academic year), the external reviewer will visit our campuses. Although, this is the typical time frame, external reviewers may be scheduled earlier. For example, if a program sent the final version of their self-study to the reviewers by mid-October, then they could bring in their external reviewers before Thanksgiving. Since external reviewers are allowed one month to deliver their evaluation, programs should avoid scheduling their external reviewer visits after 28 February.

11. By 1 April, the external reviewer’s report is submitted to the Provost and to the program review coordinator.

12. After receipt of the external reviewer’s report, both the program’s faculty and Academic Affairs Administration will reflect upon its observations and recommendations.
   12.1. Within three weeks of receiving the external reviewer’s report, the program review coordinator should submit the program’s response to that report to the Provost’s office. This document should explain concisely the reaction of the program’s faculty to the observations and suggestions made by the external reviewers.
   12.2. Within three weeks of receiving the program’s response, the Provost responds to both the reviewer’s report and the program’s response.
   12.3. The Provost, Vice Provost, Academic Dean, Director of OARCA, and the chair of APSAC will review the program’s response.
12.4. The Provost will then organize at least one action plan meeting of the individuals above, and at a minimum, the program chair and the program review coordinator. However, all program faculty members may attend. The attendees of this meeting will work together to produce an action plan for the program. The action plan details steps that both the program and academic affairs administration can take to address the findings of the program review process and improve the program’s ability to meet its academic mission.

13. By 30 June, the program will submit its final program review portfolio the Provost’s office in lieu of their annual report for that year. The final review portfolio consists of:
   13.1. the self-study report;
   13.2. the external reviewer’s report;
   13.3. the program’s response to the external reviewer’s report;
   13.4. the final version of the action plan that has been agreed upon by the program and the Provost.

The results of the program review will be presented to the CSB and SJU Boards of Trustees during a joint meeting that will take place in the fall of the academic year following the program review year.
Appendices

Appendix I: Duties of the program review coordinator

The program review coordinator is responsible for overseeing the timely completion of all of the tasks associated with the program review process. Normally, programs select one individual to fulfill this responsibility, but may appoint two or more individuals if the situation dictates it. Except under extraordinary circumstances (and with approval of the Provost), program review coordinators must be tenured faculty members.

The program review coordinator(s) will receive compensation in the form of a stipend or release time. The program review coordinator, program chair, and Academic Dean (in consultation with the Associate Dean) will negotiate the type and extent of compensation.

The specific duties of the program review coordinator(s) include:

- Communicating with the Provost, Vice Provost, Academic Dean, Director of OARCA, and the chair of APSAC as necessary;
- Organizing meetings of the program’s faculty as necessary to accomplish program review tasks;
- Communication with external reviewer, ensuring that he or she is briefed on the principal tasks, impediments, or challenges facing the department that have guided and informed the self-study report, helping to arrange their transportation and lodging as needed, and organization of the visit of the external reviewers to our campuses;
- Compilation and timely submission of the self-study, the program’s response, and the final review portfolio.

Please note that the program review coordinator is not solely responsible for performing all of the analysis and writing associated with producing the program review documents; they may work with their colleagues and delegate duties as necessary to accomplish tasks efficiently.

Appendix II: Selection of the external reviewer

Individuals who serve as external reviewers should have professional experience that allows them to serve effectively as disciplinary experts and impartial evaluators of the program’s academic quality. This evaluation will examine the quality and rigor of the program’s curriculum and pedagogy, advising of students, student outcomes assessment, and the quality of faculty scholarship, teaching, and service. External reviewers will be expected to identify and recommend realistic opportunities for meaningful improvement in the program’s curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment practices. While such individuals would typically be senior or emeritus members of an appropriate academic discipline, under some circumstances it may be appropriate for an external reviewer to be employed outside higher education.

The program review coordinator will submit the name, qualifications, and rationale for each potential external reviewer to the Provost, Vice Provost, Academic Dean, and Director of OARCA for consideration. Candidate external reviewers should be contacted to ensure their willingness and availability before their names are submitted for consideration. If multiple
candidates are submitted, the program review coordinator may wish to rank them in order of their perceived suitability. If the program believes that two external reviewers are needed, they should include a justification for this request. However, programs should be aware that one external reviewer is the norm. If there is more than one external reviewer, then they will come to campus at the same time and write a single report as a team.

Appendix III: Identification of peer and aspirant programs

Each program should identify 2–4 peer and 2–4 aspirant programs for comparative purposes in the self-study. Peer programs are those that the program judges to be similar to themselves in their goals and objectives for student learning, curriculum, pedagogy, and post-graduate statistics. Aspirant programs are those that have characteristics that the program would like to emulate in these areas. Not every peer or aspirant program need be located at an institution like ours.

As part of the self-study, the program should compare itself to their peer and aspirant programs in as many ways as possible so as to identify strengths and areas for improvement. In addition to the areas identified above, comparison of the facilities, instrumentation, spaces, staffing, budgetary allocations, internship programs, or other dimensions might be fruitful depending upon the characteristics of the program.

Appendix IV: Format of the self-study

1. *Executive Summary* — Please summarize the highlights of your program’s self-study in three pages or fewer.

2. *Program’s status at the time of its last review* — Please summarize in three pages or fewer to give the readers of the self-study report some context for the analyses presented.
   2.1. The narrative of this section should be accompanied by Appendix 1a: Executive summary from the last program review and Appendix 1b: Action plan from the last program review.

3. *Program’s current status and its activities since its last review* — Please explain and evaluate how your program has changed since its last program review, and present your readers a clear and frank analysis of your program’s strengths and areas where you believe improvements are needed. Your program has submitted many annual reports since its last program review, so be certain that your self-study includes a synthesis and evaluation of what those reports have revealed. This section of the self-study should evaluate your program’s progress and status in the following areas:
   3.1. Mission, goals, curriculum, pedagogy, and advising
      3.1.1. The narrative of this section should be accompanied by Appendix 2: Mission and goals and objectives for student learning and Appendix 3: Course offerings and plans of study for majors and minors
3.1.2. Please explain your program’s mission, goals and objectives and why your faculty believes that these are appropriate for students at our institutions. This evaluation should compare your program’s mission and learning goals to those of peer and aspirant institutions and also address the relationship between your program’s mission and goals and those of CSB and SJU.

3.1.3. Please explain the rationale for the structure of your curriculum and programs of study, and evaluate how well it supports your program’s mission and goals. Explain why particular pedagogies are used in your curriculum as appropriate. Explain how advising of students is conducted in your program, and evaluate how well you believe your system of advising works.

3.2. Resources

3.2.1. The narrative of this section should be accompanied by:

3.2.1.1. **Appendix 4: Curriculum Vitae of program faculty members** — please include staff if appropriate (e.g., lab coordinators);

3.2.1.2. **Appendix 5: Staffing summary** — shows the FTE of teaching faculty and other faculty responsibilities (e.g., sabbaticals, study abroad, reassigned time, etc.) over the review period;

3.2.1.3. **Appendix 6: Enrollment summary** — shows the enrollment in the program’s courses over the period covered by the program review (Table with spark lines);

3.2.1.4. **Appendix 7: Program-specific resources** — (if necessary) describes any specific resources used by the program in its educational mission and scholarly or creative activities (e.g., laboratories, designated artistic spaces, instruments, etc.).

3.2.2. Please provide a clear evaluation of the resources available to the program and whether they are sufficient to meet the program’s goals for both student learning and faculty scholarship and creative activity. If there are specific needs (e.g., library holdings, academic technology, consistent budgetary shortfalls), then these should be documented and explained. Please discuss the current and near-term status of the department’s staffing situation, noting anticipated retirements and providing a justification for the expertise of any new or replacement hires desired.

3.3. Student learning outcomes

3.3.1. The narrative of this section should be accompanied by: **Appendix 8: Assessment plan** — Please describe the program’s procedures for assessing its student learning outcomes. Be sure to indicate the timing and frequency of assessment activity and include descriptions of tests, rubrics, or other scoring systems used.

3.3.2. Please summarize and evaluate what your assessment activities have revealed about student learning during the time since your last review. How well has your program done in addressing all aspects of its assessment plan? How have your majors and minors performed relative to your expectations? What sorts of post-B.A. activities, education, or employment have your students pursued and how well did their education in your program prepare them for these activities?
3.4. Scholarship and creative activity
3.4.1. The narrative of this section should be accompanied by:

3.4.1.1. **Appendix 9: Scholarly and creative activity – faculty** — This appendix summarizes the scholarship or creative activities of the program or its faculty during the period since the last program review (please include staff if appropriate (e.g., lab coordinators));

3.4.1.2. **Appendix 10: Scholarly and creative activity – students** — This appendix summarizes the scholarship or creative activities of the program’s students during the period since the last program review (please acknowledge faculty mentorship of these activities.).

3.4.2. Please evaluate the scholarly and creative activities of your program’s faculty and students during the interval since the last program review.

3.5. Service
3.5.1. The narrative of this section should be accompanied by:

3.5.1.1. **Appendix 11: Service to other programs** — list courses taught by your program’s faculty that are components of the curricula of other programs (including the Common Curriculum)

3.5.1.2. **Appendix 12: Service by faculty** — summarize the institutional and professional service activities of the program and its faculty during the period since the last program review.

3.5.2. Please evaluate service performed by your program and its faculty during the time since the last program review. Discussion of service to other programs should include evaluations by those programs. Discuss areas of excellence and those in need of improvement.

4. Program’s vision for the upcoming decade — In this section, the program’s faculty should explain clearly the vision they have for the program’s future, essentially answering the question “where would we like our program to be at our next program review, and what steps must we take to get there?” The format for this section is flexible; a program’s faculty might take each of the components of section 3 above and explain the changes they would like to see happen in each of these areas. Alternatively, faculty might write a narrative that describes their vision and development goals in broader terms. However, this section of the self-study is presented, it should give readers a cogent presentation of the program’s development plan that is informed by its analyses and evaluations from section 3 above, comparisons with peer and aspirant institutions, and an understanding of the evolution of undergraduate education within the field.

5. Specific foci and questions for external reviewers — After completion of and reflection upon sections 3 and 4 above, the program’s faculty should help guide the external reviewer’s evaluation of their program. This guidance might take the form of specific questions the program’s faculty would like the reviewers to address, or the faculty may suggest items that they would like the reviewer to focus upon during the review of the self-study and the campus visit. Whatever form it takes, it is critical that the program’s faculty provide the reviewer with a degree of guidance sufficient to take maximal advantage of the reviewer’s effort.
Appendix V: The external reviewer’s visit & report

The site visit by the external reviewer is central to the program review process. External reviewers perform two separate, though related functions. The first is to conduct a scholarly impartial evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of a specific academic program at CSB/SJU in relation to disciplinary expectations and practices appropriate for a given academic program. The second is to offer an impartial observer’s recommendations concerning existing opportunities for improvement in the program’s curriculum, pedagogy, assessment practices, scholarship, and advising policies and practices. The evaluation and recommendations are fundamentally concerned with both assuring and improving the quality of student learning.

Briefing Interview

Immediately upon their arrival on campus, the external reviewer should meet with the program chair and the program review coordinator to discuss the department’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 in order to review the self-study report and 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.

Meetings

An external reviewer should have opportunities to conduct face-to-face interviews with the program’s faculty, support and technical staff, students, and 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.

Debriefing Interview

The external reviewer will conduct two final meetings to inform campus stakeholders of their preliminary findings and recommendations. One will be with the program chair and the program review coordinator, the other with the Provost, Vice Provost, and Academic Dean. 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.

Written Report

The external reviewer must write a formal report (or a joint report if there are two approved external reviewers) that is required four weeks after the completion of the site visit, preferably no later than 1 April of the review year. This report should be based on the program’s self-study, and documents, interviews, and other evidence obtained before, during, and after the campus visit. This report is submitted to the program chair and the Provost.
At a minimum, the report must address the following:

- **Departmental Overview:** An evaluation of the coherence and appropriateness of the department’s current mission and learning goals; its contribution to the missions of the institutions; its assessment practices and level of faculty participation in assessment of student learning; its specific contributions to the Common Curriculum; its contribution to the greater educational effort and intellectual life of the institutions; the effectiveness of the department vis-à-vis the number and quality of faculty, students, staff, and resources; and the department’s response to its previous program review;

- **Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment:** An evaluation of the appropriateness of the department’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;

- **Students:** An overall evaluation of the quality of the education received by students; the richness and suitability of the department’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; job placement of students after graduation; student enrollment in graduate school; the role of students in departmental decision-making; and student morale;

- **Faculty:** An evaluation of the appropriateness of faculty training and credentials for achieving the mission of the department; 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’s faculty; the quality and quantity of faculty scholarship in light of its teaching and service obligations; faculty mentoring practices; and faculty morale;

- **Resources:** An evaluation of the adequacy of the budget available to the department; 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; any other interdisciplinary or extra-disciplinary agreements and endeavors affiliated with the department; and the adequacy of staff, student worker, and student researcher support for the department;

- **Recommendations:** An evaluation of the particular strengths and weaknesses of the academic department; its alignment with the missions of the institutions; ways the department can improve its academic program; and ways the institutions can better support the department in fulfilling its academic mission.