

From: John Raich (8/16/95)

To: Dean Jaros

CC: George Barisas, Scott Hamilton, Georgeann Venis

Subject: Time:8:27 AM

OFFICE MEMO Review Committee - Psychology Date:8/16/95

The membership of the departmental committee to conduct the CCHE-mandated program review during 1995-96 for the Department of Psychology is:

George Barisas, Associate Dean, Committee Chair,
Bill Boyer, Prof.,
Ross Loomis, Prof.,
Kate McNamara, Assoc. Prof.,
George Thornton, Prof.

Please contact Dr. Barisas to set up the initial meeting with this group.

=====

From: John Raich (8/15/95)
To: Scott Hamilton
CC: George Barisas
Reply to: RE>>Departmental Program Review

I'll ask George to set up the meeting with Jaros. This meeting should include the review committee members, the department chair, the college dean and the graduate dean.

Date: 8/15/95 2:54 PM
To: John Raich
From: Scott Hamilton

I just got through finalizing the members of the self-study committee for your consideration. The following faculty have agreed to serve on the committee: Kate McNamara, George Thornton, Ross Loomis, and Bill Boyer (I think this is an excellent group). George Barisas suggested that we also have a graduate student on the committee, but I thought I'd let the committee entertain several graduate students for the position. Kate agreed to chair the committee, but your memo indicated that George would be chairing (the last time we did this 6 years ago, I chaired the committee but possibly the chair now comes from outside the Department). I will run the appropriate documents over to George this afternoon so that we can move on with this. Do you want me to try to get a meeting set up with Jaros, and if so, who should be in attendance.

Date: 8/15/95 9:39 AM
To: Scott Hamilton
From: John Raich

Could you give me your suggestions for the membership of the departmental committee to conduct the CCHE-mandated program review during 1995-96? Associate Dean Barisas has agreed to chair the committee. Dean Jaros would like us to proceed with a meeting of that group and would like to schedule a meeting as soon as possible.

=====

From: Scott Hamilton (8/15/95)
To: John Raich

Reply to: RE>Departmental Program Review

I just got through finalizing the members of the self-study committee for your consideration. The following faculty have agreed to serve on the committee: Kate McNamara, George Thornton, Ross Loomis, and Bill Boyer (I think this is an excellent group). George Barisas suggested that we also have a graduate student on the committee, but I thought I'd let the committee entertain several graduate students for the position. Kate agreed to chair the committee, but your memo indicated that George would be chairing (the last time we did this 6 years ago, I chaired the committee but possibly the chair now comes from outside the Department). I will run the appropriate documents over to George this afternoon so that we can move on with this. Do you want me to try to get a meeting set up with Jaros, and if so, who should be in attendance.

Date: 8/15/95 9:39 AM
To: Scott Hamilton
From: John Raich

Could you give me your suggestions for the membership of the departmental committee to conduct the CCHE-mandated program review during 1995-96? Associate Dean Barisas has agreed to chair the committee. Dean Jaros would like us to proceed with a meeting of that group and would like to schedule a meeting as soon as possible.

=====

From: John Raich (8/15/95)
To: Scott Hamilton

Subject: OFFICE MEMO Time:8:24 AM Date:8/15/95
 Departmental Program Review

Could you give me your suggestions for the membership of the departmental committee to conduct the CCHE-mandated program review during 1995-96? Associate Dean Barisas has agreed to chair the committee. Dean Jaros would like us to proceed with a meeting of that group and would like to schedule a meeting as soon as possible.

=====

Office of the
Provost/Academic Vice President
108 Administration
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523
(303) 491-6614
FAX: (303) 491-0215

August 11, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Scott Hamilton, Psychology
FROM: Dean Jaros, Associate Provost
SUBJECT: Program Review--1995-96



On June 14, I sent you a memo regarding your scheduled CCHE-mandated program review. By means of a copy of that memo, I asked the college dean to consult with you regarding the appointment of an appropriate departmental committee to conduct the required self-study. It is now time for the initial planning meeting with that committee.

If this committee has not yet been appointed, would you please see to it at an early convenient moment. We need to start the process of scheduling right away. In order that the departments have enough time to complete the necessary work, these initial meetings should be completed no later than September.

Please let me know who will serve on the committee. Ms. Richmond in my office will be calling to arrange a meeting time.

Guidelines and other information was provided with the June 14 memo. I will look forward to hearing from you.

DJ/jr
xc: John Raich, Natural Sciences ✓

June 14, 1995

Graduate School
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523-1005
Telephone: (970) 491-6817
FAX: (970) 491-2194
E-mail: gschool@vines.colostate.edu

MEMORANDUM

TO: Scott Hamilton, Psychology

FROM: Dean Jaros, Associate Provost

SUBJECT: Six-year CCHE-mandated Program Reviews



Your department is scheduled for CCHE program review in 1995-96.

This review process has perhaps been overshadowed in recent years by various other University evaluation procedures. Nonetheless, it is a state requirement and we are obliged to complete it on schedule. Moreover, we must treat them seriously. Both the Board and the CCHE have access to them and we cannot afford to release anything that does not present Colorado State University in a good light.

Moreover, the review process presents the opportunity to do a straight-out comparison between the department and comparable units in peer universities--or at least some explicit measuring of the department against some sort of credible national criterion measures. Of course, this sort of tough examination is valuable regardless of who commissions the self-study. Such external validation of quality has become the central feature of the program review process in recent years. In sum: In the assessment portion, present comparative empirical data.

On the other hand, much of the self-study document can be prepared by a cut-and-paste process using materials already at hand from the various other exercises. All units already have planning documents, Application of the Strategic Plan materials, etc., in the files. That is, while this is a serious activity, a complete de novo study may not be necessary. In sum: Use off the shelf materials from the Strategic Planning Process and related efforts wherever possible.

Guidelines for the review process are attached. By means of a copy of this memo, I am asking the college dean to consult with the department head with regard to the appointment of a self-study committee. In September, we will meet with this committee and other concerned parties to plan the remaining steps of the review process.

I am enclosing a copy of a past self-study which had many good features to it--especially relative brevity--as well as the accompanying institutional response. Though direct and complete emulation may not be the best strategy, these items might be useful in planning. If you would like to examine other self studies as models, I will try to make them available.

I look forward to a successful completion of this process.

DJ/jr

Enclosure

xc: John Raich, Natural Sciences

October 6, 1995

Graduate School
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523-1005
Telephone: (970) 491-6817
FAX: (970) 491-2194
E-mail: gschool@vines.colostate.edu

MEMORANDUM

TO: / Program Review Committee Chair

FROM: Dean Jaros, Dean

SUBJECT: Program Review Information

Attached is a program review data sheet, a college summary and a description of data elements used.

Chris Maldonado from the Office of Budgets and Institutional Analysis will be available to answer any questions you may have or provide any additional data that may be needed. She can be reached at 1-6487.

DJ/jr
Attachment
xc: Department Head

**COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
REQUIRED DATA ELEMENT FORMAT: APPENDIX A (CCHE)
PROGRAM REVIEW**

DEPARTMENT of PSYCHOLOGY

1876 - 10/4/95

	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>	<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1992-93</u>	<u>1993-94</u>	<u>1994-95</u>
FTE Faculty	30.25	28.79	27.13	28.27	28.87	26.71
FTE Support Staff	9.34	4.90	6.03	5.54	5.27	4.91
Credit Hours Produced						
Lower Division	12,546.8	12,124.0	12,406.0	11,719.0	10,711.0	10,213.0
Upper Division	7,281.0	7,677.0	8,148.0	9,487.0	9,260.0	9,855.0
Graduate I	1,290.0	1,570.0	1,369.0	1,290.0	1,501.0	1,401.0
Graduate II	563.0	523.0	762.0	706.0	686.0	667.0
TOTAL	21,680.8	21,894.0	22,685.0	23,202.0	22,158.0	22,136.0
Average Faculty Salary	\$42,444	\$47,188	\$48,278	\$50,168	\$52,226	\$54,628
Student/Faculty Ratio	19.94	18.77	18.96	17.76	16.67	17.71
Average Class Size						
Lecture	81	78	73	83	79	80
Laboratory	18	18	16	15	17	16
Avg. Faculty Teaching Load	598.09	562.97	568.83	532.89	499.95	531.35
Number of Courses Offered						
Lower Division	16	16	16	14	14	15
Upper Division	42	46	47	55	54	52
Graduate I	18	19	27	26	28	26
Graduate II	18	19	9	11	8	9
TOTAL	94	100	99	106	104	102
Number of Degrees Granted						
B. Science	127	149	138	148	151	131
M. Science	9	12	15	15	9	10
Doctor of Philosophy	17	15	9	11	18	13
TOTAL	153	176	162	174	178	154
Number of Majors-Fall Hdct						
Undergraduate	623	576	599	652	648	638
Graduate	91	88	95	95	98	101
TOTAL	714	664	694	747	746	739

Note: For 1989-90, FTE figures were budgeted. Since 1990-91, figures are actual.

**COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
REQUIRED DATA ELEMENT FORMAT: APPENDIX A (CCHE)
PROGRAM REVIEW**

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES

1800 - 10/4/95

	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>	<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1992-93</u>	<u>1993-94</u>	<u>1994-95</u>
FTE Faculty	204.53	176.91	171.75	180.47	179.04	164.48
FTE Support Staff	67.63	51.28	51.88	51.42	52.02	37.33
Credit Hours Produced						
Lower Division	98,310.2	93,625.9	92,735.8	94,256.0	93,257.6	92,100.3
Upper Division	28,663.2	28,267.4	28,982.1	30,874.0	32,130.3	35,071.3
Graduate I	5,991.5	6,693.0	6,990.1	6,742.1	7,209.3	6,448.7
Graduate II	3,748.0	3,581.5	4,260.8	4,849.0	4,990.3	5,071.6
TOTAL	136,712.9	132,167.8	132,968.8	136,721.1	137,587.5	138,691.8
Average Faculty Salary	\$47,405	\$50,652	\$52,816	\$54,277	\$56,251	\$58,301
Student/Faculty Ratio	16.83	16.76	16.57	16.28	16.20	18.45
Average Class Size						
Lecture	80	74	63	64	62	63
Laboratory	24	23	23	20	21	21
Avg. Faculty Teaching Load	504.89	502.73	497.08	488.31	485.93	553.57
Number of Courses Offered						
Lower Division	128	128	130	126	122	129
Upper Division	218	223	216	236	236	229
Graduate I	162	163	176	183	178	172
Graduate II	80	84	66	64	72	68
TOTAL	588	598	588	609	608	598
Number of Degrees Granted						
B. Science	430	426	437	464	441	457
M. Science	68	61	77	61	75	63
M. Arts for Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Doctor of Philosophy	55	54	46	45	58	49
TOTAL	553	541	560	570	574	569
Number of Majors-Fall Hdct						
Undergraduate	2,413	2,256	2,206	2,371	2,450	2,652
Graduate	440	420	459	483	519	494
TOTAL	2,853	2,676	2,665	2,854	2,969	3,146

The number of Bio-Core courses are included in the college total.

Note: For 1989-90, FTE figures were budgeted. Since 1990-91, figures are actual.

Program Review Data Elements

Office of Budgets and Institutional Analysis, September 1995

FTE Faculty

FTE faculty includes all employees with an employee type of 'F' (Faculty), 'FT' (Faculty Transitional), and 'FO' (Faculty Overseas) with 13 or 14 funds. The source document for 1989-90 was the Operating Budget. Since 1990-91, the data is from HRS. Summer session months are excluded. FTE faculty were budgeted for 1989-90 and actual since 1990-91. The source document for 1989-90 was the Operating Budget. Since 1990-91, the data is from HRS.

FTE Support Staff

FTE Support Staff includes all employees with an employee type of 'SP' (State Personnel), 'SH' (State Hourly), or 'TH' (Temporary Hourly) funded with 13 or 14 funds. Summer session months are excluded. FTE support staff were budgeted for 1989-90 and actual since 1990-91. The source document for 1989-90 was the Operating Budget. Since 1990-91, the data is from HRS.

Student Credit Hours Produced

Student credit hours produced includes course level student credit hours for the academic year (fall and spring terms only). The source document is the *Academic Year Student Credit Hour and Contact Hour Report*, 1989-90 through 1994-95.

Average Faculty Salary

Average faculty salary includes all faculty ranks with both nine- and twelve-month appointments. Twelve-month salaries are converted to a nine-month base using a .75 conversion factor. Faculty salaries are included regardless of funding. Since 1989-90, the data is from the HRS system as of October of each year (October 1994 for 1994-95).

Student/Faculty Ratio

Student/faculty ratio is a calculated item. Academic year FTE students are divided by FTE faculty (including GTAs).

Average Class Size

Average class size is the average number of students enrolled in each section. The source document is the *Academic Year Class Size Analysis Report*, 1989-90 through 1994-95.

Average Faculty Teaching Load

Average faculty teaching load is a calculated item. Student credit hours are divided by FTE faculty (including GTAs).

Number of Courses Offered

The number of courses offered is from the *Course and Section Analysis Report* for 1989-90 and from ISIS for all years since 1990-91.

Degrees Granted

Degrees granted are from the *Report of Degrees Conferred*, 1989-90 through 1994-95.

Number of Majors

The number of majors represents the number of departmental majors during each fall semester (at census date). The source document is the *Fall Enrollment Data Report* 1989-90 through 1994-95.

From: John Raich (11/27/95)
To: Scott Hamilton
CC: George Barisas, Cheryl Peregoy, Georgeann Venis
Reply to: RE>CCHE Comparative Data

A quick answer to your questions:

(1) I would suggest the CCHE peers plus any group of departments that you think are reasonable peer departments and from which you can get the information you want.

(2) I would start with the following type of data:

(a) The following information, some of which Cheryl regularly provides on departments in the College:

- student credit hours (by level, if possible),
- numbers of undergraduate, graduate majors,
- numbers of undergraduate and graduate degrees,
- numbers of regular and temporary faculty, GTA's, support staff,
- indirect cost recoveries (to the University),
- contract and grant expenditures,
- department budget (excluding ICR returns, capital equipment, remodeling and other one-time allocations),
- any comparative information on publications,
- salary and stipend information on faculty and GTA's.

(b) You might also use the St. Malo department review format to pick up possible comparisons in addition to the ones above.

You will find that department budget data from other institutions are the most difficult to obtain. Departments release this information only reluctantly.

You have a copy of last year's Statistics review. Use the format and the comparison tables if they are suitable. Computer Science has almost completed a first draft of their review document. This draft includes a reasonable peer comparison. You might ask Pradip for a copy.

Date: 11/27/95 9:23 AM
To: John Raich
From: Scott Hamilton

John:

I'm trying to put together some peer comparison data for the CCHE 6-year Department Review. My first question is: what peers should we use - - CCHE designated peers or Departments of comparable size w/ similar graduate programs? Second, does the College have a file containing information relevant to peer comparison figures? I have some info. over here, but it is far from complete and somewhat old. Let me know if you have some information that would be useful. Thanks a bunch!

=====