

## **An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Academic Program Review Process** California State University, Stanislaus

### OVERVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The academic program review process at CSU Stanislaus is the most important method by which California State University, Stanislaus evaluates the effectiveness of its academic programs in promoting high levels of student achievement. As such, all academic programs are subject to periodic academic program review on a cycle not to exceed seven years. Programs include baccalaureate, master's, doctoral, post-baccalaureate credentials, interdisciplinary majors, honors, stand-alone minors, and general education.

Program self-study documents are to be timely (in accordance with established timelines for each phase of the review), comprehensive, reflective, analytical, and evaluative, focus on the assessment of student learning objectives and use of assessment results for improving program quality. The self-study process is designed for the alignment between the academic program review and annual assessment processes and is implemented in accordance with the university's *Principles for the Assessment of Student Learning*. The use of external reviewer(s) during the self-study phase is strongly encouraged (with available university funding) for those programs not subject to specialized accreditation review.

Participation of all program faculty in the development and review of the self-study document is expected, and programs are encouraged to employ strategies for significant student participation in the assessment and review process, as appropriate for each discipline. Colleges evaluate academic program reviews using their established processes and criteria consistent with university policy and procedures and accreditation standards. Colleges establish internal processes and criteria for the effectiveness of the academic program review process. Similarly, the appropriate university governance committees employ processes and criteria to evaluate academic program reviews, consistent with requirements identified in the *Constitution of the General Faculty*. The provost makes final determination for program continuance or discontinuance, after conducting a program review meeting, receipt of a final implementation plan from the department chair, and recommendations from the dean, college committee, and university committees, as appropriate.

Results from program reviews are integrated into planning and budgetary processes of the college and university. The provost annually reviews proposals from the college deans for planned new degree programs for the subsequent five years. Such programmatic projections are required to be aligned with those academic plans identified in program reviews and agreed upon by the provost at the APR meetings. (Some programmatic opportunities may arise that had not been anticipated during the program review and would appear on the planning document). Prior to the provost's review, each college's budgeting and planning committee (or equivalency) reviews curricular proposals, evaluates program reviews, and makes recommendations to the dean for the pursuit of new programs. These curricular plans are also reviewed by university-wide governance committees, the University Educational Policies Committee, and the Graduate Council.

Governance responsibility for implementing the development and periodic review of the effectiveness of procedures is vested with the University Educational Policies Committee in consultation with appropriate governance committees and academic leadership. Any recommended policy changes are to be submitted to the Academic Senate for appropriate action and Presidential approval. Administrative responsibility for managing, evaluating, and improving the review process rests with the Vice Provost in consultation with the University Educational Policies Committee and the Provost's Council of Deans. Campus policy and procedures comply with CSU system policy, Academic Planning 71-32, Board of Trustees of the California State University (1971).

The earliest campus academic reviews at CSU Stanislaus date back to 1973, illustrating a long systematic commitment to maintaining and improving high quality academic programs. Academic program review procedures are dynamic, subject to continual examination and refinement.

PROGRESS SINCE THE WASC CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW***CPR Team Recommendations for Program Reviews***

While the most substantial revision to the academic program review process occurred in 2005, CSU Stanislaus was in the process of revising the procedures again in 2008 based on our self-assessment of the extent to which those 2005 revisions resulted in enhanced quality of program reviews. During its October 2008 site visit, the WASC CPR team examined academic program reviews completed under this older 2005 academic program review process as we were in transition to the revised 2008 procedures that had not yet been initiated. The team encouraged us to prepare for the Educational Effectiveness Review by focusing more systematically on student learning outcomes and improving their assessment, increasing range of direct measures of actual student learning, improving follow-up procedures to ensure completion of reviews, increase demonstration that data/evidence is used to improve programs, and being less descriptive and more analytical. The CPR team also recommended that we pay particular attention to the review process for graduate programs, especially employing external evaluators.

***Allen Recommendations for Program Reviews***

In addition to the CPR Visiting Team recommendations, the campus also benefited from an extensive evaluation conducted by Dr. Mary Allen (2007). Overall, Allen confirmed the strength of CSU Stanislaus' Academic Program Review (APR), citing that it incorporated many of the best practices for program reviews as identified by the WASC rubric. Recommendations for continued improvement included increased use of external reviewers (especially those disciplinary experts with assessment expertise), training of college review committees for increased expertise in giving effective feedback on assessment, and increased sophistication in learning outcomes assessment. Allen's findings also indicate that some faculty skepticism remains with regard to linkage of assessment/APR results to budgetary allocations. Allen acknowledges that last step in the APR process is a mutual agreement among administrators (dean/provost) and faculty about the action plan for program and decision-improvement, and she encourages administration to continue its efforts to be more overt about linking budgetary decisions to these action plans and promoting a culture of decision making based on evidence.

***WASC Requirements/Resources for Program Reviews***

In addition to the CPR Team Report and Allen recommendations, the University Educational Policies Committee conducted an analysis of CSU Stanislaus' academic program review policy/procedures guided by four WASC documents: *WASC Standards/CFR 2.7 and 4.4* (2008), *Addressing New 2008 Requirements of the Institutional Review Process (Table B-2008)*, *WASC Suggested Approaches for Evaluating Program Review on EER Visits* and the *Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews* (2008). The overall self assessment derived from these WASC resources suggests that for most of the "best practices" for conducting academic program reviews, CSU Stanislaus ranks fairly high.

Although most respondents rated each criterion as either developed or highly developed, areas for increased refinement were fairly consistent among constituent groups. These "emerging" areas include more overt and formal alignment between the annual assessment reporting process and the academic program review process, using comparative data from external sources/evaluators, increased use of benchmarking discipline-based assessment results against similar programs on other campuses employing direct assessment methods that are effective and sustainable, increasing student participation in self-assessment of outcomes and levels of performance, more generation of annual institutional research data related directly to programs' student learning outcomes, and better linkages between program reviews and university planning and budgeting processes. (Attachment A – *Self-Assessment of WASC Educational Effectiveness Review Requirements for Program Reviews*)

***Benchmarking to CSU and UC Program Review Processes***

WASC formed a task force to develop guidelines and resources for institutions for the purpose of improving their program review processes. A CSU representative on the task force gathered information from the CSU/UC campuses with regard to 29 components of the academic program review process. This information was used as benchmark information in evaluating APR procedures. (Attachment B – *Benchmarking: CSU and UC Campus Comparison of Program Review Processes*)

Results indicate that program review practices at CSU Stanislaus are comparable on most dimensions. CSU Stanislaus is distinctive from other campuses in that its review process for interdisciplinary/intra-college programs includes the development of program charters, annual APR workshops for department chairs and college committees, and formal meetings with the provost at the conclusion of the process.

Two components separated CSU Stanislaus from other CSU and UC campuses: external reviewers and review committees. While almost all CSU and UC campuses mandate external reviewers, CSU Stanislaus continues to strongly encourage, not mandate, an external review. Resistance occurs primarily because of budgetary constraints. Efforts are underway to provide additional resources through the assessment office to support greater use of external reviews. While other campuses use a university-level committee only or a combination of both university and college-level review committees, a few years ago, CSU Stanislaus eliminated the university-level review committee and moved to a decentralized college review. An assessment of the longer length of time and questionable value-added by a university committee indicated that it would be more desirable to have a more comprehensive review at the college level, conducted by faculty from more closely aligned disciplines.

The WASC rubric for integration of student learning assessment into APR suggests that a “highly developed” campus includes students as equal partners directly in the review process. With respect to the type of student participation in the review process, none of the CSU/UC campuses appear to have students participate directly on review committees. As does CSU Stanislaus, student contributions are primarily in the form of providing important assessment data prior to or during the APR. At CSU Stanislaus, a student serves as a voting member of the Graduate Council and participates directly in graduate program reviews, although not necessarily from the discipline under review.

***Actions Taken to Improve Academic Program Reviews***

Based on WASC recommendations and resources, governance committees and academic leadership took decisive action for improvement of the APR policy/procedures. The following is a summary of specific actions taken to strengthen the program review process, resulting in enhanced student learning and program effectiveness:

*Evaluating and Revising APR Procedures*

- Approved revised academic program review procedures (Academic Senate and President, May 2009), effective for the nine programs under review in 2009/10. For those seven programs under review in 2008/09, college deans and program faculty worked together to strengthen the self studies. Six programs are currently in progress. As a result of these substantial campus efforts, we anticipate that the WASC EER Team will observe improved program reviews and a clear contrast between the prior self studies and the newly completed ones. (Attachment C – *Academic Program Review Procedures (2009)*. Attachment includes specification for compliance with WASC *Criteria for Review*)
- Incorporated into the APR document a mechanism for faculty to provide their assessment of strengths and areas for improvement of the process and APR components – review criteria, especially student learning; internal/external review; institutional research data; timeline; implementation plan; review process by department, college, and university; provost meeting; and overall effectiveness.

*From Description to Evaluation*

- Revised verbs for each APR review criteria to clarify that self studies are to be evaluative and evidentiary-based conclusions (not merely descriptive of processes).

*Integration of Assessment and APR Processes*

- Incorporated/aligned assessment and program review processes (e.g., Program Assessment Annual Reports for undergraduate/graduate programs are explicitly required as part of the program review).
- Developed a resource document for program assessment plans for use by faculty and committees working toward increasing sophistication of assessment plans, reporting, and use of results. (Attachment D – *Summary of WASC Expectations for Program Assessment Plans*)

*College Role and Linkage to Budgeting and Planning Processes*

- Established and refined each college's internal procedures for the evaluation of academic program reviews, including methods and criteria for conducting the review and for aligning program review results with college and university curricular planning and resource allocation processes. (Attachment E – *College-Level Academic Program Review Processes*).
- Decentralized the annual APR workshop to the colleges/deans. Interim process is for vice provost and deans jointly to sponsor workshop, with part in plenary session followed by breakout sessions for each college. Included college review committee chairs/members in workshops to ensure orientation/training.
- Formalized the process at the outset so that department chairs identify departmental procedures for completing of the APR – e.g., What person/group will draft the self study? How will all departmental faculty participate in the development and review of the self study?

*External Reviews*

- Changed external reviews from optional to strongly encouraged, with funding provided by deans and/or vice provost.

*General Education*

- Revised APR criteria to include a review of all general education courses offered by the program, including a paragraph for each area of general education describing how the courses align with general education goals and the results (not data) of any assessment activities undertaken to make this determination. This will result in a systematic and integrated process for recertification of general education courses.
- Revised APR criteria to require a description of how the general education program aligns with and complements the program's student learning objectives; requires an analysis/evaluation of how the 51-unit GE program complements or supports the major program of study, including any assessment activities or discussion used to make this determination.
- Revised General Education Program Charter requirements to include specific outcomes of the review process: description of general education program; general education requirements, policies, procedures; student learning goals by area; content requirements by area; assessment of student learning outcomes; faculty qualifications and responsibilities; and organization structure, governance, and program leadership.
- Completed academic program review of general education based on APR charter requirements. Draft approved by the General Education Subcommittee and forwarded for review to colleges and university community.

*Graduate Studies*

- Approved review criteria to guide in the Graduate Council's evaluation of the quality of master's degree programs. These explicit review criteria and greater clarity of structure ensure a comprehensive and consistent evaluation of program quality among graduate programs. (Attachment F – *Guidelines for the Graduate Council's Evaluation of Academic Program Reviews for Master's Degree Programs*)
- Added required review criteria related to graduate academic culture. Continued sustained discussions of graduate culture, reflecting upon issues related to definition, assessment methods, barriers, engagement of graduate students, experience and benefits from the perspective of diverse students, institutional-level and program-level support structures, among others. (Attachment G – *Graduate Academic Culture – Questions*)
- Updated the Graduate Assessment Plan to align with academic program review criteria and aligned academic program reviews with graduate assessment reporting. Revised and approved the *Assessment of Graduate Studies at CSU Stanislaus (2009)*, updated and implemented its annual reporting of individual

## An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Academic Program Review Process

program graduate assessment plans and reports, and aligned individual program's graduate student learning objectives and the six graduate student learning goals.

- Reviewed desirability of separate or integrated program review documents for graduate programs. Option remains; created specific criteria for guiding the evaluation of graduate APR whether separate or integrated.
- Began discussions of governance structures in support of doctoral programs, including placing priority for the development of the APR process for doctoral programs. A work group was formed to begin development of recommended APR criteria and process.

### *Institutional Research*

- Refined and expanded institutional research data elements to parallel revisions in program review criteria.
- Refined system for increasing representativeness of data for refined reporting of meaningful disaggregated data by college, program, and demographic characteristics such as gender and ethnicity; lower/upper division and graduate; and Stockton.
- Considered incorporation of national data base derived from the *National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity* (Delaware Study) for benchmarking program costs such as analysis of teaching loads by faculty category, direct cost of instruction, and externally funded research and service productivity. Exploring possible use of database as an analytical tool for faculty as part of APR to assess the relative position of their academic departments and programs against those of comparable institutions.

### *Provost's Meetings and Follow-up*

- Refined the structure for the provost's meetings with the faculty and dean, expectations for deans' recommendation letters, review of the preliminary implementation plan and submission of the final implementation plan, and the provost's follow-up letters of program continuance. Feedback provided by programs participating in spring 2009 meetings indicates the effectiveness of these changes. (Attachment H – *Provost's Academic Program Review Letter*)

### *Students' Participation*

- Discussed methods for increasing student participation in APR. Colleges and departments pursuing strategies (e.g., add an undergraduate student and graduate student, as applicable to college APR review teams); currently optional for colleges. Student representatives serve as voting members on University Educational Policies Committee and Graduate Council.

### *Student Engagement*

- Requested programs under review for 2008/09 to consider participation in piloting an APR criterion related to fostering student engagement, under section on "Commitment to Student Learning." Several programs piloted this criterion; analysis of results is underway. (Attachment I – *Student Engagement in Academic Program Review*)

### *Timeline and Timeliness*

- Shortened timeline for process from beginning to end. A more compact timeline allows for currency of findings and actions and increased linkage between APR results and budgeting process (timed with provost's requests for college budget proposals).
- Affirmed adherence to timeline; postponements/delays should be rare and for compelling reasons. (Deans to monitor progress by establishing internal college dates for various steps in consultation with appropriate college bodies.)

CONCLUSION

As these various types of evidence demonstrate, CSU Stanislaus exceeds WASC expectations for effective program reviews. The University continues to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic program review process, makes adjustments, monitors the process, and uses findings for program and learning improvement. Further, the campus employs strategies for integration of program reviews to assessment processes, future curricular planning, and resource allocations. Most importantly, academic program reviews ensure continued integrity and viability of academic programs.

DMD:rlc 7/27/09

## Attachment A

**Self-Assessment of WASC Educational Effectiveness Review Requirements for Program Reviews**  
California State University, Stanislaus

Listed below are overall findings of CSU Stanislaus' self-assessment, using WASC's scale of *initial*, *emerging*, *developed*, and *highly developed* (with plus and minus indicators).

Table 1.

WASC Standards/CFRs, Addressing New 2008 Requirements of the Institutional Review Process (Table B)/ WASC Suggested Approaches for Evaluating Program Review on EER Visits

CFR	CFR Description	Rating/Comment	Evidence
CFR 2.7	All programs subject to systematic program review.	<i>Highly developed.</i> All academic programs (undergraduate and graduate degrees, general education, interdisciplinary, and independent minors) and administrative support units subject to program review.	Academic Program Review Procedures Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures
	Includes analysis of achievement of student learning objectives and outcomes.	<i>Developed.</i> The policy requires programs to provide an analysis of students' achievement of learning objectives based on institutional research data as well as findings from the program's internal academic assessment. Most programs do this very well; a few continue to enhance the sophistication of their assessment efforts, especially direct assessment methods.	Academic Program Review Procedures Academic Program Review Self Studies Program Assessment Plans and Annual Updates Assessment Council minutes
	Includes analysis of retention and completion data.	<i>Developed.</i> Through the program reviews, all programs are required to evaluate retention/graduation data and provide insight into historical trends and future actions to enhance retention and completion rates. Enrollment Services, President's Cabinet, Student Success Committee, and other groups review aggregate retention and graduation data for reflection and appropriate recommendations for improvement.	Academic Program Review Data (APR Procedures: Appendix 1). Enrollment Management minutes President's Weekly Report Student Success Committee minutes
	Includes results of licensing examinations and placement (where appropriate)	<i>Highly developed.</i> Accredited programs are sophisticated in use of licensure and placement data and are inextricably linked to professional success.	WASC Required Data Elements 7.1, Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators and 8.1, Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators Peer Data Sources Peer Institutions as an External Source of Institutional Quality
	Includes evidence from external constituencies (employers/professional organizations).	<i>Developed-</i> All accredited programs and 40% of the non-accredited programs include data derived from external constituencies.	WASC Required Data Elements 7.1, Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators and 8.1, Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators Peer Data Sources Peer Institutions as an External Source of Institutional Quality

Table 1 (continued)

CFR	Description	Rating/Comment	Evidence
CFR 4.4	Employs deliberate set of quality assurance processes for program review.	<i>Highly developed.</i> The APR process is deliberate, systematic, and implemented with great oversight. Over the past decades, the APR process has been substantially improved; is increasingly evidentiary and focused on assessment of student learning.	Academic Program Review Procedures College-level Academic Program Review Processes College, Dean, and Provost letters Academic Program Review Workshop
	Includes assessing effectiveness and tracking results over time.	<i>Developed-</i> . Assessing effectiveness is central to the APR process; institutional research data provides longitudinal data for tracking student success; within programs, consistent tracking results over time varies and remains an area for improvement.	Academic Program Review Procedures Academic Program Review Self Studies Academic Program Review Data (APR Procedures: Appendix 1)
	Using comparative data from external sources.	<i>Emerging+</i> . Increased use of external comparative data occurs through CSU system comparisons and other peer review benchmarking studies, especially for university-wide institutional data of survey results and direct measures (such as Collegiate Learning Assessment). Benchmarking of programmatic student learning outcomes remains area for enhanced developed.	Benchmarking: CSU and UC Campus Comparison of Program Review Processes Peer Data Sources Peer Institutions as an External Source of Institutional Quality
	Improving curriculum and pedagogy (program improvement).	<i>Developed.</i> Each program's APR provides substantial evidence of the use of assessment results for curricular and pedagogical improvement.	Academic Program Review Self Studies WASC Required Data Elements 7.1, Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators and 8.1, Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators Peer Data Sources Peer Institutions as an External Source of Institutional Quality

An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Academic Program Review Process

Table 1 (continued)

WASC Table B/ Suggested Approaches	Description	Rating/Comment	Evidence
WASC Table B/Suggested Approaches	Meets WASC expectations for integration of student learning assessment into program reviews.	<i>Developed.</i> See campus self-ratings for each criterion on WASC's rubric. Overall, articulation of assessment and program review processes has been greatly improved over the past year through the leadership of the Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning working with faculty assessment coordinators.	Self-ratings using WASC Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews
	Aligned with program and campus planning and budgeting processes.	<i>Emerging+.</i> Substantial progress has been made to ensure alignment occurs at both college and university levels. Current severe budget climate has negated ability to respond, as normally would occur, with plans for new program development, hiring new faculty, and increasing instructional resources.	Framing the Future: California State University, Stanislaus Strategic Plan College-level Academic Program Review Processes Academic Affairs Program and Budget Planning and Allocations
	Process itself reviewed on a systematic basis.	<i>Highly developed.</i> The campus collects annual feedback regarding the review process and makes adjustments in procedures that do not alter policy; conducts formal reviews of the effectiveness of its program review process at least once every five years. Most current revisions occurred in 1996, 2002, 2005, 2008.	Dr. Mary Allen Review (2007) Internal Evaluation 01/02, 07/08 and 08/09 An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Academic Program Review Process (2009) Evaluation of the Support Unit Review Process (2009)
	Program reviews conducted in a timely manner and keeping with good practices.	<i>Developed.</i> The University Educational Policies Committee and the deans gave priority to ensuring support structures allowed for the timely completion of analytical program reviews to ensure "closing the loop." Evidentiary support is abundant to illustrate the process responds to best practices for effective program review.	Academic Program Review Procedures Academic Program Review Schedule Benchmarking: CSU and UC Campus Comparison of Program Review Processes Self-ratings using WASC Rubrics
	Program reviews are available for review.	<i>Yes.</i> Completed reviews are available in print copy on the campus. Implementation plans and the provost's final letter of determination for program continuance posted on website.	Archival records in Office of Academic Programs

## An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Academic Program Review Process

Listed below are overall findings of CSU Stanislaus self-assessment for the integration of student learning assessment into program reviews (using WASC's scale of *initial*, *emerging*, *developed*, and *highly developed*, with plus and minus indicators):

Table 2.

## WASC Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews

Criterion	Rating
<b>Required Elements</b>	
Faculty provide and evaluate student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, and benchmark results.	<i>Developed</i> . A formal campus process results in programs' submission of annual reports and updated plans for assessment of student learning and overall findings (not data). <i>Emerging+</i> for use of benchmarks. Use of benchmark results has increased substantially through leadership of Office of Institutional Research for university-wide measures and is increasing in use for the more difficult benchmarking of student learning outcomes at the program level.
Faculty provide a description of subsequent changes and impact of changes based on review of evidence.	<i>Developed+</i> . Annual Assessment Reports verify programmatic changes resulting from student learning assessment and other evidentiary data sources.
Faculty present a plan for the next assessment cycle.	<i>Developed</i> . Faculty provide implementation plans and update assessment plans as part of the APR and assessment processes.
<b>Process of Review</b>	
Reviews include an evaluation of program learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact by internal and external reviewers.	<i>Developed</i> . The APR process requires analytical, evaluative review of learning assessment, assessment plan, and use of annual findings; <i>Emerging</i> for benchmark results. <i>Emerging</i> for use of external reviewers. Frequency of use of external evaluators has increased as resources are provided to support hiring of external reviewers.
Programs use feedback from reviewers to improve student learning.	<i>Highly developed</i> for accredited programs. <i>Emerging</i> for non-accredited programs.
<b>Planning and Budgeting</b>	
The campus integrates program review into campus planning and budgeting processes.	<i>Emerging+</i> . Substantial progress made to make more formal process to ensure alignment. Has become increasingly more important during time of severe budgetary reductions.
<b>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</b>	
A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact.	<i>Developed</i> . College committees, deans, and provost participate in program reviews and academic assessment. The Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning, Director of Faculty Development, and the Associate Vice President for Assessment and Quality Assurance work with the Assessment Council and other groups to provide feedback about the quality of assessment initiatives and serve as resources for improvement.
Programs use feedback from annual review to improve student learning.	<i>Developed</i> . Each program's annual assessment report provides substantial evidence of the use of assessment results for curricular, pedagogical, and student learning improvement.
The campus provides support for follow-up activities.	<i>Developed</i> . Substantial investment of resources in supporting faculty's assessment efforts and follow-up actions. Currently, the impact of the current severe budget constraints remains unknown but likely will reduce or delay normal campus allocations while rightfully maintaining priority for instruction and related academic support functions, to the extent possible.
<b>The Student Experience</b>	
Students are aware of and involved in the program review process (through follow-up on surveys, focus groups, etc).	<i>Highly developed</i> . Students' participation in indirect and direct assessment methods is substantial. <i>Emerging</i> . Areas for development are direct student involvement in committees providing evaluation of program effectiveness and student leadership for aggressive involvement in shaping direction of academic assessment.
Students provide evaluative feedback on their own work.	<i>Emerging</i> . Varies programmatically. Increasing use of capstone courses, portfolio, performance displays, and other methods in which students provide evaluative feedback of their progress on specific learning outcomes.

Table 2: Evidence

Academic Affairs Program and Budget Planning and Allocations

Academic Program Review Procedures

Academic Program Review Self Studies

External Reviewer reports in Academic Program Review Self Studies

Program Assessment Plans and Annual Updates

Core Indicators of Educational Quality

College-level Academic Program Review Processes

WASC Required Data Elements 7.1, Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

WASC Required Data Elements 8.1, Inventory of WASC Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

Accreditation Self Studies and accrediting agency reports

Institutional ePortfolio

Voluntary System of Accountability and other external documents reporting assessment goals and accomplishments

Support Unit Reviews

Peer Data Sources

Peer Institutions as an External Source of Institutional Quality

Principles of Assessment of Student Learning

**Attachment B**  
**Benchmarking: CSU and UC Campus Comparison of Program Review Processes**

Response to the following questions from CSU Stanislaus dated 10/20/08 –

<http://www.csustan.edu/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/ProgramReviewGrid.CSUStanislaus.pdf>

Full report (campuses submitting responses) available at

<http://www.csustan.edu/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/WASCPProgramReviewCSUComparison2008.pdf>

1. Are undergraduate and graduate program reviews separate or combined?
2. Is there a long-term schedule for reviews? How many years ahead does the schedule cover? What is the interval between interviews? Are there provisions for an early review if deemed necessary?
3. Who initiates and oversees the review process guidelines?
4. What office/committee is responsible for the program review process guidelines?
5. What office/committee is responsible for the self review guidelines?
6. What data are required as part of the program review process? Who collects the data and makes them available to the program? Does the department collect and analyze additional data independently?
7. Must departments state educational objectives for programs and courses and provide information about assessing success in meeting those objectives? In what form?
8. Who provides staff support for the review process?
9. Who funds any extraneous costs associated with the review (external reviewers, unusual needs)?
10. How is the dean's office involved in the review process? Do the internal review team members meet with the dean?
11. Who proposes and selects the members of a review or ad hoc committee? Is there a member from Undergraduate Council or the Educational Policy Committee?
12. Is there an external review committee involved in program reviews? Who selects the external reviewer(s)?
13. With whom or with what committee does the external reviewer(s) meet (not including department faculty, students, etc.)? Do meetings occur before, during, or after the review process?
14. Does the review include a separate external reviewer report? Are specific guidelines given to external reviewers for this report?
15. Do external reviewers receive an honorarium?
16. What type of student input is included in the review materials?
17. Are students involved in the committee doing the review? How? Are there limitations to their participation?
18. Does the review committee or ad hoc conduct a site visit? Who is invited to these sessions?
19. Briefly describe the review process. Beginning with the self-study, what offices or what committees review the departmental report; and who reviews or comments on the final recommendation?
20. At what stage does the department provide a response letter?
21. What is the outcome of the review? Is an action plan developed and monitored following the review? After the review is closed, is there a timeframe for follow-up? What form does a follow-up take; when is it done; and by whom?
22. Of the various types of reviewers does one provide a better overall critique and perspective of the program?
23. In an attempt to identify "best practices," what is it about your review process that is especially helpful?
24. Outside of the self-review, what about the process takes most time and effort?
25. What changes have had the most positive impact on the review process?
26. What changes would make your review process more effective?
27. What happens if a program is recalcitrant about participating in the review, citing reasons why now would not be a reasonable or possible time for the review?
28. Do you have programs that are not departmentally based and include faculty from multiple departments? How are their reviews different? Are there special problems that occur or changes taken in the review process?
29. Do you have an arbitration process in place if a department objects to or rejects the conclusion of the review?
30. What other information do you consider important that might not have been addressed with these questions?

## Attachment C

### Academic Program Review Procedures California State University, Stanislaus

In accordance with the academic program review policy of California State University, these procedures are provided for the review of academic programs.

The academic program review's primary goal is to enhance the quality of academic programs. To achieve this purpose, these academic program review procedures encourage self-study and planning within programs and strengthen connections among the strategic plans of the program, the college, and the university. In addition, the essential element of the academic program review is the identification and evaluation of student learning goals as a key indicator of program effectiveness. Further, academic program reviews provide information for curricular and budgetary planning decisions at each administrative level. [CFRs 4.1- 4.4](#)

The academic program review process is based on a cycle of self-inquiry, review, and improvement. The focus of the academic program review is on inquiry, analysis, and evaluation, not merely description. The reflections and conclusions drawn from the academic program review are to be evidentiary, with clear evidence that the faculty have evaluated data derived from their program's goals and student learning objectives as well as data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (see Appendix 1, *Academic Program Review Data*). Programs may secure additional program-specific data by contacting the Office of Institutional Research. The basic components of academic program review include the following: [CFR 4.5](#)

- a self-study, recommendations, and preliminary implementation plan completed by the faculty associated with the program;
- review and recommendations by the college governance committees;
- review and recommendations by the university governance committees, when appropriate;
- revision of the preliminary implementation plan in response to recommendations by the department, college, and university governance committees and the administration;
- final approval by the college dean and provost of all elements of the program review documents; and
- implementation of actions to improve program effectiveness. [CFR 4.6](#)

The college review committee, college dean, and university committee (as appropriate) recommend to the provost one of the following actions as a result of the academic program review:

1. Program approved for continuance with expectation for successful implementation of the seven-year plan.
2. Program approved for continuance with specified modifications and under conditions noted, including progress reports and possible review in less than seven years.
3. Program recommended for discontinuance. The university's policy for program discontinuance is initiated.

The provost, with delegated authority from the president, makes the final determination for program continuance through issuance of a letter at the completion of the review process.

The academic program review procedures are updated as necessary for currency and consistency with university changes in structure, institutional data, and academic programs.

#### I. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

##### Faculty Governance [CFRs 4.6, 4.7](#)

Governance responsibility for the development, implementation, and periodic review of the effectiveness of university-level academic program review procedures is vested with the University Educational Policies Committee in consultation with other governance committees participating in or affected by academic program review procedures. Academic program review procedures are dynamic, subject to continual examination and refinement as necessary for currency with university changes (e.g., structure, institutional research/assessment processes, and new and revised academic programs). Changes to the academic program review procedures may be recommended by

and to the University Educational Policies Committee for consideration, consultation with the Graduate Council and Provost's Council of Deans, and recommendation to the Academic Senate.

**Administration** CFRs 4.6, 4.7

The vice provost, on behalf of the provost, manages the academic program review process and works closely with the college deans to ensure that (a) a meaningful and thorough review is conducted for each degree program, interdisciplinary program, honors program, and general education; (b) self-study reports, recommendations, and implementation plans are completed in a timely manner; (c) outcomes of the review are communicated to the campus community and the CSU; and (d) outcomes of the review are linked to decision making processes for academic program development, strategic planning, and budgetary processes.

**Program Faculty** CFRs 1.2, 4.6, 4.7

Each academic program has an identified department chair (or equivalent), program faculty, and dean (or appropriate administrator) who are responsible for overseeing the academic program. The program faculty is normally the department faculty. All faculty participate in the preparation and review of the program's academic program review. Interdisciplinary programs are governed by an interdisciplinary set of faculty whose rights and responsibilities are identified by an established interdisciplinary program charter. (See Appendix 2, *Interdisciplinary Programs and Honors Program Charter*, and Appendix 3, *General Education Program Charter and Academic Program Review*)

Program faculty are responsible for developing expected student learning objectives for each program and for employing methods annually to evaluate program effectiveness in achieving programmatic student learning objectives. The assessment of these objectives forms the core of the academic program review. (Responsibility for assessment of student learning at the classroom level resides with the individual faculty member and is not an element of academic program review.) Overall administrative leadership in support of developing programmatic learning outcomes lies with the college deans with support from the vice provost. Faculty leadership is provided by the Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning, the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee of the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), and department chairs.

**College and University Committees** CFRs 4.6, 4.7

Colleges evaluate academic program reviews using their established processes and criteria consistent with university policy and procedures and accreditation standards and submit such documents to the Vice Provost. Colleges ensure review committee members receive orientation and training for conducting program reviews. Colleges may establish additional requirements for the effectiveness of the academic program review process. Similarly, university committees (University Educational Policies Committee and the Graduate Council) employ processes and criteria to evaluate academic program reviews, consistent with requirements identified in the *Constitution of the General Faculty*.

**External Program Reviewers** CFR 4.4

While the internal review processes are essential for program quality, an external program review perspective may also play an important role in the evaluation process. Use of external reviewer(s) is strongly encouraged and may be requested during the self study phase or following the completion of the academic program review. Appendix 4, *External Reviewer for Academic Program Review and Description of Process for Hiring and Conduct of Work*, describes procedures for conducting an external review.

**II. PROGRAMS TO BE REVIEWED**

The academic program review document is to be developed by the program faculty and accompanied by signatures of the program faculty and dean(s) (See Appendix 5, *Signature Page*).

**List of Academic Programs** CFRs 2.1, 2.2

The following programs are subject to academic program reviews: baccalaureate, master's, and post-baccalaureate credential programs; interdisciplinary programs (majors and stand-alone minors); honors program; and general education (see Appendix 6, *Listing of Programs for Academic Program Review*). Doctoral programs follow a separate

template, *Academic Program Review Procedures for Doctoral Programs*. The Graduate Council is responsible for the development of academic program review procedures for doctoral programs. Implementation pending approval of Academic Senate and President.

#### **Accredited Programs CFRs 2.1, 2.2**

For programs subject to professional, disciplinary, or specialized accreditation, academic program review is coordinated with the accreditation or re-accreditation review cycle. The self-study developed for professional or specialized accreditation reviews normally provides the essential requirements of academic program review and may, therefore, be used wholly or partially as the academic program review self study document, with approval by the college dean. The remaining steps in the academic program process are followed for accredited programs, including college and university committee review, implementation plan, and the meeting with the provost. Appendix 7, *Substitution of Accreditation Self Study for the Academic Program Review Self Study* describes the process for substitution of the accreditation self study for the academic program review self study.

### **III. PROCESS OVERVIEW AND CHRONOLOGY**

As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic program reviews must be conducted periodically in accordance with the established schedule. The process follows the chronology and timeline found in Appendix 8, *Academic Program Review Chronology*, to ensure meaningful review, timely review, feedback, and submission of academic program review reports to the provost and CSU Board of Trustees. At CSU Stanislaus, programs are reviewed on a seven-year cycle. This schedule may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the provost, college dean, departmental chair, or in compliance with recommendations from prior academic program reviews. Programs accredited by a disciplinary accrediting agency are reviewed in accordance with the review cycle established by the agency, not to exceed seven years. It is the responsibility of each individual and committee to conduct the Academic Program Review in accordance with the prescribed timeline.

Requests for delaying a review are rarely granted. If necessary for compelling reasons, requests for a delay are initiated by the department chair/program administrator to the college dean, who determines whether or not to advance the recommendation to the vice provost. The decision to delay a review rests with the vice provost and normally is granted only in rare circumstances to coordinate with a professional accreditation review process or to allow a new program sufficient time to conduct a review. Delays are granted normally for one year only.

### **IV. SELF-STUDY CRITERIA**

The academic program review process provides a comprehensive, candid, and reflective self-study that focuses on future planning to enhance student learning and program quality. **CFR 2.7**

#### **Undergraduate and Graduate Self-Study Documents CFRs 2.2a, 2.2b**

Departments with undergraduate and graduate programs provide either a separate or integrated review for each degree level, including comprehensive assessment of student learning and program functioning at both levels. If an integrated review document is submitted, each review criterion is addressed and responses clearly differentiated for the baccalaureate and master's degree.

#### **Interdisciplinary Programs CFR 2.2**

Interdisciplinary programs are reviewed using the same criteria as academic majors, with appropriate modification. Responsibility for academic program quality and the review of academic programs rests with the interdisciplinary studies faculty. The academic program review self study document is to be developed by the faculty of the interdisciplinary program and accompanied by signatures of the program faculty and dean(s).

The following criteria are addressed in the self-study document:

#### **Changes since the Last Academic Program Review CFR 2.7**

Describe and evaluate the effectiveness of actions taken in response to each of the recommendations made in the previous academic program review. Briefly describe important program and field changes over the past seven years and how the curriculum was revised for currency in response to these changes.

**Enrollment Trends** CFR 1.2

Based on institutional research data, summarize the program's enrollment trends, student characteristics, retention and graduation rates, degrees conferred, time to degree, course enrollments, and student/faculty ratio. Provide an evaluation of the program's success in recruiting, retaining, and graduating students—overall and disaggregated by demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, ethnicity, and transfer/native). Describe key actions taken or planned to ensure student success.

**Commitment to Student Learning** CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.10

List the learning objectives for students majoring in the program. Referring to the Annual Program Assessment Updates describe how achievement of each of these learning objectives is evaluated and documented through both indirect and direct methods. (Append annual assessment reports and curriculum map that aligns core courses with program goals, student learning objectives, assessment methods, instructional emphasis, and primary assessment methods.)

Based on the institutional research data and the data collected through Annual Program Assessment, describe successful outcomes and any changes the program faculty have made and/or plan to make for improving student learning, curriculum, instructional delivery, and other elements of program effectiveness.

For master's programs, also describe how the information derived from the assessment of the six student learning goals for graduate students has been used to improve the graduate program: Students will demonstrate –

1. advanced knowledge, skills, and values appropriate to their discipline.
2. the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.
3. the ability to work as individual researchers/scholars as well as in collaboration with others in contributing to the scholarship of their disciplines, as appropriate.
4. relevant knowledge of the global perspectives appropriate to their discipline.
5. knowledge of new and various methods and technologies as appropriate to their discipline.
6. advanced oral and written communication skills, complemented as appropriate to the discipline, by the ability to access and analyze information from a myriad of primary, print, and technological sources.

**Curriculum and Instruction***Delivery of Instructional Program* CFRs 3.6, 3.7

Evaluate the program's effectiveness in offering the instructional program in Turlock, Stockton, and/or other off-campus sites, and via distance education. Describe issues and actions taken or planned, as appropriate related to program delivery, such as the scheduling of courses in order to meet student program needs and for program completion, library resources, and technological support.

*Advising/Mentoring* CFRs 2.12, 2.13, 2.14

Evaluate the effectiveness of student advising and mentoring and involvement with student majors.

*Graduate Academic Culture* CFR 2.2b

For graduate programs, evaluate the effectiveness of the methods used by the graduate program to sustain a graduate-level academic culture. Include an evaluation of the extent of active student involvement with the scholarly literature of the field and ongoing student scholarly engagement. As appropriate, identify strategies for improving graduate culture that the department, college, or university may employ.

*General Education* CFR 2.2a

Evaluate the program's effectiveness in providing service courses to the General Education program. Provide a review of all general education courses offered by the program, including a paragraph for each area of general education describing how these courses align with general education goals and the results (not the data) of any assessment activities undertaken to make this determination. Attach up-to-date sample syllabi for each general education course offered by the program.

Describe how the General Education program aligns with/complements the program's student learning objectives, by describing in a paragraph or two how the 51-unit program complements or supports the major program of study, including (by reference if appropriate) any assessment activities or discussions used to make this determination. Identify any areas for further development or other recommendations for the GE program.

*Written Communication* **CFR 2.2a**

Describe the effectiveness of the program in improving students' writing skills through the curriculum and/or writing proficiency courses.

*Service Courses* **CFR 2.2a**

Evaluate the program's effectiveness in providing service courses to other majors.

*Teaching* **CFR 2.8**

Describe the teaching philosophies and instructional methods used within the program and evaluate how well these support achievement of program learning outcomes and promote student learning. Evaluate how well the program encourages, evaluates, and rewards high-quality teaching.

*Curricular Plans and Alignment* **CFR 1.1**

Describe future curricular plans and their alignment with the college and university's mission and strategic plan.

*Units Beyond 120, etc.* **CFR 2.2a**

*Units Beyond 120 for Undergraduate Programs.* Title 5 (section 40508) requires that "each campus shall establish and maintain a monitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 units." Display the program units using the template provided in Appendix 9, *Baccalaureate Degree Audit Information* and provide a justification if the units exceed 120.

*Units for Graduate and Post-baccalaureate Credential Programs* **CFR 2.2b**

For graduate programs that exceed 30 units for a Master of Arts degree or 36 units for a Master of Science degree, provide a justification for the total program units. For post-baccalaureate credential programs that exceed units required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, provide a justification for the additional units.

**Faculty** **CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4**

Evaluate collective faculty expertise for covering the breadth of the program's curriculum. Summarize and evaluate institutional research data regarding faculty and their deployment – sufficiency of full and part-time faculty, released time and reimbursed time from grants/contracts, anticipated retirements, and other faculty issues important for program effectiveness.

Evaluate effectiveness of collective faculty engagement on balance across scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and level of support for these scholarly activities. Evaluate program support for and involvement in faculty development, especially new non-tenured, and part-time faculty.

**Implementation Plan**

*Preliminary Implementation Plan* **CFRSs 4.2, 4.3**

As a result of the self study, the department chair develops a *preliminary* implementation plan that reflects the view of the program faculty. This preliminary implementation plan is discussed by the department chair with the Provost, Dean, and Vice Provost during the academic program review meeting. Participants in this meeting may also include the program coordinator and/or faculty as determined by the department chair and dean.

The implementation plan guides the activities of the program for the subsequent seven years. The implementation plan includes (but is not limited to) the following elements:

1. Key recommendations of the program faculty resulting from the self-study.
2. Anticipated student profile in terms of number and type of students over the next seven years.

3. Action steps to be taken in order to achieve each of the recommendations and student enrollments over the next seven years.
4. Types of human, fiscal, and physical resources needed to implement enrollment projections and recommendations.

*Final Implementation Plan* CFRSs 4.2, 4.3

The *final* implementation plan results from discussion and consultation among the program representative(s), the department chair, college and university committees, the college dean, the Vice Provost, and the Provost.

The *final* implementation plan is submitted electronically to the Vice Provost no later than three weeks after the meeting with the Provost.

*Improving the Academic Program Review Procedures* CFRSs 4.2, 4.3

As part of the Provost's Academic Program Review meeting and/or with the final implementation plan, the department chair provides an evaluation of the effectiveness of the academic program review procedures and recommendations for improving the process. Elements to consider include the review criteria, internal and/or external review components, assessment of student learning, institutional research data, timeline, college and university review processes, student participation, and faculty participation.

Approved by the Academic Senate May 11, 2004

Approved by President Hughes July 1, 2004

Amended and approved by the Academic Senate May 12, 2009

## Appendix 1 Academic Program Review Data

The Office of Institutional Research collects, analyzes, and summarizes program data since the last Academic Program Review (normally 7 years). For each program undergoing review, data are provided that allow for comparison to data from the previous academic program review. For selected variables, university and college data are also provided. Additional data are derived from the program's assessment of student learning.

### STUDENT ENROLLMENT

- Table 2.1 University-Wide Headcount Enrollment by College and Degree Level – Fall Terms
- Table 2.2 University-Wide Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level – Fall Terms
- Table 2.3 College Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level – Fall Terms
- Table 2.5 CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level – Fall Terms

### ENTERING STUDENTS

- Table 3.1 First-Time Freshmen University-Wide Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics – Fall Terms
- Table 3.1a First-Time Freshmen College Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics – Fall Terms
- Table 3.1b First-Time Freshmen CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics – Fall Terms
- Table 3.2 First-Time Freshmen University-Wide Headcount Enrollment and Average SAT by College – Fall Terms
- Table 3.3 First-Time Freshmen University-Wide Headcount Enrollment and Average SAT by CSU Degree Program – Fall Terms
- Table 3.5 First-Time Transfer University-Wide Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics – Fall Terms
- Table 3.5a First-Time Transfer College Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics – Fall Terms
- Table 3.5b First-Time Transfer CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics – Fall Terms
- Table 3.6 First-Time Transfer University-Wide Headcount Enrollment by College and Term
- Table 3.7 First-Time Transfer University-Wide Headcount Enrollment by Transfer Institution and Term

### STUDENT DEGREES AWARDED

- Table 4.1 Degrees Conferred University-Wide by Degree Type
- Table 4.2 Degrees Conferred University-Wide by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level
- Table 4.3 Degrees Conferred by College, Demographic Characteristics, and Degree Level
- Table 4.5 Degrees Conferred by CSU Degree Program (HEGIS), Demographic Characteristics, and Degree Level

### RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES

- Table 5.1 Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen University-Wide
- Table 5.2 Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen by CSU Degree Program (HEGIS) at Entry
- Table 5.3 Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Transfers with 60 or more Transfer Units University-Wide
- Table 5.4 Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Transfers with 60 or more Transfer Units by CSU Degree Program (HEGIS) at Entry

### COURSE GRADE DISTRIBUTION

- Table 6.1 University-Wide Course Grade Distribution
- Table 6.2 Undergraduate-Level Course Grade Distribution by Course Subject
- Table 6.3 Graduate-Level Course Grade Distribution by Course Subject

**COURSE ENROLLMENT HISTORY**

- Table 7.1 Academic Discipline Profile by Discipline and Course Level
- CSU Academic Discipline Reports Overview

**FACULTY AND STAFF**

- Table 8.1 Full-Time Faculty and Staff by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Primary Occupational Activity, and Department
- Table 8.2 Part-Time Faculty and Staff by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Primary Occupational Activity, and Department
- Table 8.3 Full-Time Faculty by Faculty Status, Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Academic Rank, and Department
- Table 8.4 New Full-Time Permanent Hires by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Primary Occupational Activity, and Department

**NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (NSSE)**

- Table 9.1a National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Combined Surveys, Summary Results by Benchmark Area, University-Wide and College, Active and Collaborate Learning
- Table 9.1b National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Combined Surveys, Summary Results by Benchmark Area, University-Wide and College, Student-Faculty Interactions
- Table 9.1c National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Combined Surveys, Summary Results by Benchmark Area, University-Wide and College, Supportive Campus Environment
- Table 9.1d National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Combined Surveys, Summary Results by Benchmark Area, University-Wide and College, Enriching Educational Experience
- Table 9.1e National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Combined Surveys, Summary Results by Benchmark Area, University-Wide and College, Level of Academic Challenge

**GRADUATION SENIOR SURVEY**

- Table 10.1 Graduating Senior Surveys, Responses University-Wide by Year of Survey
- Table 10.2 Graduating Senior Surveys, Aggregate Responses, Major and College

**OTHER (as available)**

- Graduate School Exit Survey – University-wide and College
- Alumni Survey – University-wide and College
- Collegiate Learning Assessment – University-wide and College

**OTHER (as requested)**

- Data unique to each program's learning goals as requested by the college dean. Please email Dr. Angel Sanchez ([AASanchez@csustan.edu](mailto:AASanchez@csustan.edu)), Director for Institutional Research, with your data request.

## Appendix 2

### Interdisciplinary Programs and Honors Program Charter

The academic program review of interdisciplinary major and minor programs and the Honors Program includes a self study responding to criteria, modified as appropriate to the program, and an updated charter that governs program operations as approved by dean and provost.

The charter includes, at a minimum, the following information:

1. Mission
2. Program and curricular description
3. Program goals, student learning goals/outcomes
4. Assessment Plan/Report of methods for assessing student learning outcomes
5. Administrative reporting structure
6. Program coordinator, director, or chair – by name and department
7. Program faculty by name and department
8. Process for selection and evaluation of program leader
9. Program coordinator responsibilities
10. Process for faculty selection and evaluation for program affiliation
11. Program faculty's responsibilities
12. Advising structure and responsibility
13. Fiscal support

### Appendix 3

#### GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

##### CHARTER AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The academic program review of general education includes the traditional program, both upper and lower division requirements/courses, and the Summit program. An updated charter governs program operations as approved by the provost.

The academic program review self study for the general education program is completed by the Faculty Director for General Education in collaboration with the General Education Subcommittee of the University Educational Policies Committee and under the direction of the Vice Provost. The academic program review for general education adheres to the following path for development and review:

1. Faculty Director for General Education and General Education Subcommittee
2. University Educational Policies Committee
3. Colleges (Deans, Curriculum Committees)
4. University Educational Policies Committee (to Academic Senate via Senate Executive Committee on UEPC's recommendation)
5. Vice Provost (as delegated by the Provost)

Specific recommendations resulting from the academic program review that establish or revise policy follow normal campus procedures for policy approval via the Academic Senate and President.

##### MISSION

##### PROGRAM GOALS

##### STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES/OUTCOMES

- A – G and Multicultural

##### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION/COURSES

- Program Structure (Traditional and Summit)
- Policies
- Course approval criteria and processes
- Course Ordering Requirements
- Pedagogy/Instructional Delivery (e.g., face-to-face, distance learning, hybrid)
- Scheduling (classroom space, day/evening, time modules, term)
- Distribution of courses across disciplines

##### LEADERSHIP/ORGANIZATION

- Program leadership
- Governance Structure and Responsibilities
- Administrative Accountability
- Process for selection of program leader

##### FACULTY

- Program faculty (faculty demographics and qualifications)
- Faculty Responsibilities

##### ADVISING

- Advising structure, responsibility, and effectiveness of processes

## **FISCAL**

- Fiscal support

## **ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING AND PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS**

Review effectiveness of the general education program elements as noted above, with reporting specifically focused on student learning.

- Student learning objectives
- Methods used for assessing learning objectives
  - Direct and Indirect
  - External reviewers
- Description of how data were collected, how data were used to make recommendations for improving student learning and the General Education program, and what actions for improvement are recommended.

## **CURRICULUM MAP**

- Illustrate General Education learning goals by General Education Area
- Track the introduction and reinforcement of General Education learning goals in lower/upper division
- Assess student achievement and levels of attainment of General Education learning goals

## **OUTCOMES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW**

Academic Program Review

- Academic Program Review -- Executive Summary of Findings of Program Effectiveness
- Implementation Plan – List of recommended actions and timeline to the University Educational Policies Committee

Program Document

- Description of General Education Program
- General Education Requirements, Policies, Procedures
- Student Learning Goals by Area
- Content Requirements by Area
- Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
- Faculty Qualifications and Responsibilities
- Organizational Structure; Governance; Program Leadership

Self Study for Reaccreditation

- Information for inclusion in Educational Effectiveness Review Report for Self Study

## Appendix 4

California State University, Stanislaus  
Office of Academic Programs

### External Reviewer for Academic Program Review Description of Process for Hiring and Conduct of Work

#### Overview

In accordance with academic program review policy and procedures, external program review for non-accredited programs may occur during or after the self-study phase. The purpose for the external review is to assist faculty in improving program quality by providing a new comparative and broader perspective on the program and student learning. The external evaluators will be individuals of significant professional reputation in the field.

*During Self Study Phase:* For non-accredited programs, the use of an external program review as part of the self study is strongly encouraged for both baccalaureate and graduate programs. The department chair or the college dean may request that the program be subject to an external independent evaluation as part of the self-study phase of the academic program review. External reviewer(s) may be approved to review the self-study, conduct interviews, and employ other strategies to evaluate program effectiveness. The external reviewers' summary of findings and recommendations becomes part of the materials submitted to each level of review.

*Following Completion of the Academic Program Review:* In addition to the normal academic program review procedures, programs may be subject to an independent evaluation by at least two external evaluators. External program review occurs only in those instances where a thorough review of a program's self-study has been completed and the department, college dean, or provost indicates the efficacy of an external review. One of the evaluators normally will be from a CSU campus, while the other evaluator may be from a non-CSU institution, preferably within California. The external evaluators' report becomes part of the permanent academic program review file.

To accomplish this purpose, an external reviewer is provided a copy of the self-study and other relevant documents. The external reviewer then visits the campus for 1-2 days to meet with faculty, students, staff, community members, and administrators. The external reviewer conducts an exit interview and submits a written report within two weeks of the campus visit to the department chair and the college dean. The external evaluators' report becomes part of the permanent academic program review file.

#### Qualifications

External reviewers' qualifications include the following:

1. The highest degree in the relevant discipline
2. Rank of associate professor or professor
3. Distinguished record in related teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service
4. Holds faculty rank in the same or similar programs on their respective campuses
5. No conflict of interest
6. Ability to complete a site visit and submission of report within the prescribed timeline

#### Responsibilities

The external reviewer's primary responsibility is to provide an honest, unbiased professional judgment of program quality and student learning outcomes. The external reviewer performs the following responsibilities:

1. Reviews the draft self-study document.
2. Focuses on assessment findings, the quality of student learning, and the ability of the program to foster student learning; reviews sample student work from courses (introductory to culminating), as appropriate and with student and faculty identification removed from documents.
3. Conducts selected interviews with department chair, program faculty, staff, students, faculty members outside the department but associated with the program, the college dean, community groups, advisory groups, or other community members as appropriate to the program.
4. Employs other strategies appropriate to the discipline.

5. Conducts an exit meeting with department chair, program/departmental faculty, and college dean.
6. Writes summary of findings of strengths and areas for improvement for each of the criteria identified in the university's academic program review and other issues specific to the program as identified by the department chair and college dean. This review is to be forward-looking and yet realistic in terms of actions that can be accomplished by the department within existing resources, as well as actions that may require additional investment in the program. This document becomes part of the academic review process and is submitted to each level of review.

#### Nominations for External Evaluators

The college dean is responsible for the overall coordination of the external review. Nominations for evaluator(s) are solicited from the chair of the department of the program being reviewed and from other institutions, higher education associations, and professional organizations. The nominees are reviewed by the departmental faculty, who may reject any of the nominees for cause. The evaluators are selected from the remaining nominees by the college dean.

#### Materials Provided to the External Reviewer

The department chair coordinates the review schedule. Prior to the campus visit, the department chair provides to the external reviewer a copy of the visitation schedule, self study, and supporting documentation. Additional materials (e.g., course syllabi) should be available in the department office for review during the campus visit. It is essential that examples of student work are available for review as consistent with accreditation standards for direct assessment of student work and are completed in accordance with the university's *Principles for the Assessment of Student Learning*.

#### Honorarium and Expenses

The department chair works with the college dean to select the external reviewer(s). The department chair coordinates the travel arrangements with the external reviewer, in accordance with university travel policy. A consultant contract is issued to the external reviewer (normally \$250 per day), plus transportation and one-night lodging, as required. The honorarium and refunds are processed upon receipt of the written report from the external reviewer and documented accommodation and travel costs, as previously approved. Funds are provided by the college dean and supported, when possible, from the university-wide assessment account.

**Appendix 5**

**Signature Page**

**Academic Program Review**  
California State University, Stanislaus

---

Title of Program

<u>Signatures:</u>			
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
College Curriculum Committee Chair (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
College Dean (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
Graduate Council (if applicable) (Print)	Signature	Title	Date
University Educational Policies Committee (if applicable) (Print)	Signature	Title	Date

**Appendix 6**  
**Listing of Programs for Academic Program Review**

<b>Degree Program</b>	<b>Academic Unit</b>	<b>College Affiliation</b>	<b>Degree Type(s)</b>	<b>Hegis Code(s)</b>	<b>Last Review</b>	<b>Next Review</b>
Agricultural Studies	Department of Agricultural Studies	CHSS	BA	01014	N/A	2009-10
Anthropology	Department of Anthropology/Geography	CHSS	BA	22021	2001-02	2008-09
Applied Leadership	College of Business Administration (charter)	CBA	BS	49995	1998-99	2010-11
Art	Department of Art	COA	BA/BFA	10021 10022	1999-00	2009-10
Biological Sciences	Department of Biological Sciences	CNS	BA/BS	04011	1999-00	2008-09
Business Administration	Department of Accounting and Finance Department of Management, Operations, & Marketing	CBA	BS/MBA MSBA	05011 05041	2003-04 n/a	2010-11 2010-11
Chemistry	Department of Chemistry	CNS	BA/BS	19051	2000-01	2008-09
Child Development	Department of Psychology and Child Development	CHHS	BA	08231	2002-03	2009-10
Cognitive Studies	Department of Computer Science (charter)	CNS	BA	49016	2002-03	2008-09
Communication Studies	Department of Communication Studies	CHSS	BA	06011	2007-08	2014-15
Computer Information Systems	Department of Computer Information Systems	CBA	BS	07021	2003-04	2010-11
Computer Science	Department of Computer Science	CNS	BS	07011	2002-03	2009-10
Criminal Justice	Department of Criminal Justice	CHSS	BA/MA	21051	2002-03	2010-11
Ecology and Sustainability	Department of Biological Sciences	CNS	MS	04201	n/a	2011-12
Economics	Department of Economics	CHSS	BA	22041	2001-02	2008-09
Education	Department of Advanced Studies in Education, Department of Physical Education and Health, Department of Teacher Education	COE	MA/Post-baccalaureate Credential*	08011	2002-03	2010-11
English	Department of English	CHSS	BA/MA	15011	2001-02	2008-09
French program suspended	Department of Modern Languages	CHSS	BA	11021	2001-02	2008-09
Gender Studies	Department of Ethnic and Gender Studies	CHSS	BA	22990	n/a	2012-13
Genetic Counseling	Department of Biological Sciences	CNS	MS	12171	n/a	2012-13
Geography	Department of Anthropology and Geography	CHSS	BA	22061	2002-03	2009-10

Degree Program	Academic Unit	College Affiliation	Degree Type(s)	Hegis Code(s)	Last Review	Next Review
Geology	Department of Physics, Physical Sciences, and Geology	CNS	BS	19141	2007-08	2014-15
History	Department of History	CHSS	BA/MA	22051	2002-03	2009-10
Interdisciplinary Studies	Graduate School (charter)	All Colleges	MA/MS	49993	2002-03	2009-10
Liberal Studies	Department of Liberal Studies	COE	BA	49012	2007-08	2014-15
Marine Sciences	Department of Biological Sciences	CNS	MS	49022	2003-04	2010-11
Mathematics	Department of Mathematics	CNS	BA/BS	17011	2007-08	2014-15
<i>Music</i>	Department of Music	COA	BA/BM	10051 10041	2002-03	2012-13
<i>Nursing</i>	Department of Nursing	CHHS	BS	12031	2007-08	2014-15
<i>Nursing</i>	Department of Nursing	CHHS	MS	12031	n/a	2012-13
Philosophy	Department of Philosophy	CHSS	BA	15091	2007-08	2014-15
Physical Education	Department of Physical Education and Health	COE	BA	08351	2003-04	2009-10
Physical Sciences	Department of Physics, Physical Sciences, and Geology	CNS	BA	19011	2006-07	2013-14
Physics	Department of Physics, Physical Sciences, and Geology	CNS	BA/BS	19021	2006-07	2013-14
Political Science	Department of Politics and Public Administration	CHSS	BA	22071	2004-05	2011-12
<i>Psychology</i>	Department of Psychology	CHHS	BA/MA/MS	20011	2003-45	2010-11
<i>Public Administration</i>	Department of Politics and Public Administration	CHSS	MPA	21021	2004-05	2011-12
Social Sciences	Department of Ethnic and Gender Studies (charter)	CHSS	BA	22011	2003-04	2010-11
<i>Social Work</i>	Department of Social Work	CHHS	MSW	21041	2002-03	2010-11
Sociology	Department of Sociology	CHSS	BA	22081	2002-03	2009-10
Spanish	Department of Modern Languages	CHSS	BA	11051	2001-02	2008-09
Special Major	All Colleges (charter)	All Colleges	BA/BS	49993	2003-04	2010-11
<i>Theatre Arts</i>	Department of Theatre	COA	BA	10071	2002-03	2012-13
<i>Theatre</i>	<b>Department of Theatre</b>	<b>COA</b>	<b>BFA</b>	<b>10072</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>

\*The APR for post-baccalaureate credentials is conducted coincident with the degree program

Gray shading = Interdisciplinary program/charter

Italics = Accredited program

Red font = program not implemented

### General Education

Program	Academic Unit	College Affiliation	Degree Type	Hegis Code(s)	Last Review	Next Review
General Education	Office of General Education, General Education Subcommittee (charter)	All Colleges	n/a	n/a	2002-03	2007-08
General Education Summit Program	Office of General Education, General Education Subcommittee (charter)	All Colleges	n/a	n/a	2003-04	2010-11

**Honors Program**

<b>Program</b>	<b>College Affiliation</b>	<b>Degree Type</b>	<b>Hegis Code(s)</b>	<b>Last Review</b>	<b>Next Review</b>
Honors Program	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2006-07

**Interdisciplinary Minor Programs**

<b>Program</b>	<b>College Affiliation</b>	<b>Degree Type</b>	<b>Hegis Code(s)</b>	<b>Last Review</b>	<b>Next Review</b>
Environmental and Resource Studies	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	2004-05	2011-12
Ethnic Studies	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	2003-04	2010-11
Gender Studies	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	2003-04	2012-13
Gerontology	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2009-10
Latin American Studies	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	2004-05	2011-12
Permaculture	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2009-10

## Appendix 7

### Process

#### Substitution of Accreditation Self Study for the Academic Program Review Self Study

For programs subject to professional, disciplinary, or specialized accreditation, academic program review is coordinated with the accreditation or re-accreditation review cycle. The self-study developed for professional or specialized accreditation reviews normally provides the essential requirements of academic program review and may, therefore, be used for this purpose, with approval by the college dean.

The department chair requests of the college dean a substitution of the accreditation reports for the academic program review document. The following materials accompany the request:

- the accreditation standards and procedures,
- the accreditation self-study report,
- the team's findings, and
- the accrediting agency's final report of the accreditation decision.

A request for the accreditation document to serve as the self-study document is acceptable if each of the following criteria is met:

- 1) the program has undergone a comprehensive assessment as part of a state or national accreditation review;
- 2) the procedures and standards of the accrediting agency are judged to be comparable to those of the academic program review;
- 3) the accreditation or re-accreditation is achieved; and
- 4) each program provides a summary of student learning goals, a description of its assessment process and procedures, and examples of how assessment results were used to enhance the program.

The college dean determines whether standards submitted by the department's accreditation, taken as a whole, provide a level of quality comparable to the program review criteria.

The college dean may take one of the following actions in response to the petition:

- a) The substitution is approved. The accreditation self-study report, the team findings, and the accrediting agency's final report are submitted according to the academic program review procedures and follow the academic program review process for review and commentary.
- b) A partial substitution is approved. The accreditation self-study report, the team findings, the accrediting agency's final report, and materials required for a complete academic program review (e.g., assessment of student learning goals, implementation plan) are submitted according to the academic program review procedures and follows the same process for review and commentary.
- c) The substitution is not approved. The program is reviewed in accordance with the academic program review procedures.

Appendix 8

Academic Program Review Chronology

TARGET DATE	ACTIVITY	√
By February 1	Vice provost notifies college deans and department chairs/program administrators the programs to be reviewed two years prior to the completion date of the self-study, recommendations, and implementation plan.	
By February 15	<u>Accredited programs</u> Department chair/program administrator requests of the college dean a substitution for the academic program review document.	
By March 1	<u>Accredited programs</u> College dean determines whether the accreditation review process fulfills all or a portion of the academic program review in accordance with any CSU or CSU Stanislaus mandated requirements and communicates decision to the department chair/program administrator. <u>Non-accredited programs</u> Department chair/program administrator may request of the college dean that the program be subject to an external evaluation. An external reviewer may be invited to assist in the self-study phase of the academic program review process.	
By March 15	Vice provost, college dean, and Institutional Research conduct a program review workshop(s) with department chairs/program administrators and program faculty to discuss the academic program review process and disseminate data provided by institutional research, as required for the academic program review.	
March 16 – May 29	Department chair and dean identify process and timeline for milestones for completion and identify/arrange for external reviewers (as appropriate).	
March 16 – May 29	Program faculty and department chair begin draft review of data and begin draft of self study.	
March 16 – February 1	Program faculty and department chair conduct the self-study and complete the self-study document, including recommendations and a preliminary implementation plan.	
By February 1	Department chair/program administrator submits the self-study and supporting materials to the college dean.	
February 1 – February 27	College dean submits self study to external reviewers (as appropriate).	
February 15 – April 30	College governance committee(s) reviews the self-study, requests additional materials as needed, summarizes findings, and forwards the self-study to the department chair/program administrator.	
February 15 – April 30	General Education Subcommittee reviews the General Education portion of the self-study, summarizes findings, and forwards the recommendations for recertification of the GE curriculum (lower- and upper-division) to the department chair/program administrator.	
By April 30	College dean forwards the self-study to the Office of Academic Programs.	
By April 30	Office of Academic Programs forwards the self-study to the UEPC (if requested) and/or to the Graduate Council (for master’s and post-baccalaureate programs).	
April 30 – May 29	UEPC and/or Graduate Council (as appropriate) reviews the self-study, summarizes the findings, and forwards the document and findings to the department chair/program administrator and college dean.	
May 29 – June 30	College dean finalizes self study to include recommendations from external reviewer(s) (if applicable); responses from the department (if any); recommendations from the college governance committee(s), UEPC, and/or Graduate Council; and dean’s recommendation for program continuance, continuance with conditions, or program discontinuance.	

## An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Academic Program Review Process

TARGET DATE	ACTIVITY	√
By June 30	<b>College dean</b> submits to the vice provost the self-study; recommendations from external reviewer(s) (if applicable); responses from the department (if any); recommendations from the college governance committee(s), UEPC, and/or Graduate Council; and dean's recommendation for program continuance, continuance with conditions, or program discontinuance.	
September – October	<b>College dean</b> schedules a meeting to include the program representative(s), the department chair/program administrator, the college dean, the vice provost, and the provost to discuss the results of the academic program review and the <i>preliminary</i> implementation plan.	
October – November	<b>Department chair/program administrator</b> submits to the college dean a final implementation plan that identifies resource needs consistent with the recommendations of reviewing committees and consistent with the college mission and strategic plan. Within three weeks, the <b>college dean</b> submits the <i>final</i> implementation plan to the vice provost.	
By December 1	<b>Provost</b> issues a letter indicating final determination of program continuance and additionally may require progress reports and a timeline related to specific elements of the final implementation plan.	
By December 15	<b>Office of Academic Programs</b> archives the academic program review documents and posts on the web (program faculty's final implementation plan and provost's recommendation for program continuance/discontinuance).	
By January 15	<b>Vice provost</b> provides a summary of academic program reviews to the Board of Trustees.	
ONGOING	<b>College dean</b> incorporates the results of the academic program review into the college's strategic and budget planning processes and forwards to the provost as part of the regular planning and budgetary processes within academic affairs and within the university's strategic planning processes.	

**Appendix 9  
Baccalaureate Degree Audit Information**

Department
Degree

Line	Proposed Program (# of units)	Description
1	<b>51</b>	University general education requirements (includes 9 upper division units)
2		Prerequisites to the major
3		Upper-division (major requirements) – NOTE: BA degree at least 12 upper-division units; BS degree at least 18 upper-division units; BFA and BM degrees minimum of 40 upper-division units
4		WP course (if not required in the major)
5		Other (if applicable)
6		<b>TOTAL minimum units required</b> (add lines 1 through 5)
7		University elective units (subtract line 6 from line 8)
8		<b>TOTAL UNIT DEGREE REQUIREMENTS *</b>
9		WP course required in the major  Course prefix, number, units:
10		Lower-division prerequisite course(s) that may be applied toward GE  Course prefix, number, units, area: Course prefix, number, units, area: Course prefix, number, units, area: Course prefix, number, units, area: Course prefix, number, units, area: Course prefix, number, units, area:
11		<b>TOTAL double-counted courses</b> (add lines 9 and 10)
12		<b>TOTAL units taken</b> (subtract line 11 from line 8)

\* Units beyond 120 required by a degree program (e.g., accreditation requirement) remain in effect.

Preparer/Date
Approved/Date

## Attachment D

### Summary of WASC Expectations for Program Assessment Plans California State University, Stanislaus

A fully articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan...

1. Is developed by faculty, who are engaged in design and responsible for implementation
2. Includes multiple tools for assessing student work
3. Includes both formative and summative strategies
4. Uses multiple assessment measures, beyond the GPA
5. Incorporates and weighs both direct and indirect measures
6. Includes explicit program goals and learning objectives
  - a. Objectives/outcomes list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive
  - b. Describes how students can demonstrate their learning
  - c. Describes when and how each objective will be assessed
  - d. Where applicable, illustrates that national disciplinary standards have been considered
  - e. Makes clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations
7. Establishes expected levels of student performance
  - a. Faculty has agreed on explicit criteria statements (often displayed in rubrics)
  - b. Faculty has identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each student learning objective
8. Describes how improvements based on findings will be implemented
9. Includes a curriculum map
  - a. A matrix that shows the relationship between courses in the required curriculum and the program's learning objectives
  - b. Indicates increasing levels of proficiency
10. Explains how each learning objective is to be aligned with pedagogy, grading, courses/curriculum
11. States how students...
  - a. will be made aware of expected learning outcomes and levels of performance
  - b. will be encouraged to use learning objectives to guide their own learning; self assessment
  - c. may participate in creation and use of rubrics
12. Includes a method for well-qualified internal and external reviewers to evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking, results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement.
13. Explains a method that is used for the plan to be routinely examined and revised, as needed
14. Includes a program policy that calls for inclusion of student objectives in all course syllabi

#### Note

WASC language differentiates objectives from outcomes: objectives are intended results; outcomes are achieved results.

#### Sources:

WASC Standards, 2009

WASC Expectations for Two Reviews: Clarifying the Focus and Expectations about Student Learning, 2009

WASC Rubric for Program Learning Outcomes, 2009

WASC Rubric for Program Review, 2009

## Attachment E

### Colleges' Academic Program Review Processes California State University, Stanislaus

Colleges evaluate academic program reviews using their established processes and criteria consistent with university policy and procedures and accreditation standards. Colleges establish internal processes and criteria for the effectiveness of the academic program review process. For purposes of quality assurance, such processes are reported to the provost and posted on the website [www.csustan.edu/](http://www.csustan.edu/) ...

College reports include the following information:

1. Name of college committee
2. Committee membership – including roles, types of representation (not names)
3. Methods and criteria for review – including templates for guiding committee review
4. Methods for orientation and training of college review committees for conducting quality program reviews
5. Methods used to align strategic and academic program planning and budgetary processes/decisions with outcomes of academic program reviews
6. Other key elements unique to each college

## Attachment F

### Guidelines for Graduate Council's Evaluation of Academic Program Reviews for Master's Degree Programs The Graduate Council California State University, Stanislaus

This document was designed by the Graduate Council to guide its evaluation of the quality of master's degree programs at CSU Stanislaus as reflected in the Academic Program Review process. Salient issues important to graduate education provide a structure to ensure a comprehensive and consistent evaluation of program quality among graduate programs. The review is conducted in accordance with *Principles for Assessment of Student Learning* for the purpose of program improvement.

After having read the academic program review documents and after a brief presentation by the graduate director/coordinator, the Graduate Council discusses the academic program review. The Graduate Council's review concludes with a report that provides a summary of its evaluation of program quality; commendations; recommendations for program improvement beyond those identified by the program, if any; and an overall recommendation for either program continuance, continuance with specified conditions, or discontinuance. The chair of the Graduate Council forwards the report to the graduate director/coordinator, department chair and college dean for response (if any) and then forwards its recommendation to the provost for consideration.

#### Quality of the Academic Program Review Self Study

1. Quality – Overall, to what extent is the APR self study for the graduate program comprehensive? Analytical? Focused on improvement of student learning? Future-oriented?

#### Program Improvement from Last Academic Program Review

2. Program Improvement – Is there evidence of faculty making program changes to enhance the program's currency and quality from the last academic program review?
3. Implementation Plan – Have faculty accomplished each of the actions identified in the previous review and have done so at a high level of achievement? If actions/goals were not reached, have the faculty described the constraints and articulated future plans for these or other goals?

#### Enrollment Trends

4. Student Characteristics/Profile – To what extent has faculty reflected upon the appropriateness of its student characteristics and has taken appropriate actions to ensure student success across each sub-population of students? Include numbers (headcount and FTES); Diversity (gender; ethnicity; full-time/part-time, other); Student/faculty ratio.
5. Enrollment Targets – Based on institutional research data, do faculty evidence success in meeting enrollment targets, offering a program at a sustainable level, and drawing conclusions for future enrollments?
6. Graduation – Are faculty successful in serving students as evidenced by retention and graduation rates and time-to-degree? Do faculty provide a thoughtful analysis of and recommendations for improving student success?

#### Commitment to Student Learning

7. Program Goals – Do the program's goals reflect high expectations for program quality commensurate with graduate education?
8. Student Learning Objectives – Do the student learning objectives reflect high expectations for student performance? Is there evidence that students are achieving these student learning outcomes at a high level of academic rigor (besides evidence derived from assessment methods, measures may also include student awards and honors, employment success, doctoral education)?

9. Curriculum Map – Does the curriculum map illustrate the alignment between student learning objectives, graduate learning goals, required courses, instructional emphasis, and primary assessment methods?
10. Graduate Student Learning Goals and Program Learning Objectives – Does the evidence demonstrate that students overall have achieved the program’s student learning objectives as linked to the six overall graduate learning goals?
11. Assessment Plan and Implementation – Is the assessment plan for assessing student learning effective and comprehensive, including direct and indirect methods for collecting and using data that are meaningful, measurable, and manageable?
12. Use of Assessment Results – Have faculty used results effectively from their assessment efforts to both affirm and improve program quality, instruction, student learning, and other program elements?

### **Curriculum and Instruction**

13. Delivery of Instructional Program – Is the instructional program scheduled effectively so that students may graduate within a planned timeframe (as appropriate, in Turlock, Stockton, off-campus, and via distance education)?
14. Library and Technology – What is the adequacy of the library and technological resources for instructional quality?
15. Student Advising – Is there evidence that faculty provide effective student advising and mentoring?
16. Graduate Culture – Have faculty successfully sustained a graduate-level culture and have specific plans to continue its enhancement? What is the extent and quality of students’ research, scholarship, and creative activity within the classroom, in collaboration with faculty, and in external public venues? Have faculty designed rigorous standards of written, research, and scholarly proficiency for the culminating experience? Does the evidence illustrate high levels of student performance on thesis, project, and/or comprehensive examinations?
17. Written Communication Skills – Does the evidence indicate that students have achieved writing commensurate with graduate academic rigor?
18. Teaching/Quality of Instruction – Does the evidence indicate faculty encourage, use, evaluate, and reward effective teaching methods that promote student learning? Do these methods result in enhanced teaching proficiency?
19. Curricular Plans and Alignment – Are the curricular plans for future program development aligned with the college and university’s mission and strategic plan and contribute to the distinctiveness and strengths of the graduate program? Is the number of required units appropriate to achieve program goals?

### **Faculty**

20. Faculty Characteristics, Expertise and Deployment – Are the numbers and qualifications of faculty adequate and appropriate for delivering the graduate program? What is the adequacy of the proportion of tenured/tenure track, full-time lecturers, and part-time faculty? Is there an adequacy of support for the program director/coordinator? Include numbers (faculty headcount/FTES) for graduate program; Number of tenured, tenure track, lecturer, and part-time; Demographic characteristics (gender, ethnicity, other).
21. Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – Overall, to what extent do faculty evidence currency, continuing productivity, and quality of scholarly work commensurate with graduate education (as defined by program elaborations)? What is the extent of faculty collaborative research with students?

22. Faculty Development – How effective are faculty development opportunities for supporting faculty in the achievement of their professional goals: Orienting and mentoring new and non-tenured faculty to the culture of the graduate program? Ensuring faculty advancement through the ranks? Continuing improvement of teaching effectiveness and scholarship?

**Implementation Plan**

23. External Review/Accreditation (if applicable) – What do the findings of an external reviewers/accreditation team suggest for the quality of the current program? Are external reviewers' recommendations for program improvement in the implementation plan, where appropriate?
24. Recommendations – Have the faculty identified important recommendations for improving program quality and for developing new programs? Do they show the use of evidence in reaching these conclusions/recommendations? Are there others that should be considered?
25. Implementation Plan – Have faculty described appropriate and achievable action steps in response to their key recommendations? Have the faculty included appropriate human, physical, and fiscal resources needed to implement its plan and possible methods for securing these resources?

**Improving the Academic Program Review Process**

26. What recommendations do program faculty have for improving the Academic Program Review process as related to graduate programs?

## Attachment G

### Graduate Academic Culture: Student Engagement in Graduate Programs The Graduate Council California State University, Stanislaus

The Graduate Council reviewed WASC expectations for sustaining a graduate academic culture and discussed the following questions as a prelude to its consideration of the possibility of recommending this criterion be added to the academic program review process. In spring 2009, the criterion for promoting a graduate academic culture was added to the policy/procedures for academic program review. A summary of responses to these questions is available at [http://www.csustan.edu/Grad/documents/GraduateAcademicCulture\\_000.pdf](http://www.csustan.edu/Grad/documents/GraduateAcademicCulture_000.pdf)

1. What is our definition of a graduate-level academic culture?
2. What are examples of the ways in which graduate program faculty currently promote and sustain a graduate-level academic culture?
3. What institutional structures do we have for supporting a graduate-level academic culture?
4. What methods do we use to evaluate/assess a graduate-level academic culture?
5. What are additional ideas for enhancing a graduate-level academic culture at the program and/or institutional levels?
6. How much of the responsibility is descended to a particular program or the Graduate School as a whole?
7. What barriers do we put up that prevent a graduate-level academic culture?
8. How much of the responsibility for creating/sustaining a graduate culture is descended to a particular program or the Graduate School as a whole?
9. What are effective strategies for the active involvement of graduate students in departmental governance structures and the assessment of program quality?
10. Do the methods used to sustain a graduate culture within the individual graduate programs include consideration of demographic characteristics of students (especially those historically underrepresented by higher education) that may impact student success?
11. Do sub-populations of graduate students experience and benefit from graduate-level academic culture in the same way?
12. Does the research environment place a demonstrated value on the responsible and ethical conduct of research? How is this evidenced in the university's communications, policies, procedures, and response to any deviations?
13. What applications does the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) have for graduate education? (Academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching educational experiences, and supportive campus environment.)

## Attachment H

### Provost's Academic Program Review Meetings California State University, Stanislaus

This template provides an overview of the Provost's Academic Program Review meeting. Participants include the department chair, program coordinator and/or faculty (as determined by department chair or dean), dean, and vice provost.

#### Introductions (Dean)

1. Dean's introductions of meeting participants.

#### Overview (Dean and Department Chair)

2. Dean's overall evaluation of program and key issues identified by the college's committee and dean.
3. Department chair's overview of major findings/issues.

#### Program Quality (Provost)

4. Provost's questions/discussions regarding the self study's findings and the preliminary *Implementation Plan*:
  - a. Overall conclusions about program quality and assessment of student learning outcomes.
  - b. Faculty recommendations for program enhancement, with a focus on the future (next 3-5 years) – e.g., new program development, partnership development, grants/contracts, faculty, student recruitment.
  - c. Action steps planned in response to key recommendations.
  - d. Human, fiscal, and physical resources needed for implementing key recommendations.

#### Assessment (Vice Provost)

5. Review of Assessment Plan and Reports
6. Resources – Direct Assessment

#### Next Steps (Vice Provost)

7. Explanation of next steps
  - a. Department chair completes final *Implementation Plan* and submits to the dean; dean submits electronic document to vice provost (within 2 weeks following meeting).
  - b. Provost issues letter indicating final determination for program continuance (within 3 weeks following receipt of final implementation plan).

#### Evaluation of the Academic Program Review Process (Vice Provost)

8. In what ways did the faculty find this academic program review process helpful for program improvement?
9. What are your recommendations for improving the academic program review process?
  - a. Review Criteria, especially student learning
  - b. Internal/External review components
  - c. Institutional research/assessment data
  - d. Timeline
  - e. Department/college review process and report
  - f. Other

#### Closing Comments (Provost)

## Attachment I

### Student Engagement in Academic Program Review Recommendation from Inquiry Circle One on Student Learning to Governance Committees California State University, Stanislaus

#### Exploration/Pilot

##### Recommendation

1. Determine the viability of using engagement practices as part of the Academic Program Review, assist in the development of possible criteria for reporting on and analyzing these practices, and suggest improvements to the review process.
2. Encourage departments to discuss the viability of recognizing engagement in learning in the Retention Promotion and Tenure process as a desirable component of excellence in teaching.

##### Suggested Procedures for Programs Undergoing APR

1. Engage in department-wide discussion of the impact on student class performance of techniques used to encourage student engagement.
2. Identify and document best practices.
3. Review assessment procedures.
  - a. Do student engagement practices enhance student attainment of learning goals? How?
  - b. Does lack of student engagement practices hinder student attainment of learning goals?
4. Use analysis (cost/benefit, strength/weakness/opportunity/threat, or some other analytic) to determine viability of the category in the practice of APR preparation.
  - a. Does the practice help articulate some area in a better way?
  - b. Does the practice assist the APR process in any way?
  - c. Does the practice hinder the process, or simply serve as window dressing without real depth?
5. Suggest any other improvements to the APR process.
6. Deliverable – A short (~2k words) analysis of area (4) above and recommendation for/against incorporating the procedure in the APR process.

Note: Original data remains in department, just as in ordinary assessment procedures.