



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

COLLEGE OF HUMAN AND HEALTH SCIENCES

College-Level Academic Program Review Process

College Structures for Evaluation of Program Quality via Academic Program Reviews

In the College of Human and Health Sciences, the structure for evaluating program quality through the Academic Program Review process involves the following individuals and committees within the college:

College Dean

The Dean is the chief administrative and academic officer of the college and oversees the daily operations of the Departments of Nursing, Psychology/Child Development and Social Work. Relating to the academic program review process, the Dean is accountable for and in charge of:

- **Academic Program Planning and Policy Development which includes** developing, delivering, and evaluating academic programs in the departments of the college to ensure the highest standards of excellence;
- **Curriculum and Programmatic Excellence including** the assessment of student learning, academic program review, support unit review, national and discipline-specific accreditation, curriculum enhancement, curricula development, research, and new program development within the college;
- **Recommends to the Provost** actions resulting from academic program reviews including implementation plans of the reviews.

Executive Committee

The Executive Committee is responsible for deliberating budgetary, personnel and college planning issues. Directly related to academic program reviews, the committee advises the dean on:

- Short- and long-range program planning priorities;
- Annual program assessment updates;
- Academic program reviews; and
- Annual summation of program planning and recommendations.

Department Chair

The Department Chair is responsible for working with faculty colleagues in developing new curriculum and enhancing older offerings, as well as periodically assessing how effective the department's curriculum and teaching methods meet student learning goals and that program learning objectives are being met.

In the department, the Academic Program Review emphasizes academic program assessment and planning, and links planning and assessment with budget and personnel allocations. This process gives programs an opportunity to assess curriculum, evaluate student and faculty needs and resources, and make enrollment and fiscal projections. The program review also emphasizes developing assessment practices that lead to meaningful information on student success in meeting program goals.

ONE UNIVERSITY CIRCLE • TURLOCK, CALIFORNIA 95382 • WWW.CSUSTAN.EDU • PHONE (209) 667-3155 • FAX (209) 664-7113

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

The Chair's role in the Academic Review Process includes:

- Working with department faculty and the Program Assessment Coordinator in support of major and general education student assessment of programs;
- Ensuring implementation by faculty of actions to improve effectiveness of programs as identified by the assessment and review process;
- Working as a member of the College Executive Committee to evaluate college-wide implications of the APR.

Department Program Assessment Coordinators

A Program Assessment Coordinator (PAC) is appointed in each department by the college dean in consultation with the department chair. Working with the department chair and faculty, the PAC is responsible for the development and management of a departmental assessment plan and data collection. Program assessment coordinators:

- Are members of the University's Assessment Council;
- Work with department chairs and faculty in support of major and general education student assessment of programs;
- Work with department faculty to implement actions in an effort to improve effectiveness of programs through instruction as identified by the assessment and review processes;
- Provide annual reports containing updates of progress and achievements to department chairs, college dean and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning.

Department Faculty

All full-time faculty is expected to participate in the preparation and review of programs. As outlined in the academic program review policy and procedures of California State University, Stanislaus, department faculty are responsible for:

- Developing student learning objectives for each program and for employing methods (annually) to evaluate program effectiveness in achieving programmatic student learning objectives;
- Participation and completion of departmental self-study documents;
- Make recommendations and assist in the formation of preliminary implementation plans in coordination with the department Program Assessment Coordinator and Chair;
- Assist with revisions to preliminary implementation plans in response to recommendations by the college and university level reviews and administration;
- Implement actions in instruction to improve effectiveness in programs based on identification through assessment and academic program reviews.

College Methods Used to Conduct the Review of Departmental Academic Program Reviews

By using by using the Academic Program Review Timeline and Processes (Attachment A), and the Academic Program Review Criteria (Attachment B), APRs at the college level are conducted.

College Criteria for Review of Academic Program Reviews (as outlined in California State University, Stanislaus' Academic Program Review Procedures, pages 4-7)

For both undergraduate and graduate programs, a separate academic program review is submitted which includes a comprehensive assessment of student learning and program functioning at both levels.

- **Changes Since the Last Academic Program Review**
 1. Describe and evaluate the effectiveness of actions taken in response to each of the recommendations made in the previous academic program review.
 2. 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**
 1. Based on institutional research data, summarize program enrollment trends, student characteristics, retention and graduation rates, degrees conferred, time to degree, course enrollments, and student/faculty ratio.
 2. 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**
 1. List the learning objectives for students majoring in the program. Referring to 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.)
 2. 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 programs. 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**
 1. *Delivery of Instructional Program*
Evaluate the 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.
 2. *Advising/Mentoring*
Evaluate the effectiveness of student advising and mentoring and involvement with student majors.
 3. *Graduate Academic Culture*
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.

4. *General Education*

Evaluate the 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 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 CSU Stanislaus Academic Program Review Procedures Page 6 of 23 activities or discussions used to make this determination. Identify any areas for further development or other recommendations for the GE program.

5. *Written Communication*

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

6. *Service Courses*

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

7. *Teaching*

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.

8. *Curricular Plans and Alignment*

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

9. *Units Beyond 120, etc. and 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.

10. *Units for Graduate and Post-baccalaureate Credential Programs.* 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**

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

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

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**

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.

College Methods for Aligning Planning and Budgetary Processes/Decisions with the Outcomes of the Academic Program Reviews

Once a final implementation plan is approved and in place, resources required are prioritized on the Academic Program Review Planning and Budgetary Process worksheet (Attachment C).

California State University, Stanislaus
College of Human and Health Sciences
Academic Program Review Timeline and Process

Attachment A

Timeline	Activity
February 1	Vice Provost notifies College Dean and Department Chairs/Program Coordinators of programs to be reviewed two years prior to completion date. For <u>accredited programs</u> , Department Chair/Program Coordinator requests of the College Dean a substitution for the academic program review document. The College Dean determines if the accreditation review process fulfills the academic program review in accordance with CSU and CSU Stanislaus requirements, and communicates decision to the Department Chair/Program Coordinator. For <u>non-accredited programs</u> , Department Chair/Program Coordinator can request of the College Dean that the program be subject to an external evaluation where an external reviewer may be invited to assist in the self-study phase of the academic program review process.
February 15	Program review workshops are conducted by the Vice Provost, College Dean and Institutional Research to discuss the academic program review process and to disseminate data.
March 15	Department Chair and College Dean identify the process and a timeline for completion of the review.
March 16 - May 29	Program Faculty and Department Chair begin review of data and draft of self-study
March 16 - May 29	Program Faculty and Department Chair conduct self-study and completion of self-study document including recommendations and preliminary implementation plan.
March 16 - February 1	Department Chair and Program Coordinator submit self-study and supporting materials to College Dean and Executive Committee for a first reading/review.
February 1	College Dean and Executive Committee requests additional materials if needed, and summarizes findings in writing to the Department Chair and Program Coordinator.
February 15 - April 30	When the College Dean and Executive Committee are satisfied with the additional information received, the self-study is reviewed a second time using the criteria outlined on Attachment B.
February 15 - April 30	College Dean forwards the self-study with all supporting documentation to the Office of Academic Programs.
By April 30	Office of Academic Programs forwards the self-study to the UEPC (if requested) and Graduate Council (for master's and post-baccalaureate programs).
By April 30	UEPC and Graduate Council reviews self-study (if requested) and summarizes findings in writing to Department Chair, Program Coordinator and College Dean.
April 30 - May 29	Department Chair and Program Coordinator finalize self-study to include responses to the College Dean and Executive Committee, and recommendations from UEPC and Graduate Council.
May 29 - June 30	
June 30	College Dean submits the self-study to Vice Provost along with response from the department, College Executive Committee, UEPC, Graduate Council, and Dean's recommendation for program continuance/discontinuance.
September - October	A meeting is scheduled with College Dean, Department Chair, Program Coordinator, Vice Provost and Provost to discuss results of the academic program review and its implementation plan.
October - December	College Dean submits the final implementation plan to Vice Provost.
ONGOING	College Dean incorporates results of the academic program review into the College's strategic and budget planning process.

California State University, Stanislaus
College of Human and Health Sciences
 Academic Program Review Criteria

Attachment B

Area	Section	Meets	Missing	Comments
A. Changes Since Last Review	1			
	2			
B. Enrollment Trends	1			
	2			
C. Commitment to Student Learning	1			
	2			
D. Curriculum & Instruction	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8			
	9			
	10			
E. Faculty	1			
	2			
F. Implementation Plan	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			

California State University, Stanislaus
College of Human and Health Sciences
Academic Program Review
Planning and Budgetary Process

Attachment C

Program Under Review:

Priority	Term	Faculty/Support Staff	Instructional Facilities	Library Resources	Existing Technology, Equipment and Other Materials	Additional Support Resources Required