



ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CHARGE TO THE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Program Review Committee (PRC) consists of both external and internal reviewers, as described below. As such, the PRC will carefully examine the self-study document submitted by the department/program under review. The Committee will focus on findings related to comparison of strengths and weaknesses of the program (i.e. faculty, students, leadership, curricula, research, funding, etc.) to similar programs across the country. Additionally, the Committee assesses the extent to which a program is meeting its objectives by analyzing various activities from different perspectives, leading to some determination on the program's effectiveness.

REVIEWER ROLES

External Reviewer(s) will:

1. Provide the perspective of senior faculty members in the discipline of the particular undergraduate/graduate program under review; contribute information that may be used to compare strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate/graduate programs (i.e., faculty, students, leadership, curricula, research, funding) to those of similar programs nationwide.
2. Make his/her own travel arrangements; provide Academic Program Quality Coordinator with receipts necessary for expense reimbursement, as well as all relevant information needed to process stipend payment.
3. Write a final report with the assistance of CSU internal reviewers. When there is more than one external reviewer, each one actively contributes to writing the final report. One external reviewer must serve as PRC chair and lead author of the final report. Initial preparations for writing the report begin at the conclusion of the virtual site visit. The final version of the report is to be submitted to the Academic Program Quality Coordinator no later than 30 days following completion of the site visit

Internal Reviewer(s) will:

1. Provide the perspective of CSU faculty members familiar with the institution and the needs and expectations of undergraduate/graduate programs, as they align with the Mission and Vision of the University.

2. Attend all meetings as scheduled.
3. Provide external reviewers with additional information, as necessary, and assist in the development of the first draft of the final report at the conclusion of the virtual site visit. Continue collaborating with external reviewers to finalize the report, expected to be submitted to the Academic Program Quality Coordinator no later than 30 days following completion of the site visit.

WRITING AND FORMATTING OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

In order to submit a report that provides the greatest benefit to the department/program under review, the Final Report should be concise and to the point, usually 5 – 7 pages in length, excluding the cover sheet and executive summary. The Academic Program Quality Coordinator will provide a signature page via e-mail to the entire PRC.

The report typically consists of the following four sections:

1. Program Overview. This section may include information related to the history, background, and administration of the program, providing some context for it. Material for this section comes primarily from the program's self-study.
2. Program Strengths. The strengths related to faculty, teaching, research/creative activity, leadership, students, curriculum, etc. may be presented in bullet or paragraph format. Material for this section comes primarily from the program's self-study.
3. Areas for Improvement. Generally, these areas for improvement are given in bullet format describing weaknesses and providing indicators of each weakness from the data the reviewers gathered during the review.
4. Recommendations for Improvement. Recommendations are the most important part of the review report because they become the basis for a plan of action for the program. Therefore, these suggestions for change should be clear and concrete in their depictions of what program faculty, staff, and administrators should do to improve the program in a way that aligns with the mission of the University. It is helpful to organize the Areas for Improvement and Recommendations into categories, such as *Faculty, Students, Curriculum and Instruction, Research, and Facilities*.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT WRITING PROCESS

For site visits featuring only one external reviewer, the latter will be lead author of the PRC Final Report. When there are more than one external reviewers, it is the group of experts outside CSU that will select a PRC chair, who will also serve as lead author of the Final Report. The internal reviewers serve on this committee in a supporting capacity.

The following procedural suggestions are intended to streamline the writing of the PRC Final Report:

1. PRC members discuss both areas of strength and improvement, leading to the development of a preliminary list.
2. In terms of identified areas of improvement, it is recommended that one PRC member keeps track of recommendations for the undergraduate programs. In case there is a graduate component to the program, another PRC member would tabulate the corresponding recommendations for improvement. As a team, PRC members arrange the areas for improvement and associated recommendations into appropriate categories, such as *Faculty, Students, Curriculum and Instruction* (includes student products), *Research/Creative Activity, Service/Community Engagement, Resources, Leadership and Diversity, and University Support*.
3. Through critical analysis of written evidence provided as well as based on virtual meetings, the Committee should discuss other areas of improvement and recommendations that should be added to the list.
4. Equally relevant to program faculty, staff, students, and administrators, program strengths should be discussed and documented in a way that clarifies appropriate categories to which they belong.
5. After the completion of the site visit, and based on the categorized lists of strengths, improvements, and recommendations, the lead author assembles a first draft of the report. If the sections have been divided among multiple external reviewers, each one sends his/her portion to the lead author for incorporation in the first draft. The lead author compiles the report and sends it to other review members, inclusive of the CSU internal reviewers. He/she starts with the Program Overview section, followed by a series of revisions of the report for clarity, concision, grammatical correctness, and compliance with the report structure listed above. He/she sends subsequent drafts to all committee members for review/revision and approval prior to finalizing the document.
6. Once approved by all Committee members, the PRC lead author will send an electronic copy of the Final Report to the Academic Program Quality Coordinator, who will distribute the document to relevant CSU stakeholders to conclude the process.