Adopted: March 3, 1998

ACADEMIC SENATE Of CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-492-98/PRAIC RESOLUTION ON 1996/97 PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

WHEREAS, The following departments/programs were reviewed during the 1996/97 academic year:

Aeronautical Engineering

Architecture

City and Regional Planning

Crop Science Economics

Electrical Engineering

English

Recreation Administration Speech Communication

Social Sciences;

and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate acknowledges receipt of the Program Review and

Improvement Committee's "Report on programs reviewed during 1996/97";

therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the Program Review and Improvement

Committee's "Report on programs reviewed during 1996/97"; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee's "Report on programs

reviewed during 1996/97" be submitted to the Provost and Vice President for

Academic Affairs.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Program

Review and Improvement Committee

Date: October 1, 1997

Cal Poly Memorandum

Date: September 4, 1997

Tom Ruehr

Copies: W. Baker
P. Zingg
H. Greenwald
College Deans
Department chairs in
programs reviewed

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Progmlll Review and Improvement Committee

Subject: Report on programs reviewed during 1996-97

The Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee reviewd 10 programs during the academic year 1996-97. Each program received a Request For Information, based upon the Academic Program Review and Improvement document adopted by the Senate in April 1992. The committee then met with all programs to clarify the nature and the procedure of the review process. Programs submitted their reports in winter quarter. Based on these, the committee formulated preliminary reports and forwarded them to the programs. We met individually with each program during spring quarter to allow them an opportunity to respond to the preliminary report and to clarify any misunderstandings or misinterpretations. Final reports were then prepared.

Attached is a report summarizing the committee's overall findings, as well as a summary report for each ofthe programs revie\vcd. We thank each program for the effort they have put into their reviews.

Copies of this report, and any responses from the programs reviewed, should be placed in the University Library for public access.

Walt Bremer

And Morrobel-Sosa

Kennasha Riener, Chair

Homas a Rueha

Morrobel-Sosa

Bianca Rosenthal

Homas a Rueha

Homas a

tanton

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 25, 1997

To: All Department Chairs and Head, College Deans

Copies: W. Baker

P. Zingg

H. Greenwald

Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Ken Riener, 1996/97 Chair Ken Riener Jac

Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee

Subject: Recommendations of the Program Review and Improvement Committee

The Program Review and Improvement Committee has completed the fifth year of the program review process. In addition to recommendations regarding individual programs, the Committee has also made some general recommendations, which apply to most of the programs reviewed.

Attached you will find copies of these general recommendations, along with a copy of the review schedule for the next five years. Note that departments and programs scheduled for review in the 1997/98 academic year include:

Food Science and Nutrition		Graphic Communication
Soil Science		Philosophy
Construction Management		Psychology and Human Development
BSIMBA Business Administration		Chemistry
MSIMBA Engineering Management		Biochemistry
Computer Engineering		Physics
Engineering Science	·	Physical Sciences
		Ethnic Studies

GENER.A.L RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEVV AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CYCLE 1996-97 ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CYCLE

In *the* process of analyzing and evaluating the academic programs on the 1996-97 review cycle, the Program R.eview and Improvement Committee has identified some significant genera! issues that seem to warrant immediate effort and action. The fo!lowing recommendations are presented in an effort to help guide such actions by the programs.

- 1. Specify the program's most significant observable intended learning outcomes. For both internal and external reporting and accountability purposes, it is essential for academic programs to declare clearly and specifically the high-priority learning outcomes that its students are intended to attain and be able to demonstrate as a result of participating in that program. In conjunction with this declaration, the program must have a mission statement which clearly provides the conceptual foundation for its fundamental learning goals, and it must specify observable indicators which are clearly linked to these goals.
- 2. <u>Implement a practical system for preserving empirical evidence of the degree to which students have attained the desired learning outcomes.</u> Such evidence, and its corresponding data management system, are requisites for track.ing outcome trends and documenting program successes.
- 3. <u>Fstablish an effective system of professional consultation and collaboration with on-campLl" and off-campus colleagues regarding instructional design, delivery, and improvement.</u> The scope of such professional peer review should include curriculum/course coverage, instructional activities, assessment techniques, technological mediation resources/techniques, class leadership/management, identification and use of appropriate feedback, innovation assessment, and integration of current research, as well as any other appropriate program-specific uses of peer consultation.
- 4. <u>Clearly define equitable expectations, criteria, and standards for evaluating faculty sr.hnlarship.</u>
- 5. <u>Implement an effective system for tracking and obtaining program-relevant</u> feedback from alumni.
- 6. Obtain empirical evidence for the validity of the program s admission criteria and cut-points. The definition and determination of student "success" must be clear, and must specify the indicators to be used as the criteria against which the admission criteria can be compared.
- 7. <u>nevelop a serious, comprehensive, and systematic approach to academic program planning as an on-going endeavor</u> Program planning should be linked logically to the program mission statement, specify appropriate options for dealing with short-

range issues, include long-range (5-10 year) intentions and incremental implementation specifics, and incorporate the acquisition and Llse of specifically focused feedback. The planning process must emerge from, and be guided by, an appropriate theoretical framework..

- 8. Obtain student feedback specifically for program/course improvement purposes. This use of student feedback must be separate from the RPT process, and requires instn..lmentation developed specifically for diagnostic (as opposed to evaluative) purposes.
- 9. Systematically evaluate the adequacy of the program's phYSIcal resources for supporting student learning and attaining the program's critical outcomes. Physical resources and instructional facilities should be evaluated in terms of appropriateness and adequacy for attaining specified outcomes.

Existing University resources which provide conceptual justification, support, and assistance in addressing these recommendations include:

- the University Strategic Plan (Sections 1 through 5);
- the Report of the Curriculum and Calendar Task Force (Sections 1 through 4, Section 6, and Appendix II); and,
- The conceptual and operational information incorporated in summary documentation of the focus of programmatic criteria associated with the Cal Poly Plan.

Although program review is a specific institutional endeavor, its orientation and rationale is solidly integrated with fundamental University policy documents and with program innovation/development initiatives. Building on such a body of policy and activities provides a conceptual coherence and shared operational focus, which helps to clarify and strengthen the overall University effort of continually improving the quality of its goals and their attainment.

		1	1								
PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE	Revisio	n Jan I	1997								
,						Propos	ed				
1	1992-93	.1993-	9411994-95	1995-96	, 1996-			1999-200(;	2000-01	2001-02	12002-
College of Agriculture					,						
IMS IAgriculture							Χ				
Agribusiness Department											
IB 5 ACIricultural Business				X					Χ		
Agricultural Education Department											
B.S. Agricultural Science		X					Χ				
Agricultural Engineering Department											
IB 5 Agricultural Engineering		X					X				
B.S. Agricultural Systems Manao	ement	X					Χ				
Animal SCience Department									.,		
BS. Animal Science				X					Χ		
Crop Science Department										V/	
IB.S. Crop Science					X					X	
IB.S. Fruit Science					X					X	
IB 5 Plant Protection Science					X					X	
Dairy Science Department							.,				
IBS. IDairy Science	4	Х					X				
Environmental Horticulture Sciences Department	ent	.,									
IBS. Ornamental Horticulture		Х					Χ				-
Food Science and Nutrition Department											
IBS IFood Science	X					X					X
B S. Nutrition Science	Х					X					X
Natural Resources ManaClement Department			.,					14			
B S. Forestry and Natural Resource	ces		X		\/\L	4)		X		*7	-
B.S Recreation Administration					X(Note	1)				X	
Soil Science Department											
B S. ISoil Science	X			1.51.7		X					X
Note Recreation Administration to be reviewed		year a	s Forestry ar	nd Natura	l Resou	ırces					
during the second five-year review cycle	e										
College of Architecture and Environmental	Design										
Architectural Engineering Department											
IB.S. IArchitectural Engineering			Х					X			
Architecture Department											
B.Arch/M ,Architecture					X					X	
City and Regional Planning Department											
B 5 fMC Clty and Regional Planning					X	0.1			X		
IMCRPIM 'Transportation Planning					X(note	:2j			X		
Construction Management Department											***
IBS Construction Management	Х					X					X
andscape Architecture Department											
B.L.A. ILandscape Architecture		X					X				
Note This is a joint program between City and	d Regional	Plannir	ng and Engin	eering.							
<u> </u>											
College of Business								-			
185 fM8Al Business Administration	X					X					X
IM.S.IMB Engineering Management	X					X				<u> </u>	X
IBS Economics	Х				X		, -			X	<u> </u>
B.S fMA Industrial Technology		X					X				
Della se et Francis										<u> </u>	
College of Engineering							, .				
M.S Engineering							Χ				
eronautical Engineering Department					.,						
IB.S IM.S. Aeronautical EngineerinCl					Х					X	-
ivil and Envinronmental Engineering Departn	nent										-
[B.S. Civil Engineering	L		X					X			
18.5 Environmental Engineering	1		X					X			
M.S. Civil and Environmental Engi	neerinCl		Х					X			
computer EngineerinCl Program											
18.5 Computer Engineering	Х					X					Χ
omputer Science Deoartment											
IB.S 1M S.I Computer Science				Χ					Χ		
lectronic and Electrical Engineering Departme	ent										
B.SIM.S. Electrical Engineering					Χ					X	
ngineering Science Program											
B.S Engineering Science	Х					X					X
IB.S IEngineering Science	X					X					

Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering Depa i.B.S. IIndustrial Engineering i.B.S. IManufacturinCI EnClineerinQ Materials Engineering Department i.B.S. IMaterials EngineerinCI Mechanical Engineering Department i.B.S. IMechanical EnQineering i.College of Liberal Arts Art and Design Department 18.S. IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B.A./M.A.i English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish Graphic Communication Department	ırtment	93' 1993-94 X X X	X	X	1990-91	1771-70	X X	1777-2000	X	2001-02	2002-03
industrial Engineering BS IManufacturinCl EnClineerinQ Materials Engineering Department BS IMaterials EngineerinCl Mechanical Engineering Department BS IMechanical EnQineering I College of Liberal Arts Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A i English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish		X	X	X					V		
!BS IManufacturinCl EnClineerinQ Materials Engineering Department 'BS IMaterials EngineerinCl Mechanical Engineering Department ¡BS IMechanical EnQineering College of Liberal Arts Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A. English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor French/German/Spanish		X	X	X					V		
Materials Engineering Department 'B S IMaterials EngineerinCI Mechanical Engineering Department iB S IMechanical EnQineering College of Liberal Arts Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A. iEnglish Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish			X	X					V		
'B S IMaterials EngineerinCI Mechanical Engineering Department B S IMechanical EnQineering College of Liberal Arts Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A. iEnglish Foreign Languages and Literatures Department minor French/German/Spanish		X	X	X					V		
B S IMechanical EnQineering College of Liberal Arts Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 18 A /M A. English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor French/German/Spanish		X	X						_ ^		ı
College of Liberal Arts Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A. English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish		X	X								
Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A. i English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish		X						X			
Art and Design Department 18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A. i English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish		X									
18.S IApplied Art and DesiCln English Department 1B A /M A. i English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish		X									
English Department 1B A /M A. i English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor I French/German/Spanish	i	X									
1B A /M A. English Foreign Languages and Literatures Department Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish	i						Χ				
Foreign Languages and Literatures Department	1										
Iminor IFrench/German/Spanish	t				X					Χ	
Graphic Communication Department			X					X			
Oraphilo Communication Department											
IB.S. !Graphic Communication	X					Χ					Χ
History Department											
IB.A. IHistory				X					Χ		
Journalism Department											
IB S. IJournalism		Х					Χ				
Liberal Studies ProQram											
IBA. ILiberal Studies		X					X				
Music Department											
IBA. IMusic			Х					Χ			
Philosophy Department											
IBA IPhilosophy						Χ				Χ	
Political Science Department											
IB.A. I Political Science				Х					Χ		
PsycholoClY and Human Development Department	ent										
IBS IHuman Development						Χ					X
iBS/MS ipsychology						X					X
Social Sciences Department											
IBS Social Sciences					Х				Х		
Speech Communication Department											
IB A. Speech Communication					Х					Χ	
Theater and Dance Department											
Iminor IDancefTheater			Х					Χ			
								7,			
College of Science and Mathematics											
Biological Sciences Department											
18 S/M S. 18iologic;)1 Sciences				Х					X		
8 S IEcoloQY and Systematic Blolo	IY			X					X		
IB.S IMicrobioloCIY				X					X		
Chemistry Department				T							
BS Biochemistry	Х			-		X					X
B.S Chemistry	X					X					X
M;)thematics Department		-									
BS/MS.IMathematics			X					Χ			
Physical Education and Kinesiology Department	t		- 11								
B.S./MS.' Physical Education		X					X				
Physics Department											
18 S IPhysics	Х					X					X
18 S. !Physical Science	X					X					X
Statistics Department	Λ										
18 S. IStatistics			Х					Х			
10 C. Totationio		1	^								
University Center for Teacher Education		1									
MA. IEducation		X					X				
1							^_				
Vice President for Academic Affairs											
Iminor Ethnic Studies (see Note 4)						X					X
Note Not scheduled during the first cycle since	illsan	ew minor.									
iIntent is to review Ethnic Studies durinCl to			ext five-	year cycle							
7	Ī			i							
Number of PROGRAMS reviewed	14	14	11	1 9	13	17	16	11	12	11	16

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING*	COMMENTS
I. MISSION	А	
A. Mission Statement		
B. Distinguishing features of mission	А	Design emphasis.
II. INSTRUCTIONAL	Α	
ISSUES		
A. Educational Goals		
Intended student outcomes		
2. Outline program	A	
content and skill		
coverage		
3. Co-curricular	А	
programs or		
activities		
4. Special educational	Α	The mentoring program has great potential.
services:		
a) entering students		
b) assistance for at- risk students	۸	
c) Individualized	A A	
opportunities:	Α	
B. Instructional Design	А	
and Methods		
Innovative methods		
2. Other innovative inst.	А	
methods		
C. Assessment methods and Data	А	
Student Learning		
Outcomes		
a) Methods used at		
course level		
b) Student course	Α	
outcome data	-	
c) Program	А	Instrument needs revision.
outcome data 2. Instructional methods	N 4	This process needs to be sharply focused on instructional duties.
a) Peer review of	M	This process needs to be sharply locused on instructional duties.
plans and activities		
b) Incorporating	А	
research into	- •	
instruction		
c) Student input on	М	Poor instrument with minimal coverage
instructional		
processes		

* NOTE: E - Exceptional A - Adequate M - Minimal I - Inc	ncomplete NA- Not Applicable
--	------------------------------

3. Instructors	Α	
a) Colleague evaL	, ,	
procedures		
b) Student evaL of instructors	А	
Program a) Internal Review Process	M	Define and develop the internal review process.
b) Accreditation	Е	
c) Alumni evaluation	А	
d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board	A	
e) Comparison with similar programs	А	
f) Intended program changes	А	
g) Internal planning and assessment	M	A formal plan and procedure should be developed.
III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors	E	
B. Placement	А	
C. Diversity	Α	
IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship	А	
B. Prof. Development Expectations	A-	Specific criteria within the four general areas should be developed.
C. Non-faculty staff involvement	na	
D. Resources 1. Personnel	Α	
2. Fiscal Allocation	Е	
3. Facilities	E	
E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile	М	
2. Success of criteria	М	No attempt to validate MCA criteria.
F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment	Α	
2. Program Capacity	Α	

G. Applicants/ accomm./ enrolled	А	Reflects aerospace industry economic conditions.
V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load	A	
B. SCU generated	А	
C. Retention/graduation	А	
VI. FUTURE PLANS	А	

ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING"	COMMENTS			
I. MISSION A. Mission Statement	А	Needs to be updated and revised relative to Cal Poly's mission.			
B. Distinguishing features of mission	A	THISSIUTI.			
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES A. Educational Goals 1. Intended student outcomes	A	This verbiage, borrowed from "Visionary Pragmatism," is too general. Attitudes and values should be infused in the entire curriculum, not just in the beginning and in the end of the curriculum			
Outline program content and skill coverage	A	Content coverage is adequately described. Interdisciplinar components and capstone options need to be described more fully.			
Co-curricular programs or activities	А				
Special educational services: a) entering students	А	Tracking feature is commendable, and the information obtained should be summarized. Does the portfolio review link to the advising process?			
b) assistance for at-risk students	A+	Please explain advising process for out-oF-sequence students. What role does the student services coordinator play in this process? How do the informal peer advising and extended faculty exposures assist at-risk students?			
c) Individualized opportunities:	А	Need examples and descriptions; other wise, too general			
B. Instructional Design and Methods 1. Innovative methods	Е	WWW, computer design, etc. Good on the Renewable Energy Project			
Other innovative inst. methods	А	Please explain how these may be used for individualized opportunities			
C. Assessment methods and Data 1. Student Learning Outcomes a) Methods used at course level	М	Please provide more than just the description of the instruments used. For example, what is meant by credit for student outcome assessment, credit by examination and by portfolio?			
b) Student course outcome data	А				
c) Program outcome data	М	Is Arch 481 the only source of infonmation? What percentage of students makes it to the 3 quarter capstone? How is the capstone design course assessed?			
Instructional methods a) Peer review of plans and activities	А				
b) Incorporating research into instruction	А	Active faculty but incorporation of research projects into instruction is unclear			
c) Student input on instructional processes	А				

* NOTE: E - Exceptional	A - Adequate	M - Minimal	I - Incomplete	NA- Not Applicable	

3. Instructors	А	
a) Colleague eva\.	^	
procedures		
b) Student eva\. of	A-	How are ttle results linked back to instruction?
instructors	• •	
4. Program	Е	The use of faculty-student curriculum committee and area
a) Internal Review		coordinators is commendable. Please describe the
Process		effectiveness and benefits of these committees.
b) Accreditation	А	
c) Alumni evaluation	M	Consider instituting an improved alumni survey to help in tracking alumni and obtaining their feedback.
d) Evaluation by	А	Please provide professional status or affiliations of
profession and advisory board		members of advisory board.
e) Comparison with similar programs	E	
f) Intended program changes	M	Minimal changes envisioned. The list provided is very general and not programmatic.
g) Internal planning and assessment	M	Their is no information on quality and effectiveness of methodoloOY. Need to develop assessment tools.
III . STUDENT	А	An impressive list of awards.
CHARACTERISTICS		
A. Awards and Honors		
B. Placement	Α	Suggest that you develop database of recent graduates.
		This could be done by instituting an effective alumni
C Divorcity	Λ.	system.
C Diversity IV. PROGRAM	A+ ^	Good applicant pool
ADMINISTRATION	Α	Wide variety of activity and accomplishments.
A. Faculty Scholarship		
B. Prof. Development	А	Please explain differences in resource allocations
Expectations	~	i ioaso explain amerences in resource anocations
C. Non-faculty staff	А	
involvement		
D. Resources	Α	Highly qualified faculty, but not very diverse. How will this
1. Personnel		issue be addressed?
2. Fiscal Allocation	А	Please explain assigned time for grant proposal development and grant activity.
E. Admissions criteria	Α	
1. Admissions profile		
2. Success of criteria	M	The criteria given are inappropriate as measures of student "success." They do not logically relate to the admissions criteria and weights.
F. Applicant pool	А	Program quality is its own recruitment, but is there targeted
1. Recruitment		selection? Please explain.
2. Program Capacity	А	
G. Applicants/ accomm./ enrolled	А	Highly selective program
V. INSTITUTIONAL	Α	High!
STATISTICS		
A. Fall quarter Student load		
B. SCU generated	Α	
C. Retention/graduation	Α	
VI.FUTURE PLANS	А	Need space and GEB flexibility; but appear to be very slow to adjust to 4 unit courses.

CITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING*	COMMENTS			
I. MISSION A. Mission Statement	I	No clear mission statement was found. What is distinguishing about the department's mission? Refers to the 1990 statementis it only the first 2 sentences? What document were these excerpts taken from? What is meant by "striving for social equality?"			
B. Distinguishing features of mission	Ι	See above comments			
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES A. Educational Goals 1. Intended student outcomes	М	The significant intended student outcomes are not clear. Greater specificity is needed to indicate just what is anticipated to result from the content coverage.			
Outline program content and skill coverage	I	Need more information describing the rationale of the program.			
Co-curricular programs or activities	А	Students have a required internship which has good potential. Students do community service.			
Special educational services: a) entering students	Α	The graduate mentor notion seems to have potential benefits.			
b) assistance for at- risk students	I	Information .about mentoring of at-risk students is inadequate.			
c) Individualized opportunities:	М	None indicated.			
B. Instructional Design and Methods 1. Innovative methods	М	The use of team teaching and electronic media are good techniques, but are not necessarily innovative. What is the rationale for their use in this program?			
Other innovative inst. methods	M	None indicated.			
C. Assessment methods and Data 1. Student Learning Outcomes a) Methods used at course level	l	Please describe the methods used			
b) Student course outcome data	M	What do the goals in appendix A mean? What is the "goals assessment?" This was not discussed in the report.			
c) Program outcome data	I				
Instructional methods a) Peer review of plans and activities	I				
b) Incorporating research into instruction	I				

, • NOTE: E - Exceptional A - A	dequate M - Minimal	I - Incomplete	NA- Not Applicable
---------------------------------	---------------------	----------------	--------------------

c) Student input on instructional	I	
processes		
3 Instructors a) Colleague eval. procedures	M	Perfunctory. What does this mean?
b) Student eval. of instructors	Α	Coverage is minimal.
Program a) Internal Review Process	М	The department just holds meetings. What else is done? A serious internal review is desirable and appropriate.
b) Accreditation	Α	
c) Alumni evaluation	М	No evaluation of feedback was provided.
d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board	М	What additional input is available? Please explain.
e) Comparison with similar programs	М	Merely noting that the program is a hybrid is too general to be informative.
f) Intended program changes	I	What are the growth changes? Doe the faculty have a clear plan for future changes? What are they? When will these anticipated program changes be implemented? there appears to be no plan regarding this matter.
g) Internal planning and assessment	I	No internal planning was apparent. Describe your action plans. What is being done to fill positions?
III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors	I	Tracking of awards and student recognition needs to be improved. Who receives these honors? Are no other honors available?
B. Placement	М	Need more careful tracking of this. Career Services information alone is too minimal.
C. Diversity	Α	
IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship	M	Need specifics of the criteria and priorities.
B. Prof. Development Expectations	М	What are the specific expectations? What are the priorities?
C. Non-faculty staff involvement	na	
D. Resources 1. Personnel	Α	Apparently, some faculty no longer participate in the program, according to Appendix D. Most are current in the field.
2. Fiscal Allocation	I	What dollars are associated with the assigned time? Need to be specific. The Question was not answered.
3 Facilities	I	Need greater specificity in connection with the facilities and instructional activities.
E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile	Α	
2. Success of criteria	M	No statement was found reQardinQ the usefulness of the criteria.
F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment	Α	
2. Program Capacity	M	What is being done to recruit students? The SAT scores seem low. It appears that the department could enrich the applicant pool by effective recruiting efforts. Need to develop a plan for recruiting and enhancing of the applicant pool.

G. Applicants/ accomm.l enrolled	M	Consider redirection of applicants who apply to other departments and are rejected elsewhere as possible applicants to your program
V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load	А	
B. SCU generated	А	
C. Retention/graduation	А	
VI. FUTURE PLANS	М	What does the department plan to do in the future? What is the department's response to the lack of flexibility referred to in the accreditation report?

CROP SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING*	COMMENTS
I. MISSION A. Mission Statement	M	General, vague, boiler-plate phrases. Essentially focuses on industry preparation. What departmental educational goals transcend vocational training? Consider articulating/incorporating the notion of experiential leaming via enterprise projects, particular purposes/styles of faculty-student interaction, content coverage, intended immediate or long-term learning outcomes and aspects of personal development, and any other goals that are NOT institutional characteristics or by-products that are outside the department's direct control (such as the emphasis on undergraduates, location of facilities, advising by faculty, etc.)
B. Distinguishing features of mission	А	Enterprise projects are noted. What about the department's role in the larger (polytechnic) University context?
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES A. Educational Goals 1. Intended student outcomes	M	It would be helpful for the department and the University to have the program's highest-priority intended learning outcomes specified in greater detail than merely to note that students should "acquire knowledge of biological systems and their applicability to production," "acquire knowledge and skills in current cropping practices such as," recognize and appreciate the scientific method, and "effectively communicate technical knowledge to a variety of audiences." Does "acquire knowledge" mean to remember a set of facts, determine implications, see/perform simple/complex applications, recognize inappropriate use, develop complex solutions to problems for which there are no single right answers, or what? Does "appreciate" the scientific method mean to see it as a good thing or to use it appropriately, or what? Is communication to be oral, written, electronic, individualized, in groups, or what? A helpful approach may be for the department to describe in some detail the observable characteristics of an "ideal" graduate, and then to categorize, refine. and prioritize those characteristics.
Outline program content and skill coverage	A	A curricular "flow chart" would clarify this topic. How seriously has the department considered integrating Spanish, social science, ethics, broad environmental analysis, more mathematics, and more biological science into its curriculum? Insufficient information is given about the senior seminar and how it is structured/taught to determine if it is a significant or merely traditional course. How rigorously designed, monitored and evaluated are the senior projects?
Co-curricular programs or activities	A	If internships and summer jobs are high priorities, their rationale and connections to the instructional process and learning goals should be described in detail. Similarly, the educational impact of the community service experiences should be explicated. Use of clubs for instructional purposes is significant.
Special educational services: a) entering students	A	Standard and traditional. Does the department have any evidence for the effectiveness of its offerings?

* NOTE: E - Exceptional A - Adequate M - Minimal I - Incomplete NA- Not Applicable

	1	
b) assistance for at- risk students	А	Same as above. Also, what proactive measures could the department take? Is there a role for the Mulitcultural Agricultural Program?
c) Individualized opportunities:	А	Same as 4a, above. Also, what proportion of students avail themselves of these opportunities?
B. Instructional Design and Methods 1. Innovative methods incorporated into the traditional instructional format.	А	Simulated PCA performance is a good instructional activity if it is not too narrowly focused on licensing requirements to the exclusion of other educational objectives. A credible range of non-traditional tasks is presented, but beyond a description of activities, per se, the rational and intended and observed effects of these various activities would be helpful. The one sentence provided is too general.
Other innovative instructional methods	А	The only item in this category seems to be the enterprise projects. What structure, requirements, and restrictions are placed on these projects to ensure that they are effective means for enhancing clearly defined student learning objectives?
C. Assessment methods and Data 1. Student Learning Outcomes a) Methods used at course level	А	A good range is presented. How extensively are they used, and how well do they seem to work for producing a range of informative information? Elaborate on student peer evaluations, in particular.
b) Student course outcome data	M	Since the program's intended learning outcomes are vague, the relevance of course outcome information is indeterminate. "Integration of what they have learned" may be a goal of the 400-level courses, but it is not clear how that goal relates to broader department goals, nor is evidence presented for the attainment of that goal. Similarly, the relevance of, and evidence for, "creativity" and "independence" needs to be presented. The information regarding CRSC 463 is more to the point, but, again, is the department satisfied with how "effectively" students actually do communicate? As regards "learn-by-doing," requiring particular instructional activities does not constitute evidence that learning has occurred.
c) Program outcome data	М	Exit interviews is a good technique; however, instrumentation is too general. Job placement is not evidence for attaining specific learning outcomes: Passing a PAC exam is relevant only if the exam tasks/items are directly representative of desired program learning outcomes.
Instructional methods a) Peer review of plans and activities	М	Seems perfunctory, casual, and unsystematic. How often and how rigorous is the expanded course outline update process? How systematic is the critical collaboration of instructors involved in multi-section courses? Are faculty meeting discussions of instructional plans substantive? How systematic and substantive is tile informal mentoring process?
b) Incorporating research into instruction	А	
c) Student input on instruct, processes	А	
Instructors a) Colleague eva!. procedures	А	In practice, how rigorous, focused, and substantive are the processes described?
b) Student eval. of instructors	A	

Program a) Internal Review Process	М	Process seems unsystematic and episodic. What is the composition of the Advisory Board?
b) Accreditation	М	Could the department consider seeking review by the American Society of Agronomy? The Certified Crop Advisor Program is voluntary under the supervision of the ASA and the Calif. Fertilizer Assoc. What efforts are being taken to enable CS graduates to pass this certification as a critical component of California crop production?
c) Alumni evaluation	M	Given extensive contact with alumni, a systematic plan should be developed.
d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board	M	Meetings with professional and advisory boards should follow a systematic agenda to insure adequate topic coverage.
e) Comparison with similar proQrams	A	"Upside-down" feature is noted. Otller points repeat those made in section I. above.
f) Intended program changes	A	
g) Internal planning and assessment	A	How specifically do the cited activities actually address strategic planning, as opposed to, say, problem-solving, resource management, or specific tasks/projects/issues?
III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors	E	
B. Placement	А	
C. Diversity	А	Probation % seems high. Are there serious outreach efforts to enhance diversity?
IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship	M	What is meant by "significant strength?" Other than repeating the points in the Strategic Plan, how are accomplishments judged?
B. Prof. Development Expectations	M	Standards or levels of expectation are not clear. Does mentoring for probationary faculty occur to any significant degree, and is it effective? What occurs in post-tenure evaluation?
C. Non-faculty staff involvement	A	Consider exploring the potential in this area and expanding non-faculty staff functions that can enrich students' academic experience.
D. Resources 1. Personnel	A	Diversity is minimal.
2. Fiscal Allocation	A	"Other" category seems relatively high. Explain or itemize. Also, what is the plan for utilizing the donated funds for program goals and needs?
3. Facilities	Α	
E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile	A	
2. Success of criteria	М	No information presented, nor plans described to obtain it.
F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment	М	What is planned to enhance outreach efforts? Consider retargeting the recruitment letters to a more sharply defined and
1. Regratifient		more potentially productive group.

G. Applicants/ accomm.l	A	
V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load	A	
B. SCU generated	А	
C. Retention/graduation	А	
VI. FUTURE PLANS	A	Plans described mainly focus on resource acquisition. What about pedagogical and instructional technology issues? Also, could the department enhance the scientific aspect of the curriculum by appropriate use of para-professional and technical staffing?

ECONOMICS PROGRAM REVIEW 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING"	COMMENTS
I. MISSION	М	Gives College goals but vague about Economics program goals.
A. Mission Statement		The Business Advisory council statements could be summarized.
B. Distinguishing features of	1	None described.
mission		
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES	М	Too vague and general. How are these met?
A. Educational Goals		
Intended student		
outcomes		
Outline program content and skill coveraQe	Α	
Co-curricular programs or activities	M	How is the co-curricular program integrated into the Economics program? What does the Economics Association do?
Special educational	Α	Provides free tutoring.
services:		
a) enterinQ students		
b) assistance for at-	M	Did not address the at-risk students within the program. Need to
risk students		be more pro-active.
c) Individualized	Α	About 1/3 of students participate.
opportunities:	•	
B. Instructional Design and	Α	Innovations and community service are commendable. Need to
Methods		explain more about the integrated core curriculum and how it
1, Innovative methods incorporated into the		functions with respect to Economics.
traditional		
instructional format.		
2. Other innovative	A	
instructional methods	, ,	
C. Assessment methods	Α	
and Data		
1. Student Learning		
Outcomes		
a) Methods used at		
course level		
b) Student course	М	Need data or information. What are the results provided by the
outcome data	3.4	course-level assessment methods?
c) Program outcome	М	Computer mediated instruction could provide outcome data.
data 2. Instructional methods	N 4	Need further information about just what is feeded an
a) Peer review of	М	Need further information about just what is focused on.
plans and activities		
b) Incorporating	A	
research into	^	
instruction		
c) Student input on	M	What is done with the student input which is evaluated nearly
instruct. processes		every quarter? Specifically, how does it link back to the
		instructional process?
· 		

* NOTE: E - Exceptional A - Adequate M - Minimal I - Incomplete NA- Not Applicable

Instructors a) Colleague eva!. procedures	М	Need additional information about what is done beyond that which pertains specifically to instructional methods (as asked for in Section II.C.2.a).
b) Student eval. of instructors	М	What is done with this information?
Program a) Internal Review Process	М	An informal review is seems inadequate for a major program.
b) Accreditation	A	
c) Alumni evaluation	М	Too Qeneral and vaQue. What was in the survey?
d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board	A	Should consider seeking separate external evaluation of Economics program.
e) Comparison with similar programs	M	Similar to other programs. What is the special niche of Economics at Cal Poly? Upper division program is very small-is it suported by teachinQ large sections?
f) Intended program changes	A	
g) Internal planning and assessment	М	A specific and systematic planning process is needed.
III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors	A	
B. Placement	М	Little attempt to track graduates, either directly or through Placement center.
C. Diversity	М	There are fewer than 30% women in the major.
IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship	A-	
B, Prof. Development Expectations	М	Economics department expectations seem to be same as College expectations.
C. Non-faculty staff involvement	na	
D. Resources 1, Personnel	A	
2. Fiscal Allocation	М	Increased assigned time, concurrent with enrollment increase. seems to be inconsistent with educational needs of students.
3. Facilities	Α	
E. Admissions criteria	А	
1. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria	1.4	No data relating MCAS to student success.
F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment	A	TWO data relating INICAS to Student Success.
2. ProQram Capacity	Α	

G. Applicants/ accomm.l enrolled	А	
V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load	A	
B. SCU generated	А	
C. Retention/graduation	А	
VI. FUTURE PLANS	A	Plans may suffer in coherence from a lack of a clear mission statement. What has happened as a result of the college's consultant on the facilitation for planninQ?

ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING.	COMMENTS	
I. MISSION A. Mission Statement	М	Narrowmore a description of the programs than a statement o the department's mission.	
B. Distinguishing features of mission	A-	Cited features are not related to the department's mission. It is not clear what the reference group is, and therefore whether this program is distinctive or unique.	
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES A. Educational Goals 1. Intended student outcomes	M	Description is too vague and general.	
Outline program content and skill coverage	А		
Co-curricular programs or activities	A+	Extensive co-op program.	
Special educational services: a) entering students	А		
b) assistance for at- risk students	А	Are contracts successful?	
c) Individualized opportunities:	А	Student involvement in faculty research.	
B. Instructional Design and Methods 1. Innovative methods	A-	Teams not really innovative. NSF grant a plus.	
Other innovative inst. methods	A-	Nothing innovative in place now?	
C. Assessment methods and Data 1. Student Learning Outcomes a) Methods used at course level	М	Descriptions are needed of specific methods used to assess identified significant learning outcomes.	
b) Student course outcome data	A-	Grades on courses cited (EE309 and 462) are very indirect indicators. and then only of specific aspects of program goals.	
c) Program outcome data	A-	Indicators need direct links to clearly described program goals.	
Instructional methods a) Peer review of plans and activities	А		
b) Incorporating research into instruction	A-	Specific examples of research being brought into classroom would be more informative than an assertion of "direct osmosis."	

* NOTE: E - Exceptional	A - Adequate	M - Minimal	I - Incomplete	NA- Not Applicable	

c) Student input on instructional	М	Is this the only means for students to evaluate processes and activities?
processes		activities:
Instructors a) Colleague eval. procedures	А	
b) Student eval. of instructors	М	Form is inadequate. Even so, the committee finds the results troublesome.
Program a) Internal Review Process	M	
b) Accreditation	А	
c) Alumni evaluation	М	Good form. Form could be refined; how are results used?
d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board	А	Industrial Advisory Board evaluation not in binder.
e) Comparison with similar programs	I	What are the comparison programs? (The response provided to Section I.B belongs here.)
f) Intended program changes	A-	Co-op as a tech elective is a plus. What role will co-op play in unit reduction/repackaging?
g) Internal planning and assessment	А	
III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A Awards and Honors	А	
B. Placement	A-	How good is the tracking of alumni?
C. Diversity	A-	Few women, limited diversity.
IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A Faculty Scholarship	А	Vague, no standard (quantitative or implied).
B. Prof. Development Expectations	A-	Please provide and explain standards.
C. Non-faculty staff involvement	A-	How do they help?
D. Resources 1. Personnel	Α	
2. Fiscal Allocation	A-	Small \$ for professional development? Is some proportion of grant revenue used for professional development?
3. Facilities	A+	
E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile	А	
2. Success of criteria	М	No attempt to assess success of criteria.
F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment	A-	Can personal contacts be specifically targeted to applicants from underrepresented groups? Outreach programs courd be "looked at" systematically.
2. Program Capacity	Α	
G. Applicants/ accomm./ enrolled	Α	

V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load	А	
B. SCU generated	А	
C. Retention/graduation	А	
VI. FUTURE PLANS	A-	Laudable goal, but not a planhow to get there?

ENGLISH PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING*	COMMENTS
I. MISSION	A-	
A. Mission Statement B. Distinguishing features	Λ	
0. missing reatures	A-	
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES A. Educational Goals	A+	Desired skills well presented.
Intended student outcomes		
Outline program content and skill coverage	А	Discussion involved the program to be implemented in Fall 1998. Program appears to provide a balance between canonical and non-canonical material.
Co-curricular programs or activities	A+	Activities include visiting writers and activities associated with Living and Learning Environment in the CLA dorm.
Special educational services: a) entering students	A	Notable effort for large number of majors; hold is placed on registration unless students contact academic advisor.
b) assistance for at- risk students	А	Appears to provide appropriate level of support and direction for students on academic probation.
c) Individualized opportunities:	Α	
B. Instructional Design and Methods 1. Innovative methods	А	Evaluation of the innovations should be instituted.
Other innovative inst. methods	E	Notable array of activities.
C. Assessment methods and Data 1. Student Learning Outcomes a) Methods used at course level	А	Portfolio concept laudable.
b) Student course outcome data	А	
c) Program outcome data	Α	
Instructional methods a) Peer review of plans and activities	А	Rationale for the process can be commended. Committee had some concern that the rigidity could be problematic for some probationary faculty who might be excellent faculty members, but not a "good fit."
b) Incorporating research into instruction	А	
c) Student input on instructional processes	A-	The mechanism for how this information is used, is unclear.

2 Instructors		
3. Instructors	Α	
a) Colleague eva!. procedures		
	^	
b) Student eval. of instructors	Α	
4. Program	^	The Committee recommends that the denortment consider a mare
a) Internal Review	Α	The Co.mmittee recommends that the department consider a more explicitly structured process.
Process		explicitly structured process.
b) Accreditation	M	The DDAIC Committee recommends that the Department not wait as
ŕ		The PRAIC Committee recommends that the Department not wait so long for their initial external review.
c) Alumni	M	The PRAIC Committee recommends development of an alumni
evaluation		evaluation and critique prOQram.
d) Evaluation by	M	The PRAIC Committee recommends increased connection with CLA
profession and		Advisory Board or other professional organization such as the EMLA
advisory board		
e) Comparison with	Α	
similar programs		
f) Intended program	Α	
changes		
g) Internal planning	Α	
and assessment		
III. STUDENT	Α	Department noted that official awards and honors records have been
CHARACTERISTICS		only kept for a short time.
A. Awards and Honors		
B. Placement	М	The PRAIC recommends development of an improved alumni tracking system.
C. Diversity	Α	
IV. PROGRAM	А	
ADMINISTRATION	, ,	
A. Faculty Scholarship		
8. Prof. Development	E	Clear and specific, and aids newly hired TT faculty.
Expectations		,
C. Non-faculty staff	na	
involvement		
D. Resources	Α	The PRAIC Committee notes highly active core.
1. Personnel		
2. Fiscal Allocation	А	How does the large amount of release time for BWS/ILE impact the
	-	ability of the Department to offer its program?
3. Facilities	M	The PRAIC Committee recommends upgrade of lecture facilities in
		CLA.
E. Admissions criteria	А	
1. Admissions profile		
2. Success of criteria	E	Department provided definition and sources of evidence of student
	-	success.
F. Applicant pool	Α	
1, Recruitment		
2. Program Capacity	Α	
	•	
L		

G. Applicants/ accomm.l enrolled	А
V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load	А
B. SCU generated	А
C. Retention/graduation	A
VI. FUTURE PLANS	А

5 D -

RECREATION ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING*	COMMENTS
I. MISSION	E	Good job
A. Mission Statement		
B. Distinguishing features of mission	A	Well documented but some are quite generic.
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES A. Educational Goals 1. Intended student outcomes	A	Lacks prioritization, carefully identified, but prioritize; "understand" is too general.
Outline program content and skill coverage	А	Well presented - explain interdisciplinary activities (i.e. projects, connections to other departments).
Co-curricular programs or activities	А	Good to have community centered activities; curriculum and assessment links are not addressed.
Special educational services: a) entering students	А	Adequate, many departments do the same; "Mandatory" meeting has merit; two year plan is good.
b) assistance for at- risk students	Α	Newly-implemented advising process and form for students on Academic Probation is good.
c) Individualized opportunities:	A	Categorization would be more informative, rather than history
B Instructional Design and Methods 1. Innovative methods	A	Quantity good, but most are not very innovative. Provide rationale and intended effects for the most significant innovations.
Other innovative inst. methods	A-	Not very innovative.
C. Assessment methods and Data 1. Student Learning Outcomes a) Methods used at course level	A	Additional information about how these are employed or used would be helpful.
b) Student course outcome data	A	What are the "tools" and "instruments" for obtaining data? What evidence do they provide?
c) Program outcome data	А	Methods for evaluating intemships are well described.
Instructional methods a) Peer review of plans and activities	А	What is the format for the CAGR Professional Development Plan? There could be more information specific information unique to your program.
b) Incorporating research into instruction	А	No clear sense of curriculum significance.
c) Student input on instructional processes	А	"Mandatory" meeting for all students is commendable.

	* NOTE: E - Exceptional	A - Adequate	M - Minimal	I - Incomplete	NA- Not Applicable
--	-------------------------	--------------	-------------	----------------	--------------------

3. Instructors a) Colleague eval. procedures b) Student eval. of instructors 4. Program a) Internal Review Process b) Acoreditation C) Alumni evaluation d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board e) Comparison with similar program A changes g) Internal planning A- Program review seems reactionary - lack of specificity in terms of particular intended student outcomes. III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A Incomplete. C. Diversity A New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development B. Prof. Development C. Poevelopment D. Resources 1. Recruitment D. Resources D.			
b) Student eval. of instructors 4 Program a) Internal Review Process b) Accreditation A c) Alumni evaluation d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board e) Comparison with similar programs f) Internal planning and assessment III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A Incomplete. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff D. Resources 1. Personnel 2. Fiscal Allocation 3. Facilities A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A. The survey instrument for the juniors and seniors could be improved and extended to II.C.2.c. The survey instrument for the juniors and seniors could be improved and extended to II.C.2.c. The survey instrument for the juniors and seniors could be improved and extended to II.C.2.c. The survey instrument for the juniors and seniors could be improved and extended to II.C.2.c. The survey instrument for the juniors and seniors could be improved and extended to II.C.2.c. The survey instrument for the juniors and seniors could be improved and extended to II.C.2.c. A broader alumni survey would be useful. A broader alumni survey	a) Colleague eval.	А	Please provide the form for part-time faculty.
a) Internal Review Process b) Accreditation	b) Student eval. of	А	
c) Alumni evaluation d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board e) Comparison with similar programs f) Intended program A changes g) Internal planning and assessment III. STUDENT A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A. Honor Development Expectations B. Prof. Development B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources 1. Presonnel C. The comparison with other programs is implied. More specific information would be helpful. A. Honor Program review seems reactionary - lack of specificity in terms of particular intended student outcomes. Suggest creating a database. A. Honor Program review seems reactionary - lack of specificity in terms of particular intended student outcomes. Suggest creating a database. C. Diversity A. New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. 2. Fiscal Allocation A. Facultities A. A. Semilities A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A. C. Retention/graduation A. Faculty Student Load C. Retention Student Load C. Retention Student Load C. Re	a) Internal Review	А	
evaluation d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board e) Comparison with similar programs formation would be helpful. 1) Intended program A changes g) Internal planning A- program review seems reactionary - lack of specificity in terms of particular intended student outcomes. III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement A. Incomplete. C. Diversity A New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources 1. Personnel 2. Fiscal Allocation A. Facilities E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile C. Suggest creating a database. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. 2. Fiscal Allocation A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? 1. Recruitment P. Program Capacity A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A. Fall quarter Student load C. Retention/graduation A	b) Accreditation	Α	
profession and advisory board e) Comparison with similar programs f) Intended program A changes g) Internal planning and assessment III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A low process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources 1. Personnel 2. Fiscal Allocation 3. Facilities 4. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria 1. Admissions profile 2. Program Capacity A. G. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A. G. Retention/graduation A. Fall quarter Student load C. Retention/graduation A. Fall quarter Student load C. Retention/graduation A. Fall quarter Student Load C. Retention/graduation A. C. Retention/graduation A. C. Retention/graduation A. Fall quarter Student Load C. Retention/graduation A. The comparison with other programs is implied. More information informatic information informa	,	A-	A broader alumni survey would be useful.
similar programs 1) Intended program changes g) Internal planning and assessment III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A Incomplete. C. Diversity A New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources 1. Personnel C. Fiscal Allocation A. Facultites A. Lit is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Corants record. C. Fiscal Allocation A. Facultites A. C. Admissions profile C. Success of ortieria A. Admissions profile C. Program ceview seems reactionary - lack of specificity in terms of particular intended student outcomes. Suggest creating a database. Lincomplete. C. Diversity A New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. Well developed. Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement A Well developed. Expectations C. Non-faculty staff Corants record. C. Program Capacity A. A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A. Hall quarter Student load C. Retention/graduation A C. Retention particular advancements A C. Retention of particular advancements A C. Retention of pa	profession and advisory board	А	
g) Internal planning and assessment III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A Incomplete. C. Diversity A Incomplete. C. Diversity A Incomplete. C. Does and a Stepectations B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources 1. Personnel A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Orants record. A It is recommended that the number of facul		А	
III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A C. New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development A Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. 2. Fiscal Allocation A S. Facilities A E. Admissions criteria A 1. Admissions profile C. Success of criteria A C. Replicant pool A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? 1. Recruitment C. Program Capacity A G. Applicants/ accomm./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load G. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A C. Retention/graduat	chanqes	А	
CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors B. Placement C. Diversity A New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources 1. Personnel C. Fiscal Allocation A. Facilities A. E. Admissions profile C. Success of criteria A. Admissions profile C. Success of criteria C. Recruitment C. Program Capacity A. G. Applicants' accommr./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load G. SCU generated C. Retention/graduation A. Incomplete. A. Incomplete. A. Incomplete. A. Well developed. B. Well developed. Well developed. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Grants record.	and assessment	A-	
C. Diversity A New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources A It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. 2. Fiscal Allocation A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? 1. Recruitment A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. B New process for advising students on academic Probation has been implemented. Good detail. Well developed. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. S C. Non-faculty staff Involved I	CHARACTERISTICS	A-	Suggest creating a database.
implemented. IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources 1. Personnel 2. Fiscal Allocation A. Facilities A E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria M. No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A. G. Applicants/ accomrn./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A Well developed. Well developed. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record.	B. Placement	A-	Incomplete.
ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship B. Prof. Development Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. 2. Fiscal Allocation A. Facilities A. E. Admissions criteria A. Admissions profile C. Success of criteria A. Applicant pool A. Recruitment C. Program Capacity A. G. Applicants/ accomrn./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A. Well developed. Well developed. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A E. Admissions profile Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A Distribution of faculty be increased; good Qrants record.	C. Diversity	А	
Expectations C. Non-faculty staff involvement D. Resources A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good 1. Personnel Qrants record. 2. Fiscal Allocation A 3. Facilities A. E. Admissions criteria A. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria M. No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. F. Applicant pool A. Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A. G. Applicants/ accomm./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A. C. Retention/graduation A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. Grants record. A. Grants record. A. Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A. Fall quarter Student load A. G. SCU generated A. C. Retention/graduation A. C. Retention/graduation	ADMINISTRATION	E	Good detail.
involvement D. Resources 1. Personnel 2. Fiscal Allocation 3. Facilities A E. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A G. Applicants/ accomm./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good Qrants record. A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good A. It is recommended that the number of faculty be increased; good A. It is recommended.		А	Well developed.
1. Personnel Qrants record. 2. Fiscal Allocation A 3. Facilities A E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria M No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. F. Applicant pool A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A G. Applicants/ accomrn./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A		N/A	
3. Facilities A E. Admissions criteria A 1. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria M No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. F. Applicant pool A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A G. Applicants/ accomrn./ A enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A	1. Personnel	A	
E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria M No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity G. Applicants/ accomrn./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success?		Α	
1. Admissions profile 2. Success of criteria M No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A G. Applicants/ accomrn./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A No empirical data and no plan to obtain the data. Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A Hard Statistics A Stat			
F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A G. Applicants/ accomrn./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success? A evidence of success? A evidence of success? A evidence of success?	1. Admissions profile		
1. Recruitment 2. Program Capacity A G. Applicants/ accomrn./ A enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A			
G. Applicants/ accomrn./ enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A	1. Recruitment		Good range of methods! Is there evidence of success?
enrolled V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated C. Retention/graduation A			
STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load 6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A	enrolled		
6. SCU generated A C. Retention/graduation A	STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student	A	
		А	
VI FUTURE PLANS A Good plan, well thouQht out.	C. Retention/graduation	А	
	VI FUTURE PLANS	A	Good plan, well thouQht out.

SOCIAL SCIENCES PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING.	COMMENTS
I. MISSION	A-	No discussion of service mission.
A. Mission Statement	^	Dacific Dim amphasis is noted
Distinguishing features of mission	Α	Pacific Rim emphasis is noted.
II. INSTRUCTIONAL	A-	Too general. No discussion of (observable) outcomes.
ISSUES		
A. Educational Goals 1. Intended student		
outcomes		
2. Outline program	A-	No rationale given for organization of curriculum.
content and skill		
coveraQe	•	
Co-curricular programs or	Α	Intemship is good.
activities		
4. Special educational	А	
services:		
a) entering students b) assistance for at-	M	Academia probation acome too late to identify at risk atudents
risk students	IVI	Academic probation seems too late to identify at-risk students.
c) Individualized	А	
opportunities:		
8. Instructional Design	М	Pacific Rim emphasis is not an innovative instructional method.
and Methods 1, Innovative methods		
2. Other innovative inst.	M	No response given.
methods		
C. Assessment methods	M	Are there any methods within the individual disciplines to assess
and Data 1. Student Leaming		achievement of course objectives?
Outcomes		
a) Methods used at		
course level		N
b) Student course outcome data	M	No response.
c) Program	M	No response.
outcome data		
2. Instructional methods	Α	OK for post-tenure review.
a) Peer review of		
plans and activities b) Incorporating	A	
research into	, ,	
instruction		
c) Student input on	Α	The form used is of very limited value. A new form will be adapted
instructional processes		from Political Science.
Processes		

	* NOTE: E - Exceptional	A - Adequate	M - Minimal	I - Incomplete	NA- Not Applicable
--	-------------------------	--------------	-------------	----------------	--------------------

3. Instructors a) Colleague eva!. procedures	M	The form used is of very limited value.
b) Student eval. of instructors	M	The form used is of very limited value.
Program a) Internal Review Process	M	The process is not systematic. What are the criteria?
b) Accreditation	М	Are there accrediting bodies for any of the individual programs in the department, equivalent to the Geography review attached?
c) Alumni evaluation	M	Progress is needed in this area.
d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board	M	Need better input from the professions.
e) Comparison with similar programs	A-	It would be informative to make comparisons at the individual discipline level within the department.
f) Intended program changes	Α	
g) Internal planning and assessment	M	No detail given.
III. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors	M	Very small sample.
B. Placement	M	Better alumni tracking would be valuable.
C. Diversity	Α	
IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship	A-	No specific criteria provided. A definition tailored to the department strengths and Mission might help focus faculty professional development.
B. Prof. Development Expectations	M	No measurable standard. The response equates professional development with published research. Professional development standards should reflect the department value system.
C. Non-faculty staff involvement	Α	No involvement.
D. Resources 1. Personnel	Α	
2. Fiscal Allocation	M	If there truly are no resources available for allocation, then the department should try to develop alumni support, and other sources of funds to support department activities.
3. Facilities	A-	
E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile	Α	What is the rationale for the 2:1 freshman-transfer ratio?
2. Success of criteria	M	Is there any evidence that the (department/college) admissions criteria are valid? How is success defined?
F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment	А	Pro-diversity statement in material sent to high schools is a positive action.
2. Program Capacity	A-	Is growth in number of majors at the expense of service courses?

A-	Students enrolled do not have particularly impressive SAT's or GPA's. Are efforts made to target specific applicants to encourage the best qualified to enroll?
А	
А	
А	
A	The Pacific Rim concentration appears to be a new discipline, rather than a unifying theme in all the department's disciplines. Are there plans to modify the department's other programs? Would a tenure-track faculty hiring plan which focused on overall department needs (reflecting a unified department vision)have been more successful?
	A A

SPEECH COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT 1996-1997

ITEM	RATING.	COMMENTS
I. MISSION A. Mission Statement	A	
B. Distinguishing features of mission	Α	The specific details provided are very informative, but refer more directly to the actual program rather the program's mission.
II. INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES A. Educational Goals 1. Intended student outcomes	А	Educational goals are appropriate for the Department.
Outline program content and skill coverage	Ш	Chronology through the major appears logical and appropriate.
Co-curricular programs or activities	A	Debate and Storytelling activities are noted as having potential for embodying desired program outcomes.
Special educational services: a) entering students	А	Traditional and minimal.
b) assistance for at- risk students	A-	The contact and tutoring seems to be too little, too late.
c) Individualized opportunities:	A-	Unclear what percentage of students participate in the listed activities?
B. Instructional Design and Methods 1. Innovative methods	A+	
Other innovative inst. methods	Α	Criteria for the weekly reports while on internship are commendable.
C. Assessment methods and Data 1. Student Learning Outcomes a) Methods used at course level	A	Assessment of the above innovative methods should be undertaken.
b) Student course outcome data	M	Available information, even if "speculative," would be useful.
c) Program outcome data	M	The Department should develop the tools to be able to respond to this topic.
Instructional methods a) Peer review of plans and activities	A-	The PRAIC was unable to determine rigor of the review process
b) Incorporating research into instruction	А	Excellent examples provided.

• NOTE: E - Exceptional A - Adequate M - Minimal I - Incomplete NA- Not Applicable

c) Student input on instructional processes	Е	The use of individualized faculty instruments is laudable. Details would be helpful.
3. Instructors a) Colleague eval. procedures	А	
b) Student eval. of instructors	Α	Summary statistical information would be useful.
4. Program a) Internal Review Process	М	The PRAIC recommends development of Departmental Committee and process for this purpose.
b) Accreditation	М	Even if there is no separate accreditation available for this Department, the PRAIC recommends that the Department pursue a regular external review proQram.
c) Alumni evaluation	М	The interactive Website is a promising means of contacting alumni.
d) Evaluation by profession and advisory board	M	As stated above, the PRAIC recommends that the Department pursue a regular external review program. The PRAIC also recommends increased connection with CLA Advisory Board or other professional organization.
e) Comparison with similar programs	А	
f) Intended program changes	А	The PRAIC suggests consideration of other issues, e. g., increasing the breadth of support courses, consistent with a Polytechnic university?
g) Internal planning and assessment	М	The PRAIC agrees with the Department in noting a deficiency in this area.
1/1. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS A. Awards and Honors	M	The relevant information is not recorded.
B. Placement	M	Career Services can provide limited information. The PRAIC Committee recommends development of an improved alumni tracking system.
C. Diversity	А	
IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION A. Faculty Scholarship	E	
B. Prof. Development Expectations	А	The distinction in expectations for tenured and tenure-track faculty is not clear.
C. Non-faculty staff involvement	na	
D. Resources 1. Personnel	A+	The PRAIC notes significant activity across the department
2. Fiscal Allocation	Α	An improved alumni tracking system might improve discretionary funding.
3. Facilities	М	PRAIC Committee recommends upgrade of lecture facilities in CLA
E. Admissions criteria 1. Admissions profile	А	Does your (CLA) MCA include specifically the topics listed in the report?
Success of criteria	М	The PRAIC lauds the success in terms of graduation rate. Can the aspects of the MCA that contribute to the graduation rate be determined?

F. Applicant pool 1. Recruitment	А	Applicant pool appears strong. The PRAIC would encourage the reestablishment of the high school debate tournament. Appears to be an excellent recruitment tool and an appropriate co-curricular activity for majors in this field.
2. Program Capacity	А	
G. Applicants/ accomm.l enrolled	А	The Department appears to be effective in maintaining a high show rate.
V. INSTITUTIONAL STATISTICS A. Fall quarter Student load	А	
8. SCU generated	А	
C. Retention/graduation	A+	While data is limited, it does appear the students can progress readily through the maior.
VI. FUTURE PLANS	A	The PRAIC acknowledges the progress towards some of the goals set in 1991. The Department provided a reasonable set of goals for the next cycle. However, the PRAtC would hope that a resolution of the apparent conflict in the Department would be the highest priority.

State of California

Memorandum

RECTIVED

Academic Senate



SAN LUIS OBISPO CA 93407

To: Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Chair

Academic Senate

Date:

March 30, 1998

From:

Warren 1. Baker

Copies:

Paul 1. Zingg

President

Harvey Greenwald

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-492-98/PRAIC

Resolution on 1996/97 Program Review and Improvement Committee Report of

Findings and Recommendations

Thank you for your memorandum of March 9, 1998, which transmitted Academic Senate Resolution AS-492-98/PRAIC - Resolution on the 1996-97 Program Review and Improvement Committee Report of Findings and Recommendations.

I am pleased to approve this resolution and to acknowledge the findings of the Committee. The Committee's findings have been summarized and forwarded to the CSU Chancellor's Office. As you know, the Provost is currently in the process of meeting with the faculty of the programs which have been reviewed to emphasize the value of internal reviews and to discuss the recommendations within the reVIews.

Please express my appreciation, once again, to both the Academic Senate and the members of the Senate's Program Review and Improvement Committee for their efforts.