Assessment Goals

Loma Linda University’s goals for assessment are to:

• Develop, implement, and monitor assessment and institutional learning activities.
• Support the implementation and monitoring of systematic program review.
• Provide oversight, periodic review, and recommendations regarding the University’s institutional research data capacities and utility.
• Monitor rigorous academic training in all curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular learning activities in support of mission-focused learning.

Structure

Office of Assessment
The Office of Assessment and institutional Learning was created to coordinate and support systematic program review, assessment, capacity review processes, and related issues. The office is staffed by:

• Director
• Institutional Researcher
• Administrative Assistant

The primary purpose of the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning is to coordinate systematic program review and assessment research activities for the university to promote a culture of evidence of student learning, and to provide expertise in the design and implementation of systematic program review, assessment activities, and interpretation of data related to student development and learning outcomes.

Organization chart at end of document shows relationship of OA to university offices and processes:

• OA reports to the Office of Academic Affairs.
• OA supports the WASC Steering Committee in regards to WASC accreditation and related assessment issues.
• OA supports and guides schools and programs in systematic program review and assessment, capacity review issues and activities, supports university-wide organizational research, and provides faculty and staff development.

1 Initial draft shared with the following: Deans Council; Academic Deans Council; University Assessment Committee; Educational Effectiveness Committee.
• OA leads the Assessment Committee to support schools and the university.
• OA promotes and supports Institutional Research and data analysis of shared University assessment issues.
• OA supports the LLUAHSC Strategic Plan Committee with assessment data analyses to help inform decisions.

**School Assessment Representatives**
Each school has a designated Assessment Representative. While we request the schools to nominate a person with evaluation and measurement experience, the OA is committed to offer ongoing additional training to assure meaningful coordinated involvement by all parties. The primary purpose of the School Assessment Representative will be to coordinate school assessment activities and interpretation of data related to student development and learning outcomes.

The School Assessment Representative will:

• Represent the academic learning, program review, and assessment activities of the school.
• Report back to school with information regarding assessment.
• Work with the Associate Academic Dean, or designated assessment officer/representative, to develop and implement the school’s Strategic Assessment Plan.
• Develop and submit school assessment reports to the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning.

**Assessment Committee**
The Assessment Committee’s 20 members include the following:

• School Assessment Representatives (8)
• FGS Representatives (2)
• General Education (3)
• OA Director, chair
• OA Administrative Assistant, secretary
• OA Institutional Researcher
• VC Academic Affairs
• University Accreditation Steering Committee (3)

The committee’s purposes are to:

• Share lessons learned about assessment issues and activities
• Develop a network of support for assessment
• Bring school needs and requests regarding assessment
• Develop schedule of annual professional development themes based on SLOs, core values, and instructional strategies
• Make recommendations for professional development to support effective instruction and assessment of SLOs and PLOs
• Set up SLO assessment cycle and timeline
• Analyze SLO data analyses and make recommendations to the LLUAHSC Strategic Plan Committee, university, and schools to inform decisions
See organization chart showing relationship of Assessment Committee to other committees and sub-committees at the end of this document.

**Assessment**

**Systematic Program Review**

- Program review processes exist and will be implemented as part of the Program Review Schedule by EEC in conjunction with FGS. EEC will review professional programs, whereas FGS will review its research-oriented programs.

- As outlined in the FGS Program Review Strategic Plan and the EEC Program Review Strategic Plan programs will be formally reviewed by peers on a 10-year cycle plus will have annual assessment themes (see end of document for these similar plans; highlighted areas are areas of difference).
  - A pilot full program review study will be completed in the 2008-2009 academic year on selected programs.
  - The program review process will be re-evaluated at that time and changes made, if indicated.

- All programs will fill out and annually update their Program Self-assessment Reviews in the web-based Program Review System.

- A campus-wide baseline of all program review self-assessments will be taken on June 16, 2008; annual data captures/snapshots will be taken every June 30 in the future for research purposes.

- The Program Review System allows departments, schools, and the university to analyze one guideline at a time across a department, school or university in an aggregated and disaggregated manner.

**University Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):**

- SLO rubrics for direct SLOs will be developed by a university wide sub committee to assure meaningful application across programs; guidance will be given as far as program start and end (to allow longitudinal assessment) essays. This process will begin in Summer 2008.

- SLO Cycle: the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning will organize the implementation of analyzing data on one to two SLOs each year campus-wide; although, data will be collected on all eight SLOs every year.

- The Assessment Committee will recommend the featured SLOs for each year in the five-year cycle and will set up the schedule. Their recommendations will go through a full institutional approval process.

- SLO data will be given to schools and programs for further analysis to inform decisions and thus close the assessment loop.

- The Assessment Committee will recommend to EEC how SLO analyzed data should inform campus-wide decisions.

- Each year one to two SLOs will be featured in campus-wide professional development.

- Example of SLO assessment:
Program Assessment: each program will develop the following for its program portfolio:

- **Learning Outcomes with Performance Indicators**
  Program learning outcomes are student-learning expectations for the program; they are the “knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that students should be able to demonstrate by the end of the program”.

- **Performance Indicators**
  Performance indicators describe how an outcome will be measured and include two parts: content references and action verbs.

- **Curriculum Maps**
  Curriculum maps help programs focus on the goal of implementing the Loma Linda University SLOs as well as the program outcomes. Without this process, programs are at risk of drifting away from LLU’s core mission.

- **Assessment Matrices**
  An assessment matrix is a tool to organize and track how university Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and program outcomes are assessed and tracked all the way to making appropriate program decisions based on the data analysis.

Online Syllabus System: Beginning in the fall 2008 all course syllabi will be created or partially created in the LLU Online Syllabus System.

- **Online Syllabus System** contains research-based elements selected by a university research team.

- Schools and programs whose accrediting organizations require complex syllabus requirements may use the online tool to develop a syllabus sheet to add to their regular syllabus. This will ensure that all students receive required and consistent information in all of their courses’ syllabi and that the current university legal statements are included.

- **The Online Syllabus System** will generate curriculum maps based on SLOs and Program Learning Outcomes after all the program course syllabi have been generated. Topic or competency maps can also be generated, if needed.

- Program review processes exist and will be implemented as part of the Program Review Schedule by EEC in conjunction with FGS. EEC will review professional programs, whereas FGS will review its research-oriented programs.

Program Review and Assessment Policy

- The 1999 Program Review policy was updated on 05-20-2008 to include a statement on assessment to create a combined Program Review and Assessment Policy (see policy at end of document).

- **Co-Curricular Activities**
  - OA will encourage and support the development of campus co-curricular assessment plans, data collection and analysis, and appropriate closing-the-loop decisions.

---

2 Gloria Rogers
Co-curricular assessment plans should be mission-focused and address university SLOs and core values.

**Capacity Review**
- Assessment concepts for select committees
  - Closing the Lop: The Learning and Technology Committee and the International and Off-campus Programs Committee will develop strategic self-evaluation plans to assess the quality of the programs they have approved.
  - Committee Function: The strategic plans will also assess the effectiveness of the committee itself in addressing its responsibilities.
- Learning and Technology Committee
  - Participates in New Program Proposal Process for online programs and for hybrid programs where at least 50% of the course work is online.
  - Online Program Review: will work with Program Review Committee concerning online learning issues and the Distance Learning Philosophy. Will have Program Review chair to come in to address online programs that they have reviewed.
- International and Off-campus Programs Committee
  - New committee that began in winter 2007 to guide the development and on-going review process for international and off-campus programs.
  - New criteria were developed to guide the above activities.
  - An International and Off-campus Program Development Template based on the new criteria is available. All future international or off-campus programs will need to fill out this template and have this committee make the initial approval before taking it through the established program approval process.
  - The committee will develop a rubric for international and off-campus programs that will be added to the regular Program Review System.
- Surveys
  - Student climate surveys will be developed and implemented along with timelines by the Office of Student Affairs.
  - Faculty and staff system surveys and cycle will be developed and implemented by the Assessment Committee and approved by EEC.

**Institutional Research**
- Institutional Research Taskforce to initiate the review of the institutional research needs.
- OA will work with University Offices and departments to evaluate the effectiveness of data warehouses, the suitability of the usefulness of data (access and ability to conduct academic and strategic queries).
- Work with schools to integrate their needs into a comprehensive, accessible and efficient institutional data system.
- Define goals for institutional research capacity.
- Develop projected timeline for the resolution of institutional research issues.
- The OA will work with the University to procure external consultation to assist in a review of campus-wide data processes and related issues, and to provide recommendations to address the alignment of the University's data needs with strategic planning to sustain its mission and purposes.
• Assess and incorporate recommendations as appropriate to modify LLU’s institutional research systems.
• Develop systematic data review processes to sustain the integrity of the University’s institutional research systems both centrally and in schools.
  o Develop permanent committee structure, roles, and responsibilities; membership will include representatives from all schools and key central offices.
  o Determine nature of periodic system review, timelines, etc.
  o Integrate institutional research strategic planning with broader institutional planning.
  o Campus-wide, periodic trainings for administrators, faculty, and staff to provide quality assurance with regard to data definitions and compatibility issues.

Projects and Plans

Ongoing Projects
• Assessment processes will be set up to determine and address the gap issues. Gap issues are the identified areas, processes, or services that have specific problems needing to be repaired or developed.
• Regular assessment activities will be implemented in a variety of ways to determine gap issues such as faculty, staff, and student surveys, Deans’ Council, Chancellor’s Leadership Council, and focus groups. Collected data will be analyzed; as a result issues will be listed and prioritized at least every year.
• The gap issues prioritized list will be the basis of action plans and decisions at appropriate levels.
• This is a partial list of known gap issues as of June 2008:
  o Fully vet program review process after doing a pilot study on the process.
  o Assessment work began with a focus on academic programs but in the future will move to assessment of central services and co-curricular activities.
  • DCR issues
    • Process/review
    • Turn around times
  • Variance
    • Process/review
    • Turn around times
  • Admissions
    • Duplication between school and university
    • Process
    • Transcript—scanning/digitizing
    • Unreadable DCR products
  • Office of Records
    • Workflow of online documents, e.g. online variances
      • Distributed decision making
• IT Issues
Admission software
○ Currently there are approximately 100-200 request items
○ Staff capacity and training
○ CourseEval/Questionmark
• Annual Assessment Report: Closing the loop between assessment and strategic planning.
  ○ Look for horizontal linkages – continuing development of this assessment plan will be to look for vertical and horizontal linkages.
• Assessment data will be shared across campus and to the public in a variety of appropriate venues.

Future Plans
Administrative services assessment:
• OA will encourage and support administrative services to develop assessment plans, collect and analyze data, and make appropriate closing-the-loop decisions.
• Administrative services assessment plans should be mission-focused and address applicable university SLOs and core values.

Central Services and Co-Curricular Activities
• OA initially focused on academic program reviews but will expand its assessment activities to assessing central services and co-curricular activities.

Development of assessment leadership
• OA will provide professional development activities to promote assessment leadership across campus to academic and administrative assessment representatives.

Academic Management System
• IT will continue to develop the Academic Management System to include summary reports through dashboards and other features to enable leadership and program faculty to make appropriate decisions based on assessment data.
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LLU University-Wide Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Performance Indicators

Outcome 1: Students understand and apply the University philosophy of wholeness into their personal and professional lives.
   1. Demonstrate knowledge of LLU’s philosophy of wholeness.
   2. Plan a strategy for wholeness, including implementation of your wholeness strategies.

Outcome 2: Students understand the importance of integrating LLU’s Christ-centered values in their personal and professional lives.
   1. Identify the Christ-centered values identified by LLU.
   2. Explain/describe how to incorporate LLU’s Christ-centered values.
   3. Explain the purpose for the values embedded in their profession.

Outcome 3: Students demonstrate critical thinking.
   1. Accurately interprets (analyzes and evaluates) information.
   2. Objectively justifies conclusions and assimilates content into honest and thorough presentation of findings.

Outcome 4: Students develop a commitment to discovery and life-long learning.
   1. Demonstrate an awareness of opportunities for learning after graduation appropriate to their professional and personal lives.

Outcome 5: Students demonstrate effective communication skills in English.3
   1. Demonstrate effective oral communication skills.
   2. Demonstrate effective written communication skills.

Outcome 6: Students demonstrate effective use of technology appropriate to the discipline.
   1. Meet the technological expectations for the degree level and discipline.

Outcome 7: Students understand the importance of embracing and serving a diverse world.
   1. Demonstrate a sensitivity and awareness of all aspects of human diversity.
   2. Analyze cross-cultural beliefs and values.

Outcome 8: Students demonstrate the importance of collaborating with others within and across disciplines.
   1. Engage in a cross-discipline project.

---

3 Excluding WASC-approved distant campus programs who will be assessed in the language of instruction.
Courses developed shall be mission-oriented
  • Focus on wholeness
  • Reflect University’s stated values

Courses developed shall focus on thinking processes
  • Mastery of foundational knowledge
  • Focus on higher order thinking processes
  • Reflection on learning experiences

Courses developed shall address the relational basis of learning
  • A design for interaction between learner and content
  • A design for interaction between learner and learner
  • A design for interaction between learner and teacher
  • A design for interaction between learner and self (reflection)
  • A design for interaction between learner and the community (includes service)

Courses developed shall create stimulating learning experiences
  • Instructional variety
  • Naturally engaging
  • Relevance (connections to real life)

Courses developed shall address the individuality of learners
  • Sensitivity to cultural diversity
  • Attention to learning styles

Courses developed shall incorporate appropriate assessment processes
  • Courses are built on specific learning outcomes
  • Assessment is directly connected and appropriate to learning outcomes

Courses developed should provide access to appropriate support services and learning materials
  • Library
  • Student support
Loma Linda University
Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC)
Review of Academic Programs

I. Goal
Develop and implement a sustainable process for reviewing academic programs

II. Objectives
A. Prepare a schedule that will permit the review by 2010 of programs associated with EEC (See also FGS Program Review Document.)

B. Create a 10-year prospective schedule of reviews for all degree programs (See also FGS Program Review Document.)

C. Develop mechanisms for sharing information and organizational experience among academic programs with the aim increasing innovation, implementing continuous quality improvement and raising academic standards.

III. Frequency of Program Reviews
A. Programs will be reviewed at least once every 10 years. New programs and those with unresolved academic, structural or organizational issues may be scheduled for more frequent reviews.

B. For programs that are regularly reviewed by external accrediting entities, the EEC review will coordinate with the external review and focus on the adequacy of spiritual, ethical, diversity and service components. Such programs will provide a copy of the report from the most recent external review. ¹

C. Programs associated with the Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS) defer to the program review guidelines developed by FGS. Reference is made in this document to the FGS guidelines where appropriate.

IV. Preparation and Training for the EEC Review Process
A. The EEC Program Review Committee will consist of at least two representatives from each of the schools, including but not limited to school representatives also serving on the Educational Effectiveness Committee. (See also FGS Program Review Document.)

¹ When professional programs in LLU schools offering research-based graduate degrees are reviewed by external accrediting agencies, the Dean of FGS will have an opportunity to interact with members of the review teams to provide basic information about research education at LLU.
B. Additional representatives from areas of the university which support the social and learning environment of students will also be members of the Program Review Subcommittee, i.e., service learning and student services.

C. Members of the EEC Program Review Committee will be responsible for overseeing the review of programs and will guide programs in conducting their self-studies and in preparing their Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) plans. (See also FGS Program Review Document.)

D. The EEC Program Review Subcommittee will provide general information, small group training and technical assistance to the FGS Program Review Committee and to faculty in programs scheduled for review.

E. At least two faculty members from each program scheduled for review will participate fully in Program Review Subcommittee training programs.

F. Programs under review will prepare a self-study document with guidance and support from members of the EEC Program Review Committee assigned to the program. (See also FGS Program Review Document.)

G. The self-study document will identify strengths and deficiencies in each of the attributes identified in Section VII.

V. Composition and Scheduling of Site Review Teams

A. Site review teams will consist of at least three members, typically from other institutions (i.e., not employed by any component of Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center). Additional members may be appointed when indicated by the structure or special needs of the program.

B. The program will identify criteria to be used in selecting potential members of the site review team.

1. To the extent possible, site review teams will be composed of individuals from academic units that are similar to the program under review, (e.g., academic specialty, program size, number of faculty, student composition, religious affiliation).

2. Consideration will be given to the inclusion of one LLUAHSC representative on the site review team when there is a LLUAHSC entity with related expertise. The program will provide appropriate justification when recommending individuals from LLUAHSC entities as potential site review team members.

3. Site review team members may not have appointments in the program under review nor receive compensation from it.
H. Programs scheduled for review will provide a list of at least five suggested site review team members to the EEC Program Review Committee six months before the scheduled date of the site visit. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

I. The program representative will provide assurances that no conflicts of interest exist between any of the proposed review members and the program faculty or LLU. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

J. Site visits are typically scheduled for two days at LLU or at the primary program site.

1. To the extent possible, site visits are scheduled by the program to accommodate the site review team members and university representatives (i.e., Office of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, dean of the sponsoring school, dean of FGS where appropriate, department chair, program faculty, student representatives, etc.).

2. Accommodations for the site review team will be arranged by the school designee (i.e., office of the dean, department chair, or program coordinator). (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

K. Appropriate expenses incurred by the site review team (e.g., travel, accommodations, office supplies, clerical support, etc.) will be shared equally by the EEC, the FGS and the program/department.  

VI. Program Review Process

A. The program will submit five copies of the self study document with supporting data to the EEC Program Review Committee two months prior to the scheduled site visit.

5 A decision to review all graduate programs by 2010 would require that at least two programs begin their review process each quarter. That pace is not achievable with existing resources. Scheduling meetings; reserving meeting rooms; typing, editing, duplicating and distributing documents; distributing announcements; arranging hotel accommodations; and processing expense reports cannot be accomplished entirely by program clerical staff who are also be involved in assembling program data, collating information from graduates and supporting the faculty in their assignments. Faculty will be responsible for drafting and refining the self study and preparing continuous quality improvement plans, in addition to their regular academic assignments. A formal arrangement to credit faculty participation in program review is essential. Faculty will take the program review assignment seriously only to the extent that their departments and schools recognize their efforts with release time and work load credit. Additional clerical staff attached to the Educational Effectiveness Committee, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the FGS are essential. Indeed, centralizing clerical operations will foster consistency in processing and document formatting. Such consistency will aid in collating the information for the WASC review. Costs associated with the review process, including the site visits, administrative, clerical and faculty time will be significant. This policy recommends that the programs/departments assume one-third of the expense and the remainder be borne by the administration.
B. The self study document will be distributed by the program representative to the members of the site review team, the dean of the sponsoring school, FGS where appropriate, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

C. At the conclusion of the site visit, the visiting team will provide a short overview of their findings to the EEC Program Review Committee. The Committee will distribute these findings to the department chair, program coordinator, the dean of the sponsoring school, FGS where appropriate, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

D. The site review team will submit a complete report of their findings to the EEC Program Review Committee within 30 days of completing the site visit. The Committee will distribute the final report to the department chair, program coordinator, the dean of the sponsoring school, FGS where appropriate, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

E. The program may provide to the EEC Program Review Committee brief clarifications and supplementary data within 60 days of receiving the site review report. Such information must be reviewed and approved by the department chair and the dean of the sponsoring school. The EEC Program Review Committee will distribute the document to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

F. Within 120 days of receiving the site review report the program will submit to the EEC Program Review Committee a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) plan with actions addressing deficiencies identified in the site review report, plans to capitalize on strengths and a schedule for their implementation. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

G. The EEC Program Review Committee will review the CQI plan and, in consultation with the program, may require modifications before approval. The approved CQI plan will be distributed to the department chair, program coordinator, the dean of the sponsoring school, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

H. The program will provide annual updates to the EEC Program Review Committee describing implementation of their CQI plan. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

I. The EEC Program Review Committee will evaluate annual program updates in light of the approved CQI plan. They will consult with the program when there are significant deviations from the schedule specified in the approved CQI plan and notify the department chair, program coordinator, the dean of the sponsoring school,
and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

J. In the case of persistent failures to implement planned improvements, the EEC Program Review Committee is authorized to recommend specific remedial actions in consultation with the program, the deans of the sponsoring school and FGS (where appropriate), and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Recommended changes may address the content, sequence, organization or administration of the program. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

K. Remedial recommendations proposed by the EEC Program Review Committee must be approved by the FGS Graduate Council (where appropriate) and the University Academic Affairs Committee. (See also FGS Program Review Document for programs associated with FGS.)

VII. Reporting and Dissemination of Program Review Findings

A. EEC will regularly transfer to the Research Themes Subcommittee and/or Capacity Review Subcommittee program review findings and recommendations which suggest the need for organizational research, or which are considered to have substantial impact on the capacity of like programs to sustain and/or improve their educational effectiveness.

B. EEC will annually compile a summary report of the program review activities, including status of programs reviewed, identified areas of concern and strengths from completed reviews, and CQI developments.

C. EEC will provide associated recommendations to the Chancellor and VC of Academic Affairs regarding institutional challenges and successes affecting educational effectiveness of LLU programs. This report will incorporate the recommendations of the Research Themes and Capacity Review Subcommittees.

D. EEC program review findings and CQI activities to improve the educational effectiveness of programs at LLU will be incorporated into WASC reports as appropriate.

VIII. Attributes to Be Reviewed

A. In the preparation of the self study document the program and the site review team will use the applicable WASC Criteria For Review (CFR). (See below and attached.)

1. STANDARD 1: Defining Institutional (Program) Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives. Review will focus on CFR 1.1; 1.2 and 1.4 through 1.8 (see pp. 17-18 of WASC Handbook). Note: CFR 1.3 and 1.9 may not apply directly at the program level. Suggestions for how these might be adapted are included in the attached WASC program review matrix.

2. STANDARD 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions Review will focus on CFR 2.1 through 2.14 (see pp 20-24 of WASC Handbook).
3. STANDARD 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational (Program) Structures to Ensure Sustainability. Review will focus on CFR 3.1 through 3.11 (see pp 25-28 of WASC Handbook).

4. STANDARD 4: Creating an Organization (an Environment) Committed to Learning and Improvement. Review will focus on CFR 4.1 through 4.8 (see pp 25-28 of WASC Handbook)

B. Evaluating Adequacy of Spiritual, Ethical, Diversity and Service Components

1. Programs will demonstrate how the university’s mission with respect to spiritual, ethical, diversity and service components are integrated and reflected in the mission, goals, objectives, and outcomes of the program.

2. Programs will demonstrate how the outcomes are defined and measured, including efforts to provide learning experiences (both curricular and co-curricular) that support students’ attainment of these outcomes.
Review of Academic Programs  
Associated with the  
Faculty of Graduate Studies  
(Approved 11-28-06)

1. **Goal**  
Develop and implement a sustainable process for reviewing academic programs associated with the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

II. **Objectives**

A. Prepare a schedule that will permit the review by 2010 of programs associated with the FGS that have not been evaluated by an external organization since January 1, 2001.

B. Create a 10-year prospective schedule of reviews for all programs associated with the FGS.

C. Develop mechanisms for sharing information and organizational experience among FGS programs with the aim increasing innovation, implementing continuous quality improvement and raising academic standards.

IV. **Frequency of Program Reviews**

A. Programs associated with the FGS will be reviewed at least once every 10 years. New programs and those with unresolved academic, structural or organizational issues may be scheduled for more frequent reviews.

B. For programs that are regularly reviewed by external accrediting entities, the FGS review will coordinate with the external review and focus on the adequacy of spiritual, ethical, diversity and service components. Such programs will provide a copy of the report from the most recent external review.  

IV. **Preparation and Training for FGS Review Process**

1. The FGS Program Review Committee will consist of five FGS members representing different graduate programs in at least three different schools.

1. The FGS Nominating Committee will assemble a slate of 10 nominees to establish the FGS Program Review Committee. The members of the committee will be elected by ballot at a general meeting of FGS. Three of the committee

---

6 When professional programs in LLU schools offering research-based graduate degrees are reviewed by external accrediting agencies, the Dean of FGS will have an opportunity to interact with members of the review teams to provide basic information about research education at LLU.
members will be designated to serve two sequential 3-year terms and two individuals will serve for one 3-year term.

2. At the end of each 3-year term, retiring members of the FGS Program Review Committee will be replaced by election from a panel of nominees assembled by the FGS Nominating Committee.  

B. The FGS Program Review Committee will coordinate all activities with Program Review Subcommittee of the University Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC).  

1. Members of the FGS Program Review Committee will simultaneously serve as members of the EEC Program Review Subcommittee.

2. All FGS Program Review Committee members will participate fully in the training activities provided by the EEC Program Review Subcommittee.

3. Members of the FGS Program Review Committee will be responsible for overseeing the review of FGS programs and will guide programs in conducting their self studies and in preparing their Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) plans.

4. The EEC Program Review Subcommittee will provide general information, small group training and technical assistance to the FGS Program Review Committee and to faculty in programs scheduled for review.

5. At least two faculty members from each program scheduled for review will participate fully in EEC Program Review Subcommittee training programs.

C. Programs under review will prepare a self-study document with guidance and support from members of the FGS Program Review Committee assigned to the program and with technical assistance from the EEC Program Review Subcommittee. The self-study document will identify strengths and deficiencies in each of the attributes identified in Section VII.

V. Composition and Scheduling of Site Review Teams

A. Site review teams will consist of at least three members, typically from other institutions (i.e., not employed by any component of Loma Linda University

---

7 The highlighted section shows how FGS differs from EEC in Program Reviews.
8 The EEC Program Review Subcommittee must include the members of the FGS Program Review Committee. To maintain the distinctive values of research-related education, members of the FGS Program Review Committee will guide and evaluate the review process. Collaboration with the EEC includes taking advantage of EEC-sponsored training programs, consulting the EEC Program Review Subcommittee in making critical decisions, and providing timely updates and copies of review documents to the EEC.
Adventist Health Sciences Center). Additional members may be appointed when indicated by the structure or special needs of the program.

B. The program will identify criteria to be used in selecting potential members of the site review team.

1. To the extent possible, site review teams will be composed of individuals from academic units that are similar to the program under review, (e.g., academic specialty, program size, number of faculty, student composition, religious affiliation).

2. Consideration will be given to the inclusion of one LLUAHSC representative on the site review team when there is a LLUAHSC entity with related expertise. The program will provide appropriate justification when recommending individuals from LLUAHSC entities as potential site review team members.

3. Site review team members may not have appointments in the program under review nor receive compensation from it.

C. Programs scheduled for review will provide a list of at least five suggested site review team members to the FGS Program Review Committee six months before the scheduled date of the site visit.

D. The FGS Program Review Committee will recommend the composition of the site review team for approval by the dean of FGS.

E. Site visits are typically scheduled for two days at LLU or at the primary program site.

1. To the extent possible, site visits are scheduled by the program to accommodate the site review team members and university representatives (i.e., Office of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, dean of FGS, dean of the sponsoring school, department chair, program faculty, student representatives, etc.).

2. Accommodations for the site review team will be arranged by the dean of FGS with assistance from the sponsoring department and the EEC.

F. Appropriate expenses incurred by the site review team (e.g., travel, accommodations, honoraria, office supplies, clerical support, etc.) will be shared equally by the EEC, the FGS and the program/department.

---

A decision to review all graduate programs by 2010 would require that at least two programs begin their review process each quarter. That pace is not achievable with existing resources. Scheduling meetings; reserving meeting rooms; typing, editing, duplicating and distributing documents; distributing announcements; arranging hotel accommodations; and processing expense reports cannot be accomplished entirely by program clerical staff who are also be involved in assembling program data, collating information from graduates and supporting the faculty in
VI. Program Review Process

A. The program will submit a self study document with supporting data to the FGS Program Review Committee two months prior to the scheduled site visit.

B. The self study document will be distributed by the FGS Program Review Committee to the members of the site review team, the **EEC Program Review Subcommittee**, the deans of the sponsoring school and FGS, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

C. At the conclusion of the site visit, the visiting team will provide a short overview of their findings to the FGS Program Review Committee. The Committee will distribute it to the program director, the **EEC Program Review Subcommittee**, the deans of the sponsoring school and FGS, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

D. The site review team will submit a complete report of their findings to the FGS Program Review Committee within 30 days of completing the site visit. The Committee will distribute it to the program director, the **EEC Program Review Subcommittee**, the deans of the sponsoring school and FGS, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

E. The program may provide to the FGS Program Review Committee brief clarifications and supplementary data within 60 days of receiving the site review report. Such information must be reviewed and approved by the department chair and the dean of the sponsoring school. The FGS Program Review Committee will distribute the document to the **EEC Program Review Subcommittee**, the dean of FGS, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

F. Within 120 days of receiving the site review report the program will submit to the FGS Program Review Committee a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) plan with actions addressing deficiencies identified in the site review report, plans to capitalize on strengths and a schedule for their implementation.

their assignments. Faculty will be responsible for drafting and refining the self study and preparing continuous quality improvement plans, in addition to their regular academic assignments. A formal arrangement to credit faculty participation in program review is essential. Faculty will take the program review assignment seriously only to the extent that their departments and schools recognize their efforts with release time and work load credit. Additional clerical staff attached to the Educational Effectiveness Committee, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the FGS are essential. Indeed, centralizing clerical operations will foster consistency in processing and document formatting. Such consistency will aid in collating the information for the WASC review. Costs associated with the review process, including the site visits, administrative, clerical and faculty time will be significant. This policy recommends that the programs/departments assume one-third of the expense and the remainder be borne by the administration.
G. The FGS Program Review Committee will review the CQI plan and, in consultation with the program, may require modifications before approval. The approved CQI plan will be distributed to the EEC Program Review Subcommittee, the deans of the sponsoring school and FGS, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

H. The program will provide annual updates to the FGS Program Review Committee describing implementation of their CQI plan.

I. The FGS Program Review Committee will evaluate annual program updates in light of the approved CQI plan. They will consult with the program when there are significant deviations from the schedule specified in the approved CQI plan and notify the EEC Program Review Subcommittee, the deans of the sponsoring school and FGS, and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

J. In the case of persistent failures to implement planned improvements, the FGS Program Review Committee is authorized to recommend specific remedial actions in consultation with the program, the EEC Program Review Subcommittee, the deans of the sponsoring school and FGS, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Recommended changes may address the content, sequence, organization or administration of the program.

K. Remedial recommendations proposed by the FGS Program Review Committee must be approved by the FGS Graduate Council and the University Academic Affairs Committee.

VII. Attributes to Be Reviewed

A. In the preparation of the self study document the program and the site review team will use the applicable WASC Criteria For Review (CFR). (See below and attached.)

1. STANDARD 1: Defining Institutional (Program) Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives. Review will focus on CFR 1.1; 1.2 and 1.4 through 1.8 (see pp. 17-18 of WASC Handbook). Note: CFR 1.3 and 1.9 may not apply directly at the program level. Suggestions for how these might be adapted are included in the attached WASC program review matrix.

2. STANDARD 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
   i. Review will focus on CFR 2.1 through 2.14 (see pp 20-24 of WASC Handbook).

3. STANDARD 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational (Program) Structures to Ensure Sustainability. Review will focus on CFR 3.1 through 3.11 (see pp 25-28 of WASC Handbook).
4. STANDARD 4: Creating an Organization (an Environment) Committed to Learning and Improvement. Review will focus on CFR 4.1 through 4.8 (see pp 25-28 of WASC Handbook)

B. Evaluating Adequacy of Spiritual, Ethical, Diversity and Service Components

1. Programs will demonstrate how the university’s mission with respect to spiritual, ethical, diversity and service components are integrated and reflected in the mission, goals, objectives, and outcomes of the program.

2. Programs will demonstrate how the outcomes are defined and measured, including efforts to provide learning experiences (both curricular and co-curricular) that support students’ attainment of these outcomes.
1. All academic programs are subject to periodic academic review by qualified internal and external reviewers. This may be scheduled in conjunction with preparation for professional accreditation of the school or related program (where such exists). For programs where there is no associated professional accreditation of the program or school in which it resides, intervals for program review should not exceed ten years. Documents will be prepared under the coordination of the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning, and the guidance of the Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) in collaboration with the Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS). Content for the program reviews will incorporate the assessment of LLU Student Learning Objectives (including Wholeness and LLU core values), program specific assessment, capacity issues guided by the WASC accreditation standards, and such other items as may be determined by the dean of the school, department chair, or the program director. Programs will prepare a response to the recommendations and develop a plan of action to address the issues raised. Details guiding the program review process will follow processes set forth by EEC through collaboration with FGS. The Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning will facilitate the implementation of these processes.

2. Professional programs for which a professional accrediting organization provides professional accreditation will obtain review by such organizations at intervals specified by the accrediting organization.

3. Academic programs for which professional accreditation is not available, will arrange, in conjunction with the dean of their school, for program review as per established periodic intervals.

4. In addition to the periodic and regular program reviews, all LLU programs will participate in the University’s annual selective academic assessment and/or capacity review processes that address overarching University themes.
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