

From: George Barisas (7/26/95)  
 To: Scott Hamilton,  
 CC: John Raich, Tom Gorell,  
 Mail\*Link@SMTP CCHE review of Psychology d  
 Received: by cnsmail.natsci.colostate.edu with SMTP;26 Jul 1995 09:59:42 -0700  
 Received: from barisasdesk.CHM.ColoState.EDU by lamar.ColoState.EDU (AIX 3.2/UCB  
 5.64/4.03)  
 id AA139406; Wed, 26 Jul 1995 09:59:13 -0600  
 Date: Wed, 26 Jul 1995 09:59:13 -0600  
 Message-Id: <9507261559.AA139406@lamar.ColoState.EDU>  
 X-Sender: barisas@lamar.colostate.edu  
 X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 2.0.3  
 Mime-Version: 1.0  
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
 To: "Scott Hamilton" <scott\_hamilton@cnsmail.mso.colostate.edu>  
 From: barisas@lamar.ColoState.EDU (George Barisas)  
 Subject: CCHE review of Psychology department  
 Cc: "John Raich" <john\_raich@cnsmail.mso.colostate.edu>,  
 "Tom Gorell" <thomas\_gorell@cnsmail.mso.colostate.edu>

Dear Scott:

This is to follow up on our chat about strategies for preparing the CCHE review of your department this fall. As we discussed, the first step is to suggest members of your self-study committee to John. Three hard-working faculty and one graduate student might be about right. Could you have these suggestions in to John by August 12? This would let him actually appoint the committee by the start of school.

Last year, in the course of the Statistics review, we found a key element in getting a first draft roughed out in a timely fashion. This was to gather up beforehand all previously-prepared reviews, etc., that might contain relevant information or useful text. Could I thus ask you to scout around the Department for the following items? I will then arrange these together with Dean Jaros' instructions and with sample reviews and have bound copies made for all committee members.

1. Your most recent CCHE review from 5-7 years ago.
2. Your program review prepared for the St. Malo retreat in fall, 1993
3. Any recent self-studies for accreditation by professional organizations
4. Any planning or related documents prepared in the Department within 5-7 years.
5. Anything else containing potentially useful statistics or boilerplate.

If you could have this material to me by FRIDAY, AUGUST 12, I should be able to have the "books" done soon after the start of school. This ought to let us get the process under way as soon as the dust from the start of classes settles.

One final question. Dean Jaros apparently likes to start the process in each department off with a meeting with the department head and myself. I don't think a lot of information changed hands either way in last year's meeting for Statistics. This year in the College we have four departments being reviewed. It seems to me that all four department heads could easily meet with Dean and me in a single meeting. Would you be amenable to such a joint "kickoff" meeting if it could be arranged?

I think we'd all like to have the reviews out of the College altogether by the end of the semester. Based on last year's experience, this seems a realistic goal. Certainly the Dean's Office will do everything possible to help move things forward. Please let us know what we can do to help.

With best regards,  
 George

TOM X JOHN K

From: John Raich (6/15/95)

To: Norm Curthoys, Robert Gaines, Scott Hamilton, Pradip Srimani

Subject:

Time: 2:23 PM

OFFICE MEMO

CCHE-mandated program reviews

Date: 6/15/95

The following departments in the College of Natural Sciences are scheduled for CCHE-mandated program reviews during 1995-96:

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology,  
Computer Science,  
Mathematics,  
Psychology.

On the basis of his success in working with the Department of Statistics last year in producing their review document in record time and with minimal bulk, I will ask George Barisas to coordinate these four reviews. George will be contacting you regarding the timetable for the review.

---

*This will be a lot of work!*

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: Norman Curthoys, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology  
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

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: Pradip Srimani, Computer Science  
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

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: Robert Gaines, Mathematics

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 

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 ✓