

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

**Self Study Elements for Academic Program Review for Doctoral Programs**

Program Improvement from Last Academic Program Review

1. Summarize major changes from the previous academic program review, particularly related to currency of the curriculum and its responsiveness to disciplinary trends nationally.
2. Describe and evaluate the impact of actions taken in response to recommendations made in the previous APR.

Student Profile

3. Describe and evaluate headcount number of student majors currently in program.
  - *Institutional Research (IR) Table 2.5: CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics*
4. Describe and evaluate demographic characteristics (including types of current and advancement in positions/employment).
  - *IR Table 2.5: CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics*
5. Describe and evaluate FTES generated.
  - *IR Table 7.1: Academic Discipline Profile by Discipline and Course Level*
6. Describe and evaluate the student/faculty ratio.
  - *IR Table 7.1: Academic Discipline Profile by Discipline and Course Level*
7. Evaluate the program's success and challenges for recruiting and graduating high quality doctoral students, including those who represent diverse backgrounds.
  - *IR Table 2.5: CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics*
  - *IR Report to be generated: Program GRE scores*
  - *IR Report to be generated: iSkills/iCritical Thinking Assessment scores*
  - *Program Report: Doctoral Executive Council Report on Written Qualifying Examination*

Enrollment Trends

8. Describe and evaluate the number of graduates annually since last program review.
  - *IR Table 4.5 Degrees Conferred by CSU Degree Program and Demographic Characteristics*
9. Describe and evaluate the annual retention rates overall and by demographics.
  - *IR Report to be generated: Annual Retention Rates for Doctoral Students*
10. Describe and evaluate the graduation rate.
  - *IR Report to be generated: Annual Graduation Rates for Doctoral Students*
11. Describe and evaluate the average time to degree.
  - *IR Report to be generated: Average Time to Degree for Doctoral Students*

Faculty Profile

12. Summarize and evaluate the number and FTEF total currently and trend over the past 5 years; display by category of tenured/tenure track/lecturer, ethnicity, gender, years of service. Evaluate faculty expertise for covering the breadth of the curriculum.
  - *IR Table 7.1: Academic Discipline Profile by Discipline and Course Level*
  - *IR Table 8.1: Full-Time Faculty and Staff Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Primary Occupational Activity, and Department*

- *IR Table 8.2: Part-Time Faculty and Staff by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Primary Occupational Activity, and Department*
  - *IR Table 8.3: Full-Time Faculty by Faculty Status, Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Academic Rank, and Department*
  - *IR Report to be generated: The National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (Delaware Study)*
13. Evaluate faculty workload and deployment for program delivery.
    - *IR Report generated: : Number of courses taught, headcount, FTES, and positions generated per faculty per semester; average workload for doctoral faculty*
    - *Program Report: Faculty assigned time for research and related doctoral responsibilities; amount derived from program funding (state/self support) and from extramural funding*
  14. Describe and evaluate faculty scholarship.
    - *Program Report: Curriculum vitae for each faculty, including list of peer reviewed/invited RSCA, works in press, type and amount of grants in support of RSCA, and other scholarly endeavors, fellowships, new courses in past five years, professional awards and honors, consulting work, retraining in other specializations or disciplines, participation in national/regional/local professional activities, community service related to academic field.*  
*(OR Annual Reports are submitted by each doctoral faculty as part of responsibilities identified in by-laws and included in the Research Compendium, using template so can document annual progress disaggregated and aggregated.)*
  15. Describe and evaluate faculty scholarship of practice, if applicable.
  16. Address how faculty practice contributes to the teaching/learning process and enhances the program, if applicable.
  17. Describe and evaluate the types of faculty practice and the varied practice roles faculty assume, if applicable.
  18. Evaluate program support for and faculty involvement in professional development activities.

#### Program Quality

19. Mission and Vision – Evaluate how the program’s mission and vision reflects disciplinary trends and regional needs.
  - *IR Report to generated: Findings from California Academic Performance Index*
  - *IR Report: Employer Survey Results*
20. Program Distinction – Describe the distinctiveness or strengths of the program in comparison to programs at other comparable universities in California or nation, as appropriate.
  - *The National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (Delaware Study)*
21. Curricular Rigor – Evaluate the level of academic rigor evidenced in the doctoral program's curricular design, course delivery, and expectations for superior student performance.
  - *Program Report: Current doctoral course syllabus from each faculty teaching doctoral courses.*
22. Program Delivery – Evaluate the effectiveness of the methods used for delivering the program.
23. Quality of Instruction – Evaluate the quality of faculty engagement in an ongoing inquiry into their teaching proficiency and the processes of teaching and learning to promote high academic rigor. What is the relationship between current teaching practices and learning effectiveness? Evaluate how well the program encourages, evaluates, and rewards high quality teaching.
  - *IR Report: Aggregate IDEA results or other appropriate assessment information*
24. Doctoral Research Culture – Describe and evaluate the learning environment so as to help diverse students meet the academic standards and goals of the program, especially focused on the quantity and quality of student independent and student/faculty collaborative scholarship, publications, presentations, and involvement/contributions to professional organizations.

- *Program Report: Evidentiary set of exhibits that demonstrates the program faculty's creation and evaluation of a strong doctoral culture, and faculty and student scholarship as a core element of doctoral education.*
25. Dissertation – Evaluate quality of dissertations.
- *Program Report: Evidentiary exhibit that demonstrates use of specific criteria in the evaluation and determination of the quality of dissertation research.*
26. Student Perceptions of Program Quality – Evaluate the results of institutional research related to student perceptions of program quality.
- *IR Report: Graduate Alumni and Graduate Exit Surveys*
  - *Program Report: Student Focus Group Summary of Findings*

#### Promoting/Monitoring/Evaluating Student Learning

27. Summarize the methods, results, and use of the assessment of student learning for improvement of program.
- *Program Report: Assessment plan, curriculum map, and annual assessment reports that address how well students are learning.*
28. Evaluate the effectiveness of the program in ensuring students achieve the program goals and learning objectives for doctoral education.

#### Budgeting and Resources

29. Evaluate the quality and adequacy of library resources (holdings; electronic, acquisitions, expenditures).
- *University Library Report: University Library holdings/ expenditures*
30. Evaluate the extent to which the current fiscal support is adequate to support the doctoral program (faculty, students, professional development/travel, research, staffing, and equipment).
31. Identify any realistic actions that might be taken at the University level to strengthen or improve program's effectiveness.
32. Describe additional external financial support received in the last five years. Describe/evaluate current efforts to obtain such support.

#### Program Infrastructure

33. Evaluate the effectiveness of the program's infrastructure, program leadership, and quality assurance processes for ensuring integrity of operations, collaborative decision making, significant faculty involvement, effective internal communications, and high accountability for improvement of program quality.

#### Doctoral Policy and Procedures

34. Provide verification that the program establishes and implements program policy and procedures that adhere to university policy for doctoral programs. Identify any challenges or issues for possible policy modification for increased program effectiveness.

#### **Implementation Plan for Doctoral Program**

Develop your program's implementation plan for program enhancement over the next 7 years. Base this plan on assessment findings from the self study and external reviewers from the following elements:

- Student Profile
- Enrollment Trends
- Faculty Profile

- Program Quality
- Promoting/Monitoring/Evaluating Student Learning
- Budgeting and Resources
- Program Infrastructure
- Doctoral Policy and Procedures

### **Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Doctoral Academic Program Review Process**

As part of the Provost's Academic Program Review meeting and/or with the final implementation plan, the doctoral faculty, program director, college dean, the Graduate School, and others involved in the doctoral program provides feedback about the effectiveness of the doctoral APR process. Elements to consider include the review criteria, external review components, assessment of student learning, institutional research data, timeline, college and university review process, student participation, and faculty participation.

DD:rl 2/12/10

Graduate Council Approved 2/18/10

## **Appendices**

1. Institutional Research Data Portfolio
2. Approval/Signature Page
3. Steps and Chronology for Academic Program Review
4. External Reviewers
5. Accreditation Supplement Request
6. Program Units Audit Template
7. Graduate Council Process for Review of Doctoral Academic Program Reviews
8. Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Doctoral Academic Program Review Process

## Appendix 1

### Institutional Research Data Portfolio

The Office of Institutional Research collects, analyzes, and summarizes program data since the last Academic Program Review. For each doctoral 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 2.5 CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level – Fall Terms

#### ENTERING STUDENTS

- IR Report to be Generated: Program GRE Scores
- IR Report to be Generated: iSkills/iCritical Thinking Assessment Scores

#### STUDENT DEGREES AWARDED

- Table 4.5 Degrees Conferred by CSU Degree Program (HEGIS), Demographic Characteristics, and Degree Level

#### RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES

- IR Report to be Generated: Annual Retention Rates for Doctoral Students
- IR Report to be Generated: Annual Graduation Rates for Doctoral Students
- IR Report to be Generated: Average Time to Degree for Doctoral Students

#### 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
- IR Report to be Generated: The National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (Delaware Study)
- IR Report to be Generated: Number of Courses Taught, Headcount, FTES, and Positions Generated per Faculty per Semester; Average Workload for Doctoral Faculty

#### GRADUATING SURVEY

- IR Report to be Generated: Graduate Alumni and Graduate Exit Surveys

**OTHER**

- IR Report to be Generated: Findings from California Academic Performance Index
- IR Report to be Generated: Employer Survey Results
- IR Report to be Generated: Aggregate IDEA Results

**OTHER (as requested)**

- Data unique to each doctoral program and its student learning goals may be requested by the college dean. Please email Dr. Angel Sanchez ([ASanchez@csustan.edu](mailto:ASanchez@csustan.edu)), Director for Institutional Research, with your data request.

:rle DRAFT 2/01/10



### Appendix 3

#### Academic Program Review Chronology for Doctoral Programs

TARGET DATE	ACTIVITY	√
By February 1	<b>Vice provost</b> notifies college deans and department chairs/program directors 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> <b>Department chair/program director</b> requests of the college dean to submit the accreditation document to serve as a primary, but not sole, component of the self-study.	
By March 1	<u>Accredited programs</u> <b>College dean</b> determines whether the accreditation review process fulfills a portion of the academic program review in accordance with any CSU, CSU Stanislaus, or WASC mandated requirements and communicates decision to the department chair/program administrator. <b>Department chair/program director</b> request of the college dean that the program be subject to an external evaluation. An external reviewer is invited to assist in the self-study phase of the academic program review process.	
By March 15	<b>Vice provost, college dean, and Institutional Research</b> conduct a program review workshop(s) with department chairs/program directors 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	<b>College dean</b> identify process and timeline for milestones for completion and identify/arrange for external reviewers (as required).	
March 16 – May 29	<b>Program faculty and program director/department chair</b> begin draft review of data and begin draft of self-study.	
March 16 – February 1	<b>Program faculty and program director</b> conduct the self-study and complete the self-study document, including recommendations and a preliminary implementation plan.	
By February 1	<b>Program director</b> submits the self-study and supporting materials to the college dean.	
February 1 – February 27	<b>College dean</b> submits self-study to external reviewers (mandatory for doctoral programs).	
February 15 – April 30	<b>College governance committee(s)</b> reviews the self-study, requests additional materials as needed, summarizes findings, makes recommendation for program continuance, and forwards the self-study to the department chair/program director and college dean.	
By April 30	<b>College dean</b> forwards the self-study to the Office of Academic Programs.	
By April 30	<b>Office of Academic Programs</b> forwards the self-study to the Graduate Council.	
April 30 – May 29	<b>Graduate Council</b> reviews the self-study, summarizes the findings, makes recommendation for program continuance, and forwards the document and findings to the program director and college dean.	

TARGET DATE	ACTIVITY	√
May 29 – June 30	<b>College dean</b> finalizes self-study to include recommendations from external reviewer(s); responses from the department/program (if any); recommendations from the college governance committee(s), Graduate Council; and dean’s recommendation for program continuance, continuance with conditions, or program discontinuance.	
By June 30	<b>College dean</b> submits to the vice provost the self-study; recommendations from external reviewer(s); responses from the department (if any); recommendations from the college governance committee(s), 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 director, 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 director</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 4

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

#### Overview

In accordance with doctoral academic program review policy and procedures, external program review for doctoral programs occur during 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 doctoral programs, the use of an external program review as part of the self-study is required. External reviewers are 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.

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 three 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 normally include the following or their equivalency:

1. The highest degree in a relevant discipline (normally Ph.D. or Ed.D.)
2. Rank of Professor (Associate Professor acceptable if currently teaching in a doctoral program)
3. Distinguished record in related teaching, research, and scholarly activity
4. Notable background in the effective employment of program-level student learning assessment methods
5. No conflict of interest
6. Ability to complete a site visit and submission of report within the prescribed timeline
7. Other qualification as related to the discipline (e.g., expert in program-level assessment employed at a university involved in the Carnegie Initiative on Educational Doctorates.)

#### Responsibilities

The external reviewers' primary responsibility is to provide an honest, unbiased professional judgment of when assessing student work. The external reviewers perform the following responsibilities over a two-day on-site campus visit:

1. Reviews the draft self-study document.
2. Conduct interviews and conduct an exit meeting with the following individuals/groups: Program faculty, Program Director, current students, alumni, Doctoral Executive Committee, Community Advisory Board, Dean, Vice Provost, and Provost.
3. Employs other strategies appropriate to the discipline.
4. Submit a written summary of findings within three weeks of the campus visit.

Elements for review by the external reviewers will include the assessment plan/processes of the respective assessment roles of faculty, administration, students, and external community; assessment of

Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes, especially direct assessment methods/measures; and effective use of assessment data for program improvement. Assessment of student learning will include a meta-review of dissertation research, oral defense, and embedded assessment artifacts. Each provides a direct measure of the quality of student work, and a rubric for each of these meta-reviews will be developed and guide the assessment.

As a result of the external reviewers' report and the self-study document, the Dean of the College of Education and the Program Director will develop an implementation plan that will include the actions for change, timeline, key person responsible for leading the actions, and fiscal costs.

### **Nominations for External Reviewers**

The college dean is responsible for the overall coordination of the external review. Nominations for evaluators are solicited from the doctoral program director and from other institutions, higher education associations, and professional organizations. The nominees are reviewed by the program 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 program director coordinates the review schedule. Prior to the campus visit, the program director 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 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 program director works with the college dean to select the external reviewers. The program director coordinates the travel arrangements with the external reviewers, in accordance with university travel policy. A consultant contract is issued (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

### Process

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

For doctoral 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 provides many of the essential requirements of the doctoral academic program review and may, therefore, be used as the primary, but not sole, component of the self-study with approval by the college dean.

The doctoral program director 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 primary, but not sole component of 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 program'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, 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.
- b) The substitution is not approved. The program is reviewed in accordance with the academic program review procedures.

Appendix 6

Doctoral Degree Audit Information

Department/College
Degree

Line	Program (# of units)	Description
1		Core requirements
2		Specialization requirements
3		Electives
4		Dissertation requirements (minimum of 12 units required for dissertation)
5	<b>60</b>	<b>TOTAL minimum units required</b> (add lines 1 through 3) (42 units must be completed in residence at CSU Stanislaus)

Preparer/Date
Approved/Date

## Appendix 7

### Guidelines for the Graduate Council's Evaluation of Doctoral Academic Program Reviews

This document was designed by the Graduate Council to guide its evaluation of the quality of doctoral degree programs at CSU Stanislaus as reflected in the Academic Program Review process. Salient issues important to doctoral education provide a structure to ensure a comprehensive and consistent evaluation of program quality among doctoral 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 doctoral program director/coordinator, the Graduate Council discusses the doctoral 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 doctoral program director, 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

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

#### Program Improvement from Last Academic Program Review

1. Program Improvement – Is there evidence of faculty making program changes to enhance the program's currency and quality from the last academic program review?
2. Implementation Plan – Have faculty accomplished each of the actions identified in the previous review and 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?

#### Student Profile

- 3-7. Student Characteristics/Profile – To what extent has faculty reflected upon the appropriateness of its student characteristics and 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; student scores on admission and assessment tests (GRE scores, iSkills/iCritical Thinking scores, and Written Qualifying Examination scores).

#### Enrollment Trends

- 8-11. Retention and Graduation – 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? 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?

### Faculty Profile

- 12-13. Faculty Characteristics, Expertise, and Deployment – Are the numbers and qualifications of faculty adequate and appropriate for delivering the doctoral 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 doctoral program; number and FTE total currently and 5-year trend, number of tenured, tenure track, lecturer, and part-time; demographic characteristics (gender; ethnicity, years of service); average workload for doctoral faculty.
- 14-17. Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – Overall, to what extent do faculty evidence currency, continuing productivity, and quality of scholarly work commensurate with doctoral education (as defined by program elaborations)?
18. 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 doctoral program? Ensuring faculty advancement through the ranks? Continuing improvement of teaching effectiveness and scholarship?

### Program Quality

19. Mission and Vision – To what extent does the program's mission and vision reflect disciplinary and regional needs?
20. Program Distinction – Does the evidence demonstrate the distinctiveness or strengths of the program in comparison to programs at other comparable universities in the state and/or nation?
21. Curricular Rigor – Do the curricular design, course delivery, and expectations for student performance display a high level of academic rigor?
22. Program Delivery – Is the instructional program scheduled and delivered effectively so that students may graduate within a planned timeframe and achieve the program's learning outcomes?
23. Quality of Instruction – Does the evidence indicate that faculty encourage, use, evaluate, and reward effective teaching methods that promote student learning? Is there evidence that these methods result in enhanced teaching proficiency?
24. Doctoral Research Culture – To what extent have faculty successfully sustained a doctoral research culture for diverse students? Do they have specific plans to continue its enhancement? What is the extent and quality of students' independent and student/faculty collaborative scholarship, publications, presentations, and involvement/contributions to professional organizations?
25. Dissertation – Does the evidence indicate that students have met and/or exceeded the criteria established for dissertation research?

26. Student Perceptions of Program Quality – Does the evidence suggest student satisfaction with program quality (based on findings from alumni surveys, exit surveys, and student focus groups)?

#### Promoting/Monitoring/Evaluating Student Learning

27. Assessment Plan and Implementation – Do the program’s goals and student learning objectives reflect high expectations for program quality commensurate with doctoral education? Is there evidence that students are achieving these student learning outcomes at a high level of academic rigor? Does the curriculum map illustrate the alignment between student learning objectives, required courses, instructional emphasis, and primary assessment methods? 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?
28. Use of Assessment Results – Have faculty used results effectively from their assessment efforts to both affirm and improve program quality, student learning, instruction, and other program elements?

#### Budgeting and Resources

29. Library and Technology – What is the adequacy of the library and technological resources for instructional quality?
- 30-32. Fiscal support – To what extent is the fiscal support from internal and external sources adequate to support the doctoral program (faculty, students, professional development/travel, research, staffing, and equipment)? Have faculty identified program and University level actions for strengthening program quality? Are there other actions that should be considered?

#### Program Infrastructure

33. Program Infrastructure - Does the evidence display an effective program infrastructure (with consideration of program leadership, quality assurance processes, collaborative decision making, significant faculty involvement, effective internal communications, and high accountability for improvement)?

#### Doctoral Policy and Procedure

34. Program Policy and Procedure - Has the program established and implemented program policy and procedures that adhere to university policy for doctoral programs? Have faculty identified any possible policy modifications to improve effectiveness? Are there others that should be considered?

#### Implementation Plan for Doctoral Program

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?

Recommendations – Have the faculty identified important recommendations for improving program quality? Do they show the use of evidence in reaching these conclusions/recommendations? Are there others that should be considered?

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?

Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Doctoral Academic Program Review Process

Suggestions for Improvement - What recommendations do program faculty have for improving the Academic Program Review process as related to doctoral programs?

DD:ep1/rle 02/02/10

## Appendix 8

### **Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Doctoral Academic Program Review Process**

The Graduate Council reviews the effectiveness of the doctoral APR policy and procedures every 5 years or sooner if programs recommend changes for greater APR effectiveness.

The Graduate Council requests the doctoral faculty, program director, college dean, the Graduate School, and others involved in the doctoral program to provide feedback about the effectiveness of the doctoral APR process. Questions to guide this summary include the following:

1. Outside of the self-study review, what takes the most time and effort in the review process?
2. What elements of the review process are especially helpful? Not helpful?
3. What changes would make the review process more effective?
4. Other

:rle 2/02/10