

**DRAFT**

**PROGRAM REVIEW and ASSESSMENT HANDBOOK**



**Assessment Committee**

# Table of Contents

<b>DRAFT</b> .....	1
<b>PROGRAM REVIEW and ASSESSMENT HANDBOOK</b> .....	1
<b>Assessment Committee</b> .....	1
<b>AT A GLANCE: What you need to do and know</b> .....	4
<b>CHAPTER 1: Overview of Program Review</b> .....	5
<b>COMPONENTS OF SELF-STUDY, EXTERNAL REVIEW and CLOSING THE LOOP.</b> .....	6
<b>THE SELF STUDY</b> .....	7
<b>Mission and Goals</b> .....	7
<b>Department History</b> .....	7
<b>Department Personnel</b> .....	7
<b>Curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes and Curricular Map</b> .....	7
<b>Student Data and Student Outcomes in the Curricular and Learning Context</b> .....	7
<b>Learning and Operational Environment</b> .....	7
<b>Successes and Challenges in Delivering Your Educational Mission</b> .....	7
<b>SELF-STUDY APPENDIX</b> .....	7
<b>INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW</b> .....	8
<b>CLOSING THE LOOP</b> .....	8
<b>Chapter 2: Program Review Cycles</b> .....	9
<b>Benchmarks for Review Cycles and Typical Timelines</b> .....	9
Three-year Review Cycle.....	9
Five-year Review Cycle.....	9
Seven-Year Review Cycle .....	10
<b>Chapter 3: Internal Reviews</b> .....	11
Self-study Report Comments .....	12
External Review.....	12
Progress Report.....	12
Assessment Obligations Leading to Next Self-study Report/External Review .....	12
<b>Chapter 4: External Review - After the Visit Report: Template for External Review</b> .....	13
<b>Chapter 5: Closing the Loop</b> .....	14
<b>Chapter 6: Annual Assessment</b> .....	15
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	16
<b>Appendix 1: Forms</b> .....	16
<b>Appendix 2: Glossary</b> .....	16
<b>Appendix 1a- Curricular Map</b> .....	17

<b>Appendix 1b- Long-term Assessment Plan</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix 1c- Yearly Assessment Plan</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix 1d- Yearly Assessment Report</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 1e: Guidelines for Selecting External Reviewers</b> .....	<b>21</b>
Qualifications .....	21
External Reviewer Selection: Department/Program Roles.....	21
<b>Appendix 1f: Introduction Letter to External Reviewer</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix 1g: Invitation Letter to External Reviewer</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix 1h</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Confirmation to Letter to Participate as an External Reviewer</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix 1i: Sample External Review Schedule</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix 1j: Sample Memorandum of Understanding</b> .....	<b>27</b>
Sample #2 .....	29
<b>Appendix 2: Glossary</b> .....	<b>31</b>

## **AT A GLANCE: What you need to do and know**

1. All degree programs must participate in assessment of student learning outcomes and program review to satisfy accreditation standards.
2. Due dates are always September 30 for yearly assessment and self-studies. A self-study can be extended to November, but only if an external peer reviewer and an external review date have been chosen.
3. Program Review (self-study and external reviewer) and “closing the loop” should occur in the same academic year, with an MOU no later than September 30 of the following academic year of the self-study.

<b>Examples</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Yearly Assessment for 2017-18	September 30, 2018
Self-Study due in 18-19	September 30, 2018
Closing the loop of an 18-19 self-study	May 2019


4. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will provide you with raw data and can do custom queries for you.
5. Not including data, a typical self-study is 25-40 pages.
6. All assessment and program review activities have both internal (Assessment, administration) and external (peer reviewer colleagues, accreditors) audiences and we encourage departments to consider their readers!

## CHAPTER 1: Overview of Program Review

Program review is a process that serves Whittier College students and the Whittier College community by helping ensure the meaning, quality and integrity of Whittier College degrees. It combines multiple years of student learning outcomes and assessment, your global analysis of your curriculum and program, and external peer review. It cannot be stressed enough that assessment and program review are most beneficial to students, departments, and the College when undertaken with an eye towards improvement. Note too that program review is equally important for non-degree programs and departments and that the practice is growing beyond just degree-granting departments.

Program review combines thoughtful, data-driven self-reflection and independent peer review in order to recognize success, address challenges, and plan effectively for the future. At the end of the program review cycle, departments will have established goals and needs, and worked with the relevant committees, campus or external partners or accreditors, and the Office of the Dean to develop an agreed-upon action and assessment plan and a mutual understanding of next-steps. That action plan lays the groundwork for departmental change, resource allocation, and yearly assessment and review activities for the remainder of the next review cycle.

If program review lies at the heart of the meaning quality and integrity of a Whittier degree, then evidence of student success through assessment is foundational to program review. Are your students able to fulfill the expectations of a graduate in your discipline? Does your department know where its students are exceeding, meeting or failing to meet common benchmarks in your area? Programs are encouraged to engage in assessment activities that are useful and meaningful as a process and therefore more likely to result in a meaningful product (results, narratives, and data) that will result in improving student learning, curriculum development and pedagogy.



PROGRAM REVIEW IS AN EVIDENCE-BASED  
PROCESS THAT THOUGHTFULLY CONSIDERS  
STUDENT OUTCOMES AND DEPARTMENT  
OPERATIONS IN ORDER TO REINFORCE  
STRENGTHS, RECOGNIZE CHALLENGES, AND PLAN  
FOR MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT.

## **COMPONENTS OF SELF-STUDY, EXTERNAL REVIEW and CLOSING THE LOOP.**

While every program or department will differ somewhat, self-studies are intended to be comprehensive and thoughtful summaries of the current programs, their recent histories, and their future plans in the context of their discipline, or, in the case of auxiliary departments<sup>1</sup>, their area of responsibility or expertise. The self-study is then sent to an independent expert in the field (usually an experienced department chair from another similar school), who is then asked to review the document and conduct a campus visit. The external review results in a series of commendations and recommendations that inform the closing-the-loop process with the Dean. In this final step the Dean and the department reach a common understanding of next steps, personnel and budgetary implications, and an assessment plan for the coming years. Details of the process are discussed in the next chapter.

Departments should be aware of the fundamental issue of **meaning, quality and integrity of degrees**. The singular goal of program review is to promote positive outcomes for our students through processes which ensure and enhance the meaning, quality and integrity of our degrees. For WASC, MQID simply means the following: “A degree that is of high quality and integrity is one in which appropriately relevant and challenging learning goals are met by students who are offered a rich and coherent educational experience that is designed, delivered, and assessed by appropriately qualified faculty and supported by other institutional personnel as needed to ensure student success in achieving those goals” (WSCUC CFR 2.2).

At Whittier, program review and self-studies address meaning, quality and integrity here:

<b>MQID Areas</b>	<b>Self-Study and Program Review Components</b>
Meaning	Mission, goals Disciplinary values Contribution to College and Lib Ed
Quality	Department personnel qualifications Curriculum Student learning outcomes Self-reflection Planning and improvement Independent review Administrative and institutional support
Integrity	Assessment activities Data-driven decisions Self-reflection Culture of inquiry and honesty

---

<sup>1</sup> Auxiliary programs are departments that do not offer a degree, but which serve students and other constituents on campus: Office of International Programs, CAAS, LEAP, Business Office, Registrar, etc. While these departments may not have specific learning outcomes, their operations impact students.

## THE SELF STUDY

(Due in September of your Program Review Year and no later than November)

### Mission and Goals

- What do you do, for whom, and why? How does it align with the College's mission?

### Department History

- Provide a brief (1-2) page summary of your department focusing on important trends or changes since your last self-study, including how you addressed questions from your last self-study.

### Department Personnel

- Who is currently serving full-time in your department and what are their qualifications?
- What are the personnel trends in your department such as ratios of T/TT faculty to adjuncts and visitors? Are faculty deployed in specific ways? Contribution to lib ed?

### Curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes and Curricular Map

- Explain your curriculum briefly along with a curricular map and student learning outcomes so that readers understand your students' developmental path and its intersection with your student learning outcomes. Your mission explains the what and for whom, this explains the *how*.
- How does your curriculum and program compare to similar programs at liberal arts colleges?
- How does your curriculum intersect with the college's general education program?
- How does your curriculum and/or your activities (advising, mentoring) support Whittier's commitment to inclusion and diversity?

### Student Data and Student Outcomes in the Curricular and Learning Context

- Student learning outcomes and educational effectiveness! Are your students achieving the outcomes you expect? Discuss your annual assessment data cumulatively and how you have used it.
- Enrollment and demographic trends. [Note: OIRA will provide you with data for your department. Review it carefully and feel free to request other data as needed.]
- Discuss intersection of curriculum, personnel and student audience. Do you have choke points? Trouble delivering some classes?

### Learning and Operational Environment

- Discuss the physical context as well as administrative and budgetary support.

### Successes and Challenges in Delivering Your Educational Mission

- Reflect on what is working and areas that you believe should be improved.
- Propose an action plan and benchmarks that can be assessed in the coming years.

### SELF-STUDY APPENDIX

- Faculty CVs
- Syllabi [OIRA will provide you with your prior submissions]
- Departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion
- Annual/Yearly Assessment Data & Reports
- Copy of the latest Factbook with your self-study when you share it with the external reviewer
- Institutional Data [Provided by OIRA]

## INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW

Following the submission of your self-study, your document will be reviewed by the Assessment Committee, the Associate Dean of Academic Planning in order to assure the self-study is complete and reflects the standards of the college.

In consultation with departments, an independent peer reviewer will be selected who will read your document, visit campus, and provide a list of commendations and recommendations for your Department and the College.

## CLOSING THE LOOP

Submit your action plan (your to-do list), your assessment plan, and curricular map. At this stage, you will receive official word for a 3, 5 or 7-year action and assessment period and, after meeting with the Dean, have an MOU for next steps. This is completed by the end of your program review year and no later than September of the next academic year. (In cases where the closing the loop stage carries over into the next academic year, departments remain responsible for completing assessment and program review dues for the next assessment cycle.) (See Chapter 5)

---

### *WASC STANDARDS:*

*The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. (WSCUC CFR 4.1)*

*Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment – in support of academic and co-curricular objectives – is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. (CFR 4.3)*

---



## Chapter 2: Program Review Cycles

In 2018, the Assessment Committee adopted language that it would begin recommending longer or shorter review cycles (3-5-7 years) depending on a variety of criteria related to a department's performance, compliance with assessment, changes in personnel, age and history, etc. As of summer 2018, the criteria for recommending the review cycle period to the Dean is still under development. As we phase out the cohort model, you will receive notifications of your cycle timeline and due-dates.

Each department, at the conclusion of the closing the loop process, will be notified of the due date for the next program review and/or any additional requests for materials. If your due-date is 21-22, that means that your self-study is due in SEPTEMBER OF 2021 and that your external review and closing the loop process should happen during that year as well. Delay of a self-study usually removes the possibility of consideration for a seven-year cycle.

### Benchmarks for Review Cycles and Typical Timelines

#### Three-year Review Cycle

A three-year cycle may be recommended for new programs, for departments undergoing substantive change in scope or personnel, which are therefore in essence "new." Three years may also be recommended for departments having trouble complying with College processes and policies (i.e., program review, assessment, personnel, budget, etc.), departments seeking extra coaching and development opportunities, or departments struggling with achieving and documenting performance in critical operations. A three-year review cycle is usually focused on organizational issues such as implementing student outcomes, hiring, or curriculum development rather than on longitudinal study of student outcomes.

#### A typical three-year cycle timeline:

- Year 1: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- Year 2: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- **Year 3: complete self-study or other required document, external peer review and closing the loop.**

#### Five-year Review Cycle

Five years is a typical cycle at Whittier College and reflects a stable department with a history of graduating students with the necessary skills for their discipline, mentoring junior faculty and overall compliance and satisfactory performance in areas of program review, assessment, personnel policies and procedures, budgetary responsibility, etc.

#### A typical five-year cycle timeline

- Year 1: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- Year 2: assessment and follow-through with action plan

- Year 3: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- Year 4: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- **Year 5 : assessment and follow-through with action plan; complete self-study or other required document, external peer review and closing the loop**

### **Seven-Year Review Cycle**

A seven-year cycle for departments reflects a stable department with a history of on-time and successful program review and assessment activities as defined by well-written and regularly assessed student learning outcomes. These departments also have attributes such as solid enrollments across their curriculum, projected stability in faculty, staff and student enrollments, and well-developed action plans that strive for continuous improvement. Like departments with a five-year review cycle, these departments also have a history of graduating students with the necessary skills for their discipline, mentoring junior faculty and overall compliance and satisfactory performance in areas of program review, assessment, personnel policies and procedures, budgetary responsibility, etc.

#### **A typical seven-year cycle timeline:**

- Year 1: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- Year 2: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- Year 3: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- **Year 4: assessment and follow-through with action plan and mid-cycle report (usually short)**
- Year 5: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- Year 6: assessment and follow-through with action plan
- **Year 7: assessment and follow-through with action plan; complete self-study or other required document, external peer review and closing the loop.**

## Chapter 3: Internal Reviews

The faculty Assessment Committee conducts the Internal Review at the end of a program review cycle. Depending on the workload of the full Assessment Committee, a sub-committee may be assigned to review a department/program self-study and report their findings to the full committee and the Dean.

Department or Program Name:

Date of Last Review:

Recommended Period until next review?

Next Self-study Report Due:

Next External Reviewer Visit/Report:

Progress or Mid-Cycle report due (optional, see end of form):

C = Complete, IP = In Progress, U=Unsatisfactory or Absent

Activity during prior assessment cycle...				
Annual assessment (Year: 20??-??)	C	IP	U	n/a
Annual assessment (Year: 20??-??) – Annual assessment report	C	IP	U	n/a
Annual assessment (Year: 20??-??) – Annual assessment report	C	IP	U	n/a
Annual assessment (Year: 20??-??) – Annual assessment report	C	IP	U	n/a
Annual assessment (Year: 20??-??) – Annual assessment report	C	IP	U	n/a
Annual assessment (Year: 20??-??) – Annual assessment report	C	IP	U	n/a
Annual assessment (Year: 20??-??) – Year of most recent self-study report/external review	C	IP	U	n/a
Current self-study report...				
Data Snapshots	C	IP	U	n/a
Self-Study Process Description	C	IP	U	n/a
Program Mission/Description	C	IP	U	n/a
Goals	C	IP	U	n/a
Student Learning Outcomes	C	IP	U	n/a
Curricular Map	C	IP	U	n/a
Students	C	IP	U	n/a
Faculty	C	IP	U	n/a
Administrative Support	C	IP	U	n/a
Facilities and Resources	C	IP	U	n/a
Summary Reflections	C	IP	U	n/a
Future Plans and Goals	C	IP	U	n/a
Supporting Evidence	C	IP	U	n/a
Progress Report, if requested (Date _____)				

### **Self-study Report Comments**

Were there any areas of the self-study that stood out for their quality or because they will need improvement the next time? Comments?

### **External Review**

A copy of the external peer reviewer's report will be including along with this report.

### **Progress Report**

If the Committee is recommending a progress report, please briefly explain the area(s) of focus. All departments on a seven-year cycle should include a brief 1-2 page mid-cycle report in year 4 covering progress on assessment, their action plan, etc. Failure to submit a substantive mid-cycle report may result in moving to a 5-year cycle.

### **Assessment Obligations Leading to Next Self-study Report/External Review**

The schedule listed below is provided for information purposes. The schedule indicates the assessment-related items and corresponding due dates based on the timing of your current and future self-study reports and external reviews. Please see the Assessment Handbook (available on the OIRA website) for further details.

AY	Item	Date Due
20??-??	"Close the loop" with Dean of the Faculty: Complete/sign MOU	End of fall 20?? semester
" "	Assess component of curriculum (basis for 20??-?? Annual Assessment Report)	..
20??-??	Submit 20??-?? Annual Assessment Report to Assessment Committee and Institutional Research and Assessment	Sept. 30, 20??
" "	Assess component of curriculum (basis for 20??-?? Annual Assessment Report)	..
20??-??	Submit 20??-?? Annual Assessment Report to Assessment Committee and Institutional Research and Assessment	Sept. 30, 20??
" "	Assess component of curriculum (basis for 20??-?? Annual Assessment Report)	..
20??-??	Submit 20??-?? Annual Assessment Report to Assessment Committee and Institutional Research and Assessment	Sept. 30, 20??
" "	Submit information for three potential external reviewers to Dean of the Faculty	2 <sup>nd</sup> Monday of Oct. 20??
" "	Complete/submit Self-study Report to Assessment Committee and Institutional Research and Assessment	End of fall 20?? semester
" "	External reviewer visit	End of spring 20?? semester

## **Chapter 4: External Review - After the Visit Report: Template for External Reviewer**

**Program:**

**External Reviewer's Institution:**

**Date:**

This template is provided to assist External Reviewers in the completion of their report.

External Reviewers are asked to write a report that:

- Includes an **executive summary** of general comments, singles out features of the program that merit **commendations**, and makes **recommendations** for improvement.
- Varies in length, at **minimum five pages**.
- Is completed within three weeks of the visit.

### **1. Executive Summary**

Provide a brief executive summary of major findings for this program. Include:

- General observations and comments on the program and curriculum, quality of student learning and the achievement of student learning outcomes, the assessment plan, faculty, students, facilities and resources
- Responses to questions posed by faculty

### **2. Commendations**

Provide comments about what the program is doing well. Note suggested topic areas below.

### **3. Recommendations**

Provide comments to guide future direction for faculty to use to improve student learning and achieve departmental goals.

### **4. Discussion**

Provide evaluative feedback that would improve any aspect of the program and recommendations that require no new resources as well as those that do. The report may note recommendations that have been shown to be effective elsewhere. Note suggested topic areas below.

Educational Effectiveness Topic Areas for Commendations and Recommendations sections:

- Provide feedback/suggestions on any learning outcome.
- Analyze/evaluate direct and indirect evidence of student learning
- Offer suggestions to improve the assessment process
- Evaluate assessment plan
- Evaluate assessment impact

## Chapter 5: Closing the Loop

The final step in the departmental/program review process involves working with the Dean of the Faculty to create a Memorandum of Understanding between your department and the administration. The findings and recommendations of the department/program self-study, the internal review report completed by the members of the Assessment Committee, and the report of the external reviewer will inform your final action plan, assessment plan and curricular maps, as well as your final discussions with the Dean about assessment planning and resource allocation decisions.

No Later than September 30<sup>th</sup> following the academic year of the self-study:

- The Department/Program will review the internal review and the external review reports and submit a “Response to the Internal/External Review” to the Dean of the Faculty. The scope and breadth of this response document will depend on the contents of the self-study, internal review, and external review reports; however, there are three primary functions of the document.
  - The document should inform the Dean of the Faculty of department/program assessment plans (i.e., a schedule) of the assessment cycle
  - The document should facilitate discussion between the Dean and the department/program about resource allocation decisions
  - The document should include a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- The Department/Program Chair will meet with the Dean to discuss the review (i.e., the self-study, internal review report, external review report, and the response document) and resource allocation.
- The Dean and the Department/Program Chair will have finalized and signed a Memorandum of Understanding.

For sample MOUs, see Appendix 1j: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

## **Chapter 6: Annual Assessment**

It is the expectation of faculty to participate in on-going assessments of departments and programs with the goal of continuous program improvement. The faculty Assessment Committee, the Director of Assessment, and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment should be viewed as resources for facilitating this process.

In the model for continuous assessment, a Long-Term Assessment plan is developed during the self-study and closing the loop process. This plan is based on the feedback from the Self-study, the Internal Review by the Assessment Committee, the External Review, and the discussions that led to the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) between the department/program and the Dean of the Faculty.

Yearly Assessment Plans should be submitted by September 30<sup>th</sup>. Though work may be distributed within departments, it is the responsibility of the department chair or program director to submit the plans and reports.

In addition to continuous program improvement, a goal of Yearly Assessment is to use them to inform the department's or program's self-study which begins the next cycle of assessment.

See Appendix 1b: Action Plan and Long-term Assessment Plan, Appendix 1c: Yearly Assessment Plan, and Appendix 1d: Yearly Assessment Report

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix 1: Forms**

- a. Curricular Map
- b. Action Plan and Long-term Assessment Plan
- c. Yearly Assessment Plan
- d. Yearly Assessment Report
- e. External Review Guidelines
- f. Introduction Letter to External Reviewers
- g. Invitation Letter to External Reviewers
- h. Confirmation Letter to Participate as an External Reviewer
- i. Sample External Review Schedule
- j. Sample Memorandum of Understanding

### **Appendix 2: Glossary**

- a. Implicit and Explicit Curriculum



## Appendix 1a- Curricular Map

The Curricular Map should be revised/updated during Year 2 of the Assessment Cycle.

Course #	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					
Course #					

\*I = Introduced the concept; P = Primary course of instruction; R = Reinforcement of the concept/outcome

## Appendix 1b- Long-term Assessment Plan

Learning Outcome/Curricular Component	Year of Assessment
Outcome/Curricular Component X	20XX
Outcome/Curricular Component X	20XX
Outcome/Curricular Component X	20XX

\*Each academic year departments are asked to submit an Annual Assessment plan (fall semester) assessing at least one of their learning outcomes or curricular components. Once the assessment is complete, departments are then asked to submit an assessment report of their findings, analysis and recommendations. This report is submitted each spring/early summer. At least one learning outcome or curricular component should be assessed annually.

## Appendix 1c- Yearly Assessment Plan

Cohort \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Year \_\_\_\_\_

Learning Outcome/Curricular Component:  
\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Direct Assessment of Student Learning</b>	<p><i>Course Embedded Assessment</i></p> <p>___ Test ___ Papers ___ Projects ___ Other (specify):</p>
	<p><i>Non Course Embedded Assessment</i></p> <p>___ Paper in the Major ___ Other (specify):</p>
<b>Indirect Assessment</b>	<p><i>Authentic Assessment</i></p> <p>___ Practica ___ Internship ___ Study Abroad ___ Other (specify):</p>
	<p><i>Non Course Embedded Indirect Assessment</i></p> <p>___ HEDS ___ NSSE ___ BSSE ___ Focus Groups ___ Alumni Data ___ Other (specify):</p>

## **Appendix 1d- Yearly Assessment Report**

Cohort: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Learning Outcome/ Curricular Component:

---

1. Introduction: Question Posed
2. Method: method & criteria to assess outcomes
  - A. Schedule
  - B. Population and sampling
    - All students
    - Student Cohort (at risk, under-represented, graduating class)
    - Random Sampling
  - C. Members of the Interpretation Team
3. Results: describe the data --qualitative, quantitative, portfolios, longitudinal. Tables and graphs should go here. Talk about the results in a systematic way: a) are your objectives being met; and b) what are the strengths and the weaknesses of your students.
4. Analysis/Discussion: Answer the question. What does the data mean to us? What does it mean to students? Have your faculty and students look at the results and have them explain it from their perspective.
5. Conclusions: summarize most important findings. Establish benchmarks or talk about developing them if this is initial research
6. Final Report: Determine how and with whom you will share the results. Document the suggested recommendations and changes from the results.

## **Appendix 1e: Guidelines for Selecting External Reviewers**

### **Qualifications**

These are suggested qualifications for External Department/Program Reviewers. The External Reviewer should

- Be a full-time, part-time or emeritus faculty member at an accredited institution (WASC, SACS, etc.)
- Have an educational and/or practice background that is similar to the curriculum reviewed
- Have a minimum of 7 years of teaching, administrative, or practice experience related to the curriculum reviewed

### **External Reviewer Selection: Department/Program Roles**

The Department/Program under review has the right and responsibility to:

- By the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday of October of the self-study year, provide the Dean of the Faculty a list of three recommended External Reviewer candidates, with a brief biography and/or CV of each candidate
- Identify and communicate to the Dean of the Faculty any potential conflicts of interest between the external reviewer candidates and the department/program or its members (e.g., former employee, former student, graduate school adviser or classmate, co-author or research collaborator, applicant for employment, immediate family member affiliated in the department/program, served as External Reviewer in the last review, etc.)
- Consult with the Dean of the Faculty in the selection and invitation of an External Reviewer by the end of the fall semester
- Clarify roles and responsibilities with the External Reviewer
- Provide feedback to the Dean of the Faculty regarding External Reviewer's Performance

Adapted from Council on Social Work Education Handbook (2012). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards Handbook*. Alexandria, VA: CSWE.

## **Appendix 1f: Introduction Letter to External Reviewer**

Dear Professor XXX,

Based on your professional qualifications, we have identified you as a potential reviewer for Whittier College's \_\_\_\_\_ department's comprehensive program review. All academic programs go through the review process to confirm compliance with Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) standards. We would like to ask you if you would be interested in participating as the External Reviewer for this department.

If you agree to participate, we will send you an outline of the criteria for evaluating the program and your responsibilities and expectations as an External Reviewer. At least one month prior to your visit, we will send you a copy of the departmental/program self-study. During your visit, you will have the opportunity to interview and meet with department members, key administrators, and students. Following the visit, you will be asked to submit a final report summarizing your findings, commendations and recommendations.

For your assistance, the college offers an honorarium, in addition to covering the cost of all travel, lodging and meals. If you agree to participate, we will follow-up with more details and advise you about hotel accommodations and transportation.

We look forward to hearing from you (please reply to all).

Sincerely,

Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty

cc. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

cc. Department Chair of \_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix 1g: Invitation Letter to External Reviewer**

[On Whittier College letterhead]

Date

Address

Dear

Whittier College requests a comprehensive program review of all academic programs. Our \_\_\_\_\_ department is scheduled for a program review during this academic year. We would like to formally invite you to participate as the external reviewer for this department.

As an external reviewer:

1. Whittier College and the Department ask you to examine the program's self-study to confirm compliance to WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) standards.
2. Prior to the visit, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will send you a letter of instruction that will outline the criteria for evaluating the program and your responsibilities and expectations as an External Reviewer. The department also receives a copy of this letter.
3. At least one month prior to your visit, the department chair will forward a copy of the self-study and supporting documents.
4. In order to obtain as accurate an assessment as possible, you have the authority to examine all records relevant to these instructions. You are further authorized to seek additional information from personnel relevant to the department's self-study.
5. Your final report should include a summary of your findings, identifying areas of strength and making suggestions for continued growth and development. You will be provided a template to formulate your findings, commendations, and recommendations. This report will be forwarded to the Dean of Faculty, the Department, the Faculty Assessment Committee, and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.
6. Prior to your arrival, the department chair will create an agenda for your visit that will give you the opportunity to interview/meet department members, key administrators, and students.
7. Elizabeth Ibarra, Administrative Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Affairs will advise you about hotel accommodations and transportation.

We look forward to hearing from you about your participation as the external reviewer for the \_\_\_\_\_ department at Whittier College.

Sincerely,

Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty

cc. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

cc. \_\_\_\_\_ Department Chair

## **Appendix 1h**

### **Confirmation to Letter to Participate as an External Reviewer**

[On Whittier College Ltr. Head]

Date

Address

Dear

As I mentioned to you [on the telephone / by e-mail] on [date], Whittier College requests a comprehensive program review of all academic programs every five years. Our \_\_\_\_\_ department is scheduled for a program review during this academic year. [The program is preparing or has prepared] its self-study and will be ready for an External Reviewer to visit our campus [during the XXXX semester or on Month-Date-Year]. This letter verifies that you have agreed to participate as the External Reviewer for the \_\_\_\_\_ program.

#### *Responsibilities*

The responsibilities of an External Reviewer include reviewing the departmental self-study, confirming the information through dialogue with department members and constituents during the visit, and preparing a minimum five page report according to the provided guidelines. The report is shared with the Dean, the department faculty, the Faculty Assessment Committee and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. As you are aware, department reviews are very important for student and college level planning; your consultation will influence the future direction of the program.

#### *Criteria for the Report*

In preparation for your visit to Whittier College, please review the enclosed criteria and guidelines for the visit and report. The categories under review, and around which you should structure your report, are below for your quick reference:

1. Institution and Department
2. Quality of the Curriculum
3. Quality of the Faculty
4. Quality of Resource Adequacy
5. Quality of Students and Learning Environment
6. Progress toward Goals and Objectives
7. Overall Program Summary

#### *Role of the External Reviewer*

The External Reviewer discusses with the department the strengths and the challenges identified in the self-study, and provides suggestions that enhance departmental growth. We ask you, as a consultant/evaluator, to focus on program strengths and ways we can build upon them, rather than prescribing mandates about curriculum content and/or departmental functions. Examples of role misunderstandings and boundaries violations include:

1. Advocating for particular readings, curriculum, and pedagogy;



2. Entertaining “side bar” conversations from student, faculty, or other community members without the knowledge and consent of the department/program chair;
3. Expanding the scope of the review beyond the areas of the letter of invitation and the review guidelines;
4. Identifying individuals rather than focusing on departmental actions; and
5. Failing to disclose conflicts of interest, including status as a former or current mentor or friend of faculty members, faculty members or administrators who are currently or formerly employed at Whittier College, intention to apply for a faculty or administrative position at Whittier College or other institutions in immediate competition with the academic programs of Whittier College.

In the event that there are violations of the boundaries of the External Reviewer role, we have the right to ask you to clarify and revise the report you submit.

#### *Process and Procedures*

We appreciate the time and talent you have agreed to invest in the program review process. Please note the procedures following your visit and review:

1. Submit your written report within [three] weeks of the site visit. Please submit electronic copies to the individuals below, and mail a signed paper copy to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty.
  - a. Darrin Good, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty, [dgood@whittier.edu](mailto:dgood@whittier.edu)
  - b. Susana Santos, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, [ssantos3@whittier.edu](mailto:ssantos3@whittier.edu)
  - c. [Name], \_\_\_\_\_ Department Chair, [email address]
2. Upon receipt of your report, the College may take up to three weeks to review the document and/or request revisions.
3. The College offers a \$XXX honorarium, and provides all travel, lodging and meal costs.
4. The honorarium and expense reimbursement will be paid upon acceptance of the consultant’s report. Elizabeth Ibarra, Administrative Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, will assist you.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXX

Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty

Enclosure:

Departmental Reviews and Assessment of Educational Effectiveness: External Review Outline and Summary Sheet

Cc: Department Chair

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

## Appendix 1i: Sample External Review Schedule

(\* Remember to allow time for walking from meeting to meeting)



### Whittier College Department/Program

Name of External Reviewer College/University

Date

9:30	Meet with Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty Mendenhall
10:00	Meet with Department/Program Chair Room
11:00	Observe Class Room
12:00	Meet with Professor Room
12:30	Lunch with Students Chef's Table at the CI
1:30	Break
2:00	Observe Class Room
2:30	Meet with Professor Room
3:00	Meet with Professor Room
3:30	Break
4:00	Meet with Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty again to wrap-up
5:00	[Possible Dinner with Faculty]

## Appendix 1j: Sample Memorandum of Understanding

### Sample #1

DRAFT  
Memorandum of Understanding  
Learning Assistance Center  
Division of Academic Affairs  
September 2013

This Memorandum of Understanding outlines the consensus reached by the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) and the Division of Academic Affairs based on the recently conducted program review. It describes the goals to be achieved, and the actions to be undertaken by all parties to this MOU to achieve these goals, during the next program review cycle. Progress toward goals is to be addressed in the annual report.

Since the last program review in 2005, the LAC has moved to a new location in the Horn Center, which also now houses the University Center for Undergraduate Advising. In addition, the LAC has focused on demonstrating compliance with national standards of learning assistance, including achieving certification by the College Reading and Learning Association for its tutor education program. Recently the LAC has been involved in several components of the university's "Highly Valued Degree Initiative" to support and improve student success.

The program review identified several areas for consideration and recommended action. The review identified a need for continued expansion of partnerships with other units and persons on campus that promote student learning, including academic departments, faculty, and the Faculty Center for Professional Development, among others. The importance of sharing data with LAC stakeholders was stressed. Continued attention to assessment, including a focus on assessment data and information regarding specific student groups, was identified as a priority. In light of lost staff positions, the reviewers recommended that the leadership structure of the LAC be assessed to ensure optimal year-round staffing and appropriate professional development for staff and student employees.

It is therefore agreed that:

1. The LAC will continue to strengthen and expand partnerships between LAC programs and other units and individuals that support student learning across campus.
2. The LAC will continue to strengthen assessment of the outcomes and effectiveness of its various programs.
3. Working with Academic Affairs, the LAC will assess its leadership structure.
4. The LAC will maximize data use by sharing information with stakeholders, particularly deans, department chairs, and faculty who utilize LAC resources.
5. The program will provide an annual update on progress made towards the actions agreed to in this MOU, to be

submitted in conjunction with its annual assessment report.

This MOU has been read and approved by:

Department Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

College Dean: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Vice Provost: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample #2****Memorandum of Understanding****MA in Global Logistics Program****Department of Economics****College of Liberal Arts****November 7, 2006**

This Memorandum of Understanding outlines the consensus reached by the Department of Economics, the College of Liberal Arts, and the Division of Academic Affairs, based on the recently conducted program review. It describes the goals to be achieved, and the actions to be undertaken by all parties to this MOU to achieve these goals, during the next program review cycle. Progress toward goals is to be addressed in the annual report.

The review of the pilot MA in Global Logistics revealed a program that has rapidly made progress since its inception five years ago. The external reviewer commented on the program's proven ability to fulfill the academic demands of this interdisciplinary field and to provide students with a structure that facilitates their learning. The internal reviewers also commented on the program's dedicated leadership, collegial faculty, and strong administrative support that give it the ability to meet the demand in this field. Both sets of reviewers recommended the program apply for permanent status.

Concerns emerging from the program review include these issues.

1. Some curricular changes are in order, including more in-depth study of supply chain logistics through two courses instead of one, and extending students' research projects past descriptive research to include the analysis of alternatives leading to program and/or policy recommendations.
2. Future faculty asked to teach in the program should include faculty from outside the discipline of Economics who can contribute expertise in such areas as supply chain management (from business) and/or decision modeling for logistics systems (from engineering). These could be joint hires between Economics and other departments/colleges.
3. Student learning outcomes assessment could be strengthened with the addition of an external advisory board to refine expected student learning outcomes and levels of student achievement; the collection of additional assessment information from direct measures (student work) and indirect measures (exit interviews); and the institution of meetings of all program faculty to review assessment information at the end of each cohort and to monitor student retention and graduation rates.

It is therefore agreed that:

1. The department will undertake curriculum revisions in light of the suggestions of the external reviewer.
2. The department will formalize its plan for assessment of student learning, implement the plan, and use the results for program improvement (to be reported in the annual report).
3. The department will regularly analyze data on retention and graduation of students in the M.A. in Global Logistics and use the results to examine the effectiveness of program delivery, advisement, and other student support activities.
4. The department will continue to recruit tenured and tenure-track faculty from the Colleges of Business and Engineering to sustain the interdisciplinary nature of the degree.

This MOU has been read and approved by:

Department Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

College Dean \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Vice President \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 2: Glossary

### Appendix 2a: Implicit and Explicit Curriculum

- *The Explicit Curriculum* consists of the formal educational structure of the Department or Program. This includes the Guidelines for the Major or Minor and the courses in a program or major.
- *The Implicit Curriculum* refers to the educational learning environment in which the explicit curriculum is presented. The implicit curriculum is evidenced through fair and transparent substance and implementation, the qualifications of the faculty, and the adequacy of resources. Attention to the importance of the implicit curriculum promotes an educational culture that is congruent with the values of the college and the Departments/Programs.

Departments/Programs should identify implicit curriculum areas that are germane for academic success of the students in the major/minor or program. Suggested elements of the implicit curriculum could include, but are not limited to those listed below:

- Advisement
- Retention
- Termination policies from the major
- Student participation in governance
- Faculty
- Administrative structure
- Resources
- Department/Program commitment to diversity
- Partnerships with Disability Services, CAAS, etc.
- Library

Council on Social Work Education (2008). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards*. Alexandria, VA: CSWE.

Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.