Thanks to Cyd Jenefsky for permission to utilize the JFK University Program Review Guide as a template for our adaptation.
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Chapter 1: Program Review Introduction & Overview

The purpose of program review is continuous program improvement. The Program Review Guide provides a framework for conducting a thorough, evidence-based analysis of a program in order to understand a program’s strengths, identify key areas of improvement, and create a workable plan for achieving the desired improvements.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), created under the Provost’s office in Spring 2012, supports and manages institutional effectiveness activities, including program review for all academic and non-academic units on campus. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness (DIEF) oversees this office. The Director of Learning oversees outcomes based learning assessment in the academic units and Academic Assessment who works closely with the DIEF to ensure the alignment and integration of the learning assessment and institutional effectiveness review processes.

Introduction

The (OIE) works with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)—appointed in Fall 2011 as a 2-year pilot with current membership—to implement the new program review process and assist faculty, deans and non-academic unit leaders with building foundational skills for effective program assessment. The IEC oversees the implementation of program review in coordination with the Provost Office.

In 2008, the Academic Council approved Pacific’s revised Program Review process. The revised Program Review Guide has been further modified by the IEC as a pilot for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 review cycles in an effort to make the review process more straightforward. The document will be reviewed by the IEC at the end of the two-year implementation pilot and updated with input from those units that have undergone review during this period. The IEC’s intention in adopting this guide is to make the program review process easier and more effective.

Overview of Program Review

All programs are scheduled to undergo program review within about a 7-year cycle. Our current schedule is available on the Provost’s website.

Program Review Process

The major steps of the Program Review Process are illustrated in the chart “Steps in Evidence Based Decision-Making”, available on the Provost’s website here.

These are:

- Data Collection & Analysis
- Cumulative 6-Year Self-Study
- Interpretation/Presentation of the Evidence:
  - External Review
  - Program Review Team Report
- Action Plan
- IEC’s Summary & Evaluation of Program Review
Program Review Timeline

Program Review (PR) is approximately 12 months, beginning with creation of the Self-Study Groups (SSG) in May and commencement of the Self-Study process. The Review is complete once the program’s Action Plan is finalized, as early as May of the following year.

April/May DIFE meets with Deans and program leaders re: following year PR; Data Packets distributed; SSGs created and participate in training with DIFE

June/July DIFE meets with VPs /Deans and unit leaders re: following year PR; Data Packets distributed; SSGs created and participate in training with DIFE

Aug-Dec Self-Study Group creates Self-Study Report
  
  DIFE works with VPs and Deans to create Program Review Teams (PRT); PRTs meet with DIFE to prepare for writing the Program Review report; External Reviewers identified

Oct 15 Draft of Self-Study Report due to IEC

Oct 15-Nov 15 IEC reviews draft Self-Study Reports and meets with each SSG to provide feedback

Nov 15-Dec 15 SSG revises Self-Study Report based on feedback from IEC

Dec 15 Self Study Report due to the OIE

Dec 15-Jan 1 VPs and DIFE review SSGs and affirm ready for external reviewers; DIFE invites External Reviewers to campus for Feb site visit
  
  Program Review Teams (PRT) receive Self-Study Reports

Jan-Feb External Reviewers conduct site visits; reports due no later than March 1st

Jan-Apr Program Review Reports written by PRTs based on Self-Study and External Reviewer reports

April 1 Draft Program Review Reports due to IEC

April 1-May 1 IEC reviews draft Program Review Reports and meets with each PRT and Deans or VPs to provide feedback

May 15 Program Review Teams revise and finalize Program Review Reports
  
  Program/unit leaders work with Deans and VPs to draft Action Plan
Constituted in May, the Self-Study Group completes its Self-Study Report by December 15, which is due to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). For academic reviews, the SSG is a team of faculty assigned by the program chair and dean. For non-academic reviews, the SSG is a team of staff assigned by the Division head or his/her designate.

Self-Study Preparation

Planning Meeting
The Director of Institutional Effectiveness meets with the respective department/program chairs and deans for academic program reviews in May. For non-academic reviews, the DIEF meets with unit leaders and VPs during June/July. The purpose of these meetings is to provide assistance with preliminary planning for their self-studies that start in August and to discuss composition of the Self Study Group (SSG).

This meeting provides an overview of the program review process and addresses resources, data sources and other evidence used for the program’s self-study inquiry, timelines and important dates, and issues unique to the program or unit under review (multiple campuses/locations, external disciplinary accreditation, etc.).

Standard data packets provided by Institutional Research for the purposes of program review will be distributed at these meetings.

Appointing the Self-Study Group
For academic reviews, the program/department chair (in communication with the dean) appoints a Self-Study Chair and enlists faculty and staff as appropriate to serve as the Self-Study Group. This process is completed before the commencement of summer recess.

For non-academic reviews, the division VP or his/her designate appoints a Self-Study Chair and enlists staff and faculty as appropriate to serve as the Self-Study Group. This process is completed during June/July.

Once the SSG is established, they meet with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness (DIEF) to discuss the program review process, data packet, self-study and timeline as well as to address initial questions.

SSGs officially convene to begin the Self-Study in August, kicked off by a training meeting hosted by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Previous SSGs may also be invited to attend this meeting so they may share valuable insights about their program review experience.

Resources to Support Self-Study
The OIE provides any required resources to support Program Review, including providing administrative support, covering the costs associated with external review visits, and purchasing all required office supplies. SSGs should contact the DIEF if additional expenses arise during the preparation of the Self-Study to determine whether the identified cost is justifiable and will be funded by the university. Be sure to make such inquiries to the DIEF before any additional expenses are incurred.

Program data
The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, working in close collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research, provides each program
or unit under review with a set of relevant data reports necessary for completing the self-study. These data will be provided to the appropriate dean in May for academic reviews and to the appropriate VP in June/July for non-academic reviews.

In some cases, an administrative unit new to Program Review will not have data relevant to its operations or effectiveness. It will be the job of the DIEF, working closely with the appropriate VP, to identify a plan for collecting data for future reviews and to determine an appropriate method for completing the Self-Study.

Additional Support
The Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the Office of Institutional Research and members of the IEC are all available for questions, advice, organizational tips, and assistance. For academic program reviews, the Director of Learning and Academic Assessment is also an important resource and should be consulted during the preparation of the Self Study. Additionally, for academic reviews, deans should remain engaged in the program review process and can provide support. For non-academic reviews, VPs should remain engaged in the program review process and be accessible to SSGs for the same support. It is advised that the SSG check-in periodically with the DIEF to discuss concerns that may arise.

Conducting the Self-Study Inquiry
Self-Study questions: Assessing Program Quality (Part A), Assessing Program Sustainability (Part B), and Overview of Program Changes (Part C) are provided (in Chapter 3, pages 7-10) to help guide the self-study inquiry. The SSG should address all questions by providing an evidence-based analysis of the program, including: the interpretation of data, discussion of results, and decisions for improvement. For examples of how this applies to non-academic programs, see Chapter 4: Self-Study Report Questions & Appendix for Non-Academic Programs.

When answering the self-study questions, be concise with all discussions and make underlying evidence transparent to the audience/readers (see report distribution below).

Draft Self-Study Report
On October 15, a working draft of the Self-Study Report and related evidence are to be submitted to OIE for review by the IEC. The dean or appropriate VP will need to review the draft before then.

Shortly after, the IEC will meet with the program/department chair/director (academic reviews) or unit leader (non-academic) and the SSG to review work-in-progress and provide constructive feedback for the final report. Deans and VPs should make every effort to be present for these discussions as well.

Final Self-Study Report
The final report with all appendices (submitted electronically) is due December 15 to the OIE.

Report Distribution
The OIE will distribute the following:

- 2 copies to be sent electronically to 1-2 external reviewers (see Chapter 4 for detailed information) who provide outside expert recommendations on how to improve your program or unit.

- 1 electronic copy for the OIE and IEC to provide feedback on the quality of the self-study and alignment between evidence and proposed improvements. The OIE will be responsible for archiving all program review documents for the university.
• Consult with the dean or VP if additional copies of the self-study are requested within the school or unit.

Self-Study Report Format
The final Self-Study Report should be organized with the following components (templates and samples are provided on the Provost Office website):

**Cover Page**
The cover page of the self-study report should include:

- The title - “Self Study Report”
- The year of the self-study
- Name of the program or unit under review and its chair or director
- Name of the college/school or division in which the program/unit under review resides and the name of the appropriate dean or VP
- Names of the members of the SSG
- The date submitted to the OIE.

**Table of Contents**
The table of contents should include a Program Profile, Parts A, B, & C of the self-study report and appendix.

**Program Profile**
Write the program profile for a reader who is not familiar with the program or unit. Define key terms and concepts that explain the program or unit’s philosophy and/or purpose. If an academic, degree-granting program, briefly explain what graduates do with the degree earned. If an academic center or program that is non-degree granting, briefly explain what programming is provided. If a non-academic office or program, briefly explain its services or function. List other programs/offices with relevant affiliations and/or partnerships, if any, and reveal any current changes or new initiatives in these affiliates that are significant to the program or unit under review. Finally, provide brief information about the SSG and program/unit leader and school or divisional leader.

**Self-Study**
Self-study answers (Assessing Program Quality (Part A), Assessing Program Sustainability (Part B) and Overview of Proposed Changes (Part C)) should be single-spaced. When answering the self-study questions, be concise and mindful of audience/readers who may not be familiar with special language (i.e. jargon) or short-hand (i.e. acronyms) typically used in the program or unit under review. For academic units citing relevant scholarly literature on pedagogical or disciplinary best practices, use APA citation format.

**Appendix**
After the self-study report, include an appendix, a collection of data/evidence supporting the self-study.
Self-Study Group (SSG)

1. Designate particular members to oversee and write different parts of the self-study report.

2. Identify faculty or staff with the following skills to be a part of your SSG:
   a. project management—track ‘to-do’ lists, manage schedules, monitor due dates, manage documents, data, and drafts of the report
   b. research & analysis—collect evidence, develop assessment tools, and tally data for results

Logistical and Administrative Support

SSGs may rely on ________ to coordinate meetings, order office supplies, process and track expenses, format, print and assemble final report and appendices and set-up the external review site visit.

Evidence

Evidence is a crucial element for the findings and conclusions in your report. For each report section, identify and inventory the evidence needed to answer the questions. Work with the Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness and the Director of Institutional Research and, for academic reviews, also the Director of Learning and Academic Assessment to make sure you have the evidence you need and understand what the data provided in the distributed Program Review Data Packet indicates. Be sure to note in the Self Study if there are additional pieces of data that would have been useful to your Self Study but were unavailable and why. This will be an important part of the IEC’s evaluation of Pacific’s capacity to conduct Program Review productively.

Feedback to the Self-Study Report

The IEC uses specific guidelines to provide self-study feedback. You can refer to these guidelines to help you understand how the self-study will be evaluated.
Chapter 3: Self-Study Report Questions & Appendix for Academic Programs

The self-study report is an evidence-based assessment of your program so be sure to ground all of your responses in data/evidence. The data/evidence relevant to each section of the report is identified below and should be placed in your report’s appendix.

Assessing Program Quality

This section of your self-study report is drafted by the department chair or program director and Self-Study Group. For departments with a graduate program, make sure you answer the questions below for both your undergraduate and graduate programs.

1. Student Learning Results

To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix A: Academic and Professional Standards, and Appendix B: Annual Report

a) How well do your program learning outcomes (PLOs) represent the scope and depth of learning appropriate to:
   - The degree/certificate program offered
   - To the standards of your discipline/profession

   How do you know?

b) Based on your annual learning results did your program achieve its standards for success? (Yes/No, explain) How well are students learning in comparison to your standards for success?

c) From the above answers, what did you learn about your students' learning? And what changes do you want to make to improve student learning?

2. Student Learning Assessment Process

To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix B: Annual Report and Appendix C: Assessment Plans

a) Are your annual learning results giving you useful information for guiding ongoing program improvements? Explain. How does your program routinely utilize its annual learning results for program planning/improvement? In what ways have your program improvements impacted student learning? How do you know?

b) How effective are your current methods/procedures for assessing student achievement of your program learning outcomes? What is working well and how do you know? What needs improvement and why? Explain.

c) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your student learning assessment process?
3. Academic Curriculum
To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix D: Curriculum Alignment Matrix and Appendix E: Curriculum Flow Chart

a) How well does your program offer sufficient opportunities for students to learn relevant disciplinary and professional knowledge, skills, competencies, etc. (at relevant beginning, intermediate and advanced levels) for the type and level of degree/certificate conferred? Explain.

Include in your discussion:

- alignment between courses and program learning outcomes (PLOs)
- scaffolding (how all the parts build on each other in a progressive, intentional way) and scheduling of courses so students can follow the best sequence (e.g. examine your program’s flow chart)
- whether students take courses in the recommended sequence (whether required to do so or not)

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s curriculum?

4. Faculty Quality
To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix F: Faculty CVs, Appendix G: Criteria for “Quality” Faculty, Appendix H: Faculty Profile, and Appendix I: Core Faculty Work/Teach Load

a) Based on the data from your: 1) faculty CVs; 2) your criteria for ‘quality’ faculty, 3) core faculty and active adjunct faculty profiles; and 4) core faculty work/teach load, how well does your overall faculty meet the needs of your program(s) (e.g., in terms of teaching experience, areas of expertise, academic qualifications, committee and advising needs, etc.)? How do you know? What are the particular strengths and areas for improvement in your program’s faculty composition?

b) Explain your standards/processes for faculty hiring, professional development, and evaluation. How well are you cultivating a high quality faculty? Explain.

c) Using the core faculty workload data above, is your faculty workload well distributed: 1) between the faculty? 2) well distributed to accomplish all faculty responsibilities within the program/school/university?

d) Describe how well adjunct faculty are integrated into the life of your program beyond the courses they teach (e.g. meeting with students, student learning assessment, service on committees and professional development, mentoring and coaching).

e) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s faculty quality?

5. Student Satisfaction
To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix J: Student Satisfaction Survey Results
a) Based on student satisfaction survey results and any other evidence you have (e.g. focus groups with students), how satisfied are students with your program’s curriculum, faculty, program administration, general learning environment, campus facilities and student services? Do their answers meet your expectations? How proud are they of your program and Pacific?

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s student satisfaction?

6. Graduates’ Success
To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix K: Graduate Success Defined and Appendix L: Graduate Survey Results

a) To what extent are graduates of your program succeeding in relevant careers, graduate programs, community service, creative endeavors, ways of living, or other indicators of graduate success? How do you know? (Include evidence in Appendix K)

In your discussion, include the following:

- student perceptions about attaining their personal and professional goals
- information from employers, graduate schools, licensure exams or other external sources to assess graduates’ degree of success
- other kinds of achievements and/or outcomes used to measure graduate success.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your program’s graduates’ success?

Assessing Program Sustainability
This section of your self-study report is drafted collaboratively by the program chair and dean.

7. Student Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation
To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix M: Student Retention, Attrition, and Graduation Data and Appendix N: Student Demographics

a) Is your program attracting, retaining, and graduating the mix of students you seek in your program (target markets, demographic mix, qualifications, etc.)? How effective are your recruitment and admission processes? How do you know?

b) What does your program do to improve/address retention, attrition, and graduation rates?

c) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s student enrollment, retention, and graduation rates?

8. Contributions to the University
To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix O: Missions and Appendix P: Your Program’s Assets to the University
a) In what ways does your program contribute to the University (mission alignment, external accreditation, contributions to the community or profession, etc.)? Also include a discussion (and evidence) of any external recognition your program has received.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s contributions to the University?

9. Societal and Professional Demand

To assist you with the questions below, use (but do not limit yourself to) evidence from Appendix O: Missions, Appendix Q: Societal/Market Trends and Appendix R: Program Competition

a) How does this program meet/address societal and professional needs (including partnerships with organizations, community involvement, specialized accreditation, etc.)? How do you know?

In your discussion, include the following:

- how this program meets current and potential future trends within the labor market and society
- how this program differentiates itself from its competition
- any foreseen modifications that may be needed in order to stay competitive.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your academic curriculum?

OPTIONAL: Future Data Needs

In hindsight, did you learn that there were data needs (new and/or improved) that could have better assisted you with this report? Please describe what your data needs would be for your next self-study.

Pacific will accept reports for external accreditation with an addendum that addresses any gaps with the information requested above, particularly those related to institutional wide learning outcomes.

Overview of Proposed Changes

This section of the self-study report is drafted collaboratively by the department chair or program director and dean.

10. Program Vision & Goals

a) Vision--In light of the mission of Pacific, your college and your program, state the five-year vision for your program.

b) Goals--Identify the key goals that need to be achieved in 1, 3 & 5 years to fulfill your vision.

11. Overview of Proposed Changes

Review and reflect on all parts of your self-study and use the Overview of Proposed Changes worksheet to provide the following information about each proposed change that will significantly improve the quality of your program. List changes in order of priority.

a) Brief description of significant proposed changes to improve your program.

b) Rationale & evidence from your Self-Study Report that support this change.
c) Rationale & evidence from outside sources beyond your self-study findings.

Below is a list of basic materials (data/evidence) which should be referenced in the self-study report. You are not limited to this list. If you have additional evidence that supports your report, include it in the appendices. The appendices should be included in all final copies of your self-study report.

NOTE: Large files such as faculty CVs and samples of student work should be available during the external review site visit, but will not be mailed to external reviewers (see Chapter 4 for a list of external review site visit evidence).

Appendix A: Academic & Professional Standards
Provide academic and professional standards of your discipline and other related evidence in Appendix A.

Appendix B: Annual Learning Results Reports
Provide Annual Learning Results reports and other related evidence (e.g. rubrics, copies of survey instruments, other assessment instruments) in Appendix B.

NOTE: Samples of student work should be available for external reviewers during the time of your site visit.

Appendix C: Assessment Plans
Provide assessment plans and other related evidence in Appendix C.

Appendix D: Curriculum Alignment Matrix
Provide a list all courses offered in your curriculum by filling out (or attaching your current) Curriculum Alignment Matrix. Identify whether each course is required or elective and its delivery model (face-to-face, on-line, hybrid, or other). Identify program learning outcomes taught in each course and at what level- (B) beginning, (I) Intermediate, or (A) Advanced. Also include other related evidence in Appendix D.

Appendix E: Curriculum Flow Chart
Provide your program’s curriculum flow chart. Be sure to include the quarter/semester each course is offered. Also include other related evidence in Appendix E.

Appendix F: Faculty CVs
Provide a roster or CV summary (e.g., from catalogue or website) of all active faculty. Clearly indicate core (tenured and tenure-track) and non-tenure-track faculty status.

NOTE: Copies of active faculty CVs should be available for external reviewers during the time of your site visit.
Appendix G: Criteria for “Quality” Faculty
Provide your program’s criteria for “quality faculty” (in the aggregate for your program, not just individual faculty). Also include other related evidence in Appendix G.

NOTE: Copies of course evaluation forms from students should be available for external reviewers during the time of your site visit.

Appendix H: Faculty Profile
Provide a summary of your faculty profile-Years of Teaching Experience, Faculty Demographics (gender and ethnicity), and rank of all faculty actively teaching at Pacific. In the unit under review? Or as compared to Pacific as a whole.

Appendix I: Core Faculty Work/Teach Load
Provide Core Faculty Work/Teach load information here.

NOTE: A copy of your faculty hiring and evaluation process and work/teach load guidelines should be available for external reviewers during the time of your site visit.

Appendix J: Student Satisfaction Survey Results
Provide student satisfaction survey results here. (University-wide student satisfaction survey is provided by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness). Also include other related evidence in Appendix J.

Appendix K: Graduate Success Defined
Provide your program’s criteria of graduate success. Also include other related evidence (e.g. summary information from alumni, employers, graduates schools, licensure exams, other kind of achievements used to measure graduate success) in Appendix K.

NOTE: Sample material should be available for external reviewers during the time of your site visit.

Appendix L: Graduate Survey Results
Provide graduation survey results here. (Graduate survey information is provided by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness.) Also include other related evidence in Appendix L.

Appendix M: Student Retention, Attrition, and Graduation Data
Provide summary (as well as copies of the original data) of disaggregated student retention, attrition, and graduation rates here. (Information is provided by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness.) Also include other related evidence in Appendix M. If the department is actively involved in reviewing candidates for admission (e.g. graduate programs), provide a copy of your admissions process and criteria.

Appendix N: Student Demographics
Provide student demographic information here (or fill-out the Student Demographic table). (This information is provided by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness). Also include other related evidence in Appendix N.

Appendix O: Missions
Provide the University’s mission (can be extracted from Provost Office website), your school’s mission and program’s mission.

**Appendix P: Your Program’s Assets to the University**

Provide a list of your program’s assets – grants, research, honors, awards, donor contributions, specialized accreditation, contributions to the community or profession from faculty/staff/students/alumni, etc. Also include other related evidence in Appendix P.

**Appendix Q: Societal/Market Trends**

Provide a list of current and potential future trends of your discipline, profession, and society that may impact future planning for your program (e.g. refer to the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics website: [http://www.bls.gov/oco/](http://www.bls.gov/oco/), other research on disciplinary & social trends, etc. as evidence.) Also include related evidence in Appendix Q.

**Appendix R: Program Competition**

Provide your program’s top 5 competitors—name, location/s, delivery model/s and niche market (or fill-out the Program Competition table). Also include related evidence in Appendix R.

**OPTIONAL: Continuation of the Appendices**

Add additional appendices as needed. Clearly label your evidence and identify its relevance to the report (including relevant page numbers.)
The self-study report for all programs and units in Pacific’s Student Life Division shall be based on the program standards developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. These standards pertain to each service area within Student Life and prompt specific assessment questions. Additionally, each Self-Study Report for programs in the Division will include the specific areas of inquiry stipulated below. Like all Program Review Self-Studies at Pacific, this document is an evidence-based assessment of your unit.
### Assessing Program Quality

*This section of your self-study report is drafted by the program director or unit leader and Self-Study Group.*

#### 1. Student Learning Results

How well do your program learning outcomes (PLOs) represent the scope and depth of learning appropriate to your program or unit?

How do you know?

- Based on your annual learning results did your program or unit achieve its standards for success? (Yes/No, explain)
- How well are students learning in comparison to your standards for success?
- From the above answers, what did you learn about your students’ learning? And what changes do you want to make to improve student learning?

#### 2. Student Learning Assessment Process

Are your annual learning results giving you useful information for guiding ongoing program improvements? Explain. How does your program routinely utilize its annual learning results for program planning/improvement? In what ways have your program improvements impacted student learning? How do you know?

How effective are your current methods/procedures for assessing student achievement of your program learning outcomes? What is working well, and how do you know? What needs improvement and why? Explain.

From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your student learning assessment process?

#### 3. Co-Curriculum

How well does your program offer sufficient opportunities for students to learn relevant knowledge, skills, competencies, etc. (at relevant beginning, intermediate and advanced levels) as laid out in your program/unit goals and objectives? Explain.

Include in your discussion:

- alignment between learning opportunities and program learning outcomes
- scaffolding (how all the parts build on each other in a progressive, intentional way) and accessibility of learning opportunities so students can follow the best sequence (e.g. examine your program’s flow chart)
- whether students take advantage of learning opportunities in the intended or recommended sequence/manner (whether required to do so or not)

From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s curriculum?

#### 4. Student Satisfaction

---

*Student Life Self-Study PART A*
Based on student satisfaction survey results and any other evidence you have (e.g. focus groups with students), how satisfied are students with your program’s co-curriculum, staff, program administration, general learning environment, campus facilities and student services? Do their answers meet your expectations? How proud are they of your program and Pacific?

From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s student satisfaction?

5. Defining Quality
How does your unit define quality? Are there standards beyond student learning that are important measures of success and insights for improvement for your program or unit?

What is the unit’s role in the institution? Is it adequately fulfilling its role? How do you know?

How well do your unit goals and objectives (UGOs) represent the scope and depth of the unit’s stated function? How do you know?

Based on your annual reports did your unit consistently achieve its standards for success? (Yes/No, explain) How well is the unit delivering the service it is charged to provide? How do the unit’s performance outcomes compare with its goals? Are the standards for success being met?

What did you learn about your unit’s quality by examining performance indicators? And what changes do you want to make to improve the unit’s effectiveness and efficiency?

6. Assessing Unit Performance
How does your unit routinely utilize information about its performance to engage in ongoing improvement? Are your annual measures of success giving you useful information for guiding ongoing improvements? Explain. In what ways have your unit improvements impacted employees, other university staff, students and/or their families, or alumni? How do you know? What is working well and what needs improvement?

What did you learn by investigating these questions? And what changes do you want to make to improve the performance assessment process for your unit?

7. Staff Development
What are your unit’s criteria for “quality” staff? What is the staff workload? How well does current staff meet the needs of the unit? How do you know? What are the particular strengths and areas for improvement in your unit’s staff composition?

Explain your standards/processes for staff hiring and evaluation. How well are you cultivating a high quality staff? Explain.

Describe the unit’s staff development plan and the unit’s efforts toward developing this plan.

What training was offered? Do all unit staff members have opportunities to improve their performance? Describe any other staff development efforts and how they have improved unit effectiveness.

What certifications are required or recommended in the unit? Describe how successful the unit is with its staff certifications (please provide evidence).
From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your unit’s staff quality?

**Assessing Program Sustainability**
*This section of your self-study report is drafted collaboratively by the program or unit leader and appropriate AVP or Dean.*

**7. Student Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation**
What does your program/unit do to improve/address recruitment/enrollment of students?

What does your program do to improve/address retention, attrition, and graduation rates?

From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s contributions to student enrollment, retention, and/or graduation rates?

**8. Contributions to the University**
In what ways does your program contribute to the University (mission alignment, external accreditation, contributions to the community or profession, etc.)? Also include a discussion (and evidence) of any external recognition your program has received.

From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s contributions to the University?

**9. Societal and Professional Demand**
How does this program meet/address societal and professional needs (including partnerships with organizations, community involvement, specialized accreditation, etc.)? How do you know?

In your discussion, include the following:
- how this program meets current and potential future trends within the labor market and society
- how this program differentiates itself from its competition
- any foreseen modifications that may be needed in order to stay competitive.

From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your academic curriculum?

**OPTIONAL: Future Data Needs**
In hindsight, did you learn that there were data needs (new and/or improved) which could have better assisted you with this report? Please describe what your data needs would be for your next self-study.

**Overview of Proposed Changes**
*This section of the self-study report is drafted collaboratively by the program or unit leader and appropriate AVP.*

**10. Program Vision & Goals**
Vision—In light of the mission of Pacific, your Division and your program or unit, state the five-year vision for your program.

Goals—Identify the key goals that need to be achieved in 1, 3 & 5 years to fulfill your vision.

11. Overview of Proposed Changes
Review and reflect on all parts of your self-study and provide the following information about each proposed change that will significantly improve the quality of your program. List changes in order of priority.

a) Brief description of significant proposed changes to improve your program/unit.

b) Rationale & evidence from your self-study report that support this change.

c) Rationale & evidence from outside sources beyond your self-study findings.

Please include all evidence that supports your report in the appendices. Clearly label your evidence and identify its relevance to the report (including relevant page numbers.)

The appendices should be included in all final copies of your self-study report.
Chapter 5: Self-Study Report Questions & Appendix
for Non-Academic Programs

The self-study report is an evidence-based assessment of your unit. For non-academic units the goal of the report is to identify what a unit is doing, what it is doing well, what needs to improve, and how improvement might be accomplished. Evidence for each of these components helps to answer the underlying question: how do you know what you know? Often the starting point is measuring whether a goal has been accomplished. For example, if a lock shop determined that its’ goal was to make building access easier for campus users, it would have to provide evidence showing that it had done so. All of the following forms of evidence might help to demonstrate this: quotes from user surveys, numbers of surveyed individuals who reported satisfaction with the services of the lock shop, a decline in the number of calls to Public Safety to obtain access to a building, and examples of common access challenges that have ceased since the lock shop implemented changes to achieve the goal. Such evidence could also be used to identify “next steps” in improving customer service for this unit. The goal of the self-study report for non-academic units, therefore, is to evaluate the performance not of a unit’s leader but of the entire unit and how it carries out its purpose.

Assessing Unit Quality
This section of your self-study report is drafted by the unit leader and Self-Study Group.

1. Defining Quality
How does your unit define and measure quality?
How well do your unit goals and objectives (UGOs) represent the scope and depth of:

- The services your program/unit provides to the university?
- The standards or best practices of your program/unit?

How do you know?
How do the unit’s performance outcomes compare with its goals? Are the standards for success being met?
What did you learn about your unit’s quality by examining performance indicators? And what changes do you want to make to improve the unit’s effectiveness and efficiency?

2. Assessing Unit Performance
How does your unit routinely utilize information about its performance to engage in ongoing improvement?

Are your annual measures of success giving you useful information for guiding ongoing improvements? Explain.

---

1 This section of the report includes some ideas taken from the University of Central Florida Program Review Guide for non-academic programs. Some of the particular questions listed here were taken from that document. It can be found on-line at the CFU’s website. Other program review guides consulted for this document include:
In what ways have your unit improvements impacted employees, other university staff, students and/or their families, or alumni? How do you know?

What did you learn by investigating these questions? And what changes do you want to make to improve the performance assessment process for your unit?

3. Staff Quality & Development

Based on the data from your 1) staff resumes; 2) your unit’s criteria for “quality” staff; and 3) staff profiles, how well does your overall staff meet the needs of the unit in terms of experience, areas of expertise, and qualifications? How do you know? What are the particular strengths and areas for improvement in your unit’s staff composition?

Explain your standards/processes for staff hiring, professional development and evaluation. How well are you cultivating a high quality staff? Explain.

Is your staff workload well distributed to accomplish all responsibilities within the unit? Use workload data to address (and any other relevant information).

Describe the unit’s staff development plan and the unit’s efforts toward developing this plan.

- What training was offered?
- Do all unit staff members have opportunities to improve their performance?
- Describe any other staff development efforts and how they have improved unit effectiveness.

What certifications are required or recommended in the unit? Describe how successful the unit is with its staff certifications (please provide evidence).

From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your unit’s staff quality?

4. Customer Satisfaction

How does your unit define its customers? Why?

How does your unit collect feedback from your customers? How satisfied are your customers with the services provided by the unit? How do you know? Provide Evidence.

- Cite and describe customer service survey results if applicable. Do the results meet your expectations?
- Describe any action items resulting from survey results.
- Present any other evidence of customer satisfaction or dissatisfaction/

Do your customers’ answers meet your expectations?

What did you learn by examining customer satisfaction in the unit? What changes do you want to make to improve your unit’s collection of customer feedback? What changes do you want to make in response to customer satisfaction feedback and data collected for this Self-Study?

Assessing Program Sustainability
This section of your self-study report is drafted collaboratively by the unit leader and VP or his/her designate.

5. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
What are the Key Performance Indicators for your unit?

Are your annual KPI assessment results giving you useful information for guiding ongoing program improvements? Explain. How does your program routinely utilize its KPI assessment results for program planning/improvement?

Discuss key performance indicators (KPIs) that support the efficiency and effectiveness of the unit. What additional data/evidence do you need to adequately answer this question?

How do you benchmark or compare your unit’s performance against similar units at other peer institutions? What evidence do you use to help you do this?

From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your KPIs or the way your measure them?

6. Budget Sufficiency & Efficiency
Based on your analysis of your unit’s budget, is your unit’s budget sufficient to meet all service and operating objectives? How do you know? Which areas of your budget need to be enhanced? Which areas need to be reduced?

Explain the budget formulation and review processes used in your program, including how examination of budget variances is used to increase efficiency. How does this process help to manage the unit’s budget and provide enhanced services to the university? Explain.

From the answers above, what did you learn about your budgeting process and the use of budget information to improve efficiency? What changes do you want to make?

7. Contributions to the University
How do unit goals align with Pacific’s mission, strategic goals and university-wide learning outcomes? (These are available on the Provost Office website.)

Provide evidence of goals accomplished and yet to be accomplished and describe how they will specifically support Pacific’s institutional mission, goals and strategic priorities and initiatives.

How well does your program offer sufficient activities and developmental opportunities for program staff to learn relevant disciplinary and professional knowledge, skills, competencies, etc. at relevant beginning, intermediate and advanced levels? Explain. Include in your discussion:

- Alignment between opportunities and university learning objectives
- Scaffolding (how all the activities and opportunities build on each other in a progressive, intentional way)
- Scheduling of activities and opportunities so your program’s staff can follow the best sequence
- Whether program staff is able to participate in the recommended sequence of activities.

From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your unit’s contributions to the University?

8. Societal and Professional Demand
Are there any changes required by government regulators or licensing bodies that are creating new or unmet challenges for your unit? Any anticipated changes in the future? How will the unit respond? What, if any, needs have you identified?

Are there new expectations for your unit that are creating challenges? Are these new institutional expectations from Pacific or are they new expectations or requirements arising from relevant professional bodies?

In your discussion, include the following:
- how this program meets current and potential future trends within the labor market and society
- how this program differentiates itself from its competition
- any unforeseen modifications that may be needed in order to stay competitive.

In what ways does this unit contribute to the larger community (including partnerships with organizations, community involvement)? How do you know? Please provide evidence.

From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your unit?

**OPTIONAL: Future Data Needs**

In hindsight, did you learn that there were data needs (new and/or improved) which could have better assisted you with this report? Please describe what your data needs would be for your next self-study.

---

**Overview of Proposed Changes**

_This section of the self-study report is drafted collaboratively by the unit leader and VP or his/her designate._

**8. Program Vision & Goals**

**Vision**—In light of the mission of Pacific, your division and your unit, state the seven-year vision for your program.

**Goals**—Identify the key goals that need to be achieved in 1, 3, 5 & 7 years to fulfill your vision.

**9. Overview of Proposed Changes**

Review and reflect on all parts of your self-study and provide the following information about each proposed change that will significantly improve the quality of your unit. List changes in order of priority.

1. Brief description of significant proposed changes to improve your unit.
2. Rationale & evidence from your self-study report that support this change.
3. Rationale & evidence from outside sources beyond your self-study findings.

Please include all evidence that supports your report in the appendices. Clearly label your evidence and identify its relevance to the report (including relevant page numbers.)

The appendices should be included in all final copies of your self-study report.
Chapter 6: Internal and External Reviews

The purpose of the internal and external reviews is to provide an outside perspective which provides constructive analysis of program or unit quality and recommendations for future planning and improvements.

Once the final Self-Study Report is submitted to the Office for Institutional Effectiveness, external and internal review teams will be appointed by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness working in close collaboration with the unit VP/dean (or President for in the President’s Office review).

Selection of Internal Review Team

The internal review team, called the Program Review Team (PRT), will be appointed by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness (DIEF) working in close collaboration with the unit VP/dean. This team will include faculty and/or staff external to the unit under review but whose role at the university provides them with a helpful vantage point from which to evaluate the unit.

The internal review team engages in a neutral and independent evaluation of the program or unit under review. The unit’s Self-Study Report and the evaluation by External Reviewers form the basis for the Program Review Report created by this team.

Selection of External Reviewers

One to two external disciplinary or professional expert(s) from peer or other appropriate institutions of higher education will review the self-study and accompanying evidence. They will then come to campus to meet with faculty, students, alumni, and senior administrators as appropriate. The External Reviewers will then submit their evaluation within a few weeks following the site visit.

The Self-Study Group may recommend potential External Reviewers but should not contact them.

The Director of Institutional Effectiveness (DIEF) will work closely with the unit VP or appropriate dean to make the selection of external reviewers. These may or may not include those recommended by the SSG. As part of the External Reviewer selection process, the DIEF interviews potential candidates for the job and once a decision is made extends an invitation on behalf of the university.

External Reviewers’ Participation

Below is an outline of the External Reviewers’ responsibilities before, during, and after the site visit.

For their participation, each person receives an honorarium and reimbursement for travel.

- Review self-study and other program or unit review materials prior to the site visit. Program Review materials will be delivered at least 4 weeks before the scheduled visit.
- Participate in a pre-visit conference call with the DIEF prior to the site visit to identify key issues or specific concerns with the self-study and site visit.
- Participate in a site visit at Pacific to meet with faculty, students, alumni, and/or senior administrators as appropriate.
- Complete an external review report within 2 weeks of the site visit using guidelines provided by the DIEF.
The Site Visit

Once external reviewers and the site visit date are confirmed, the DIEF informs the program or unit leader and dean or VP. Site visits will be scheduled during the spring semester. The members of the SSG, program or unit leader, dean or VP, and the program or unit’s faculty, staff, students, and/or alumni, as well as the DIEF will actively engage in discussions about the program or unit with the External Reviewer(s) during the site visit.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for managing all of the logistics of the site visit. A detailed schedule will be provided to all of the members of the campus community participating in the visit. The OIE will also:

- Inform the program or unit’s faculty, staff, and students about the site visit and prepare them to participate in group discussions with the external reviewers
- Assigning one person to escort the external reviewer(s) between discussion groups the day of the site visit
- Provide and/or pay for meals as necessary
- Coordinate all necessary travel arrangements.

External Review Reports

These reports focus on insights from the Self-Study Report and the site visit and provide recommendations from the perspective of experts in the program’s or unit’s discipline or field. Criteria for review will be provided by the DIEF to both the External Reviewers and the SSG and program/unit leaders.

The SSG, program or unit leader, dean or VP and the Internal Program Review Team receive this report from the OIE upon receipt from the external reviewers.

OPTIONAL – After receiving the external review feedback report, the SSG has the opportunity to write a brief (1-2 pp. maximum) response. This response is not required nor expected. The response will be attached to the external reviewer report for reference.

If the SSG chooses to write a response, it should be submitted to the OIE within one week of receipt of the external review report.

Program Review Team Report

The PRT writes the Program Review Report based on the Self-Study and the External Reviewer(s) report(s). A Program Review Template is available from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and guidance and support is provided by the DIEF (Director of Institutional Effectiveness).

A draft of the Program Review Report is due April 1st so that the IEC (Institutional Effectiveness Committee) can provide feedback for revisions. The final report is due to the OIE no later than May 15th.
Chapter 7: Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)

The purpose of the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) is to take results from the self-study and all feedback reports to create a plan for future improvements to your program. Once finalized, the QIP is then used to plan, implement, and track program improvements. This document is also referred to as the Action Plan.

After receiving the external review reports and the Program Review Team report the program or unit leader works with the dean or VP (or his/her designate) to create the program’s Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) or Action Plan. The QIP is a revision of Self-Study Report Part C: Overview of Proposed Changes based on input from all feedback reports (External Reviewers and Program Review Team Report) and includes a detailed list of the required resources to make these changes and an identification of the necessary sources of funding. It is the job of the dean or VP to identify whether reallocation of existing funds will be sufficient to address the identified budget needs to carry out the Quality Improvement Plan. If not, it is the job of the dean or VP to prioritize any new budget requests within his/her annual budget requests to the Institutional Priorities Committee (IPC). Documentation from Program Review will serve as sufficient documentation for any related IPC requests.

Approved Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)

The QIP is finalized once the Program or unit leader, dean (for Academic Reviews), or VP sign off on it. This then becomes the program’s (and OIE’s) blueprint for planning, implementing and tracking program and unit improvements.

Implementing the QIP

Once the program’s QIP is finalized, changes for program improvement should be integrated into existing university procedures. (For instance, any major curricular changes require approval of the unit’s Curriculum Committee (if any) as well as the university-wide Academic Affairs Committee.

Budget requests for new funding should be prioritized within a school or division’s budget requests and submitted through the existing Institutional Priorities Committee request process.

Tracking Progress

Progress updates on the agreed upon action items should be integrated into the program or unit’s annual reporting. The program or unit leader, in conjunction with the Dean or VP (or his/her designate), are responsible for ensuring that progress is made and monitored.

Additionally, 2 years after approval of the unit or program’s Quality Improvement or Action Plan, the program or unit leader and dean or VP (or his/her designate) will be responsible for providing an update to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee on the progress to date. The purpose of this “check in” is to ensure accountability for continuous improvement to all of Pacific’s programs and units.
Chapter 8: Role of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)

Feedback on Drafts

The IEC provides feedback on all draft Self-Study Reports in the fall and all draft Program Review Reports in the spring. This feedback is delivered informally and in person when the SSG (and program/unit leaders) or PRT members meet with the IEC. The purpose of this step in the process is to:

- provide helpful input to Self-Study Groups (SSGs) and Program Review Teams (PRTs)
- provide an opportunity for Q & A
- provide a forum for discussing “best practices” in program review
- ensure that the significant efforts represented in each of these reports lead to concrete program or unit improvement

Ensuring Quality Assessment & Continuous Improvement: IEC’s Annual Report

The IEC serves as a conduit to the Cabinet and Board of Regents to ensure progress and quality of instructional assessment and overall institutional effectiveness. It receives reports on assessment of student learning related to the university-wide learning outcomes as well as monitoring the program review process.

The IEC evaluates all the program reviews that are completed each year and produces a summary report responding to questions about institutional effectiveness:

- How well do program reviews represent each program’s definition and improvement of quality?
- How well do program reviews represent programs’ quality relative to peers?
- What aspects of the program review process need improvement?
- What recommendations are merited for enhancing quality, creating efficiencies, sharing resources, and developing best practices?

The IEC’s summary report is distributed to the Cabinet, Institutional Priorities Committee and the Regents. It is also available to the University community on the Provost Office website.

Tracking Progress on Quality Improvement or Action Plans

The IEC also revisits action plans for completed program reviews two years post-review. The purpose of this is to ensure accountability for continuous improvement of our programs and units.
Chapter 9: Dean and VP Participation in Program Review

This section specifically summarizes the dean’s role in supporting programs through the program review process and the VP’s role in supporting programs and units through the program review process.

Self-Study Preparation

- Reviewing the data distributed for each program or unit review in conjunction with the program or unit leader
- Appointing the program or unit’s Self-Study Group (SSG) in collaboration with the program or unit leader
- Discussing with the DIEF and program/unit leader how unique parts of the program or unit (i.e. online v. on-site program, multiple campuses/locations, external disciplinary accreditation, etc.) will be addressed and presented in the self-study.

Self-Study

- Working with the program or unit leader on the following sections of the Self-Study Report (which includes the evidence to support the answers):
  
  **Assessing Program Sustainability (Part B)**
  
  **Overview of Proposed Changes (Part C)**

- Checking-in with the program or unit leader and SSG’s progress by October 1
- Submitting his/her CV (or CV summary) to be added to the program profile section of the self-study report.

External Review

- Collaborating with the program or unit leader to recommend the names of potential external reviewers to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
- Meeting with external reviewer(s) during the site visit.

- The Director of Institutional Effectiveness (DIEF) informs the dean or VP of the selected external reviewer(s), the confirmed external review site visit dates, and the site visit schedule.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) forwards to the dean or VP copies of all External Review reports as they are submitted.

Quality Improvement Plan or Action Plan

- Meeting with the program or unit leader to discuss and create the QIP.
- Overseeing implementation of and the status updates on the QIP.
- Providing a progress report to the IEC (in collaboration with the program or unit leader) about the changes agreed upon in the QIP two years after its adoption.
Templates and Tools

This section provides templates and tools to assist the Self-Study Group with program review. Electronic copies are available at: DRAFT
[year]

Program Review Self-Study Report

[Program, College]

[Self-Study Group Members]

[Program Chair]

[Dean]

[Submit Date]
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Self-Study Program Profile

Program Overview
Provide a brief overview of your program—origin/history, affiliations and partnerships (within or outside the school and university). Include all campus locations, technological learning modalities, brief information about your faculty, staff, and students.

College Overview
Provide a brief overview of your school listing all programs within the school. Also provide school affiliation and partnerships (within or outside the university).

Current Program Changes
Disclose any major changes that are currently underway—describe the change/s, its current stage in the process (i.e. starting, midway through, almost complete, etc.), and when you expect to change/s to be complete.

Self-Study Group, Program Chair and Dean
Provide a brief description of the Self-Study Group, the Program Chair, and Dean.
Self-Study: Assessing Program Quality (Part A)

Drafted by the program chair and Self-Study Group.

1. Student Learning Results

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix A: Academic and Professional Standards and Appendix B: Annual Learning Results Reports

a) How well do your program learning outcomes (PLOs) represent the scope and depth of learning appropriate to:
   - the degree/certificate program offered?
   - to the standards of your discipline/profession?
   How do you know?

b) Based on your annual learning results did your program achieve its standards for success? (Yes/No, explain) How well are students learning in comparison to your standards for success?

c) From the above answers, what did you learn about your students’ learning? And what changes do you want to make to improve student learning?

2. Student Learning Assessment Process

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix B: Annual Learning Results Report and Appendix C: Assessment Plans

a) Are your annual learning results giving you useful information for guiding ongoing program improvements? Explain. How does your program routinely utilize its annual learning results for program planning/improvement? In what ways have your program improvements impacted student learning? How do you know?

b) How effective are your current methods/procedures for assessing student achievement of your program learning outcomes? What is working well, and how do you know? What needs improvement and why? Explain.

c) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your student learning assessment process?

3. Academic Curriculum

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix D: Curriculum Alignment Matrix and Appendix E: Curriculum Flow Chart

a) How well does your program offer sufficient opportunities for students to learn relevant disciplinary and professional knowledge, skills, competencies, etc. (at relevant beginning, intermediate and advanced levels) for the type and level of degree/certificate conferred? Explain.

Include in your discussion:
   - alignment between courses and program learning outcomes (PLOs)
   - scaffolding (how all the parts build on each other in a progressive, intentional way) and scheduling of courses so students can follow the best sequence (e.g. examine your program’s flow chart)
   - whether students take courses in the recommended sequence (whether required to do so or not)
b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s curriculum?

4. Faculty Quality

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix F: Faculty CVs, Appendix G: Criteria for “Quality” Faculty, Appendix H: Faculty Profile, and Appendix I: Core Faculty Work/Teach Load

a) Based on the data from your: 1) faculty CVs; 2) your criteria for ‘quality’ faculty, 3) active adjunct and core faculty profiles; and 4) core faculty work/teach load, how well does your overall faculty meet the needs of your program (e.g., in terms of teaching experience, areas of expertise, academic qualifications, committee and advising needs, etc.)? How do you know? What are the particular strengths and areas for improvement in your program’s faculty composition?

b) Explain your standards/processes for faculty hiring, professional development, and evaluation. How well are you cultivating a high quality faculty? Explain.

c) Using the core faculty workload data above is your faculty workload well distributed: 1) between the faculty? 2) well distributed to accomplish all faculty responsibilities within the program/school/university?

d) Describe how well adjunct faculty are integrated into the life of your program beyond the courses they teach (e.g. meeting with students, student learning assessment, service on committees and professional development, mentoring and coaching).

e) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s faculty quality?

5. Student Satisfaction

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix J: Student Satisfaction Survey Results

a) Based on student satisfaction survey results and any other evidence you have (e.g. focus groups with students), how satisfied are students with your program’s curriculum, faculty, program administration, general learning environment, campus facilities and student services? Do their answers meet your expectations? How proud are they of your program.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s student satisfaction?

6. Graduates’ Success

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix K: Graduate Success Defined and Appendix L: Graduate Survey Results

a) To what extent are graduates of your program succeeding in relevant careers, graduate programs, community service, creative endeavors, ways of living, or other indicators of graduate success? How do you know? (Include evidence in Appendix K)

In your discussion, include the following:

- student perceptions about attaining their personal and professional goals
- information from employers, graduate schools, licensure exams or other external sources to assess graduates’ degree of success
• other kinds of achievements and/or outcomes used to measure graduate success

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your program’s graduates’ success?

Self-Study: Assessing Program Sustainability (Part B)

Drafted collaboratively by the Program Chair and Dean.

7. Student Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix M: Student Retention, Attrition, and Graduation Data and Appendix N: Student Demographics

a) Is your program attracting, retaining, and graduating the mix of students you seek in your program (target markets, demographic mix, qualifications, etc.)? How effective are your recruitment and admission processes? How do you know?

b) What does your program do to improve retention, attrition, and graduation rates?

c) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s student enrollment, retention, and graduation rates?

8. Contributions to the University

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix O: Missions and Appendix P: Your Program’s Assets to the University

a) In what ways does your program contribute to the University (mission alignment, external accreditation, contributions to the community or profession, etc.)? Also include a discussion (and evidence) of any external recognition your program has received.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s contributions to the University?

9. Societal and Professional Demand

To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix O: Missions, Appendix Q: Societal/Market Trends and Appendix R: Program Competition

a) How does this program meet/address societal and professional needs (including partnerships with organizations, community involvement, specialized accreditation, etc.)? How do you know?

In your discussion, include the following:
• how this program meets current and potential future trends within the labor market and society
5. how this program differentiates itself from its competition
2. any foreseen modifications that may be needed in order to stay competitive.

b) From the above answers, what did you learn? And what changes do you want to make to improve your academic curriculum?

OPTIONAL: Future Data Needs

In hindsight, did you learn that there were data needs (new and/or improved) which could have better assisted you with this report? Please describe what your data needs would be for your next self-study.
10. Program Vision & Goals

c) **Vision**—In light of the mission of the university, your school and your program, state the five-year vision for your program.

d) **Goals**—Identify the key goals that need to be achieved in 1, 3 & 5 years to fulfill your vision.
Self-Study Report Part C  
Overview of Proposed Changes  
(This document is online at: DRAFT)

Review and reflect on all parts of your self-study and provide below proposed changes that will significantly improve the quality of your program: (Space is provided for up to ten proposed changes, if you have more add to the list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Brief description of significant proposed changes to improve your program:</th>
<th>b) Rationale and evidence from your self-study report (review “Discoveries and Proposed Actions” in Parts A &amp;B) that support this change:</th>
<th>c) Rationale and evidence from outside sources beyond your self-study findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix D: Curriculum Alignment Matrix

(This document is online at: DRAFT)

List all courses offered in your curriculum. Identify whether each course is required or elective and its delivery model (face-to-face, on-line, hybrid, or other). Identify program learning outcome/s taught in each course and at what level—(B) beginning, (I) Intermediate, or (A) Advanced. Also attach [in Appendix D] other pertinent evidence of curriculum alignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses (including practicum, thesis, etc.)</th>
<th>Core or Elective</th>
<th>Delivery Model (face-to-face, on-line, hybrid, or other)</th>
<th>PLO #1 [List]</th>
<th>PLO #2 [List]</th>
<th>PLO #3 [List]</th>
<th>PLO #4 [List]</th>
<th>PLO #5 [List]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample – CUR Intro to Curriculum Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Faculty Profile

*(This document is online at: DRAFT)*

### a) Years of Teaching Experience (Refer to CVs) - Breakdown the # of both core and active adjunct faculty by total of years of teaching experience (Pacific and other institutions.) Refer to CVs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Total # of core faculty</th>
<th>Total # of adjunct faculty</th>
<th>Sub-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b) Faculty Demographics (gender and ethnicity)-Breakdown the total # of both core and active adjunct faculty by: gender; and ethnicity (This information will be provided by the Institutional Research Office. Contact them to obtain information.). Also attach [in Appendix H] other pertinent evidence related to faculty Profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Sub-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Sub-Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, Mexican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander, Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign, Visa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c) Active Adjunct Faculty – Step Level and Units Actively Teaching at Pacific - Breakdown the total # of active adjunct faculty by level, disaggregate by # of active adjunct faculty currently (within 2 years) teaching by # of units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pacific Faculty Step Level</th>
<th>Units Actively Teaching at Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Adjunct Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Core Faculty Work/Teach Load

(This document is online at: DRAFT)

Fill out the following for all core faculty. List each core faculty (use #s or their names): 1) FTE (FT, ¾, ½); 2) teaching load by number of units per academic year. List duties of each core faculty within your program/school: 3) reassigned time by number of units per year & the title of duties; 4) additional program or school assigned time with stipend; 5) other assigned duties within your school (list whether the title of duties is “C” contracted or “V” volunteer). Also list University-wide services of each core faculty: 6) reassigned time by number of units per year & the title of duties; 7) additional assigned time with stipend; 8) other assigned duties within your school (list whether the title of duties is “C” contracted or “V” volunteer). Also attach [in Appendix I] other pertinent evidence related to Core Faculty work/teach load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>1) FTE</th>
<th>2) Teaching Load (# of units/quarter in an academic year)</th>
<th>3) Reassigned Time w/in program/school (# of units/yr &amp; title of duties)</th>
<th>4) Additional Assigned Time w/Stipend w/in program/school (title of duties)</th>
<th>5) Other assigned duties w/in your program/school (Contracted or Volunteer &amp; title of duties)</th>
<th>6) Reassigned Time U-wide Services (# of units/yr &amp; title of duties)</th>
<th>7) Additional Assigned Time w/Stipend U-wide Services (title of duties)</th>
<th>8) Other assigned duties U-wide Services (Contracted or Volunteer &amp; title of duties)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix N: Student Demographics**

*This document is online at: DRAFT*

This information will be provided by the Institutional Effectiveness Office. Contact them to obtain information. Also attach [in Appendix N] other pertinent evidence related to student demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-60</td>
<td>Latino, Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>Asian-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>Pacific Islander, Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Non-Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign, Visa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R: Program Competition

(This document is online at: DRAFT)

List your program’s top 5 competitors—name, location/s, delivery model/s and niche market. Also attach [in Appendix R] other pertinent evidence related to program competition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location/s</th>
<th>Delivery Model/s</th>
<th>Niche Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45am</td>
<td>(15 mins)</td>
<td>Meet with Office for Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>(75 mins)</td>
<td>Meet with the Self-Study Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15am</td>
<td>(60 mins)</td>
<td>Meet with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15am</td>
<td>(60 mins)</td>
<td>External Reviewer time: recap meetings, review materials, &amp; break time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15pm</td>
<td>(60 mins)</td>
<td>Lunch with students and alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15pm</td>
<td>(60 mins)</td>
<td>External Reviewer time: recap meetings, review materials, &amp; break time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15pm</td>
<td>(45 mins)</td>
<td>Meet with the Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>(45 mins)</td>
<td>Meet with the Vice President Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45pm</td>
<td>(60 mins)</td>
<td>External Reviewer time: complete notes on the external review team summary sheet &amp; exit/debriefing meeting with Office for Education Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45pm</td>
<td>(15 mins)</td>
<td>Exit meeting with the Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional – continuation of External Review team discussions and drafting report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important Contact Numbers**

Escort/Liaison: xxx-xxx-xxxx  
Program Chair/SSG Chair: xxx-xxx-xxxx  
Dean: xxx-xxx-xxxx  
OEE: 925-969-3495  
Conference Bridge: 218-486-1600, Access Code: 85743
External Reviewer Space & Evidence Setup

CHECKLIST

Office:
- A private and secure place for the external reviewers to collaborate
- Note pads, pens/pencils, post-it notes
- Stapler, paper clips, 3-hole punch
- Water
- Optional – other refreshments & snacks

Evidence/Documentation:
- Copy of the self-study report
- Current Pacific Catalog
- Admissions process
- Course descriptions
- Representative samples of student work
- Student handbook
- Faculty hiring and promotion
- Advising practices/policies
- Marketing materials
- All other supporting evidence and program materials
### Program Review Templates & Tools

**External Review Summary Sheet**

*(This document is online at: DRAFT)*

---

**Instructions:** Please complete this summary sheet at the end of your site visit and email it to: DRAFT prior to departing Pacific. This will assist you with identifying key areas (strengths and improvements needed) to address in your final report.

Please rate the following program review criteria using the following:

- **E** = Exemplary
- **S** = Satisfactory
- **N** = Needs Improvement
- **U** = Unclear/need more information

#### 1. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td>The PLOs reflect the most important skills, knowledge, and values of the discipline/profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong></td>
<td>The criteria and standards of achievement for the PLOs adequately match disciplinary/professional standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td>Based on your review of student work samples and annual learning results reports, student achievement of the PLOs is adequate for the degree and discipline/profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td>The assessment practices are yielding the needed information to determine how well students are learning the PLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5</strong></td>
<td>Do you recommend any changes to enhance student achievement or program assessment of the PLOs? If so, please explain and advise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td>The current curriculum content is appropriate to the level and purpose of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
<td>The design of the curriculum is adequate (required depth and breadth of study, flow of courses, frequency of course offerings, overall coherence, alignment with desired learning outcomes, etc.) to enable students to develop the skills and attain the outcomes needed for graduates of this program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td>The program clearly outlines program requirements and offers courses regularly to ensure timely completion of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td>Do you recommend any changes to enhance the curriculum (content, design, course availability, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If so, please explain and advise.

### 3. STUDENT EXPERIENCES AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation E, S, N, or U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Students are satisfied with the overall quality of their learning experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Students are adequately supported through the curriculum and advising to ensure their learning success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Admissions criteria and performance standards for continuing students clearly stated (e.g. Catalogue, program materials) and consistently applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Class size levels are sufficient to ensure the critical mass of students necessary for productive learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>The program provides adequate opportunities for internships, practica, professional development, and/or field experiences, as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Student support services are adequate and supportive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Do you recommend any changes to improve student experiences and learning environment? If so, please explain and advise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. FACULTY QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation E, S, N, or U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Faculty competencies/credentials are appropriate for the discipline and degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Faculty specialties correspond to program needs and to the concentrations in which they teach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The system for evaluating teaching practices facilitates continuous improvement of teaching and learning throughout the program (core and adjuncts).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Faculty are adequately supported and engaged in ongoing professional development necessary for staying current in their field and continuously updating their courses/curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Do you recommend faculty changes (qualifications, expertise, teaching practices, professional development, etc.) to enhance program quality and student learning? If so, please explain and advise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. DIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation E, S, N, or U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The Program demonstrates a commitment to diversity in its curriculum, student and faculty composition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Do you recommend changes to the commitment of diversity? If so, please explain and advise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 6. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation E, S, N, or U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The program director receives adequate release time to carry out administrative duties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>The library and student support resources are current and adequate to meet student and faculty needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Considering current budget constraints, the program has accurately identified and prioritized the program’s most pressing resource needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>The program’s student recruitment and retention processes are adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Overall program administration is efficient, effective and meets professional standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Do you recommend any changes to strengthen the program’s current administration, support, and resources (including possible reallocations of resources from current program operations to fund new budgetary needs)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 7. PROPOSED CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation E, S, N, or U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>The proposed changes are responsive to the program’s most important needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>The program makes use of assessment results, institutional research data, and other information obtained from students/alumni/employers as the basis of its proposed improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Do you recommend changes to the program’s proposed changes (Part C #11? If so please explain and advise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 8. OVERALL PROGRAM SUMMARY

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the program? Please identify the evidence that supports your answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>What goals would you suggest the program set for the next five years (please list in order of priority, the most important goal first) and how do these comport with those identified in Part C of the self-study? Please identify the evidence that supports your answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Considering budget constraints, what are the most realistic and important strategies the program can use to achieve the highest priority goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>What goals would require additional resources? What level of resources would these goals require? How might the program secure these resources?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PRC Self-Study Feedback Rubric

The PRC self-study feedback focuses on the quality of assessment processes in Parts A & B and on alignment between results (from A & B) and proposed changes (in Part C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each Self-Study Section:</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completeness</strong></td>
<td>All questions have been answered completely.</td>
<td>Some questions are not answered completely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence &amp; Results</strong></td>
<td>There is sufficient/relevant evidence to produce valid/reliable results.</td>
<td>There is insufficient or insufficiently relevant evidence to produce valid/reliable results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Study Answers</strong></td>
<td>The self-study answers are adequately aligned to support the major claims in the discussion &amp; analysis.</td>
<td>The self-study answers are insufficiently aligned to support the major claims in the discussion &amp; analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Changes</strong></td>
<td>The proposed changes address all major discoveries in the self-study.</td>
<td>The proposed changes do not respond to some significant findings in the self-study or are inadequately based upon findings in the self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an explicit, well-reasoned connection between the proposed changes and self-study answers.</td>
<td>The connection between the proposed changes and self-study answers are either not clear or not well-reasoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Institutional Data Needs</strong></td>
<td>No future institutional data needed. Existing institutional data are sufficient and relevant for answering self-study questions effectively.</td>
<td>Future institutional data definitely needed to support sections of the self-study. Insufficient or insufficiently relevant institutional data exists to answer self-study questions effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vice President Academic Affairs (VPAA) Self-Study Feedback Guidelines

Following are questions to guide the VPAA in recommending and supporting program changes proposed in PART C – Overview of Proposed Changes

JUSTIFICATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES

The Program’s proposed changes in the PQIP (Part C of the Self-Study Report) are adequately justified by documentation (evidence and reasoning) in the:

1. Self-Study Report (Explain Below)

   Agree  Disagree  Unsure
   [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

2. External Review Report (Explain Below)

   [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

3. PRC Feedback (Explain Below)

   [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT OF PROPOSED CHANGES

The proposed changes are aligned with:

4. University Priorities (Explain Below)

   [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

5. University Strategic Plan (Explain Below)

   [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

6. University’s academic plan, and school’s plan (Explain Below)

   [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

OVERALL EVALUATION

Note the areas of:

7. Significant achievements:

8. Concerns:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on all components of the Program’s Self-Study:

9. VPAA endorses the following proposed changes: (List)

10. VPAA will consider endorsing the following proposed changes contingent upon conditions and or modifications explained below: (List)

11. VPAA does not endorse the following proposed changes: (List and include rationale)
## QIP Resources Projections for Proposed Changes

Based on the proposed changes in #11, provide resource information for implementing each change. List the resources by categories (CUR-curriculum-related, HR-Human Resources-related, CAP-capital expense-related, or OTHER-for other Pacific resources not specified); type (N-new, E-existing, or R-redeployed); resource description; the account (school, department, etc.) from which funds will be drawn; the effective/active date; and the 5-year cost (if relevant) related to each resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change #</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>School/Dept Account</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>[List Year 1]</th>
<th>[List Year 2]</th>
<th>[List Year 3]</th>
<th>[List Year 4]</th>
<th>[List Year 5]</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---