

11/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 5/AS/04/UEPC--ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES-Approved June 19, 2009

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.

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:

- 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Undergraduate and Graduate Self-Study Documents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

General Education

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

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

Service Courses

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

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.

Curricular Plans and Alignment

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

Units Beyond 120, etc.

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. 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.

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), 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**

Degree Program	Academic Unit	College Affiliation	Degree Type(s)	Hegis Code(s)	Last Review	Next Review
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
Degree Program	Academic Unit	College Affiliation	Degree Type(s)	Hegis Code(s)	Last Review	Next Review

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
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	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	2003-04	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>	Department of Theatre	COA	BFA	10072	n/a	n/a

*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

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

Interdisciplinary Minor Programs

Program	College Affiliation	Degree Type	Hegis Code(s)	Last Review	Next Review
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).	
TARGET DATE	ACTIVITY	√
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.	
By June 30	College dean 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	College dean 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 preliminary implementation plan.	
October – November	Department chair/program administrator 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 college dean submits the final implementation plan to the vice provost.	
By December 1	Provost 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	Office of Academic Programs 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	Vice provost provides a summary of academic program reviews to the Board of Trustees.	
ONGOING	College dean 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	51	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	TOTAL minimum units required (add lines 1 through 5)
7	University elective units (subtract line 6 from line 8)
8	TOTAL UNIT DEGREE REQUIREMENTS *
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	TOTAL double-counted courses (add lines 9 and 10)
12	TOTAL units taken (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