

California State University, Long Beach  
Division of Academic Affairs

Program Assessment and Review Council  
Academic Year 2005-2006 Annual report

Introduction

The Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC) is a new body. It was constituted in the late spring of 2005 and it operated for the first time during the 2005-2006 academic year. PARC was formed to replace three entities that previously practiced program review and/or assessment, including the Program Review and Planning Council (PRAP), the Graduate Council, and the Assessment Committee.

The function and purpose of PARC is eloquently summarized in the following document that can be found on the Academic Senate web site,

[http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/grad\\_undergrad/senate/councils/prap/charge](http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/grad_undergrad/senate/councils/prap/charge).

Rather than the paraphrase we have incorporated the document into this report in the following paragraphs.

*The Program Assessment and Review Council shall serve as the primary advisory body to the Academic Senate and University administration on matters relating to the assessment and periodic review of graduate and undergraduate academic programs and the planning associated with those programs, including the University's Strategic Planning Process.*

*The Program Assessment and Review Council is subordinate to the Academic Senate, and, as such, all policies and regulations recommended by the Program Assessment and Review Council shall be presented to the Academic Senate for approval, except for those matters specifically delegated to the Council itself.*

*The Program Assessment and Review Council shall:*

- 1. Develop and implement the University's policy on the periodic review of academic programs;*
- 2. Recommend policies for the campus on matters related to assessment of University and especially academic programs;*
- 3. Provide advice to University administration on accountability reporting*
- 4. Periodically report on graduate accountability*
- 5. Review and make recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding proposed changes in the Academic Master Plan;*
- 6. Provide regular faculty input on the Strategic Planning Process under University Policy Statement 01-08, Policy on Strategic Planning, and any other campus-wide planning processes that that may occur.*

*Upon request of the Academic Senate or University Administration, the Council shall nominate members to serve on committees that require the particular expertise of its membership.*

*Membership*

*Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee)*

*Director of Strategic Planning*

*Vice President for Administration and Finance (or designee)*

*Vice President for Student Services (or designee)*

*Program Review and Assessment Coordinator*

*Four (4) tenured or tenure track faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts, two (2) from each of the other Colleges and one (1) from the University Library*  
*One (1) lecturer who shall serve for a period of one year*  
*One (1) tenured or tenure track student services professional, academic-related*  
*One (1) member from the Academic Senate elected by the Academic Senate, who should also be an elected member of the Council if possible; if an individual with dual membership is not available, the Senator becomes a non-voting member*  
*One (1) Department Chair, either an elected member of the Council or a Department Chair appointed by the Senate upon recommendation of the Nominating Committee as a non-voting member if an elected member is not available*  
*Two (2) student members, selected by the Associated Students, Inc.*

#### *Steering Committee*

*The Council shall establish a Steering Committee composed of the elected officers of the Council, the Program Review and Assessment Coordinator, and the designee of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.*

*The Steering Committee shall be responsible for the planning and scheduling of meetings, agenda setting, and transmittal of items to the Academic Senate. The Steering Committee shall also make appointments to Council subcommittees and ad hoc committees, including program review subcommittees, subject to provisions of the policy on program review.*

#### *Subcommittees*

*The Steering Committee may appoint such subcommittees and ad hoc committees it deems necessary to fulfill its charge.*

*The Council shall select a Council Liaison who will attend Academic Senate meetings and report back to the Council. The Council liaison should be an Academic Senator if possible; if not, the Council shall appoint a member who will become a non-voting member of the Senate.*

*The Chair of the Program Assessment and Review Council is an ex officio voting member of the Campus Planning Committee and the Resource Planning Process Task Force.*

### PARC Activities During AY 2005-2006

The duties performed by the members of the PAR Council during the AY 2005-2006 were difficult. The main difficulty was the transitional nature of the program review process, which strives to promote continuous improvement in the academic mission of the University.

Many programs due for program review during 2005-06 year prepared their self study according to the old policy that predated the formation of PARC. Only a few programs participated in a pilot program according to the new policy. As a result the process was not as smooth as it is expected to become in the future.

Despite that, the Council conducted 27 separate reviews covering 47 degree granting programs and 6 non-degree programs. One of these resulted in a discontinuance review. Nine (9) reviews have resulted in a completed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and another eleven (11) MOUs are in the process of being finalized. Eight programs are currently reviewing draft program review reports prior to their presentation to the full Council, and another five (5) reports

are in the final writing stages. It is expected that the remaining thirteen (13) reports will be presented to the Council during the fall semester of 2006.

<b>Program Reviews 2005-2006</b>	<b>PARC Reviewer (Chair)</b>	<b>PARC Reviewer</b>
Anthropology	Kelly Janousek	Robin Richesson
Asian and Asian American Studies	Michelle Saint-Germain	Phi Loan Le
Biological Sciences	Keith Freeseemann	Liesl Haas
Black Studies	Michelle Saint-Germain	Ray De Leon
Chemistry and Biochemistry	Michelle Saint-Germain	Van Novack
Chicano and Latino Studies	Judy Strauss	Robin Richesson
Communication Studies	Kristin Powers	Judy Strauss
Cooperative Education	Michelle Saint-Germain	Jeremy Redman
Criminal Justice	Michelle Saint-Germain	Van Novack
Economics	Zvonimir Hlousek	Sabine Reddy
Family & Consumer Sciences	Zvonimir Hlousek	Liesl Haas
Gerontology	Betsy McEneaney	Jeremy Redman
Global Logistics	Zvonimir Hlousek	Peter Holliday
Kinesiology	Michelle Saint-Germain	Frank Murgolo
Occupational Studies	Van Novack	Zvonimir Hlousek
Political Science	Betsy McEneaney	Kris Slowinski
Sociology	Michelle Saint-Germain	Phi Loan Le
Student Athlete Services	Guy Bachman	Liesl Haas
Translation & Interpretation Studies	Mason Zhang	Kelly Janousek
University 100	Joan Theurer	Guy Bachman
University Honors Program	Betsy McEneaney	Renee Cramer

<b>Previous Reviews completed in 05-06</b>	<b>First Reviewer (Chair)</b>	<b>Other Reviewers</b>
Audiology	Sabine Reddy	
Engineering & Industrial Applied Mathematics (Ph.D.)	Todd Gray	Zeus Leonardo Yu-Ming Wang
Geological Sciences	Mary Jacob George Scott	Bill Weber Ken Gregory
Learning Assistance Center	Jennifer Coots	Susan MacDonald Jose Aguinaga
Psychology	Sara Sluss Michelle Saint-Germain	Guy Bachman Charles Wallis
University Library	Leland Vail	David Hood Bill Ziemer

Work on the Council is difficult, if for no other reason, because of the amount of time that membership must invest. For each review, UPRC members devote substantial time to reading the program's self study as well as approximately 2 days' work to just visit the program and talk to

program faculty, students, and administrators. In addition, a significant amount of time is devoted to the collection of necessary data, writing the report, etc.

Each University Program Review Committee (UPRC) acts as an internal review team. Often, but not always, it works closely with and is helped by the external review team. Largely, the members of UPRCs have reported positive experiences working side-by-side with external program reviewers. Given that 2 out of 3 UPRC members are outsiders to the discipline of the program under review, external reviewers, when present, can provide the context for the internal team. In cases where no external reviewers are present, this role can be fulfilled by the UPRC member from the College where the program being reviewed resides.

In part because both the process of writing the self-study and the process of conducting the review according to the new policy are very different from the old procedures, the Council has experienced some difficulties in clearly communicating its findings and preliminary versions of the report to program faculty. To address these issues, the Council has crafted a letter of introduction to that in essence summarizes the expected flow of the review process. This letter has been submitted to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for approval.

Upon completion of many of the reviews undertaken during the AY 2005-2006, several issues have come to light. The PAR Council and the Director of Program Review and Assessment have observed that University is lacking in some key areas. The PAR Council Steering Committee has identified that the University lacks or does not have an adequate policy on student internships, on minimum standards for degree programs, on self-support courses and degree offerings through UCES, and also on international cooperation with other Universities. It is planned that during the AY 2006-2007 the Council will formulate such policies based on its experiences and submit its proposals to Curriculum and Educational Policies Council.

### Summary

The full and successful implementation of the new Program Review Policy adopted by the Academic Senate requires change in University culture at all levels. Such change in the culture is a slow process, and will take some time to complete. In general, the new Policy and the process that goes along are viewed as positive and empowering for programs and for faculty. Hence, it is expected to be good for the University as a whole, for it makes it a better institution of learning.

Formulation of coherent policies that the University lacks or at present has in inadequate form and the number of reviews that have to be completed during the 2006-2007 and the 2007-2008 academic years are the main challenges for the Council.

Attachments:

Membership roster for 2005-2006

Draft letter of introduction for UPRCs