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Introduction

Periodic reviews serve as important evidence to the College community that academic programs are engaged in a continuous regimen of critical self-examination and evaluation. The self-study and the review process allow divisions, departments and their programs the opportunity to examine their research and educational effectiveness, raise critical issues within the program, and propose plans for future development. Each department, and its programs¹, will normally go through review every 7 years and at least every 10 years. Those departments/programs/schools that have specialized accreditation (ABET, CAEP etc.) will follow the cycle and process of their specialized accreditation, though Deans may, at their discretion, initiate targeted reviews under the College process.

The program review calendar is maintained by the Office of Academic Assessment and updated on an ongoing basis in consultation with the school/divisional Deans.

The program review process at CSI consists of the following steps:²

1. Department prepares and submits a self-study
2. A visit by outside evaluators and a submission of their report
3. A response by the department to the evaluators report.
4. An action plan by the department to address issues raised by the review
5. Institutional Planning Committee review of action plan.
6. A one year follow up report by the department

Copies of the documents will be housed in the Office of Academic Assessment as well as the appropriate Dean.

The Self-Study

Self-Studies will generally include all majors, minors and graduate programs, as this will capture programmatic interactions and administrative support for the department. The department will submit a draft of their self-study document to the Dean of its school/division and to the Director of Academic Assessment before anything is sent out to external reviewers. The divisional Dean is responsible for signing off on the self-study. The Director of Academic Assessment and the Dean’s Office provide suggestions, editorial comments, factual corrections, etc. These should be shared with the school/division Dean. The department and its degree program(s) submit the final a self-study document electronically to the respective Dean and the Director of Academic Assessment. Supporting materials may be included in appendices. External scholars will visit the program to discuss the review document with the program constituencies, and will produce a report of their analysis. The program will address that report, and the findings of the review, in an action plan.

The review goal is to focus the department, program director, faculty and staff, and the reviewers on the following:

- Current status and effectiveness: assess scholarly research and creativity; assess the curriculum of the majors/minors, review of the recruitment, retention, and graduation of majors/minors
- Critical issues: raise any critical issues that arise from the program’s self-examination of its current

¹ For our purposes, “programs” refers to degree and certificate programs housed in an academic department.
² Interdisciplinary Programs (including “stand alone” minors) shall follow a different procedure outlined below.
Future plans: project future development and improvement of programs and scholarship in the context of the program’s current strengths, and within foreseeable resources

Student Learning

The Self-Study will include sections that address the following areas:

I. Mission, Goals, and Learning Outcomes

- What are the mission and goals of the department?
- What are the student learning outcomes for each of the department’s degree programs?
- What is the relationship of the department and its mission to its school/division?
- What is the relationship of this mission and these goals to the missions of the College of Staten Island and the City University of New York?

II. Program Organization

- Which degrees/certificates are offered by the department?
- How are the degree program(s) situated in the department and administered? Is the organization of the department and its programs viable and, if not, how might it be improved?

III. Curriculum

- Describe the program’s curriculum addressing, where appropriate, the following:
  - Course offerings that satisfy the College’s General Education requirements,
  - Requirements and course offerings in programs offered by the department.
  - The department’s service courses for other programs and departments.
  - Updates that have been made to the curriculum since the most recent self-study
- What is the cycle by which courses are offered? What are the caps for each course? How many sections of each course are offered and how often are the courses offered in the evenings and on weekends? What is the usual enrollment in each course? (Syllabi should be in an appendix).

IV. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

- What student outcomes have the faculty identified for each degree (and certificate if appropriate) program offered in the department? How is assessment evidence used to support a process to assure the quality of the curriculum and that it is appropriate for each degree program?
- The student learning outcomes assessment plan for the department’s programs must be included in an appendix.
- How are the goals of the program conveyed to students? Does every syllabus contain learning course level learning objectives/outcomes? Are they linked to program level learning outcomes?
• What is the program’s assessment plan? How do faculty members engage in the assessment of student learning outcomes?
• What process/structures are employed by the department to analyze assessment results and disseminate them to faculty and other stakeholders?
• Some specific recent and/or significant examples of changes made as a result of the regular student learning outcomes assessment process should be included in text or appendix.

V. Faculty

• This section should include brief bios of all full time faculty that highlight education, specialization and the most significant and/or recent professional accomplishments. (full Vitae or an electronic link to them are to be in an appendix)
• How many full-time and part-time faculty teach in the program?
• How many of the faculty hold appointments in the Graduate Center? What is their level of participation at the Graduate Center? How does this relate to the number of faculty teaching undergraduate courses?
• What is the distribution of faculty with regard to area of specialization? How does this relate to the offerings of the degree programs?
• What is the distribution of faculty with regard to rank, gender, and ethnicity? How do these distributions compare to the distribution of faculty at the College, and CUNY?
• What have been the hiring trends since the last self-study? What new hires are anticipated and/or planned. What analysis was used to determine the need for new hires? How are the desired areas of specialization of new hires determined? How do they relate to student learning outcomes in the degree programs?
• What are the expectations of full-time faculty regarding research and scholarly activity? How much scholarship has the program faculty produced over the last five years? Is funding available to support faculty research, and if so, have faculty members obtained any? How does faculty research impact the degree programs for students?
• Describe the teaching load and schedules of full-time faculty. (reference the types of pedagogy if relevant)
• What is the quality of teaching as determined by peers and students? What measures, if any, are followed to prevent grade inflation? What measures if any are taken to prevent plagiarism?
• How does the program faculty ensure that the curriculum is consistent across different sections of the same course? How do faculty ensure that similar standards are applied consistently across multiple sections?
• What are the expectations of full-time faculty regarding advisement, service to the program and department, and service to the College? How do faculty provide service to the University or to the Staten Island community?
• What, if any, is the involvement of graduate teaching fellows or graduate assistants in the program?
What percentage of courses do they teach? How is the teaching of graduate fellows and graduate assistants evaluated?

- What courses do part-time faculty teach? How has the distribution of teaching by full-time faculty, graduate teaching fellows, and part-time faculty changed in the past five years?
- How are non-full-time faculty supported in their teaching?
- [IF APPLICABLE]: How are departmental and/or school/division HEOs, CLTs, and other non-professorial positions integrated into the activities of the program?

**VI. Students**

- What are the program’s requirements for admission? Are specific standards set for continuation in or graduation from the program? How were these standards determined?
- How many students are currently enrolled as majors in the program? What is the enrollment pattern of majors over the past 7 years? 4 years?


- How many students graduated from the program in the past year? What is the pattern of graduation from the program over the past ten years? What factors have affected students’ ability to graduate? What specific evidence and analysis supports your conclusions?


What efforts are made to recruit students into the program? How are students supported in the program (e.g., supplemental instruction, tutoring, faculty mentoring, clubs, and research opportunities)?

- What is the distribution of students with regard to gender and ethnicity?


- What activities, if any, has the program engaged in to encourage diversity among its students?
- What are the academic and/or employment achievements of graduates of the program? How are these determined? What information about graduates does the program/school/division collect?

**VII. Resources**

- What are the personnel resources of the program/school/division with regard to administrative, laboratory, and secretarial support?
• What are the library, technology, and media requirements of the program? Are these resources available? What are the space resources of the program, including access to laboratories and computer laboratories?
• How is faculty scholarship supported, with regard to funds for faculty travel and reassigned time for research? Dean’s and Provost’s Awards? Special funding from Dean’s Office? Special retention packages?
• What are the financial resources of the program/school/division to support instruction (i.e., the program's OTPS allocation)? To what extent are these resources adequate?
• What resources have been allocated to the department/school/division for equipment each year for the past five years? (e.g. OTPS, Dean’s Office, Student Tech Fees)

VIII. Program Analysis and Planning

• How well has the department and its degree programs met their goals? What specific evidence and analysis supports your conclusion?
• What are the program's strengths and weaknesses?
• What are the future directions of the program? What recommendations emerge from this self-study regarding:
   the degree program's goals/outcomes
   the degree program’s alignment with the goals of the department/school/division
   the assessment of outcomes,
   the addition or discontinuation of programs (or concentrations within programs)
   the program's curriculum and pedagogy
   Its resource needs, with regard to faculty, staff, space, etc.

APPENDICES

1. Syllabus for every course offered by the program.
2. Curriculum vitae or summaries for all-time faculty teaching in the program.
3. Complete Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan, and most recent results.
4. Other as appropriate

Outside Review Process

1. Departments propose external reviewer names to the division/school Dean. Full credentials must be submitted to the Dean for review. Usually there are two reviewers. Only one of which can be from another CUNY school. The Dean must approve the external reviewers.
2. Departments, in conjunction with the Dean, make their arrangements and schedule the visit to include the Dean, Provost or designee, and the Director of Academic Assessment on the schedule. Calendars must be coordinated well in advance of the visit. (See the sample schedule in the appendix)

3. External evaluators receive an honorarium of $500. Their travel expenses are covered.

4. Evaluators are expected to produce a report, ideally within two weeks of the visit, but no later than 6 weeks.

6. The department will prepare a response to the evaluator’s report that becomes part of the Academic Program Review file in the Office of Academic Assessment. The Dean receives a copy. This information will become part of the institution’s documentation of its ongoing assurance of institutional effectiveness.

7. The department/program, in consultation with the Dean, produces an action plan to address issues surfaced by the review process. A year following the visit, the department reports on what has been accomplished since the review. This follow up report is submitted to the Dean, who may provide commentary. The information will become part of the academic program review file in the Office of Academic Assessment and part of the institution’s documentation of its ongoing assurance of institutional effectiveness. All documents will be made available to appropriate institutional stakeholders as needed and/or required.

**Interdisciplinary Programs**

At the discretion of the Dean(s) interdisciplinary programs (including “stand alone” minors) *without specialized accreditation* may follow an abbreviated program review process or go through the above process, again, at the Dean’s discretion.

An abbreviated process might include:

- Deans review of relevant review documents from the departments that contribute to the program.
- Meeting with the program director/coordinator and/or advisory committee (as applicable)
- Meeting with relevant department chairs and/or faculty who regularly teach in the program
- A shortened self-study prepared by the director/coordinator in consultation with the Director of Academic Assessment.
- External Consultant Review