

*Guide for Annual
and Periodic Program
Planning & Self-Study*

UNIVERSITY OF THE
PACIFIC

August 25, 2008

Table of Contents

1. Overview of Academic and Administrative Program Planning and Self Study3

2. Integrated and Dynamic Planning3

3. Strategic Goals, Outcomes, Assessment, and Change.....4

4. Self-Study, Peer Review, External Review, and Accreditation5

5. The Annual Report6

6. The Periodic Self-Study

 6.1 The “Self-Study” Process7

 6.2 Content Requirements.....9

 6.3 Roles of Those Involved.....10

 6.4 The Collaborative Self-Study.....11

7. The Criteria

 7.1 Criteria for Academic Programs11

 7.2 Criteria for Administrative Units12

8. Support for and Improvement of the Process.....13

Appendices

 A. WASC Standards14

 B. Schedule15

 C. Key Terms16

A special note of thanks to the members of the task forces that worked on the basic concepts in this handbook through 2007: David Chambers, Robert Cox, Cathy Dodson, Katie Golsan, John Livesey, Tim Naccaratto, Jean Purnell, Sondra Roeuny, Joanna Royce-Davis, and Brian Weick. In addition, a sub-committee of Academic Affairs provided significant revisions and improvements in the spring of 2008.

Endorsed by Academic Affairs on May 1, 2008.
Endorsed by Academic Council on May 8, 2008.
Approved by Cabinet on August 19, 2008.

GUIDE FOR ANNUAL AND PERIODIC PROGRAM PLANNING AND SELF-STUDY

1. Overview of Academic and Administrative Program Planning & Self-Study

This document provides guidelines for the review, self-study, and integrated planning for the academic and administrative units of the University. These processes, collectively known as *Program Planning & Self-Study*, call for units to engage in a critical self-study of their goals, activities, and outcomes. It is both a time to review the recent past and an opportunity to engage in renewal and change through planning for the future. The intent is to maintain and enhance quality in support of the University's mission and should highlight distinctiveness, collaboration, and innovation. The Periodic Self-Study seeks to identify a unit's strengths and areas needing improvement. Program Planning and Self-Study supports external accreditations such as WASC (see Appendix A) and unit specific accreditations. It is intended to be a rigorous process of reflection, evaluation, and self-improvement.

With its revision in 2008, the focus of *Program Planning & Self-Study* shifts from a retrospective process to more active planning for the department, college, school, or program(s) under review, to put in motion a plan for recognizing, developing and maintaining excellence. The process helps connect each unit's planning to the University's strategies and priorities contained in *Pacific Rising, 2008-2015*. Program Planning and Self-Study considers how well departments align with the University's values, aspirations, and commitments and, in turn, departmental goals can help shape University planning. *Program Planning & Self-Study* is not singly focused on resource deficiencies of a program, or making incremental decisions regarding faculty or staff positions, or as a substitute for administrative decisions to be made by unit heads or executive administration. The outcome of *Program Planning & Self-Study* may result in the allocation of additional resources to achieve strategic objectives for the unit. It may also result in a significant restructuring of a program or in elimination of a program.

This document describes the process, explains the roles and expectations for annual reporting, gives an outline for the Periodic Self-Study, and provides criteria for the review of both academic and administrative units. Combined, the Annual and Periodic processes help form a short and long term planning cycle.

2. Integrated and Dynamic Planning

The University has a dynamic planning process currently reflected in *Pacific Rising 2008-2015*. The six Commitment statements, however, will remain stable through 2015 while the 20 Strategic Direction statements may show modest revision. The goals, actions, and outcomes in the *Strategic Action Plan*, on the other hand, will be updated annually. The Annual and Periodic reviews of the units play an important role in the process as goals of the programs feed into broader University goals. Through annual planning and self-study processes, the units will propose new University goals, actions, and outcomes. This is a fundamental connection between departmental and University strategic planning.

Program Planning & Self-Study is composed of two strategic cycles, the annual report and a longer range self-study cycle. While these may appear to some to be new ideas, much of the work is already being accomplished at Pacific – current planning cycles are being formalized with a supporting vocabulary, connecting processes, and clarification of the contents of the reports and roles of the participants. Annual reports, similar to current unit annual reports, will be submitted by each unit (further defined in Appendix C, Key Terms) each year. Annual planning reports feed into existing annual administrative and budgeting processes within each unit, while periodic self-studies connect to strategic administrative and budgeting processes overseen by Cabinet and the Institutional Priorities Committee. While each Periodic Report will require a University response, each self-study will not necessarily have a Presidential response to requests for resources.

Thus, while annual reports and periodic self-studies are not new, some significant changes have occurred:

- The Annual reporting process has been strengthened and standardized across the University. For some units this may be new, as they have had less formal annual reporting in the past.
- A significant change is that internal University peer review panels no longer generate reports that serve as the primary review for other units.
- Self-study is a process of reflection and intention and is best conducted from within the unit. Units may call for internal University peer reviews to support their self-studies or a Dean or Vice President may request an internal University peer review be conducted as part of the self-study.
- At the same time, the roles of external peers, consultants, and accreditors have been enhanced.
- Finally, the self-study cycle has been modified to allow for more or fewer self-studies over time and for multi-unit collaborations.

3. Strategic Goals, Outcomes, Assessment, and Change

Goal statements are the yardstick by which units gauge progress and success. Units must target a desired level of regional, national, or international reputation and excellence. Outcome definition and assessment allow units to consider their effects, influences, products, and services. *Program Planning & Self-Study* should be a process that is driven by data and attainment of outcomes. Data and outcomes reveal the degree to which change should be sought in future planning. In general, *Program Planning & Self-Study* uses the following approach:

IDEAL → REAL → GAP → MAP

- IDEAL – This is the aspiration of the unit. What are the optimal programs, services, and outcomes? How does the unit pursue these? What environmental conditions affect unit strategy?

- REAL – Using assessment, data collection, and subjective considerations, determine what is really happening now. What outcomes are being achieved? What are the areas of strength and excellence?
- GAP -- How far is the actual from the intended? In what specific areas are these gaps most significant? What gaps may be created by future vision?
- MAP -- Which gaps are most critical to close? How will this be accomplished? What specific actions and resources are required? What aspects of the ideal must be implemented? How?

The Annual Report tracks progress toward strategic goals. It considers the effectiveness of planned change and may suggest alterations in course. It assesses the alignment of resources with needs. It links unit planning with University priorities. The Periodic Self-Study, which is conducted every five to ten years, lays a framework for the Annual Report and is where major changes should be explored, planned, and articulated. High performing units, those with strong alignment between the Ideal and Real, will always identify new ways for improvement. Those with large Gaps need to put strategic plans in place to close the Gaps, assessing progress in the Annual Report on the Map laid out in the Periodic Self-Study.

4. Self-Study, Peer Review, External Review, and Accreditation

To be successful, the Self-Study requires a multi-perspective approach. There are three primary sources of information to guide a unit during the Self-Study.

1. Self analysis and reflection is the primary source that includes systematic feedback from students, alumni and other stakeholders and the results of outcomes assessment and data analysis.
2. University analysis by members of the Pacific community outside of the unit.
3. All units are required to consider the external environment including regional, national, or global markets and other institutions. Representatives from external peer or aspirant programs/institutions may be engaged.

Several units are subject to periodic accreditation reviews by their respective professional association. If so, Self-Study for these units will be scheduled in close proximity to these accreditations to minimize workload and to use opportunities to join external evaluations to University Self-Studies. These units are still required to submit Annual Reports and Periodic Self Studies. Some units voluntarily adopt national standards (e.g., Council for the Advancement of Standards), and these may serve as the framework for the self-study. Other units do not participate in required external reviews even though they may have national associations or data sharing collaboratives or consortia. These units must consider the local and global contexts in their planning and review processes. All Self-Studies shall include information from both internal and external sources.

Below are some of the possible external roles in the process:

- experts engaged by the unit to compare a unit to best practices or accreditation standards
- assessment experts engaged by the unit who help design, establish, administer, analyze and/or synthesize unit level outcomes assessment
- facilitators engaged by the unit to guide and assist with unit and strategic planning activities
- experts who provide an overall assessment of a unit with recommendations
- management consultants who guide management or budgetary systems
- technical experts engaged by the unit on information management, tools, or socio-technical systems
- writers who cull self-study data and generate analyses or summaries
- accrediting teams.

5. The Annual Report

The Annual Reports serve as the official unit/department report. It does not constitute a second annual report prepared for the University. This section serves as a uniform university-wide guideline for these annual reports. Annual Reports should be brief 3-5 page summaries of the unit's performance on goals previously identified and on plans for the near future. The Provost, Vice President, or Dean may also provide additional requirements to meet specific administrative or budgetary needs. These reports should summarize the year's activities, track progress toward yearly goals supported by data, note any changes in the context or environment of the unit, and suggest plans and resource needs for the next year. The reports should provide clear linkages to budget requests. The associated Provost, Vice President, Office of the President, and Dean will set the yearly due dates for each unit and collect and archive the final reports.

The following are the content requirements for each unit's Annual Report:

- Brief statements of unit **mission, values, vision, and strategic goals**.
- Concise statements of **annual goals** from the last report including actions that were to be taken
- Summary of results and measures of **outcomes, impact, and evidence** focused on both unit Gaps and progress toward University Strategic Directions and goals.
- Statement of **existing Gaps**.
- The changing **context** in which the unit operates, both at the University level and in broader regional, national, and global settings.
- **Plans** for the coming year, stating allocated resources and resource deficiencies along with detailed Maps for closing existing Gaps.
- Choices, options, and **priorities** in these plans.

6. The Periodic Self-Study

6.1 The "Self-Study" Process

The Self-Study, applied on a five-to-ten year time table, should take no more than two years and includes pre-study, self-study, and post-study phases. In the pre-study phase, the unit should be sure to formulate the charge with the unit's direct supervisor in consultation with the Provost or Vice President of the division or Office of the President. An inventory of items including data collection, the prior Periodic Self-Study report, and other related information will be compiled. The unit should identify an internal project team to conduct the self-study, and a primary writer of the report. The roles of consultants, internal and external to the University, should be considered and plans made to contract for their services, if necessary.

Calendar for the Periodic Review

The three phases of the Self-Study are expected to take up to two years to complete, especially for larger, more complex units. There should be approximately one year of lead time before the Self-Study begins so the unit can prepare the resources necessary to adequately conduct the review and ensure its timely completion. The President's Cabinet will produce annually a three-year *Program Planning & Self-Study* schedule. Units must be reviewed at least every 10 years. The following milestones may be useful to help units organize the self-study workload over the two years of the review, but each Periodic Review will follow a unique path to completion.

One-year prior: Receive notification of Self-Study

Month 0: meet with VP/Dean/Provost and jointly determine charge and context

Month 1: unit meeting to organize work, meet with support team

Month 2: identify unit roles, set meeting strategy

Month 3: inventory complete, identify need for internal/external consultants, support

Month 6: conclude pre-study phase

Month 7: self-study begins, review/affirm mission, values, vision, goals

Month 8: gather appropriate information

Month 9: conclude first summaries of outcomes, activities, and synthesis of evidence

Month 11: conclude comparative analysis to benchmarks or other external norms

Month 13: conclude gap identification, analysis of support systems

Month 15: conclude mapping of future actions, strategies

Month 18: complete first draft and receive feedback from VP/Dean

Month 19: revised draft endorsed by VP/Dean forwarded to Evaluation Committee

Month 21: Evaluation Committee's review

Month 22: final edits to self-study (if necessary)

Month 24: self-study concludes, presentation to IPC, official response published

The process for each review should be approved by the appropriate VP or Dean. Important tasks to be performed by the unit during the pre-study phase include:

- ✓ Joint determination of charge
- ✓ Determine types/levels and duration of support
- ✓ Review context
- ✓ Consider criteria
- ✓ Inventory data
- ✓ Collect data
- ✓ Identify collaborators
- ✓ Clarify unit boundaries
- ✓ Identify consultants, if any
- ✓ Clarify role of consultants
- ✓ Determine/ Assign Responsibilities in/with unit
- ✓ Determine department consensus
- ✓ Set meeting strategy
- ✓ Set process & schedule
- ✓ Obtain input from VP/Dean

During the self-study period, the unit will affirm and update as necessary, the mission, values, vision, and goals. Both subjective and objective data should be synthesized to determine unit performance and strategic issues that will impact the unit over the next planning period. Action plans should be developed to address areas of concern, including reallocation of existing and potential new resources. Finally the document should clearly link to unit's goals and plans and to *Pacific Rising 2008-2015* and identify the potential impact on other units. The self-study document should then be discussed and reviewed with the VP or Dean. When the draft is considered complete, the VP or Dean will comment upon the Maps and strategic actions the unit recommended. Important tasks of the self-study phase include:

- ✓ Affirm mission, vision, values, & goals
- ✓ Review goals/standards
- ✓ Collect outcomes & assessment results
- ✓ Compile and analyze data
- ✓ Gather any missing, but necessary, data and information
- ✓ Synthesize evidence and identify opportunities/constraints
- ✓ Engage in self-reflection by Unit
- ✓ Complete writing and editing by drafting team
- ✓ Seek VP/Dean feedback
- ✓ Identify strategic issues
- ✓ Build action plans
- ✓ Consider alternatives
- ✓ Make choices/prioritize
- ✓ Identify linkages (strategic, internal and external)
- ✓ Complete editing and revisions
- ✓ Receive VP/Dean contribution & strategic recommendations

The post-study phase is characterized by processing the self-study and supporting materials. A University Evaluation Committee, one for academic (Academic Affairs for all three campuses) and one for administrative programs (representation from all four divisions and all three campuses), will 1) evaluate whether self-study processes were followed, 2) review the quality of report, 3) determine that criteria are addressed, and 4) recommend that the report advance or be returned to the unit for revision before advancing. The final report is forwarded to the Provost or Vice President for review and recommendation to the IPC and the President. The Assistant Provost for Planning will archive all documents. Important tasks of the post-study phase include:

- ✓ Self-study and VP/Dean response to Evaluation Committee
- ✓ Receive feedback and amendments (if necessary) by the Evaluation Committee
- ✓ Evaluation Committee endorsement
- ✓ Academic Council endorsement (for academic units)
- ✓ VP/Provost review and recommendation
- ✓ IPC review and recommendation
- ✓ Presidential review and decision

6.2 Content Requirements for the Periodic Self-Study Report

Each self-study should be organized into four primary sections and contain the following information. Additional requirements unique to Academic or Administrative units are addressed as Criteria for Review in the following sections.

Section One: Context for the Self-Study

- Statements of Mission, Values, Vision, and Goals
- Summary of significant events and activities since the last self-study
- Summary of context for the self-study, such as cultural, social, technical systems and the changing environment
- Identify linkages to the *Pacific Rising* or current strategic plan Commitments and Strategic Directions
- Clearly articulated description of the unit's aspiration

Section Two: Evidence forming the Real

- Address the criteria listed in Section 7 below
- Relevant Data derived from results, assessment, outcomes, and analyses
- Summary of the current state of the unit in the context of expected goals and outcomes
- Comparative analysis to external benchmarks, norms, or aspirational programs
- Documentation of collaboration and innovation

Section Three: Gap Identification

- Direct outcomes and primary goals (e.g. student learning, performance)
- Student and stakeholder satisfaction
- Administrative structures and leadership
- Financial, technical, and human support systems

Section Four: Mapping future actions

- Revisions to Mission, Values, Vision, and Goals (if any)
- Specific action plans and implementation strategies (including linkages to Pacific Rising Commitments and Strategic Directions)
- Resources, reallocations, new needs, and prioritization
- Business models and plans for major activities (if any)

6.3 Roles of Those Involved in the Periodic Review

UNIT: lead the self-study process, develop collaboration and consensus as appropriate, oversee outcomes assessment, generate the self-study, implement identified actions

DRAFTING TEAM of the UNIT: organize materials, generate the content of the self-study, organize the report, represent unit as appropriate

WRITER: compile parts, edit the document, create unitary tone and flow

UNIT CHAIR/MANAGER/SUPERVISOR: facilitate the process, process self-study document, represent unit

VICE PRESIDENT/DEAN: work with the unit to develop context for the review, monitor progress made by unit, provide initial review of self-study, comment on drafts, present document to IPC, final integrity and accountability for the process

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH & ASSESSMENT OFFICES: provide information to support a data driven self-study process, consult with units to meet their needs

INTERNAL PEERS/CONSULTANTS: provide a review from the institutional context if the unit requests such a perspective as evidence

EXTERNAL PEERS/CONSULTANTS: provide support to the unit during any or all of the three phases of the self-study process, see variety of possible roles in section 4

EVALUATION COMMITTEE: a University-wide committee composed of institutional peers that evaluates whether self-study processes were followed and recommends that the report advance or be returned to the unit for revision before advancing.

Academic Affairs is the evaluation committee for academic programs. The administrative committee is comprised of representatives from each division.

PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT/OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT: set multi-year program planning and self-study schedule for units, work with the unit to develop context for the review, suggest collaborative reviews, ensure linkages are made between self-studies and the *Pacific Rising 2008-2015*, process final document with Dean and Committee approvals.

INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES COMMITTEE: receive reports on all University Self-Studies, consider strategic investments and make recommendations to the President

PRESIDENT: support integrity in the *Program Planning & Self-Study* process, consider strategic directions, collaborations and external partnerships, issue and authorize decisions, allocate strategic resources

BOARD OF REGENTS: review decisions of the President and act on significant program creation or change.

6.4 The Collaborative Review

A collaborative program review is a specialized form of strategic self-study, analysis, and planning that involves more than one unit. A collaborative review can be suggested or requested for by the President, Provost, Vice President, or Dean, or be agreed upon by multiple units and approved by the appropriate Provost/Vice President. Such reviews would be initiated for several reasons – planned combined programs, for example, or new innovative service offerings, or when units share special interests, linked missions, or perform similar functions on more than one campus. Units may choose to engage in collaborative reviews more than once in a ten-year period.

7. The Criteria

7.1 Criteria for Academic Programs

During the self-study process, every academic unit of the University must address specific criteria during their self-study. There are eight primary criteria for academic programs on all three campuses. The self-study should provide evidence based on data collection, assessment activities, and observations related to each criterion. This evidence should be presented in Section Two of the self-study but should also be referenced in terms of the gaps that exist between outcomes and expectations and in future plans. Each question should be addressed.

Criterion One: Teaching & Learning: Describe how the curriculum of the program is regularly reviewed and current. Are the courses mapped to the program's learning outcomes? How successful are the necessary collaborations outside of the program? Is there adequate support for teaching and learning? Describe the variety of teaching and learning modes employed as best practice within the program. How is workload appropriately balanced across the faculty? Give evidence that advising is successful in meeting student needs. How well does the program promote linkages between liberal arts and professional education?

Criterion Two: Program distinctiveness and quality: Give evidence that the program has the quality necessary to meet learning goals and to remain competitive in the market. Does it have the resources to do so? How is the program distinctive, differentiated from programs at other comparable universities? To what extent does the program contribute to the university-wide marks of distinction, such as: leadership development, experiential learning, international education, etc.

Criterion Three: Outcomes and Assessment: How are learning outcomes defined and regularly assessed? Describe how the program's assessment plan has developed. Give evidence that alumni exhibit characteristics expected based on defined learning outcomes. To what degree are intended outcomes for faculty development and teaching attained?

Criterion Four: Scholarship: How active/productive are faculty in their scholarly/creative endeavors? Describe the program's faculty development activities. How well are faculty development leaves used? What is the quality of the unit's scholarship? Does the program have sufficient resources to support faculty scholarship?

Criterion Five: Service: What is the level of participation of the faculty in service to the University and the community? Is it appropriate and balanced? Do faculty in the program provide leadership in service to the University and/or the profession?

Criterion Six: Program Demand: How are enrollment goals being set and met? To what degree are enrollments sustained at a level that supports both the unit and the University? How does demographic information (market demand, graduate placement, etc.) inform enrollment planning? What yield activities support enrollment? To what extent does the unit/program/department support enrollment in other programs?

Criterion Seven: Administrative: How do the unit's organizational structures and operations adequately support the teaching and learning mission? To what degree are budgets successfully managed? Does the unit have resources adequate to meet its mission? To what degree do academic support services meet student needs? Does the program have sufficient resources to sustain distinctiveness and quality?

Criterion Eight: Alumni and External Relations: Describe alumni engagement in the unit's activities. How does the unit solicit alumni advice and feedback? How effectively does the unit identify and interact with its external audiences and with external partners?

7.2 Criteria for Administrative Units

During the self-study process, every administrative unit on all three campuses of the University must address the following criteria within their self-study. The purpose of the administrative self-study is to allow each unit an opportunity to systematically assess its alignment with the University's strategic plan and its own effectiveness in contributing to University priorities. There are four primary criteria for administrative units. The self-study should provide evidence based on data collection, assessment activities, and observations related to each criterion. This evidence should be presented in Section Two of the self-study but should also be referenced in terms of the gaps that exist between outcomes and expectations and in future plans. Each question should be addressed. Certain units such as the Library may have both academic and administrative missions and should consider mixed or hybrid criteria as appropriate.

Criterion One: Alignment: How aligned is the unit to the mission of the University? What is the interconnectedness to the academic mission? How does the unit collaborate with other administrative units and processes, including those on the other campuses? How does the unit enhance shared resources and services?

Criterion Two: Program distinctiveness and quality: Does the program have the quality necessary to meet production and service goals and contribute to overall University operations? How is the unit distinctive?

Criterion Three: Processes and Tasks: How are performance outcomes clearly defined and regularly assessed? What specific measures, metrics, and tools are used to assess outcomes? To what extent are these performance outcomes attained? Give evidence of how the unit's leadership adequately supports the unit's mission? How engaged are the employees in the unit's processes and leadership? To what degree are the unit's clients satisfied and are their needs met? To what degree are the unit's services integrated with comparable services on the other campuses?

Criterion Four: Resources: Is the unit adequately staffed to meet its mission? Do the staff have adequate skills to support unit functioning? To what degree does the unit's budget meet expense needs? To what degree does the unit collaborate with other campuses to increase efficiency and effectiveness? What is the level of technology and technical competence compared to similar units at similar institutions? To what degree do these technologies and tool meet the needs of the unit?

8. Support for and Improvement of the Process

The University's *Program Planning & Self-Study* process is facilitated by the Assistant Provost for Planning, Innovation, and Institutional Assessment and supported by the staff in the Office of the Provost who maintain historical documents and directly support ongoing reviews. In addition, a team including the Director of Institutional Research (data provision), Assessment Specialist (learning outcomes and other assessment), and Director of Performance Management (business processes and metrics) will support the process.

This first implementation of the revised *Program Planning & Self-Study* process in 2008-09 will be annually updated as the University learns more about what worked, what didn't, and what was overlooked. After a few years, the process should stabilize and remain consistent for some time.

Appendix A
WASC standards regarding the review of programs

2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.

2.7 In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such reviews.

4.4 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program planning and self-studies, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

Appendix C Key Terms

ANNUAL CYCLE: The repeating yearly calendar in which the unit conducts planning, budgeting, assessment, and analyzes gaps. The unit's annual cycle is embedded in the overall University annual planning and budgeting cycle. Annual Reports are written to summarize the annual cycle and to set the stage for next year's budgeting.

ANNUAL REPORT: A brief report written by each unit that summarizes the planning, implementation, and assessment activities in the annual cycle. The document is used to communicate progress and align planning and resource management across the University.

COLLABORATIVE PERIODIC SELF-STUDY: A specialized form of strategic self-study, analysis, and planning that involves more than one unit. These would typically occur when units share interests, have significant linkages in mission, perform similar functions on more than one campus, or are planning for combined programs or services.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW: The broad areas that each unit must consider when conducting a self-study within periodic review. They may translate to sections of the periodic review report and, while common across academic and administrative units, are customized to the mission and nature of the unit.

EVALUATION COMMITTEE: A University-wide committee responsible for ensuring that the unit has followed procedures regarding Periodic Self-Study, has addressed all necessary criteria, and has successfully consulted with required participants in the process. Two committees exist: 1) Administrative Evaluation Committee appointed by the President with representatives of the four divisions and all three campuses; 2) Academic Evaluation Committee as the Academic Affairs Committee as a whole.

EXTERNAL REVIEW: The portion of a unit's self study that involves experts external to the University. This may be an accrediting body or national association related to the discipline of the unit or other peers. An external peer review may also be composed of members of the University community that are not part of the unit or experts outside the university.

GAP: The distance between expected and attained performance along any dimension. Collectively for a unit, this pertains to the overall Ideal for the unit compared to the assessment of the Real in terms of goals, outcomes, and measures.

IDEAL: The aspirational or optimal state of performance for a unit of the University. This is defined by the unit with input from the University community in the context of external norms, benchmarks, and expert opinion.

MAP: The process of developing detailed action plans that move a unit from current to preferred aspirational or optimal performance defined in terms of goals, outcomes, and measures.

PACIFIC RISING: The University's strategic planning document for 2008-2015 composed of core and aspirational values, commitments, and strategic direction statements.

PERIODIC SELF-STUDY: A multi-year strategic process for units of the University that involves describing the Ideal vision, assessing current Real outcomes, identifying Gaps between the two, and Mapping strategies and actions for the next multi-year period. The core process of periodic review is the unit Self-Study. The purpose is program improvement.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND SELF-STUDY: A process through which units conduct annual and periodic reviews of their performance, outcomes, and goal setting linked to University strategic planning.

REAL: The current state of performance of a unit defined in terms of their expected outcomes and measured by a collection of subjective, objective, and external criteria.

SELF-STUDY: The process through which units engage in collective reflection on their mission, values, vision, and goals using assessment techniques and incorporating planning processes to map to future destinations.

STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN: An extension of *Pacific Rising* that specifies goals and actions for each strategic direction. The Strategic Action Plan is updated and informed yearly by unit planning and goal generation.

STRATEGIC CYCLE: The repeating multi-year calendar in which the unit engages in self-study and generates strategic plans. The unit's strategic cycle is embedded in and informs overall University planning. Periodic Self-Study reports are written to summarize the strategic multi-year cycle.

UNIT: Distinct organizational entities that are differentiated by mission, purpose, administrative boundaries, and budgetary controls. There are two types of units, academic and administrative, that follow separate criteria for Self-Study. Academic units directly support the central mission of teaching and learning by providing instructional activities, and are further defined by having faculty. Each is led by an Academic Dean. Administrative units generally support the central mission of the university by providing services and resources. These include academic support units and the Library.