

DRAFT Chart Comparing Program Review and Prioritization Content

The intent of this draft was to identify what content was already covered by the prioritization process with the idea of building on this analysis to identify what might constitute an effective “addendum” that could be provided by programs currently in the program review cycle so they would not need to do a full program review. The following chart simply identifies the overlaps between the documents. Ultimately, the recommended addendum would not necessarily need to include all the information that is currently in the program review but not the prioritization documents. That will be a part of the discussion for the second meeting – Friday, July 18th.

The chart is based on the structure of the program review document and makes reference to the prioritization documents. A summary of items that would be needed in the addendum *if all currently discussed items were included* appears at the end. An important part of the second discussion will be whether or not all these items are actually needed.

Self Study

1. Description of program – provide additional relevant information not contained in the prioritization Program Criteria or Department Reports (e.g. minors, certificate of study, etc.) **NEEDED**
2. Provide faculty utilization chart – otherwise this is covered by Department Report section II. Discussion of a 5 year plan including identification of those eligible to retire.
3. Same as #2.
4. Curriculum vitae – these are not included in prioritization, but Ad Hoc group was still discussing whether they are necessary at all as faculty activities are covered in prioritization documents
5. Curriculum – more discussion needed here
6. Covered by Program Criteria section I
7. Covered by Program Criteria Section III.C.3
8. Explanation if minimum unit requirements for graduation exceed 120; **NEEDED**

Since Last Program Review

1. In what ways have goals as stated in Department Report been met or not met? Identify goals met and briefly provide evidence. Explain why goals not met were not met.
2. Same as #1
3. Covered by Program Criteria II.4.A
4. Factors contributing to changes - Keep but refer to Program Criteria document
5. Covered by Department Report section II and Program Criteria III.B.1-5

Assessment

1. Covered by Department Report section IV, Program Criteria III.C.2 and Assessment Plan, which should be provided in part 3.
2. Discuss how the department assesses student satisfaction with the program – NEEDED
3. Discuss how the assessment of learning outcomes and student satisfaction have been used to maintain or improve the quality of the program since the last program review.
INSERT ASSESSMENT PLAN HERE.

The Future

This section would be “elective”: although discussants felt the information was addressed in the prioritization documents, they also felt that departments might choose to take this opportunity to focus on issues of particular interest to the department. If a department chose to do this, they would provide a short narrative referring to and building on the Program Criteria and Department reports.

Appendices

1. Data portfolio – NO - provided in Prioritization documents
2. Library Analysis – Some information is in the prioritization documents, but there is not a full Library Analysis
3. Other pertinent data

Summary: Based on discussion thus far the program review addendum MIGHT include the following:

Self Study

1. Description of program – provide additional relevant information not contained in the prioritization Program Criteria or Department Reports (e.g. minors, certificate of study, etc.) NEEDED
2. Faculty utilization chart; Discussion of a 5 year plan including identification of those eligible to retire.
3. Curriculum vitae - MAYBE – needs further discussion
4. Curriculum – MORE DISCUSSION NEEDED
5. Explanation if minimum unit requirements for graduation exceed 120; NEEDED

Since Last Program Review

6. In what ways have goals as stated in Department Report been met or not met? Identify goals met and briefly provide evidence. Explain why goals not met were not met.
7. Factors contributing to changes - Keep but refer to Program Criteria document

Assessment

8. Discuss how the department assesses student satisfaction with the program – NEEDED
9. Assessment Plan

Future – optional brief narrative

Appendices

1. Library Analysis – Some information is in the prioritization documents, but there is not a full Library Analysis
2. Other pertinent data

References

Humboldt Program Prioritization Documents:

<http://www.humboldt.edu/~aavp/HSUPrioritization/htm> See May 16, 2008 both Program Criteria and Department Report at the bottom of the list of documents.

Humboldt Program Review Documents:

<http://www.humboldt.edu/~ugst/PRguidelines.html>

San Jose State Program Planning process was recommended as a resource for consideration particularly with regard to on-going discussions about revising our program review process, but also in terms of considering what was most critical to include in creating an addendum to the Prioritization documents in our current situation. The link to the SJSU document can be found at <http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/programplanning/guidelines/>

Comments:

Please see notes from the meeting provided by Gay. Our task is to provide a streamlined process that contains only essential information but still allows departments to feel that they have represented themselves well. The task of developing a strategy to meet the current time and context specific need is separate from the future task of reviewing and revising the program review requirements.