

PLNU Program Review Self-Study Report Template

Version 2.1
3/8/2018

Table of Contents



Instructions	3
Department Level Analysis	3
A) Introduction (context for department).....	3
B) Alignment with Mission	3
C) Quality, Qualifications and Productivity of Department Faculty	4
D) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review	7
E) General Education and Service Classes.....	7
Program Level Analysis (repeat this section for each program in the department).....	9
F1) Trend and Financial Analysis	9
F2) Findings from Assessment.....	12
F3) Curriculum Analysis.....	15
F4) Potential Impact of National Trends	19
F5) Quality Markers.....	20
F6) Infrastructure and Staffing	23
F7) Challenges and Opportunities	23
F8) Recommendations for Program Improvement.....	23
Departmental Level Synthesis.....	24
G) Synthesis of Program Recommendations.....	24
H) Action Plan Considerations for MOU.....	24
Dean Level.....	25
I) Compliance Checklist	25
Program Review Committee and External Review	25

Instructions

Please use the data provided and the guiding questions to prepare your program review self-study. Please note that the data provided is not all of the data available to you and a more complete set of program review data will also be provided by the IE office. Also note that there may be a few questions that are not relevant to your academic unit and you can simply write “NA” in those text boxes where this is the case. Finally, the text boxes are intended for the reflective answers to the guiding questions and the summaries of your analyses. If there are related documents that contain data or more detailed information that will help the reviewers better understand your narratives, feel free to add these as appendices at the end. Please do not include anything in the appendices that is not necessary or referenced and discussed in the self-study itself.

Technical Note: For your convenience, fillable text boxes have been inserted after each question. If you have non-text items (e.g. tables, charts, etc.) you would like to insert into the document, feel free to remove and replace the textbox placeholder with your information.

Department Level Analysis

A) Introduction (context for department)

1. Name of Academic Unit, Program(s), and Center(s) that are included in this self-study: Include graduate and undergraduate, undergraduate majors, minors and concentrations, etc.

2. This document will be read by both the PLNU Program Review Committee and external reviewers. What do these reviewers need to know about your current programs to understand their context and how they function within the department and across the university? (500 word maximum)

3. If you believe that it will help the reviewers to understand your context, provide a brief history of what has led to your department’s current structure and program offerings.

B) Alignment with Mission

Please answer the following questions for all student populations served by your department: residential, graduate and extended learning:

1. Briefly describe how your department contributes to the intellectual and professional development of PLNU students.

- Review your department’s mission, purpose and practice and discuss how your programs contribute to your student’s spiritual formation, character development, and discernment of call.

- How do your programs develop ways to help your students explore their vocation and calling? How do your programs align with PLNU’s “University Promise” (brand platform) in helping students explore their calling?

C) Quality, Qualifications and Productivity of Department Faculty

**Table C.1:
Current Full-Time Faculty**

Faculty Name	Rank	Tenure	Degree	PLNU Service Years
Department percent of full-time faculty with doctorate (terminal) degree				
PLNU percent of full-time faculty with doctorate (terminal) degree (Fall 2017)				85.3%

- Summarize the most recent scholarly and creative activities of the faculty in this department. If desired, include information about peer reviewed scholarship.

- Summarize the grants/awards received by the faculty.

- Describe how the scholarly and creative activities of the faculty impact the mission and quality of your department.

- Comment on the adequacy and availability of institutional support and outside funding for professional development and travel.

**Table C.2:
Student Survey Feedback on Faculty**

Student Satisfaction Survey (SSI), Ruffalo Noel-Levitz, Spring 2016					
All Undergraduate Respondents					
Survey Question		Satisfaction		Importance	
		*Pct	Mean	*Pct	Mean
Faculty care about me as an individual (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU	74.0%	6.03	87.3%	6.45
Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU	60.1%	5.59	88.8%	6.46
Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU	52.2%	5.44	88.6%	6.46
Major requirements are clear and reasonable (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU	72.4%	5.95	92.6%	6.57
* Percentages are based on responses of "satisfied" / "very satisfied" and "important" / "very important" (6 and 7 on a 7 point scale)					
PLNU 5-Year Out Alumni Survey					
Administered Annually in Summer					
Survey Question		2011-12 Grads			
		*Pct	Mean		
My non-classroom interaction with departmental faculty had a positive influence on my personal growth, values, and attitudes (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU	87.0%	4.44		
My non-classroom interactions with departmental faculty had a positive influence on my career goals and aspirations (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU	86.5%	4.41		
* Percentages are based on responses of "agree" / "strongly agree" (4 and 5 on a 5 point scale)					

5. Reflect on what the student perceptions data indicate about the quality of faculty-student interactions in your department or program, including caring, fairness, lack of bias, and timely feedback.

6. Reflect on student perceptions of the clarity and reasonableness of major requirements.

**Table C.3:
Faculty Workload**

Department Faculty Instructional Loads (FT, PT, and Adjuncts) (excludes release time and independent studies)										
	2014/15			2015/16			2016/17			3-yr Average
SCH per IFTE										
<i>PLNU SCH per IFTE (traditional UG)</i>	466			484			479			476
SFTE per IFTE										
<i>PLNU SFTE per IFTE (traditional UG)</i>	14.57			15.12			14.96			14.88
Independent Studies Units Generated										
Individual Faculty Instructional Loads										
Full-Time Faculty	2014/15			2015/16			2016/17			3-Yr
	IU	SCH	SCH/ IU	IU	SCH	SCH/ IU	IU	SCH	SCH/ IU	SCH/IU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Links to complete reports that include part-time and adjunct faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2016-17 Faculty Workload Report 2015-16 Faculty Workload Report 2014-15 Faculty Workload Report 										
Total Full-Time Faculty										
Total Part-Time Faculty										
Total Adjunct Faculty										
IU = Instructional Units: Generated faculty workload units excluding release time IFTE = Instructional Full-Time Equivalent: Total Instructional workload units divided by 24 SCH = Student Credit Hours: Generated student credit hours associated with the faculty member SFTE = Student Full-Time Equivalent: Total Student Credit hours divided by 32 for undergraduates/24 for graduate students										

7. Compare the SCH load of each faculty member against the departmental average. What does this tell you about the distribution of faculty workload within the department? What changes, if any, might be appropriate?

8. Does looking at the SCH and SFTE to IFTE ratios compared to PLNU averages provide any insights for your program? Explain.

9. Looking at the longitudinal history of independent study units generated in this program, does this provide any insights that might be worth looking into? Explain.

10. What role do part time and adjunct faculty play in the quality and success of the department.

D) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

1. List the findings from the previous program review and discuss how each finding has been addressed.

2. What additional significant changes have been made in department programs since the last program review? (e.g. introduction of new major or minor, significant reshaping of a program, etc.)

E) General Education and Service Classes

Table E.1:

Links to GE Assessment

Link(s) to the Department's GE data stored on the GE assessment wheel:

- Link to General Education data in the assessment wheel

Reflection on longitudinal assessment of general education student learning data: (If you don't have longitudinal data, use the data that you do have)

1. What have you learned from your general education assessment data?

2. What changes (curricular and others) have you made based on the assessment data?

3. What additional changes are you recommending based on your review of the assessment data?

4. How do the pedagogical features of your GE courses compare with the best practices for teaching GE in your discipline?

5. What new pedagogical practices have been tried in GE and service classes by members of your department in the last few years? What has your department learned from these experiments?

6. Are there changes that you could make that would make your part of the GE more efficient and effective (e.g. reducing the number of low-enrollment sections, resequencing of classes, reallocation of units, increase interdisciplinary efforts, etc...)?

7. What service courses (non-GE courses that primarily support a program in another department) does your department teach? Are there changes that you could make that would make your service courses more efficient and effective?

***** Future: find a way to include a GE committee review in this step *****

Program Level Analysis (repeat this section for each program in the department)

F1) Trend and Financial Analysis

**Table F1.1:
Admissions FTF Funnel**

First-Time Freshman Admissions Funnel							
program	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Inquiries							
<i>Share of PLNU inquiries</i>	/16457	/18315	/18401	/21884	/16691	/22105	/23436
Completed Applications							
<i>Share of PLNU Completed Applications</i>	/2792	/2871	/2963	/2654	/2511	/2823	/3007
Applicant Conversion Rate							
<i>PLNU Applicant Conversion Rate</i>	17.0%	15.7%	16.1%	12.1%	15.0%	12.8%	12.8%
Admits							
<i>Share of PLNU Admits</i>	/1925	/1982	/2088	/2111	/2004	/2195	/2294
Selection Rate							
<i>PLNU Selection Rate</i>	68.9%	69.0%	70.5%	79.5%	79.8%	77.8%	76.3%

**Table F1.2:
Admissions TRN Funnel**

New Transfer (traditional) Admissions Funnel							
program	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Inquiries							
<i>Share of PLNU inquiries</i>	/890	/1647	/1490	/1820	/2092	/1944	/1931
Completed Applications							
<i>Share of PLNU Completed Applications</i>	/500	/470	/494	/671	/454	/460	/510
Applicant Conversion Rate							
<i>PLNU Applicant Conversion Rate</i>	56.2%	28.5%	33.2%	36.9%	21.7%	23.7%	26.4%
Admits							
<i>Share of PLNU Admits</i>	/274	/285	/323	/430	/360	/356	/387
Selection Rate							
<i>PLNU Selection Rate</i>	54.8%	60.6%	65.4%	64.1%	79.3%	77.4%	75.9%

1. What does this data tell you about the external demand for your program? What does this say about the future viability of your program?

**Table F1.3:
Admissions FTF Yield**

First-Time Freshman Admissions Yield							
program	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Admits							
Matriculants							
<i>Share of PLNU Matriculants</i>	/533	/601	/647	/588	/599	/594	/618
Yield Rate							
<i>PLNU Yield Rate</i>	27.7%	30.3%	31.0%	27.9%	29.9%	27.1%	26.9%

**Table F1.4:
Admissions TRN Yield**

New Transfer Admissions Yield							
program	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Admits							
Matriculants							
<i>Share of PLNU Matriculants</i>	/150	/136	/144	/198	/173	/174	/194
Yield Rate							
<i>PLNU Yield Rate</i>	54.7%	47.7%	44.6%	46.0%	48.1%	48.9%	50.1%

2. How does your yield rate (percentage of students who enroll at PLNU after being admitted) compare to the PLNU average? If your rate is more than 8 percentage points above the PLNU average, what factors do you believe are contributing to this positive outcome? If your rate is more than 8 percentage points below the PLNU average for more than one year, what factors do you believe are contributing to this difference?

**Table F1.5:
Enrollment**

Student Enrollment							
Majors/Concentrations	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Program Total							
<i>Share of PLNU Trad Undergraduates</i>	/2376	/2415	/2556	/2568	/2664	/2650	/2670
Minors	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Total Minors							
<i>Share of PLNU Minors</i>	/344	/361	/356	/411	/359	/380	/409

**Table F1.6:
Major Migration**

Major Migration of Completers*							
major	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	6-yr Total
Stayed within the major							
Imported into the major							
specific originating majors							
Exported to another major							
specific destination majors							

* Based on students who completed in a given year. Their graduation major is compared to their matriculation major (includes both FTF and transfers).

3. What does this data tell you about the internal demand for your program? Does this raise any questions about the viability and/or sustainability of your program as it is currently configured? Explain why or why not. Are there any actionable strategies that you can do that might make a difference if your trends are in the wrong direction?

**Table F1.7:
GE/Service Credit Hours**

General Education and Service Credit Hour Production *program*					
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
Total program student credit hours					
Number of GE sections taught					
% of SCH that are GE					
<i>Share of PLNU GE SCH</i>	<i>/35970</i>	<i>/36054</i>	<i>/35991</i>	<i>/36802</i>	<i>/36143</i>
Number of service course sections taught					
% of SCH that are service					
<i>Share of PLNU service SCH</i>	<i>/1816</i>	<i>/1852</i>	<i>/1767</i>	<i>/2242</i>	<i>/2195</i>

4. What does this data tell you about how your program is impacted by the needs of GE and other academic disciplines? Does this raise any questions about the viability and/or sustainability of your program if these non-programmatic trends continue? Explain why or why not.

**Table F1.8:
Delaware Cost Data**

Delaware Study Data *program*												
	2010/11			2011/12			2012/13			2013/14		
Program Cost per SCH												
Benchmark Percentiles												
Ranking												

5. We know that the following factors influence the Delaware cost per credit hour:
- Large amount of GE and service classes taught by the program
 - The career stage of the program faculty (early career faculty are less expensive)
 - The number of elective courses in the program
 - The amount of unfunded load (faculty receiving more credit for a course than the number of units received by a student – e.g. 4 units of faculty load for teaching a 3 unit class)
 - The amount of release time associated with the program
 - Faculty members on sabbatical
 - The size of the department budget and the cost of specialized equipment

Please reflect on your program's Delaware data in light of this information. In particular, what factors contribute to your program having a high (above 75th percentile), medium (50th-75th percentile), or low (below 50th percentile) ranking?

6. Recognizing that not all factors above are under departmental control, what kinds of adjustments might be made to reduce the cost per student credit hour?

***** Future *****

Financial Data: (possibly delayed to the future)

Extra Revenue Generated by Program (lab fees, studio fees, etc.)

Extra Revenue per student credit hour

Extra Costs for the program (equipment not purchased outside of department budget, etc.)

Extra costs per student credit hour

Modified Delaware values: Delaware – extra revenue per SCH + extra costs per SCH

7. Do these modified Delaware values tell you anything new about the future viability and/or sustainability of your program as it is currently configured? Please explain.

F2) Findings from Assessment

Table F2.1:
Assessment Wheel Links

Links to the department's assessment wheel

- Student Learning Outcomes
- Curriculum Maps
- Assessment Plan
- Evidence of Student Learning
- Use of the Evidence of Student Learning

Reflection on longitudinal assessment of student learning data:

1. What have you learned from this program's student learning assessment data?

2. What changes (curricular and others) have you made based on the student learning assessment data?

3. What additional changes are you recommending based on your review of the student learning assessment data?

**Table F2.2:
DQP**

DQP Outcomes					
Major	DQP Area	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
major title	Intellectual Skills	>10% below	<10% below	Met/Exceeded	Met/Exceeded
	Specialized Knowledge	>10% below	<10% below	Met/Exceeded	Met/Exceeded
	Applied & Collaborative Learning	>10% below	<10% below	Met/Exceeded	Met/Exceeded
	Broad & Integrative Knowledge	>10% below	<10% below	Met/Exceeded	Met/Exceeded
	Civic and Global Learning	>10% below	<10% below	Met/Exceeded	Met/Exceeded
DQP Definitions					
Intellectual Skills Intellectual Skills define proficiencies that transcend the boundaries of particular fields of study: analytic inquiry, use of information resources, engaging diverse perspectives, ethical reasoning, quantitative fluency, and communicative fluency.					
Specialized Knowledge What students in any specialization should demonstrate with respect to the specialization, often called the major field. All fields call more or less explicitly for proficiencies involving terminology, theory, methods, tools, literature, complex problems or applications and cognizance of limits.					
Applied and Collaborative Learning Applied learning suggests what graduates can do with what they know. This area focuses on the interaction of academic and non-academic settings and the corresponding integration of theory and practice, along with the ideal of learning with others in the course of application projects.					
Broad and Integrative Knowledge Students integrate their broad learning by exploring, connecting and applying concepts and methods across multiple fields of study to complex questions—in the student’s areas of specialization, in work or other field-based settings and in the wider society.					
Civic and Global Learning Civic and Global Learning proficiencies rely principally on the types of cognitive activities (describing, examining, elucidating, justifying) that are within the direct purview of the university, but they also include evidence of civic activities and learning beyond collegiate settings. These proficiencies reflect the need for analytic inquiry and engagement with diverse perspectives.					

Reflection on DQP related data:

Understanding that the DQP framework provides one particular lens on the meaning, quality and integrity of your curriculum, reflect on the DQP data and framework provided for your program.

4. What have you learned from this program’s DQP comparison?

5. What changes (curricular and others) have you made based on the DQP comparison?

6. What additional changes are you recommending based on your review of the DQP comparison?

**Table F2.3:
Stakeholder Data**

Links to stakeholder assessment data (if present this will be department housed data)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys • Focus Groups • Market Analysis • Etc...

Reflection on stakeholder feedback data:

7. What have you learned from this program’s stakeholder assessment data? If you do not have stakeholder data, please provide a plan for how you will regularly collect this in the future.

**Table F2.4:
Employer Data**
(alumni employed full-time)

PLNU Alumni Survey Administered Annually in Summer			
Survey	Employers	Job Titles	Locations
One-Year Outs (2015-16 Grads)			SD Area Other CA Other USA Intl
Five-Year Outs (2011-12 Grads)			SD Area Other CA Other USA Intl

8. What insights do you glean from reviewing your top hiring companies, job titles, and locations? What sustained practices or improvements could be made (or not) in equipping your majors for post-graduation employment?

9. What changes (curricular and others) have you made based on the stakeholder assessment data?

10. What additional changes are you recommending based on your review of the stakeholder assessment data?

F3) Curriculum Analysis

In looking at your curriculum, the program review process is asking you to analyze it through three different lenses. The first lens is looking at your content and structure from the perspective of guild standards or standards gleaned from looking at programs at comparator institutions. The second lens that of employability and is asking you to look at your curriculum and educational experiences from the perspective of skills and professional qualities that you are developing in your students that will serve them well in their future work and vocational callings. The third lens is that of pedagogy and is asking you to look at the delivery of your curriculum to ensure a high quality student learning experience.

**Table F3.1:
Culminating Experience**

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)				
Responses of Graduating Seniors				
Survey Question		Done, In Progress, or Plan to Do		
		2011	2014	2017
Have you completed a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)	Dept	(n=xx)	(n=xx)	(n=xx)
	PLNU	52.3%	63.0%	81.3%

Culminating Experience

A culminating experience (e.g. cumulative portfolio, signature assignments, senior project, or capstone course) is a senior-level activity wherein students demonstrate mastery of the program’s student learning outcomes.

1. Does your program include a culminating experience? If so, please reflect on its effectiveness. If not, what steps have you taken to develop a culminating experience and when will it be in place?

Comparison of current curriculum to guild standards and/or comparator institutions.

If your guild standards are associated with a specialized accreditation that your program has, these should be the basis of your analysis. If your guild standards are associated with specialized accreditation that we do not have, then you should primarily use comparator institutions as the basis for your analysis.

If your guild has standards that are not associated with specialized accreditation, then you may choose to use those standards and/or comparator institutions.

After consultation with your Dean, provide the set of guild standards or a list of the comparator institutions that you are using in your analysis.

If using guild standards:

2. Please provide a list of the guild standards that you are using to evaluate your curriculum.

3. Indicate if and how your curriculum satisfies the standards (this can be done in a table or narrative form). If applicable, indicate areas where your curriculum falls short of the standards.

If using comparator institutions:

Begin by working with your Dean to identify a list of 5-8 comparator schools to use. In selecting schools, consideration should be given to type of institution, mission of the institution and the number of students majoring in the program.

Institution 1
Institution 2
Institution 3
Institution 4
Institution 5
Institution 6

Gather the curricular requirements for the program in question at each of the comparator institutions.

2. Use this collection of curricular requirements to develop a list of curricular features that are essential for programs of this type. In addition, make note of any innovative or creative curricular feature that may be useful in enhancing the quality of your program.

--

Review this list with your Dean before using it to analyze your own curriculum.

3. Indicate how your curriculum compares to the list of curricular features from your analysis (this can be done in a table or narrative form).

--

**Table F3.2:
Menu/Elective Ratio**

Menu and Elective Unit Analysis *program*	
Number of menu and elective units required by the program	
Number of menu and elective units offered by the program	
Menu/Elective Ratio	
Longitudinal Class Section Enrollment Data	
• Link to Class Section Enrollment Report	

Based on the analysis of standard and reflection on the menu and elective ratio above, consider and discuss the following questions:

4. Are there courses in your program that should be modified? Why or why not.

--

5. Are there courses that should be eliminated? Why or why not.

--

6. Are there courses that could be merged? Why or why not.

--

7. Are there courses that should be added? Why or why not. Note that in general, in order to create the space to add a new course, another course will need to be eliminated or taught less frequently.

8. What did you learn about your overall curricular structure in terms of its complexity, breadth and depth in light of the guild standards/comparator schools and our institutional size and scope? Are there any structural changes that need to be made in light of your analysis (e.g. sequencing of courses, % and or grouping of electives, overall units required, use of concentrations, etc...)?

**Table F3.3:
Student Survey Feedback on Curriculum**

Student Satisfaction Survey (SSI), Ruffalo Noel-Levitz, Spring 2016					
All undergraduate Respondents					
Survey Question		Satisfaction		Importance	
		*Pct	Mean	*Pct	Mean
The content of the courses within my major is valuable (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU	73.7%	5.99	94.9%	6.73
* Percentages are based on responses of "satisfied" / "very satisfied" and "important" / "very important" (6 and 7 on a 7 point scale)					
Diverse Learning Environments Survey (DLE)					
All undergraduate respondents					
Survey Question				Pctg responding "None"	
				2012	2015
How many courses have you taken that included materials/readings about gender?	Dept	(n=xx)	(n=xx)		
	PLNU	25.9%	32.8%		
How many courses have you taken that included materials/readings about race/ethnicity?	Dept	(n=xx)	(n=xx)		
	PLNU	21.3%	23.9%		
PLNU 5-Year Out Alumni Survey					
Administered Annually in Summer					
Survey Question				2011-12 Grads	
				*Pct	Mean
Departmental faculty asked me to show how a particular course concept could be applied to an actual problem or situation. (n=xx)	Dept				
	PLNU				
* Percentages are based on responses of "often" / "very often" (4 and 5 on a 5 point scale)					

9. What insights do you glean from reviewing student perceptions of the value regarding the course content within the major, including the amount of diversity-related course materials, i.e. race, ethnicity, gender?

10. Reflect upon student perceptions with regard to faculty-directed requests to demonstrate a connection to an actual problem or a real-world situation.

**Table F3.4:
Employer Skills Requirements**

O*Net Skills Data

*** Program ***

Top Occupation Requirements

(mouse-over for details)

Knowledge	Skills	Abilities
Knowledge 1 (xx.x)	Skill 1 (xx.x)	Ability 1 (xx.x)
Knowledge 2 (xx.x)	Skill 2 (xx.x)	Ability 2 (xx.x)
Knowledge 3 (xx.x)	Skill 3 (xx.x)	Ability 3 (xx.x)
:	:	:

()'s = Average level of importance on a scale of 1-100 of occupations listed in [Table F4.1](#).

Analysis of the curriculum against preparation for employment

11. The O*Net data in this table provides a list of top (in terms of importance) occupational requirements for students entering common professions that are often linked to your major. Reflect on where these occupational requirements are being taught in your program. Based on reflecting on this data, are there changes you would recommend making to your curriculum?

12. Some programs may serve to prepare students with professional qualities and skills that can serve them well in a great variety of professions that may not show up in data sets like O*Net. If this is indicative of your program, please identify the unique skills and/or professional qualities that your program develops in your students and indicate where in the curriculum this is being taught or developed.

Analysis of the teaching of your curriculum

13. How do the pedagogical features of your program compare with the best practices for teaching in your discipline?

14. What new pedagogical practices have been tried by members of your department in the last few years? What has your department learned from these experiments?

15. Are there new developments in pedagogy in your discipline? What would be required to implement these changes in pedagogy in your department?

F4) Potential Impact of National Trends

**Table F4.1:
Top Occupations**

O*Net Occupation Data * program *				
Occupation	California Wages & Employment Trends			
	Median Salary	2014 Employment	Projected Growth (2014-2024)	Projected Annual Job Openings
Occupation 1				
Occupation 2				
:				

Note that some programs do not have as many professions listed in the O*Net data as others do. In these cases we will want to get a list of professions from the chair/school dean to supplement the O*Net data.

1. Which professions in the O*Net data were you already aware of and for which are you already intentionally preparing students and does the hiring demand in these professions signal anything about the future that you need to be aware of regarding the design and structure of your program ?

2. Are there additional professions in the O*Net list or from your knowledge of occupations your alumni have entered, for which you should be preparing students?

3. What changes in your program would be necessary in order to prepare students for the skills and professional qualities needed to succeed in these additional professions?

4. Are there national trends in higher education or industry that are particularly important to your discipline? If yes, how is your program reacting to those trends?

F5) Quality Markers

**Table F5.1:
Retention/Graduation Rates**

Retention/Graduation Rates (First-Time Freshmen)							
program	Matriculation Term						
	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
First-Year Retention							
<i>PLNU First-Year Retention</i>	81.1%	82.9%	89.3%	84.5%	84.5%	86.1%	89.2%
program	Matriculation Term						
	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Four-Year Graduation Rate							
<i>PLNU Four-Year Graduation Rate</i>	61.7%	59.1%	63.4%	62.4%	63.7%	70.3%	66.5%
program	Matriculation Term						
	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Six-Year Graduation Rate							
<i>PLNU Six-Year Graduation Rate</i>	72.8%	74.9%	72.3%	73.6%	75.2%	70.9%	74.4%

**Table F5.2:
Degree Completions**

Majors/Concentrations	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Program Total							
<i>Share of PLNU Bachelor's Degrees</i>	/547	/548	/567	/597	/553	/659	/645
Minors	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Total Minors							
<i>Share of PLNU (completion) Minors</i>	/82	/76	/85	/87	/91	/96	/94
FTF Time to Degree (in semesters)							
<i>PLNU FTF Time to Degree</i>	8.30	8.23	8.35	8.26	8.31	8.16	8.10
Study Abroad Participants							
<i>Share of PLNU Study Abroad</i>	/158	/116	/123	/115	/119	/159	/138

1. Based on comparing the quality marker data for your program with the PLNU averages:

a. What does this tell you about your program?

b. If your values are below the PLNU averages, what changes could you make to address any areas of concern?

c. If your values are above the PLNU averages, what do you believe contributes to this success?

2. Describe regular opportunities for students to apply their knowledge (internships, practicums, research projects, senior projects, etc.). Estimate what percentage of your students in this program participates in these kinds of opportunities.

3. Describe any public scholarship of your undergraduate and graduate students in this program (conference presentations, publications, performances, etc.). What percentage of your undergraduate students are involved in these kinds of activities?

4. How many of your students participate in study abroad opportunities in general? Describe any study abroad opportunities specifically organized by your program. What percentage of your majors are involved annually (annualize the number)? How many students outside of your department participate in this departmentally organized program (Annualize the number)?

5. What are any other distinctives of your program? Describe how they contribute to the program's success.

6. Does your program have an advisory board? If so, describe how it has influenced the quality of your program? If not, could it benefit from creating one?

7. Describe any current joint interdisciplinary degrees (majors or minors) offered by your department. Are there additional areas where interdisciplinary programs should be considered?

**Table F5.3:
Job Placement**

PLNU Alumni Survey Administered Annually in Summer			
Survey Question		1-Yr Out Grads	5-Yr Out Grads
		2015-16	2011-12
Overall Placement Rate	Dept	(n=xx)	(n=xx)
	PLNU	96.6%	99.5%
Percent of alumni employed full-time who are in a job related to their undergraduate major	Dept	(n=xx)	(n=xx)
	PLNU	75.0%	73.2%
Average Salary of full-time employed alumni	Dept	(n=xx)	(n=xx)
	PLNU	\$46,204	\$67,372
Percent of alumni who are pursuing or pursued an advanced degree	Dept	(n=xx)	(n=xx)
	PLNU	22.1%	46.4%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary data is collected using ranges, average salary is calculated by imputing from midpoints of the ranges. • Advanced degree percentage for 1-year outs is based on the current primary activity, while 5-year outs also include activity since graduation. 			

8. Describe your success with students acquiring jobs related to their discipline. What insights do you glean from reviewing stakeholder data on employment and/or pursuit of graduate studies? What adjustments or improvements could be made (or not) to prepare your majors for post-graduation activities?

9. Describe your undergraduate and graduate student success rate for passing licensure or credentialing exams (if they exist in your discipline).

10. Describe your success with undergraduate student acceptance into post-baccalaureate education.

11. What kind of support does your program provide for students encountering academic difficulties? How do you intentionally facilitate these students' connection with institutional support services?

F6) Infrastructure and Staffing

**Table F6.1:
Full-Time Faculty Contribution**

Department Total	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Percentage of UG classes taught by FT faculty				
<i>PLNU percentage of UG classes taught by FT Faculty</i>	74.3%	72.6%	70.4%	67.0%
Includes: regular lectures, labs, seminars Excludes: independent studies, private lessons, internships				

1. Are your program's current technological resources and support adequate? If not, what is needed? Do you foresee any additional needs in this area?

2. Are your program's current facilities adequate? If not, what is needed? Do you foresee any additional needs in this area?

3. Is your program's current staffing (administrative, clerical, technical and instructional) adequate? If not, what is needed? Do you foresee any additional needs in this area?

F7) Challenges and Opportunities

1. Are there any particular challenges regarding this program that have not been addressed through the analysis and reflection on data or questions in sections F1-F6 that you would like to include here?

2. Are there any particular opportunities regarding this program that have not been addressed through the analysis and reflection on data or questions in sections F1-F6 that you would like to include here?

F8) Recommendations for Program Improvement

List the recommendations you are making regarding this program analysis with a brief rationale for each recommendation.

Departmental Level Synthesis

G) Synthesis of Program Recommendations

Please create a combined list of program recommendations and rank order that list according to the department's priorities. Please provide a brief rationale for the ranking.

H) Action Plan Considerations for MOU

Review your prioritized recommendation list with the Dean and in partnership with the Dean develop a draft action plan and timeline to be considered as part of the MOU.

Dean Level

I) Compliance Checklist

In addition to the Dean roles above, The Dean will be responsible to evaluate and generate a brief report on the following areas to be included with the self-study that is sent to the PR committee and external reviewers.

Check the Academic Unit's Assessment Wheel for each program:

1. Do they have learning outcomes? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
2. Are their syllabi posted? Are they up to date?
3. Do they have course learning outcomes? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
4. Do they have a curriculum map? Is it adequate? Is it up to date?
5. Do they have a multi-year assessment plan? Is it adequate? Is it up to date?
6. Do they have methods of assessment? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
7. Do they have direct methods of assessment? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
8. Do they have evidence of student learning? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
9. Have they established the criteria of success? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
10. Have they analyzed their findings? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
11. Have they made changes based on evidence? Are they adequate? Are they up to date?
12. Credit Hour: Are the courses in the program in compliance with credit hour expectations?
13. Does the department have evidence posted on the assessment wheel for the Core Competencies?

When complete, the Dean signs off on the self-study as being ready to submit to the Program Review Committee and external reviewers (if no outside accreditation exists)

Program Review Committee and External Review

Once the Self-Study is ready, send it to the chair of the Program Review Committee and the Dean approved External Reviewers for their consideration. The Program Review Committee will incorporate the external reviewer feedback into a combined report that will go back to the Dean and Academic unit for their response. The academic unit leader, the Dean and the Provost will finalize an MOU with action plan for cabinet approval. The self-study, the compliance checklist, the PR committee report, the departmental response and the cabinet-approved MOU will comprise a completed program review.