



California State University
Dominguez Hills

Division of Academic Affairs
Guideline and Timeline
for
Annual Program Effectiveness Report (PER)
Revised May 2006

Each division of the University will form a council charged with the responsibility of reviewing all divisional programs. These reviews will evaluate assessments and data that may result in the modification of plans, goals, and strategies. The reviews also lead to recommendations concerning programs to be supported or to be reduced or discontinued, new programs to be initiated, priorities in program planning, and resource needs of the division and its programs. (Presidential Memorandum 00-03, effective October 17, 2003)

Process for Academic Degree Programs (including Minors without degrees)

Academic Program Review is mandated by the Chancellor's office. This campus has opted for a six-year review cycle that includes several benchmarks on the way to completion of the cycle. Annually each academic program will receive its Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool (PEAT) quantitative data from Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (IRAP). The program faculty members may elect to submit to their Dean a written response that includes critical analysis and interpretation of the PEAT data to incorporate into the college's annual Program Effectiveness Report (PER). If the program is submitting a resource allocation request, then the qualitative portion needs to be completed to submit a PEAT+ report.

Every third year, each academic program will review its PEAT quantitative data for the past three (3) years and complete the qualitative portion to submit a PEAT+ report using the format endorsed by the Academic Senate and approved by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. A draft copy of the PEAT+ report will be made available to all program faculty members for their input before being finalized. Where possible, part-time faculty also should be involved in the PEAT+ process. The PEAT quantitative data and the template for completing the PEAT+ are available at: <http://www.csudh.edu/oir/PEAT/index.htm>

The PEAT and PEAT+ reports are submitted along with the college PER to the Program Effectiveness Council (PEC) within a timetable established by Academic Affairs.

The PEC reviews the PEAT or PEAT+ for each academic program, the college PER along with unit budget requests, to determine program effectiveness and resource allocations (if applicable) for the following college year. The conclusion of the deliberations of the PEC is a set of recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Process for Colleges and Academic Support Units

I. Introduction and Overview

The unit head or dean should describe the composition of the unit and provide other information that might be pertinent to provide context for the report.

II. Unit's Goals and Objectives for previous year in relation to the University's Mission and Goals:

The unit head or dean should analyze progress toward or achievement of previous year's goals in terms of quality indicators and productivity as well as identify and analyze challenges encountered in progress toward meeting goals for the reporting period. The unit head or dean should also address the previous year's recommendations from the Academic Affairs Program Effectiveness Committee (AAPEC). Finally, instructional deans need to document progress towards meeting their College Academic Plan.

III. Criteria for Review of Program Effectiveness

Each unit should address all criteria, but not necessarily every indicator. Units may identify and define additional indicators as appropriate. Colleges should summarize the data relative to the college.

A. Quality of Instructional and Instructional Support Programs: The instructional and instructional support programs in the unit demonstrate appropriate depth, breadth, and currency with respect to disciplinary standards. **Indicators might include:**

- Evidence of faculty expertise in curriculum planning, development, and implementation (e.g. presentations, publications, etc.)
- Evidence of teaching and learning effectiveness in programs (e.g. results of learning outcomes assessments, course portfolios, student portfolios, capstones projects).
- Faculty and/or staff hiring plan that reflects changes in program goals or accreditation requirements, or projected staffing changes.
- Evidence of sufficient full-time faculty to maintain program integrity and viability.

B. Contribution of Student Success: The unit demonstrates support of students in attaining their goals within the context of the University mission. **Indicators might include:**

- Benefit to students as documented by alumni outcomes, placement data, or admission of graduates to graduate and professional schools.
- Benefit to students as documented by results of professional licensure and certification examinations, employer satisfaction, or professional advancement.
- Evidence of student success and involvement in the unit as documented by number of majors, retention and graduation rates, alumni surveys, etc.
- Evidence of special activities that contribute to student success (e.g. advisement, orientation, student clubs, etc.).
- Documentation that instructional services and scheduling meet student needs and are appropriate to unit goals (e.g. SFR, number of full-time/part-time students, number of majors/minors, class schedules, student surveys, graduation rates, etc.).
- Documentation that unit support services and scheduling meet student needs and are appropriate to unit goals (e.g. brochures, student surveys, advising records, etc.).

C. Interdependence of Programs: Programs within the unit are integral to the overall academic design of the University. **Indicators might include:**

- Documentation that indicates the unit has reciprocal or synergistic relationships with programs in other units (e.g. flat sheets, brochures, agreements, etc.).

D. Contributions to an Academic Discipline: The unit makes appropriate and significant contributions in disciplinary research, scholarship, creative activity and professional services.

Indicators might include:

- Evidence of research, publications, creative activities, grants and contracts by faculty, staff, and students.
- Evidence of sponsorship of professional events or publications.
- Evidence of professional recognition of students, faculty, and staff (e.g. awards, presentations, etc.)

IV. Achievements

This section should include a description of the unit's most important accomplishments covering the period of the report and not addressed in Section III. The author should provide qualitative or quantitative data where appropriate and an assessment of the outcomes. The assessment should allow the reader to draw conclusions about the effectiveness or quality of the achievement(s). For example, and these are not an exhaustive list, a college or department may discuss enrollment, proposed new degree(s), fund raising, and the recruitment and retention of new faculty.

V. Unit's Goals and Objectives for the Next Year

Identify or update goals and objectives for the next year and indicate how they support the University's Mission and Goals and those areas in the University's Enrollment Management Plan and Academic Master Plan (AMP) relevant to their units. Briefly outline strategies for achieving these goals and objectives; identify benchmarks that will indicate progress toward them; establish a timeline for reaching them.

VI. Challenges

In this section the unit head and deans should address those issues that most challenge the unit's accomplishment of its goals and objectives for the next reporting cycle. In this section fiscal challenges should be addressed along with others that might compromise quality.

VII. Summary and Conclusions

Unit heads or deans should summarize the report and draw conclusions that address the future of the unit. After reading this section, the reader should understand the unit's current status and future potential.

Timeline

Steps	Effectiveness Timeline*	Budget Timeline**
1. Each unit's annual Program Effectiveness Report (PER) will be submitted to the appropriate unit/college administrator. For example, academic programs will submit their PER to their respective College Dean, while other units, like CLASS, Honors Program, or Research & Funded Programs will submit their reports to their immediate supervising MPP.	December 15 th	
2. Curriculum Deans, Executive Director of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning, and Director for Center for Teaching and Learning will submit their reports to the Vice Provost.	2 nd week January	
3. College Deans, Library Dean, Assistant Vice President for Faculty Affairs, Chief Financial Officer and Vice Provost will submit their reports to the Provost.	Mid January	
4. Annual Effectiveness Reports are submitted to AAPEC.	February 1 st	
5. AAPEC will hold Open Hearings for the Colleges, Library, and Academic Program Units	3 rd week February	
6. AAPEC will submit report and recommendations to Provost regarding program effectiveness	March 1 st	
7. Governor's budget is presented		Mid January
8. UBC charge to the Divisions		February 1 st
9. All units submit budget requests to Provost		2 nd week February
10. AAPEC Open Hearing for Division PER and Budget Request		3 rd week February
11. AAPEC Recommendations regarding budget requests submitted to Provost		March 1 st
12. CAA Report to UPC		2 nd week March
13. CAA Budget Request to UBC		April 1 [*]

* If the due date falls on a non-working day (weekend or campus holiday), then the next working day will be the due date (e.g., If March 1st is a Saturday, then the due date will be Monday, March 3rd).

** Specific dates will be determined based on the annual University Budget Committee's Call to the Divisions. If the due date falls on a non-working day (weekend or campus holiday), then the next working day will be the due date.