

Self-Study Portfolio Guidelines for the Periodic Comprehensive Review of Undergraduate Programs

Periodically, the college dean(s) and, on behalf of the Provost, the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Programs review each undergraduate program. Their review is focused on the quality of the program and the summative use of results. In preparation for the review, programs should complete the self-study described below and submit the portfolio to the college associate dean(s) and to the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Programs. Programs are encouraged to work with their associate dean and the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Programs to tailor these guidelines to meet the needs of the program. Programs with external accreditation requirements may use self-study portfolios developed for accreditation in lieu of the guidelines below if approved by the college associate dean and the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Programs. Assessment consultants are available from the Division of Undergraduate Academic Programs to help the programs with their assessment efforts.

The primary purpose of the periodic comprehensive review is for faculty to reflect upon, evaluate, and improve the undergraduate education provided by their program. The review process provides a framework within which to make programmatic improvements and also provides an opportunity for programs to showcase successes. Please refer to the Academic Affairs Assessment Planning Team's final report (located at http://www.ncsu.edu/provost/governance/task_forces/) for further details about the process, the roles of faculty members and administrators, and the Guiding Principles.

1. Signature page(s) including identifying information (curriculum, concentrations if any, degree(s) offered, department(s), college(s), signature of director of undergraduate program, signature of department head(s))

2. Executive Summary (Include a description of the overall quality of your program and the indicators you used to assess the quality; include a brief summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, findings that resulted from the review, and significant changes that have been carried out or plans for changes that have resulted from this review.)

3. Program mission, objectives, outcomes and assessment plans

3.1. What is the program mission?

3.2. Assessment Plan: What are the program's objectives (the general programmatic and curricular statements that define the program's direction for continual improvement), student learning outcomes (the knowledge, abilities, and other attributes students are expected to attain), other outcomes that will enable the

program to achieve its objectives, and the kinds of data and methods the program uses to gather data for assessing program outcomes? In this section, it would be helpful to pair each objective with its associated outcome(s) and to pair each outcome with its associated assessment method(s). One possible format is:

Objective 1

Outcome 1.1

Assessment Method 1.1.1

Assessment Method 1.1.2

Outcome 1.2

Assessment Method 1.2.1

Note: we also suggest that programs gather for their own use direct evidence of students' performance including various types of student products (e.g., portfolios of students' writing assignments, videotapes and written evaluations of students' oral presentations, samples of student projects). Many other types of data are helpful as well (for example, senior exit interviews, faculty surveys, employer surveys, and other kinds of data that include evaluation of the program by students, faculty, alumni, and employers of graduates).

4. Results and interpretation of results

4.1. What outcomes were assessed from the time of the last comprehensive review (or during the last five years for programs that have not yet had a comprehensive review)? When were they reviewed? What were the summary assessment findings for each outcome, including any strengths and opportunities for improvement? Include, as well, a summary of the periodic assessment reports that were developed as part of the on-going, continuous assessment of the program. (If you choose, you may attach those reports in an appendix.)

4.2. Interpretation of results (We suggest that you consider the following questions in your interpretation:

- What has been learned about the effectiveness of the program in meeting each outcome and achieving the overall educational objectives—strengths and areas for improvement?
- What has been learned about the link between the learning outcomes of individual courses and the objectives of the program? How are course sequences, including prerequisites, used to build and reinforce student competencies?
- What has been learned about how graduates of the program apply the knowledge and skills they have acquired in the program (particularly appropriate for professional programs)?

- What has been learned about the effectiveness of the general education program as it relates to student learning for your program?)

5. Trends in undergraduate enrollment, retention and graduation: For the period since the last comprehensive review (or the last five years for programs that have not yet had a comprehensive review), indicate and interpret trends in data such as: enrollment, second Fall persistence for new freshmen, four-year, five-year and six-year graduation rates, number of degrees awarded, time to degree as well as any other information relevant to the program planning. (Note that University Planning and Analysis provides data on enrollment, persistence rates, graduation rates, number of degrees awarded and time to degree at the programmatic level, as well as other information.)

6. Application of the results to program planning

6.1. What decisions have been made and what changes have been instituted on the basis of previous on-going assessments since the last comprehensive review (for example, these might include changes in courses and curricula, faculty characteristics, instructional facilities, student support, funding priorities, the assessment procedure—including objectives and outcomes and methods of gathering and analyzing data, etc.)?

6.2. If the program has had an external review, what decisions have been made and what changes were planned on the basis of the review?

6.3. What decisions have been made and what changes are planned on the basis of the current report?

6.4. Describe any additional resources needed to implement those changes.