



COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
PUEBLO

Academic Program Review
Self-study Guideline

Revised Aug 2024

Contents

Introduction & Purpose3

Academic Program Self-Study Goals4

Procedures for Programs with Professional Accreditation4

Procedures for Programs without disciplinary accreditation.....5

External Reviewers5

 Qualification of External Reviewers5

The Self-Study Cycle6

 Program Review Timeline.....6

 Annual Updates6

Contents of Self-Study7

Program Review Standards8

 Standard 1. The program reflects and supports the mission of its school or college and the strategic vision of Colorado State University Pueblo and the mission8

 Standard 2. The program provides and evaluates a high-quality curriculum that emphasizes student learning as its primary purpose.8

 Standard 3. Resources and administrative structure facilitate achievement of program goals.....9

 Standard 4. The program retains and graduates well-prepared students..... 10

Seminar Panel, Action Plan, CAP Board, Provost, Annual Updates..... 11

 Seminar Panel..... 11

 Action Plan..... 11

 Presentation to CAPB & Faculty Senate 12

 Provost, CSU System Board of Governors 12

 Program Review Action Plan Annual Updates..... 13

Academic Program Self-Study

Introduction & Purpose

Academic program self-study is a component of the Colorado State University Pueblo strategic planning and institutional effectiveness process, in alignment with the CSU System Board Policy 303 requirement for program review. The primary purpose of systematic self-study is to maintain and support academic departments: teaching and learning; research, professional, and creative activity; and university service, community service, and outreach. It's a vehicle by which departments can better understand if and how well programs are achieving their purpose and what courses of action to take to make them more successful.

The program review process described in this guide represents a learning centered, outcomes-based approach to on-going improvement and planning. It is designed as a useful meaningful inquiry into the program's purpose and its effectiveness in achieving that purpose. The results of the program review should be integrated into the department and campus process of planning and budgeting for effective use of resources. It also includes an on-going, continuous plan of action the department can use for renewal and improvement. In alignment with our mission and student population, we must stress using the program review to identify any equity gaps and means by which departments will address the gaps.

The conclusions drawn from the program review are to be informed by evidence; that is, all claims about a program's strengths, weaknesses, and proposed improvements are to be supported by relevant, valid qualitative and quantitative evidence. Consequently, responses to the standards for review included below should depend largely on evidence.

Although leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on systematically gathered information, it is the faculty who take primary responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning. The 2021 CSU Pueblo *Faculty Handbook* describes the reasons for program reviews. Program reviews are to

- Assure that each academic unit will be afforded the opportunity to assess and evaluate its program outcomes [objectives], resources, curriculum, faculty, staff, facilities, students, alumni, and other programmatic considerations;
- Provide quantitative and qualitative information that will enable the program, college, and University as a whole to enhance their planning processes;

- Communicate to the Board of Governors program review results thereby assisting the Board in its efforts to provide informed governance and coordination. (1.2.6.2.c.3)

Through the review process academic units articulate how the program curriculum and activities support their accomplishment of their purpose, goals, and aspirations. It is also a tool for identifying gaps between a program's intended goals and its actual performance, including stewardship of resources. These gaps provide the basis for systematic annual action steps to move the program closer to achieving its goals.

Academic Program Self-Study Goals

The goals of the self-study are to:

1. Develop and enhance high-quality academic programs that are aligned with the CSU Pueblo mission statement and strategic plan, foster collaboration among departments, and meet the educational needs of enrolled students and the region we serve.
2. Encourage and support program self-improvement by highlighting program strengths, identifying opportunities for change, meeting the changing needs of stakeholders, honestly determining areas in need of improvement, and providing valid data for making budgeting decisions.
3. Provide a transparent and meaningful review of all graduate and undergraduate programs and stand-alone minors and certificates which results in systematic, actionable program improvements.
4. Involve department faculty in the self-study, its recommendations, and in implementing the on-going action plan.

Procedures for Programs with Professional Accreditation

Programs on a professional accreditation cycle will complete the self-study required by the accrediting agency. The documentation used in the accreditation self-study for new or continuing accreditation may also be used to inform the campus self-study and cycle; however, the Provost, in consultation with the college dean and Associate Provost, will determine whether there are concerns on accreditation requirements compared to campus review requirements.

When using accreditation reports as a basis for the campus self-study, a table of contents or specific references indicating the pages of the report that provide the information required by CSU Pueblo's self-study is required. Information absent from the accreditation report must also be submitted as appropriate.

Procedures for Programs without disciplinary accreditation

Non-accredited programs will submit a self-study every six years, unless other arrangements have been requested and approved by the Curriculum and Academic Programs Board, the dean, the provost, and CDHE as necessary. Requests for changes to a single cycle should be made in the academic year prior to the scheduled program review, whenever possible.

External Reviewers

For those programs with professional accreditation, external reviewers should be engaged consistent with the expectations of the accrediting agency. For all other programs, reviewers external to the CSU Pueblo campus will be selected. The Department Chair and/or Program Director should submit three to five names of potential reviewers and a brief summary of their academic and/or professional background to their college dean. From that list, a reviewer will be selected by the Provost in consultation with the dean. Invitations to the reviewer will be issued jointly by the Department Chair and the Dean. Nominees should be from high quality, respected programs at a masters I regional institution or recognized peer institution with characteristics similar to CSU Pueblo. Expenses related to travel and honorarium for the external reviewer will be paid by the department or college with Provost Office assistance upon consultation.

Qualification of External Reviewers

Required credentials:

1. A terminal degree in the same or a closely related discipline as the program under review
2. Associate professor or professor rank (emeritus faculty eligible if they had a recent academic position)
3. Does not hold an administrative position above department chair
4. Is not currently actively involved in research, teaching, or other professional projects with faculty in the program under review
5. A distinguished record of research, teaching and service in the discipline
6. An ability to conduct the review and submit a findings and recommendation report within the required timeframe
7. No close connection with any faculty member in the department

Preferred credentials:

1. A national reputation for contribution in the same discipline as that under review
2. Experience with program review and/or best practices in institutional effectiveness
3. Knowledge of or experience in a HLC accredited institution
4. Knowledge of or experience in professional accreditation of similar programs, if appropriate

The Self-Study Cycle

The self-study cycle will be coordinated by the Provost's Office in collaboration with the CAP Board. Undergraduate and graduate programs in the same discipline will be reviewed simultaneously unless the department chair presents compelling reasons for separate years of review. The decision to review undergraduate and graduate programs separately will be made by the Provost in consultation with the CAP Board, department chair, dean, and Associate Provost.

Periodically consulting with the college or school dean throughout the self-study process is recommended. Doing so may avoid significant revisions and additional information collection at the time the final draft is submitted to the dean.

Under special circumstances, the Provost may request a self-study outside the regular six-year cycle. Additional or early self-study will be conducted under such compelling circumstances as:

- The program is experiencing low productivity in terms of number of degrees awarded;
- The department faculty are not conducting systematic, authentic program assessment that results in improvement to teaching and learning; or
- Outside stakeholders such as the Colorado Department of Higher Education, the Colorado State University System, or the Higher Learning Commission require it.

Program Review Timeline

See separate timeline document for steps, due dates and responsible parties.

Annual Updates

A brief, annual update on progress toward action steps identified in the Dean's Seminar Panel Report and Action Plan will be submitted to the college dean and Provost's office by June 1 each academic year. Department chairs will meet with the dean and Provost's office to discuss the update and identify adjustments, if necessary.

Contents of Self-Study

- I. Cover Page
 - A. Program name
 - B. Program college/school
 - C. Year of review
 - D. Date self-study submitted
 - E. Name of program chair and/or director/coordinator
- II. Department Chair/Coordinator Summary (maximum of two pages)
 - A. Key findings
 - B. Departmental aspirations
- III. Response to Review Standards 1-4
 - A. Response to each review standard
 - B. Supporting documents and data
- IV. Additional Documents added after Self-Study
 - A. External Reviewers Report
 - 1. Program strengths
 - 2. Program challenges, areas for improvement
 - 3. Summary of recommendations
 - B. Response to External Reviewer report
 - C. Dean's Seminar Review Panel results summary and Action Plan
 - D. Curriculum and Academic Programs Board recommendation

Program Review Standards

The standards are arranged thematically to contextualize the review in the larger planning and effectiveness framework of the campus. Provide a comprehensive response to each standard listed below. Evidence documents should be included as appendices and referenced in the body of the review. The potential evidence lists below are suggestions only. Include outcomes of significant program changes made since the last review, especially those from the previous action plan.

Standard 1. The program reflects and supports the mission of its school or college and the strategic vision of Colorado State University Pueblo and the mission

Please address the following:

1. Scope of the program
2. The primary strengths (including its distinctive aspects) and challenges of the program
3. Alignment with mission of school or college
4. Alignment with Vision 2028 and university HSI/MSI status

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE: program mission or strategic plan

Standard 2. The program provides and evaluates a high-quality curriculum that emphasizes student learning as its primary purpose.

Please address the following:

1. Curriculum alignment with disciplinary standards
 - a. Rationale for selection of the curriculum
 - b. Required sequencing of courses (including adherence to pre- and co-requisites)
2. Curricular support for and/or by other programs, as applicable:
 - a. Multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary offerings
 - b. General education courses
 - c. Service courses (courses provided to or required by other programs)
3. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) are stated as observable skills or measures of what students will know or be able to do upon completion of the program

4. Course objectives stated in course syllabi reflect the expected student learning outcomes of the program, including general education course offerings
5. Assessment measures effectively evaluate achieving the SLOs within our diverse student population and inform continual improvement
6. Assessment results are consistently being used to inform curricular decision-making and modifications (describe internal processes and involvement of faculty, students, alumni, and other program stakeholders)
7. Summary of the data, discussion and peer feedback from annual program assessment reports submitted since the previous program review including documentation of program improvements
8. Curriculum changes since the previous self-study program review are in alignment with program goals for student success and informed by the assessment of student learning outcomes

REQUIRED EVIDENCE: Annual assessment reports submitted since previous self-study program review and program current assessment plan with curriculum map of learning outcomes

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE: Syllabi, advising sheets, 4-year planning sheets, meeting minutes, external mandates

Standard 3. Resources and administrative structure facilitate achievement of program goals.

Please address the following:

1. Qualifications of faculty (full-time, part-time, instructional staff) for teaching in the program
2. Composition of faculty in terms of demographics, tenure, and diversity
3. Faculty involvement (shared governance) in ongoing program and disciplinary and pedagogical activities such as assessment; curriculum development, review, and revision; strategic planning; and tenure and promotion standards
4. Evidence of equitable workload (instruction, advising, scholarship, service) among faculty
5. Effective course scheduling and utilization of classroom spaces and other physical resources
6. Effective and appropriate leadership and departmental collaboration with non-faculty staff
7. Adequacy of facilities and laboratories, instructional technology, and library resources to support program goals
8. Program costs and effective utilization of available funding

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE: CVs or recent activity list, summary of teaching, scholarly, creative, and service activities, Program Review data dashboards (SCH/Faculty FTE, % credits taught by FT vs T/TT faculty vs adjuncts, etc.), description of equipment (physical, technological, books) strengths and weaknesses, minutes of relevant department meeting(s), budget and expenditure summaries

Standard 4. The program retains and graduates well-prepared students.

Please address the following:

1. Diversity of students enrolled in the program compared to graduates from the program
2. Enrollment patterns relative to institutional and national enrollment patterns, and projected future program viability (including enrollment, retention, persistence and graduation rates)
3. Evidence for accuracy and consistency of student advising, mechanisms to monitor progress toward degree, and use of training to provide quality advising
4. Opportunities for students to engage in High Impact Practices: faculty research, independent study, study abroad, internships, honors courses, student organizations and other enriching activities that promote retention and graduation
5. Resources and methods to recruit and retain high-quality students
6. Student performance on licensure or professional exams relative to regional and national standards, if applicable
7. Information on alumni employment, graduate school matriculation, etc.

REQUIRED EVIDENCE: Items in Program Review data dashboards

POTENTIAL EVIDENCE: Alumni/employer survey responses, data on student research, etc.

Seminar Panel, Action Plan, CAP Board, Provost, Annual Updates

Seminar Panel

- A. Role: After reviewing the Self-Study and the External Reviewer's Report, a Seminar Panel discusses the reports and their associated observations, findings and recommendations.
- B. Members of the Seminar Panel should include:
 - Dean
 - Department Chair/Program Coordinator
 - Provost and/or Provost's representative
 - CSU Pueblo CAP Board representative
 - Additional members as appropriate:
 - Other members of the department/program
 - Off-campus community member
 - Campus faculty outside the department

All members should have a working knowledge of the degree program.
- C. Seminar Panel Meeting and Discussion
 - The Dean sets date, time and place for the Seminar Panel meeting.
 - Members read all the pertinent documents – self-study, external reviewer's report, chair's response to external reviewer's report, etc. Members are to come prepared with questions about the program.
 - Focus of the Discussion:
 - Quality of Program
 - Assessment
 - Centrality to Mission
 - Need and Demand with reference to capacity
 - Cost
 - External Mandates
- D. Dean's Seminar Panel Report summarizes the discussion and includes the Program's Action Plan.

Action Plan

- A. The Program Action Plan is prepared by the Dean and Program Chair/Coordinator
- B. Focus of the Action Plan including:
 - No-cost initiatives for the next six years
 - Low-cost initiatives for the next six years with proposed funding sources
 - Major cost initiatives for the next six years with proposed funding sources
- C. Include projected timeline and responsible person(s) for each item

Presentation to CAPB & Faculty Senate

Program chair/director will present a brief summary of the reports and action plan to the CAPB in spring of the review year. Format of presentation is to include the following:

- Progress on action plan items from previous program review cycle
- Program Strengths & Challenges
- Implementation of Recommendations in prior action plan
- Progress on significant changes or new program implementation, if applicable
- Resource status for all parts of program-what is appropriately covered, what is needed
- Budget status of program, including proposed funding sources for new initiatives

CAPB recommendation is submitted to Faculty Senate and to the Provost's office

Provost, CSU System Board of Governors

Provost reviews and provides response to chair and dean for each program review

Associate Provost prepares annual report summarizing all program reviews

Provost presents report to CSU System Board of Governors at December meeting

Program Review Action Plan Annual Updates

Update is completed by Department Chair and Dean and submitted to the Assistant Provost by June 1 each year.

Program Name	
Date of last program review	
Date of this update:	
Person completing update	
Dean's approval	

Program Updates

Briefly summarize annual updates to the program status including major accomplishments and challenges. Be sure to include any updates to program accreditation, where appropriate.

--

Action Plan updates

Brief description of action plan recommendations made:

1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Current status of actions on recommendations:

1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	