

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

In accordance with the academic program review policy of California State University, these procedures are provided for the review of undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate programs; interdisciplinary programs; honors program; and general education at CSU Stanislaus.

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 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.

I. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

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, 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 and strategic planning.

Each academic program has an identified program faculty and dean who are responsible for overseeing the academic program. The program faculty is normally the department faculty. It is expected that all full-time faculty participate in the preparation and review of the program's academic program review. Where possible and as appropriate to each program, it is desirable to involve adjunct faculty as well. Interdisciplinary programs are governed by an interdisciplinary set of faculty whose rights and responsibilities are identified by an established interdisciplinary program charter.

Program faculty are responsible for developing expected student learning outcomes for each of the programs listed (see Appendix 3 and 4) 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.) 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.

Timeframe for Review

As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic programs “should be reviewed periodically at intervals of from five to ten years.” 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.

Requests for delaying a review 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 (e.g., normally 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.

Academic Program Review Recommendations for Program Continuance/Discontinuance

The college review committee and college dean 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.

II. 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. Departments with undergraduate and graduate programs provide either a separate or integrated review for each degree level, including comprehensive assessments of student learning and program functioning at both levels. The following criteria are addressed in the self-study document:

Changes Since the Last Academic Program Review

Describe actions taken in response to the recommendations made in the previous academic program review. Briefly describe program and field changes over the past seven years and how the curriculum was revised to address these changes.

Enrollment Trends

Based on institutional research data, summarize program's enrollment trends, student characteristics, retention and graduation rates, degrees conferred, and 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).

Commitment to Student Learning

List the learning goals for students majoring in the program. Other than grades, describe how achievement of each of these learning outcomes is evaluated and documented through both indirect and direct methods.

Based on the institutional research data and assessment methods employed by the department, summarize and evaluate student learning, instruction, and other key elements of program effectiveness. Describe changes the program faculty have made and/or plan to make as a result of surveys of current students, student exit surveys, alumni surveys, and direct methods used to evaluate student learning and program effectiveness.

For master's programs, 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

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

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

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

Describe the program's role in providing service courses to other majors and the general education program. Based on an assessment of general education goals, describe how successful these courses are in supporting the university's general education goals.

For graduate programs, describe how effectively the graduate program sustains a graduate-level culture and how the curriculum is structured to ensure active student involvement with the scholarly literature of the field and ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate advanced professional practice and training experiences.

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

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 7 and provide a justification if the units exceed 120.

Units for Graduate and Post-baccalaureate Credential Programs. For graduate programs that exceed 30 required units for a Master of Arts degree or 36 required 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

Describe and evaluate 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 to the program.

Describe how faculty members are engaged and supported in scholarship, research, and/or creative activity. Describe program support for and involvement in faculty development, especially new and non-tenured 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 with the Provost, Dean, and Vice Provost during the academic program review meeting.

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 recommendations.

Final Implementation Plan

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

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

III. PROCESS OVERVIEW AND CHRONOLOGY

The process follows the chronology and timeline found in Appendix 2 to ensure a meaningful review and feedback and timely submission of academic program review reports to the provost and CSU Board of Trustees.

IV. PROGRAMS TO BE REVIEWED

An academic department or unit conducts a review of each undergraduate degree, postbaccalaureate credential, and graduate degree program for which it is responsible. An academic program is a structured, usually sequential, grouping of courses forming a considerable part, or all, of the requirements for a degree or credential.

Each interdisciplinary major or stand-alone minor is subject to academic program review. (Minors embedded within a single academic program are reviewed as part of the program's normal academic program review and are not subject to the process described in this section.) Current interdisciplinary minor programs that are "stand-alone" minors (i.e., affiliated with more than one academic department) are listed in Appendix 3.

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 document is to be developed by the faculty of the interdisciplinary program and accompanied by signatures of the program faculty and dean(s).

V. 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 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.

VI. EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW FOR NON-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS (during the self-study phase)

For non-accredited programs, a program may request of the college dean that the program be subject to an external independent evaluation as part of the self-study phase of the academic program review. An external reviewer 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 subsequent levels for review. Funds for the external review are provided by the college dean. (See Appendix 6, *External Reviewer for Academic Program Review*, for a description of the process for hiring and conduct of work for external reviewers.)

VII. EXTERNAL PROGRAM 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. The external evaluators will be individuals of significant professional reputation in the field who will report their findings to the appropriate department and college. One of the evaluators 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.

The college dean is responsible for the overall coordination of the external review. Nominations for evaluators are solicited from the chair of the department of the program being reviewed and from other institutions, higher education associations, and professional organizations. These 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. Funds in support of the expenses of the external reviews are provided by the college dean.

VIII. UPDATE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

The academic program review procedures are updated as necessary for currency and consistency with university changes in structure, institutional data, and academic programs. Draft changes are submitted by the Vice Provost to the University Educational Policies Committee, Graduate Council, and Provost's Council of Deans for review and action, as necessary.

Approved by the Academic Senate May 11, 2004

Approved by President Hughes July 1, 2004

DMD:rlc 4/25/08 revised language to align with WASC standards

Appendix 1

Academic Program Review Data

The Office of Institutional Research collects, analyzes, and summarizes program data. 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 DATA

Overall Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level
Fall 2001-2005 and Fall 2003-2007

College Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level
Fall 2001-2005 and Fall 2003-2007

CSU Degree Program Headcount Enrollment by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level
Fall 2001-2005 and Fall 2003-2007

COURSE ENROLLMENT HISTORY

CSU Degree Program FTES/FTEF/SFR by Course Level (All, Lower-Division, Upper-Division)
Fall 1997-Fall 2006

Course History by Course Subject By Term for Academic Years (7 or more years of history)

COURSE GRADE DISTRIBUTION

Course Grade Distribution (CSU Stanislaus Total) (7 or more years of history)

Course Grade Distribution by Course Subject (7 or more years of history)

DEGREES AWARDED

Degrees Conferred by Degree Type
College Years 2002-03 through 2006-07

Degrees Conferred by Demographic Characteristics and Degree Level
College Years 2002-03 through 2006-07

Degrees Conferred by College, Demographic Characteristics, and Degree Level
College Years 2002-03 through 2006-07

Degrees Conferred by College, Demographic Characteristics, and CSU Degree Program
College Years 2000-01 through 2004-05 and 2002-03 through 2006-07

TIME TO DEGREE (ANNUAL RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES)

Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen
Fall 1990-Fall 2006 Cohorts Enrolled as of Fall 2007

Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen by Degree
Program at Entry
Fall 1990 - Fall 2006 Cohorts Enrolled as of Fall 2007

Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Transfers
Fall 1990 - Fall 2006 Cohorts Enrolled as of Fall 2007

Annual Retention and Graduation Rates for First-Time Full-Time Transfers by Degree
Program at Entry
Fall 1990 - Fall 2006 Cohorts Enrolled as of Fall 2007

GRADUATING SENIOR SURVEY DATA

Class of 2002/03 through 2006/07

GRADUATE SCHOOL EXIT SURVEY DATA

Class of 2004/05 through 2006/07

ALUMNI SURVEY DATA

Class of 1999/00 through 2003/04

FACULTY DATA *(Data not currently available from APDB)*

Full time equivalent faculty – FTEF (tenured, tenure-track, visiting lecturer, part-time)

Faculty released time

OTHER

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

Appendix 2

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 – January 31	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 2 – October 31	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.	
By November 1	College dean forwards the self-study to the Office of Academic Programs.	
By November 2	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).	
November 3-30	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.	
By December 15	College dean submits to the vice provost a copy of the self-study; recommendations from external reviewer(s) (if applicable); responses from the department (if any); and reports from the college, UEPC, and/or the Graduate Council, where applicable.	

TARGET DATE	ACTIVITY	√
December 16 – January 31	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 <i>preliminary</i> implementation plan.	
February 1 – March 31	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. The college dean submits the <i>final</i> implementation plan electronically to the vice provost.	
By May 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 June 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 process within academic affairs and within the university's strategic planning processes.	

Appendix 3

Listing of Degree Programs for Academic Program Review

Degree Program <i>(Accredited programs italicized)</i>	Academic Unit	Degree Type(s)	Hegis Code(s)	Last Review	Next Review
Agricultural Studies	Department of Agricultural Studies	BA	01014	N/A	2009-10
Anthropology	Department of Anthropology/Geography	BA	22021	2001-02	2008-09
Applied Studies	Interdisciplinary degree program (charter)	BS	49995	1998-99	2006-07
<i>Art</i>	Department of Art	BA/BFA	10021/10022	1999-00	2009-10
Biological Sciences	Department of Biological Sciences	BA/BS	04011	1999-00	2008-09
<i>Business Administration</i>	Department of Accounting and Finance Department of Management, Operations, & Marketing	BS/MBA MSBA	05011 05041	2003-04 n/a	2010-11 2010-11
<i>Chemistry</i>	Department of Chemistry	BA/BS	19051	2000-01	2008-09
Child Development	Department of Psychology and Child Development	BA	08231	2002-03	2009-10
Cognitive Studies	Interdisciplinary degree program (charter)	BA	49016	2002-03	2008-09
Communication Studies	Department of Communication Studies	BA	06011	2000-01	2007-08
<i>Computer Information Systems</i>	Department of Computer Information Systems	BS	07021	2003-04	2010-11
Computer Science	Department of Computer Science	BS	07011	2002-03	2009-10
Criminal Justice	Department of Criminal Justice	BA/MA	21051	2002-03	2010-11
Economics	Department of Economics	BA	22041	2001-02	2008-09
<i>Education</i>	Department of Advanced Studies in Education and Department of Teacher Education	MA/Post- baccalaureate Credential	08011	2002-03	2009-10
English	Department of English	BA/MA	15011	2001-02	2008-09
French*	Department of Modern Languages	BA	11021	2001-02	2008-09
Geography	Department of Anthropology/Geography	BA	22061	2002-03	2009-10
Geology	Department of Physics, Physical Sciences, and Geology	BS	19141	2000-01	2007-08
History	Department of History	BA/MA	22051	2002-03	2009-10
Interdisciplinary Studies	Graduate School and MA/MS Interdisciplinary Studies Committee	MA/MS	49993	2002-03	2009-10
Liberal Studies	Department of Liberal Studies	BA	49012	1999-00	2007-08
Marine Sciences	Department of Biological Sciences	MS	49022	2003-04	2010-11
Mathematics	Department of Mathematics	BA/BS	17011	2000-01	2007-08
<i>Music</i>	Department of Music	BA/BM	10051/10041	2002-03	2012-13
<i>Nursing</i>	Department of Nursing	BS	12031	2002-03	2007-08
Philosophy	Department of Philosophy	BA	15091	2000-01	2007-08
Physical Education	Department of Physical Education and Health	BA	08351	2003-04	2010-11

Degree Program <i>(Accredited programs italicized)</i>	Academic Unit	Degree Type(s)	Hegis Code(s)	Last Review	Next Review
Physical Sciences	Department of Physics, Physical Sciences, and Geology	BA	19011	1999-00	2006-07
Physics	Department of Physics, Physical Sciences, and Geology	BA/BS	19021	1999-00	2006-07
Political Science	Department of Politics and Public Administration	BA	22071	2004-05	2011-12
<i>Psychology</i>	Department of Psychology	BA/MA/MS	20011	2003-45	2010-11
<i>Public Administration</i>	Department of Politics and Public Administration	MPA	21021	2004-05	2011-12
Social Sciences	Interdisciplinary degree program (charter)	BA	22011	2003-04	2010-11
<i>Social Work</i>	Department of Social Work	MSW	21041	2002-03	2010-11
Sociology	Department of Sociology	BA	22081	2002-03	2009-10
Spanish	Department of Modern Languages	BA	11051	2001-02	2008-09
Special Major	Dean, College of Arts, Letters, & Sciences	BA/BS	49993	2003-04	2010-11
<i>Theatre Arts</i>	Department of Theatre	BA	10071	2002-03	2012-13

*French major temporarily suspended effective fall 2006. Program to be permanently discontinued or reactivated fall 2009.

General Education

General Education	General Education Subcommittee <i>(performs role of GE program assessment)</i> (charter)	n/a	n/a	2002-03	2007-08
General Education Summit Program	General Education Subcommittee <i>(performs role of GE program assessment)</i> (charter)	n/a	n/a	2003-04	2010-11

Honors Program

Honors Program	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2006-07
----------------	--	-----	-----	-----	---------

Interdisciplinary Minor Programs

Environmental and Resource Studies	College of Natural 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	2010-11
Gerontology	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	2005-06	2012-13
Latin American Studies	College of Humanities and Social Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	2004-05	2011-12
Permaculture	College of Natural Sciences (charter)	n/a	n/a	2005-06	2012-13

Appendix 4

Interdisciplinary Programs and Honors Program Charter

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 dean and provost.

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

1. Mission
2. Program and curricular description
3. 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 5

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 and is approved by dean and provost.

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, 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 GE program, and what actions for improvement are recommended.

CURRICULUM MAP

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

OUTCOMES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWAcademic Program Review

- Academic Program Review -- Executive Summary of Findings of Program Effectiveness
- Implementation Plan – List of recommended actions and timeline to UEPC

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 6

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 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.

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. This report is included in the self-study document.

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, including assessment results.
2. Focuses on the quality of student learning and the ability of the program to foster student learning.
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. Reviews sample student work from courses (introductory to culminating), as appropriate and with student and faculty identification removed from documents.
5. Employs other strategies appropriate to the discipline.
6. Conducts an exit meeting with department chair, program/departmental faculty, and college dean.
7. Writes summary of findings of strengths and areas for improvement related to student learning, assessment of student learning, curriculum, instruction, advising, faculty scholarship, diversity, quality of support from library and academic technology, 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 subsequent levels of review.

Timeline

The review is conducted over a 1-2 day period, resulting in a written document submitted to the department chair and college dean within two weeks of the visit.

Materials Provided to the External Reviewer

The department chair coordinates the external reviewer's schedule. Prior to the campus visit, the department chair provides to the external reviewer a copy of the visitation schedule, draft 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. 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 \$200 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 7
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

Appendix 8

Signature Page

Academic Program Review

California State University, Stanislaus

Title of Degree Major or Interdisciplinary Minor

Signatures:

Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
Program Faculty Member	Title	Date
College Curriculum Committee Chair		Date
College Dean		Date
Graduate Council (if applicable)		Date
University Educational Policies Committee (if applicable)		Date