

Program Review Self-Study Outline

Academic Departments

III. Academic Programs

(includes graduate and distance-delivered programs)

Guiding WASC Standard: The institution achieves its institutional purposes and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. It demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively and that they support one another in the institution's efforts to attain educational effectiveness. (Standard II)

Questions for Engagement

Curricula

1. What actions were taken in response to previous program review recommendations? What has transpired in the unit since submission of your one-year progress report following the previous program review?
2. How are disciplines changing, and what research/data support these changes?
3. To what extent are scholarship, research and creative activity linked to the curricula?
4. In what ways have courses and programs been modified to reflect new knowledge and/or changes in the needs of society?
5. In what ways have resources been shifted to respond to these changes?

Assessment

6. What are the learning outcomes for each certificate, undergraduate and graduate program? How has the department ensured that its degree and certificate programs remain rigorous and aligned with educational objectives?
7. What indicators and sources of evidence do you use to assess whether students develop core learning abilities and competencies before they graduate? (Please summarize assessment findings.) How have these findings led to modifications in your curricula?
8. How would you assess the role general education plays in preparing your undergraduate students for the major(s)? In what areas are students well prepared? Where do you see deficiencies?
9. To what extent does the faculty regularly engage in discussing effective approaches to assessing teaching and learning within the department?

Graduation Rates

10. What factors prohibit students in your major(s) from graduating in 4 years? What data support these assumptions?
11. How does the department ensure that its programs can be completed within a timely manner? What is the rotation for required courses in your majors?
12. Assess the overall health of your academic programs.

DATA PROVIDED, 2003-2008 (unless otherwise noted):

- ❖ Previous COPR recommendations, and one-year progress report
- ❖ Annual departmental assessment reports, 2005-2008 (per OVCAA)
- ❖ Number of Degrees and Certificates Earned by Major (per IRO Quantitative Indicators)
- ❖ Program and Course Descriptions (per 2008-09 Mānoa Catalog)

**WASC Accreditation Standards:
Criteria for Review Related to Assessment of Student Learning**
(from the Handbook on Accreditation, 07/2008)

Criteria for Review (CFR)	Summary
<p>The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution. (1.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure student learning • Make student-learning results public
<p>All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. (2.2)</p> <p>Guideline: Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major. (2.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish levels of achievement for each degree • Define each degree by achievement required • Do not define degrees by required credits or courses
<p>The institution's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and expectations are reflected in academic programs and policies; curriculum; advisement; library and information resources; and the wider learning environment. (2.3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses and programs have student learning outcomes (SLOs) • SLOs are public • Programs and policies reflect the outcomes
<p>The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution's faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations. (2.4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for learning are known by all • Faculty members are responsible for the assessment of student learning
<p>The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work. (2.6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate that graduates meet established levels of achievement • Incorporate expectations into faculty evaluation of students

Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Program-level Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Plans

[Taken and adapted from the August 10, 2007 draft *Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes*" by WASC]

CRITERION	1-INITIAL	2-EMERGING	3-DEVELOPED	4-HIGHLY DEVELOPED
COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, disorganized. It may include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring relevant institution-wide learning. The list may confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems).	The list includes reasonable outcomes but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes and/or national disciplinary standards may be ignored. Distinctions between expectations for undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear.	The list is a well-organized set of reasonably outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. It includes relevant institution-wide outcomes (e.g., communication or critical thinking skills). Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.	The list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations, if applicable. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes are included. National disciplinary standards have been considered. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria for assessing (e.g., rubric, exam answers) students' level of mastery for each outcome.
ASSESSABLE OUTCOMES	Outcome statements do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. Statements such as "Students understand scientific method" do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.	Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning	Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning. E.g., "Graduates can write reports in APA style" or "Graduates can make original contributions to biological knowledge."	Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements, such as rubrics, and have identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each outcome.
ALIGNMENT	There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience.	Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the expected knowledge/skills/attitudes of the outcomes in the required curriculum.	The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design may be summarized in a curriculum map.	Pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, relevant student support services, and co-curriculum are explicitly and intentionally aligned with each outcome. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency.

continued

CRITERION	1-INITIAL	2-EMERGING	3-DEVELOPED	4-HIGHLY DEVELOPED
ASSESSMENT PLANNING	There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome.	The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in the current year.	The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements.	The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed.
THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE	Students know little to nothing about the overall outcomes of the program. Communication of outcomes to students, e.g., in syllabi or catalog, is spotty or nonexistent.	Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors.	Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the program web page, and elsewhere.	Students are well acquainted with program outcomes and may participate in creation and use of rubrics. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcomes and levels of performance. Program policy calls for inclusion of outcomes in all course syllabi, and they are readily available in other program documents.

Checklist to Critique Your Assessment Project Plan

(based on the Program Evaluation Standards by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc>)

CHECKLIST

- UTILITY:** Useful to be intended users? Meet the needs of the intended users?
- FEASIBILITY:** Realistic, practical, diplomatic, and frugal?
- PROPRIETY:** Designed to be conducted ethically, legally, and with regard for the welfare of those involved and those affected by the results?
- ACCURACY:** Designed to reveal and convey technically adequate information about the program? Designed to reliably answer the assessment question(s) being asked?