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

The Academic Program Review (APR) process at CSU Stanislaus is the most important method by which the university evaluates the effectiveness of its academic programs. In 2000, a review of the APR process was initiated, primarily as a result of the increased emphasis on the demonstration of the quality of student learning, a general dissatisfaction with a burdensome process and timeline, and the perceived inconsistent use of outcomes at the college and university levels.

Under the guidance of the University Educational Policy Committee (UEPC), the Academic Program Review procedures are viewed as a dynamic, subject to continual examination and refinement, and a process that implements the APR policy in accordance with the university’s Principles for the Assessment of Student Learning. As such, UEPC continues to evaluate the procedures and makes appropriate changes.

Chronology for the Evaluation of the Academic Program Review Process

A summary of key actions related to the review of the Academic Program Review process follows:

2000/01
The Provost formed a committee to evaluate the 1996 Academic Program Review Process and to recommend a new pilot APR process. Membership includes administration and faculty governance members.

2001/02 and 2002/03
The APR pilot process was implemented.

2003/04
As a result of the pilot process, revisions were made to the 1996 APR process and are reflected in the new 2005 APR process. (Attachment A)

2004/05 through 2006/07
The new APR process was approved and initiated for programs undergoing 2004/05 review and thereafter.

2007/08
An assessment of the 2005 Academic Program Review process was initiated as part of the university’s reaccreditation self study and in consultation with the University Educational Policies Committee.

External reviewer, Dr. Mary Allen, evaluated the Academic Program Review process as part of her evaluation of the quality the university’s assessment and quality assurance program.

During the provost’s meetings with department chairs, college deans, and faculty for those programs that completed the new 2005 APR, information was gathered to evaluate their experiences with the APR process and to secure their recommendations for improvement, e.g., Criminal Justice, Gender Studies, Physics/Physical Sciences, and Political Science.
Engagement Pilot
As part of the case study, programs undergoing APR in 2008/09 were invited to add an "engagement" criterion under the section on "Commitment to Student Learning" in which programs describe departmental efforts/accomplishments to promote student engagement in learning. At the conclusion of the process, departments will express their views for adding student engagement as a permanent criterion. Academic departments undergoing APR in 2008/09 include Anthropology, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Cognitive Studies, Economics, English, and Spanish. (Attachment B)

Alignment of Assessment and APR Processes
Department Chairs, deans, the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, the Assessment Council, and the Assessment Leadership Team will be requested to use the WASC Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning into Program Reviews (2006), a rubric that provides guidance for assessing the degree to which the university has integrated student learning assessment into its formal academic program review processes. (Attachment C)

Assessment of APR Process
As a part of the provost's meetings with academic departments undergoing APR in 2008/09 cycle, faculty and deans will be asked to provide an assessment of the APR process. Programs include Anthropology, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Cognitive Studies, Economics, English, and Spanish. (Attachment D)

WASC/CSU Review of the APR Process
WASC has formed a task force to develop guidelines and resources for institutions developing/improving their program review processes. A CSU representative on the task force is gathering information from the 23 CSU campuses with regard to various components of the academic program review process. (Attachment E)

Use of Assessment Results of the Academic Program Review Process
The results of the assessment of the Academic Program Review process will be a list of recommendations for improving the APR for consideration by the University Educational Policies Committee, in consultation with other groups, e.g., the Graduate Council, the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, the Assessment Council, the Council of Deans, and the Assessment Leadership Team. Actions, as appropriate, will be taken by the University Educational Policies Committee. (Attachment F)
Attachment A

Summary of Changes Made to the 1996 Academic Program Review Process
As Reflected in the 2005 Academic Program Review Process

The following is a summary of changes, guided by campus values, which are reflected in the 2005 academic program review process:

Streamlined Process/Greater Depth
1. A review cycle of 7 years rather than 5 years.
2. Reduction of the number of review criteria with greater focus on commitment to student learning, faculty expertise, and future program planning and action.

Student Learning
3. Centrality of the establishment and evaluation of programmatic student learning goals.
4. Greater reliance on data and assessment of student learning goals.
5. Addition of a "curriculum matrix" that displays student learning goals addressed in each course and other related information (e.g., assessment methods).

College Accountability
6. Greater decentralization for review by the faculty in the colleges rather than university level, including streamlining the process by eliminating the Academic Program Review Subcommittee of the University Educational Policies Committee.
7. Strengthening the role of the dean in ensuring departmental follow-up and accountability for program quality.
8. Meetings by provost with dean, department chair, and program faculty to affirm implementation plan based on APR.
9. Greater linkage between APR, program planning, strategic planning, and budgetary decisions.
10. Greater integration between undergraduate and graduate programs, with option of integrated documents for undergraduate and graduate.

External Review of Quality
11. Incorporation of accreditation review procedures into APR.
13. Greater clarity of APR for interdisciplinary programs.

Improved Infrastructure
14. Better centralized institutional research support to departments in data collection, analysis, and interpretation.
15. Accountability for the implementation of the APR process shifted back to the vice provost.
Attachment B

Student Engagement in Academic Program Review

Exploration/Pilot

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

Process for Department undergoing APR
1. Engage in department-wide discussion of the impact on student class performance of techniques used to encourage student engagement.
2. Identify and document best practices.
3. Review assessment procedures.
   a. Do student engagement practices enhance student attainment of learning goals? How?
   b. Does lack of student engagement practices hinder student attainment of learning goals?
4. Use analysis (cost/benefit, strength/weakness/opportunity/threat, or some other analytic) to determine viability of the category in the practice of APR preparation.
   a. Does the practice help articulate some area in a better way?
   b. Does the practice assist the APR process in any way?
   c. Does the practice hinder the process, or simply serve as window dressing without real depth?
5. Suggest any other improvements to the APR process.
6. Deliverable – A short (~2k words) analysis of area (4) above and recommendation for/against incorporating the procedure in the APR process.
7. Note: original data remains in department, just as in ordinary assessment procedures.
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### Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews—August 10, 2007 Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Elements of the Self-Study</td>
<td>Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, benchmarking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Review</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts; departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Budgeting</td>
<td>The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes.</td>
<td>The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success.</td>
<td>The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process.</td>
<td>The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</td>
<td>No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, impact, etc.</td>
<td>An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Experience</td>
<td>Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review.</td>
<td>Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys</td>
<td>The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it.</td>
<td>Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Program Review Rubric

Conclusions should be based on a review of program-review documents and discussion with relevant campus representatives, such as department chairs, deans, and program review committees.

The rubric has five major dimensions:

1. Self-Study Requirements. The campus should have explicit requirements for the program's self-study, including an analysis of the program's learning outcomes and a review of the annual assessment studies conducted since the last program review. Faculty preparing the self-study should reflect on the accumulating results and their impact; and they should plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. As much as possible, programs should benchmark findings against similar programs on other campuses. Questions: Does the campus require self-studies that include an analysis of the program's learning outcomes, assessment studies, assessment results, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, including the impact of changes made in response to earlier studies? Does the campus require an updated assessment plan for the subsequent years before the next program review?

2. Self-Study Review. Internal reviewers (on-campus individuals, such as deans and program review committee members) and external reviewers (off-campus individuals, usually disciplinary experts) should evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact; and they should provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. Questions: Who reviews the self-studies? Do they have the training or expertise to provide effective feedback? Do they routinely evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do they provide suggestions for improvement? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

3. Planning and Budgeting. Program reviews should not be pro forma exercises; they should be tied to planning and budgeting processes, with expectations that increased support will lead to increased effectiveness, such as improving student learning and retention rates. Questions: Does the campus systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes? Are expectations established for the impact of planned changes?

4. Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts. Campuses moving into the culture of evidence often find considerable variation in the quality of assessment efforts across programs, and waiting for years to provide feedback to improve the assessment process is unlikely to lead to effective campus practices. While program reviews encourage departments to reflect on multi-year assessment results, some programs are likely to require more immediate feedback, usually based on a required, annual assessment report. This feedback might be provided by an Assessment Director or Committee, relevant Dean or Associate Dean, or others; and whoever has this responsibility should have the expertise to provide quality feedback. Questions: Does someone have the responsibility for providing annual feedback on the assessment process? Does this person or team have the expertise to provide effective feedback? Does this person or team routinely provide feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

5. The Student Experience. Students have a unique perspective on a given program of study: they know better than anyone what it means to go through it as a student. Program review should take advantage of that perspective and build it into the review. Questions: Are students aware of the purpose and value of program review? Are they involved in preparations and the self-study? Do they have an opportunity to interact with internal or external reviewers, demonstrate and interpret their learning, and provide evaluative feedback?
Attachment D

Components for Evaluating the Academic Program Review Process

1. Review Criteria, especially Student Learning
2. Engagement as a Pilot Criterion
3. Internal/External Review Components
4. Institutional Research Data
5. Implementation Plan
6. Timeline
7. Department/College Review
8. Meetings with Dean and Provost
9. Overall effectiveness of APR
10. Other Criteria Identified by the Participants
11. Recommendations for Improving APR
---Original Message---
From: Linda Buckley [mailto:lbuckley@sfsu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2008 12:16 PM
To: mdhada; WLoker@csuchico.edu; lrobles@csudh.edu; carl.bellone@csueastbay.edu;
dennis@csufresno.edu; etrotter@fullerton.edu; jb139@humboldt.edu; Imahoney@csulb.edu;
alfredo@cslanet.calstatela.edu; skreta@csum.edu; mary_boyce@csum.edu; cynthia.rawitch@csun.edu;
clpinterluck@csupomona.edu; mikelee@csus.edu; jzorn@csusb.edu; jsmith@mail.sdsu.edu;
Robert.Cooper@sjsu.edu; dconn@calpoly.edu; djbarsky@csusm.edu; elaine.sundberg@sonoma.edu;
Diana Demetrulias; chanson@calstate.edu; kodonell@calstate.edu
Subject: CSU Program Review

Dear All,

I am writing to ask for your assistance. As you all probably know, WASC has changed some of the CFRs, increasing the focus on assessment and program review. As a consequence, WASC has formed a task force to develop guidelines and resources for institutions that are developing or improving their program review process, and I've been drafted for the task force.

The UC rep on the task force sent the group a grid that gives a profile for program review from each UC campus. It seems that this issue comes up every couple of years at our AVP meetings. In order to help us get a picture of the scope of our program review process and to help the WASC task force get a sense of CSU practices, I am hoping that you (or the person at your campus who handles program review) will answer the questions for your campus in the attached grid. The guy from UC, Irvine had no problem with our using his grid. I have added a few questions for us.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Linda

Linda Buckley, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President
Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness
447 Administration
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, California 94132
Tel. (415) 338-3376
lbuckley@sfsu.edu
1. Are undergraduate and graduate program reviews separate or combined?

- Departments with undergraduate and graduate programs may provide either a separate or integrated review for each degree level.

2. Is there a long-term schedule for reviews?

- Yes, there is a long-term schedule for reviews.
- The schedule is set 4 years in advance.
- The interval between reviews is 7 years.
- Program reviews may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the provost, college dean, department chair, or in compliance with recommendations from prior academic program reviews.

3. Who initiates and oversees the program review process guidelines?

- The Vice Provost, on behalf of the Provost, manages the academic program review process and works closely with the college deans, department chairs, and faculty to ensure that (a) a meaningful and thorough review is conducted for each degree program; (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 and strategic planning.

4. What office/committee is responsible for the program review process guidelines?

- The University Educational Policies Committee, a governance committee of the Academic Senate.

5. What office/committee is responsible for the self review guidelines?

- The University Educational Policies Committee.

6. What data are required as part of the program review process?

- Comprehensive assessments of student learning and program functioning, student enrollment data, course enrollment history, course grade distribution, degrees awarded, time to degree (annual retention and graduation rates), graduating senior survey, graduate school exit survey, alumni survey, faculty data including full time equivalent faculty and faculty released time, and other data unique to each program’s learning goals as requested by the college dean.

- The Office of Institutional Research collects the data and makes them available to the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Stanislaus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the department collect and analyze additional data independently?</td>
<td>The department collects and analyzes data for student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Must departments state educational objectives for programs and courses and provide information about assessing success in meeting those objectives? In what form?</td>
<td>Program faculty are responsible for developing expected student learning outcomes for each program and for employing methods annually to evaluate program effectiveness in achieving programmatic student learning goals. The assessment of these goals 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.) The assessment of the stated objectives is typically done in a narrative form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Who provides staff support for the review process?</td>
<td>The staff in the Office of Academic Programs provide support for the review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Who funds any extraneous costs associated with the review (external reviewers, unusual needs)?</td>
<td>Funds in support of the expenses of the external reviews are provided by the college dean and the Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How is the dean’s office involved in the review process? Do the internal review team members meet with the dean?</td>
<td>The dean’s office is involved throughout the entire process. The deans, the vice provost, and Institutional Research conduct a program review workshop with department chairs/program administrators and program faculty to discuss the academic program review process and disseminate data. The dean’s office receives the self-study and supporting materials from the department chair. The dean’s office forwards the self-study to the college governance committee(s) and submits to the vice provost a copy of the self-study, recommendations from external reviewer(s); responses from the department (if any); and reports from the college, the University Educational Policies Committee, and/or the Graduate Council where applicable. The dean meets with the program representative(s), the department chair/program administrator, the vice provost, and the provost to discuss the results of the academic program review and the implementation plan. The college dean approves the final implementation plan before forwarding to the provost. The dean incorporates the results of the academic program review into the college’s strategic and budget planning processes and within the university’s strategic planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Who proposes and selects the members of a review or ad hoc committee? Is there a member from Undergraduate Council or the Educational Policy Committee?</td>
<td>Each college is responsible for selecting its members for the curriculum committee. The members are faculty from the respective college. They may serve a dual role with other governance committees on campus including the University Educational Policies Committee or the Graduate Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is there an external review committee involved in program reviews?</td>
<td>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 normally 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who selects the external reviewer(s)?</td>
<td>External evaluators are identified by the department chair. The evaluators are selected by the college dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. With whom or with what committee does the external reviewer(s) meet (not including department faculty, students, etc.)?</td>
<td>The external reviewers conduct selected interviews with community groups, advisory groups, or other community members as appropriate to the program (in addition to the department chair, program faculty, staff, students, and faculty members outside the department but associated with the program). The external reviewers conduct meetings during and at the conclusion of the review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do meetings occur before, during, or after the review process?</td>
<td>No meetings are scheduled before the review process. Meetings occur during and at the conclusion of the review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Does the review include a separate external reviewer report?</td>
<td>The external reviewers are required to submit a written summary of findings. Specific guidelines and responsibilities are provided to the external reviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are specific guidelines given to external reviewers for this report?</td>
<td>Yes, specific guidelines are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do external reviewers receive an honorarium?</td>
<td>Normally, the external reviewers receive an honorarium to include $200/day plus transportation and one-night lodging as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What type of student input is included in the review materials?</td>
<td>Student data and assessment of student learning outcomes are included in the review materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Are students involved in the committee doing the review? How?</td>
<td>Students are invited to participate in the interview process. There are no limitations placed on students’ participation in the review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there limitations to their participation?</td>
<td>No, there are no limitations placed on students’ participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Does the review committee or ad hoc conduct a site visit? Who is invited to these sessions?</td>
<td>It’s expected that the external reviewers conduct the review on site. The external reviewers conduct 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Briefly describe the review process. Beginning with</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Evaluation of the Academic Program Review Process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the self-study, what offices or committees review the departmental report; and who reviews or comments on the final recommendation?</td>
<td>The department is able to provide a response letter to the college curriculum committee or other levels of review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. At what stage does the department provide a response letter?</td>
<td>The results of the academic program review are incorporated into the college’s strategic and budget planning processes. The provost incorporates the results of the review into the regular planning process within academic affairs and within the university’s strategic planning processes. An implementation plan is required. The 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. If there is follow up required, it is stipulated in the letter issued by the provost which would also include a timeline. The follow up would be completed by the department chair in consultation with the college dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. What is the outcome of the review?</td>
<td>The governance review (peer review) provides various perspectives, none is superior; strength is derived from the combination of each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an action plan developed and monitored following the review?</td>
<td>Providing a program review workshop to assist departments with the overall academic program review process has been a successful addition to the overall process. It gets the program review cycle started and allows the department chair/program administrators to discuss with Institutional Research regarding the data and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the review is closed, is there a timeframe for follow-up?</td>
<td>Getting the self-study through the governance review process takes the most time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What form does a follow-up take; when is it done; and by whom?</td>
<td>Emphasis on student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. What changes would make your review process more effective?</td>
<td>Not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. What happens if a program is recalcitrant about participating in the review, citing reasons why now would not be a reasonable or possible time for the review?</td>
<td>Efforts are made for compliance. Threats of program discontinuation or difficulty in securing new faculty positions have been rare but have been used to motivate wayward departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Do you have programs that are not departmentally based and include faculty from multiple departments? How are their reviews different? Are there special problems that occur or changes taken in the review process?</td>
<td>CSU Stanislaus has interdisciplinary programs that cross college and department organizational lines. The review process is not different for degree programs; however, for the review of the General Education Program, a different self-study format is followed. In addition to the criteria for the self-study, interdisciplinary programs and the honors program provide an updated charter that governs program operations and is approved by the dean and provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Do you have an arbitration process in place if a department objects to or rejects the conclusion of the review?</td>
<td>We do not have a formal arbitration process in place if a department objects to or rejects the conclusion of the review. There have been instances when the review process recommended program discontinuance, and there is a formal discontinuance policy and procedure to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. What other information do you consider important that might not have been addressed with these questions?</td>
<td>Do faculty find the program review process meaningful and helpful especially in the context of a cost/benefit analysis?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations for Improving the Academic Program Review Process
October 2008

Various groups or individuals have made the following recommendations for improving the current Academic Program Review procedures. These recommendations are being reviewed by the University Educational Policies Committee and the Graduate Council.

1. Timeline
   a. Shorten timeline for process from beginning to end. A more compact timeline allows for currency of findings and actions and increased linkage between APR results and budgeting process (timed with provost’s requests for college budget proposals).
   b. Adhere to 7-year timeline; postponements/delays should be rare and for compelling reasons.
   c. Deans to monitor progress by establishing internal college dates for various steps in consultation with appropriate college bodies.
   d. Revise schedule for specific programs, as requested by individual college deans.

2. Initiating the APR Process
   a. Do we need to continue to offer an annual workshop centrally, or do the deans prefer to initiate APR within each of their colleges?
   b. Formalize the process at the outset so that department chairs identify the process for completing of the APR – Who (person/group) will draft the self study? How will all departmental faculty participate in the development and review of the self study?

3. Evaluating APR’s
   a. Provide guidance for colleges in evaluating APR’s (Recommendation made in Allen Report; previous APR had university criteria used by committees to guide discussion/review). Very rough draft distributed to deans for their review.

4. External Reviews
   a. Change external reviews as part of the APR process from optional to strongly encouraged or required.
   b. Fund external reviews for non-accredited programs from AQA funding (Estimated about 7 programs per year at $1,500 per program for 1-2 reviewers. WASC revised standards/rubric for APR identifies quality APR as having external reviews and external benchmark data).

5. Students’ Participation
   a. Add an undergraduate student (and graduate student, as applicable) to college APR review teams.
   b. Identify other methods for increasing student participation in APR.

6. Student Engagement
   a. Programs under review for 2008/09 were asked to consider participation in piloting an APR criterion related to fostering student engagement.
   b. Follow-up in fall to determine which programs are considering this criterion.

7. Graduate (Master’s) Programs
   a. Should we continue to have separate or integrated APR documents for graduate programs? What has been the most successful means for ensuring attention to both undergraduate and graduate programs?
8. Institutional Research
   a. Annually, IR to provide data for all academic programs, data disaggregated by college and program and sent to each individual department and program.
   b. For selected data, data are disaggregated by demographic characteristics, gender and ethnicity; for lower/upper division and graduate; for Stockton.
   c. Data to include academic year, not fall census data only.
   d. At time of APR, IR to provide 7-year trend history, with narrative summary of findings accompanied by graphs and charts.
   e. Incorporate use of Delaware Study data from national data base for benchmarking program costs.
   f. Faculty data to be refined.
   g. Deans’ suggestions – missing data? Timeliness of data? Quality of data presentation?

9. Assessment
   a. Incorporation of PAC assessment into APR. How and what? Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee and FCASL will be reviewing Fall 2008.

10. Meeting with Provost
    a. Emphasize the importance of structuring the meeting for review of the preliminary implementation plan and submission of the final implementation plan.
    b. Structure this process more formally through a memorandum of agreement, signed by provost, dean, and department chair.

11. Other
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