

Format for Undergraduate Council Reports on Departmental Internal Reviews.

General Guidelines:

Reports should be about four to six single-spaced pages in length. Resist the impulse to go on too long and err on the side of brevity. Section headings in caps or bold type with white space in between sections will be helpful. If you are critical in any section please keep it gentle. The negatives should tend toward the inferential and where possible, imbedded in a positive or neutral context. We would like to avoid angry reactions and long meetings. Use your judgment here. If something is so outrageous that it requires unambiguous expletives, let them have it. But, in general, let's lean toward the diplomatic.

You should read the full report paying particular attention to the sections of the report related to the questions/topics listed below. The questions are keyed to the relevant sections of the "Guidelines for Internal Evaluation Report/Self Study, {the document to which the department has been responsive to in preparing the self study. Your responses to the questions/topic should be general and concise and somewhere between descriptive and evaluative. Rather than providing lengthy quotation or paraphrase, you should refer the reader to the section and page of the report that you are alluding to. If the report is not responsive to the topic under discussion, you should so note. In general, your report should focus on matters directly related to the department's intentions, operations and apparent achievements or limitations in facilitating undergraduate learning. Secondary questions regarding the availability of resources, staffing, etc. should be addressed only in a paragraph or two of general comments at the end of your report if at all.

- A. **STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:** The reference here is to B. 3. b. in the "Guidelines."

Discuss the programs processes and methods for measuring student learning outcomes.

- B. **STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE; PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS; PROGRAM CHANGES.** The reference here is to B. 6, 10 and 11.

Discuss the department's substantive program revisions since the last review, and its plans for future revisions (items 10 and 11) with particular emphasis on how these changes connect with the questions raised in item 6. (Note: don't get too tangled up in esoteric academic abstractions here; the simple question is whether or not the faculty is paying reasonable attention to the form and content of its undergraduate program over time.)

C. UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM. The reference here is TO B. 13a-g.

Comment on the departments responses to this section with special emphasis on b, c, d, f, g. (Note: be creative here in combining comments on the various sections.)

D. RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES FOR UNDERGRADUATES. The reference here is B. 15.

In your comments here please make clear whether the department's efforts in undergraduate research seem substantive. If you are reviewing one of the arts departments make appropriate adjustment to performance, studio work, etc. (Note: this is a high profile concern in our present universe; give this special attention.)

E. UNDERGRADUATE ADVISEMENT. The reference here is C. 7.

Comment on the department system for undergraduate advisement. Does it seem well-thought-out and likely to be effective? Is it clear that the faculty are expected to take this part of their duties seriously? (Note: this is a vulnerable area for many departments; be tough here if it seems warranted...)

F. COUNCIL OF MAJORS; UNDERGRADUATE HONORS; AWARDS; RECOGNITION. The reference here is C, 8-12.

Comment on the aggregate response to these items.

G. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT; TEACHING QUALITY. The reference here is D, 4 and 5.

Comment in some detail on the departments efforts in the area of faculty development and the effort to monitor and improve the quality of teaching in the program.

H. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS; SUMMARY EVALUATION.

Finally, comment on any other sections of the internal report as they are related to the department's characterization of its curriculum, teaching and advising which have not been touched upon above and which call particular attention to themselves. If appropriate, you may wish to conclude with a brief summary evaluation of the quality of the self-assessment and some tentative suggestions of program elements which the department might consider focusing on prior to their next evaluation.