March 3, 2011

To: Michael Caldwell, Chair
   Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

From: Fred Schreiber, Chair
   Academic Policy & Planning


APM 220 was forwarded by AP&P last fall to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee referred it back to AP&P with a request to conform two parts to APM 214 (see the pdf attachment). Attached is a track change document (APM 220 revised) showing all of the changes being proposed to APM 220. Changes in response to the Executive Committee are found on page 7. The 'revisedlastchangeonly document isolates the change from all other changes. APM 214 notes that:

"A call for a program discontinuation review will be issued by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) when as a result of periodic program review the Undergraduate Academic Program Review Subcommittee recommends to the Provost that a program be reviewed for possible discontinuation".

The change proposed conforms the language to this. The second change recommended by the executive committee does not seem to be relevant. The two review processes (program review vs. discontinuation review) are distinct and need not have the same criteria.
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This document describes the academic program review. Accredited programs review process will differ slightly from that detailed here as the schedule will be dictated by the accrediting agency. Once the accreditation visit and report are completed for such programs, the process is the same.
Policy on the Review of Academic Programs

Program Review Policy

Checklist For Program Reviews

Academic Unit
- Select self-study coordinator (October)
- Attend orientation meeting (October)
- Complete self-study (October to April)
- Suggest external and on-campus reviewers (April)
- Work with review officers to schedule review team visit (May)
- Revise Self Study (August/September)
- Supervise site visitors during visit (September)
- Schedule faculty meeting to discuss review and prepare response (October)
- Forward response to review officers (October-November)
- Attend Senate committee meeting (November-February)
- Develop Action Plan (February-April)
- Attend planning/implementation session (May)
- Revise Action Plan (May)

Academic Dean
- Attend orientation meeting (optional-October)
- Work with the department in preparing the self-study (October-April)
- Receive and review self-study (May)
- Meet with review panel (September)
- Read review panel's report (October)
- Forward response to review officers (October-November)
- Review proposed Action Plan (April)
- Attend planning/implementation session (April-May)

Review Officers
- Notify unit about review (May, year prior)
- Consult with chairs to appoint self-study coordinators (May, year prior)
- Conduct orientation session (October)
- Provide support to development of self study (October to April)
- Select program review panel (April)
- With unit, arrange program review panel's schedule (May)
- Review, process and distribute self-study (May-August)
- Conduct entrance and exit interviews with review team (September)
- Obtain and distribute program review panel's report (October)
- Schedule committee review (November)
- Schedule planning/implementation meeting (April)
- Coordinate final record of program review (May)
## Timeline and Procedures

### Recommended Timeline for Review of Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program notified of upcoming review in May</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify self study coordinator</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Meeting with chairs/coordinators</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide program with dataset</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Self Study</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft to Dean</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Study to University level</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify review team members</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule review team visit</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Study response to program</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final self study to university</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Team Visit</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report from review team to program</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program response to review team report</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's response to review team report</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University committee review</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unic Comm Letter to Dep/Univ</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plan by department</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Action Plan Meeting</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plan response from the dean</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan meeting</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline and procedures (continued)

1. Notification of the Review (May of academic year before review)
The review officer will notify the chair of the academic department and the appropriate dean that a review has been scheduled.

2. Designation of the Self-Study Coordinator (May, year before)
The chair of the academic department will notify the review officer and the appropriate dean of the name of the coordinator of the self-study.

3. Self-Study Orientation Meeting (October)
The review officer(s) will schedule a meeting for all departments participating in a self-study with the department chair, the self-study coordinator(s), school or college dean, other department faculty as requested by the department chair.

4. Preparation of the Self-Study (October-April)
All program faculty members should be involved, and deans and review officer(s) should be consulted throughout the preparation of the self-study report, which addresses the current status and future development of the program. If the department undergoing review has multiple degrees, each degree should have a separate self-study, although a common set of supporting materials may be provided for multiple reports. Toward the end of the process, a draft of each self-study should be distributed for comments and suggestions to all faculty members in the program. The responses should be considered during preparation of the final draft.

5. Selecting the External and On-Campus Consultants (April)
Departments suggest reviewers to Dean and Review officers. Review officer(s) will promptly notify the chair, coordinator, and team members of those selected.

6. Submission of the Self-Study (March-April)
The department should submit the self-study to the college/school dean no later than April 25. The college/school dean will review the program's self-study. If the dean has concerns about the self-study, he/she should work with the department to address the concerns. When satisfied with the quality and content of the self-study, the dean will forward the self-study with a memorandum of approval to the review officer(s) no later than May 15. The review officer(s) will review the self-study for conformity with University guidelines for self-study and requirements. A request for any changes that may be needed will be sent to the department no later than August 15.

7. Site Visit (September)
The review officer(s) will work with the department in May to schedule the review team site. The department will provide the team with an office for use during the visit, as well as a computer and printer. In addition, meeting space should be provided for scheduled meetings of the team with the various groups. It is the unit's responsibility to arrange tours of its facilities; a tour of the library; time for reviewing course syllabi and student work (including randomly selected theses); and to schedule the appropriate meetings with faculty, students, and alumni as appropriate. The site visit should conclude with an exit meeting scheduled by the review officers. Those attending will include the Associate Provost, school/college Deans, Graduate Dean (as appropriate), Dean of Undergraduate Studies (as appropriate), department chair and/or graduate program coordinator (as appropriate), to be.
8. Site Visitors’ Report (September)
   The review team’s report should be completed prior to the departure of the external consultant. If necessary, the report can have draft status at that time, subject to final review of team members, but it should be complete in scope. As appropriate, there should be separate reports on undergraduate and graduate programs. The report(s) should be delivered to the review officer(s). The report(s) will be distributed to the college/school dean and to the department via the chair and the coordinator. The department will be given one week after the visit to prepare the Chair’s Response to the team report(s). The dean will be given one week after the Chair’s Response to prepare his/her responses to the team report(s) and the Chair’s Response. The responses will be distributed with the team report(s) and the self-study to the Undergraduate Academic Program Review Subcommittee and/or the Graduate Committee.

9. Committee Review (October-March)
   The campus program review committees will review the reports provided, interview representatives of the program and the administration as appropriate, and provide their responses to the report, particularly the recommendations of the review team. They should also comment on the outcomes assessment process in the department and on the five-year assessment plan. The committee report should be completed no less than one month following receipt of the material and should be delivered to the review officer(s).

10. Planning/Implementation Meeting (February-May)
    The department chair and/or program coordinator will draft a response to the recommendations from the review committees and site team and prepare a brief draft of an action plan. The department chair and/or program coordinator will forward the draft action plan to the college/school dean and the Provost two weeks before the planning/implementation meeting occurs. The review officer(s) will schedule the planning/implementation meeting to consider all recommendations and comments. Those attending will include the chair, program coordinator, college/school dean, associate provost and provost. A representative from the review committees (if requested by the department) may also attend. During this meeting, the college/school dean and the Provost may propose elements for the action plan. An agreed-upon action plan will be developed, laying out the various actions and responsibilities entailed.
Program Review Self-Study

After notification of the scheduled review, programs may begin assembling information to be incorporated into the self-study. A self-study coordinator, selected from the department faculty, should be identified to oversee preparation of the self-study. Where a department is undergoing both a graduate and an undergraduate program review, separate self-study coordinators should be selected. All program faculty members should be involved in preparation of the self-study and consulted prior to the preparation of the final draft. Since the department chair is responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the self-study, the chair should continually and actively oversee the preparation of the report. It is the responsibility of the self-study coordinator to meet periodically with the college/school dean to review progress on the self-study, to share the content of the self-study as it develops, and to report to the department faculty the comments and recommendations of the dean.

The self-study is a comprehensive written report that is prepared by the academic program scheduled for a review. Self-studies must be prepared using the Program Review Self-Study Template (See Appendix A) and submitted electronically. The self-study report should not exceed twenty pages, excluding appendices. For accredited programs, it is the report prepared for the accrediting body supplemented with a revised student learning outcomes assessment plan. If the department undergoing review has multiple degrees, each degree must be included in the self-study. If only a portion (an option) of the degree program being reviewed is accredited, a full self-study is required for the non-accredited or the non-accredited option(s) within the program.

Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (IRAP) and the program review officer(s) will provide a standard data set to be included in the self-study and will offer technical assistance in updating the assessment plan and planning and evaluating surveys. The review officer(s) can provide guidance and answer questions about the program review process.

The self-study examines the current status of the academic program based on its activities and achievements since its last program review. The document should identify strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction, student performance, student learning outcomes, and service; resource availability and needs; and special features or services provided by the department. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it should serve as a vehicle by which the department, in conjunction with the university, can plan for the future. Goals for program improvement, a plan to achieve those goals, and strategies for measuring progress towards goal achievement should be included. Thus, the self-study should include mechanisms for solving current problems and avoiding projected problems, for building on existing strengths, and for maximizing opportunities that are likely to develop within the discipline in the near future. The allocation of resources is an important matter to all programs. However, if the self-study report becomes primarily a budget request, the unit misses an excellent opportunity to provide the campus information on its strengths, weaknesses, plans, and goals. Moreover, an unduly self-

---

1 All references to chair are meant as the department chair or program coordinator.
serving document in some measure loses credibility. The report is likely to have the most favorable impact on readers if the unit seizes the opportunity for creative thinking about plans.

The college/school dean will review the program’s self-study, provide comments to the self-study coordinator, and work with the department to address any concerns that arise. When satisfied with the quality and content of the self-study, the dean will forward the self-study with a memorandum of approval to the review officer(s) normally no later than May 15.

The review officer(s) will review the self-study for conformity with university guidelines. If the report does not meet the university requirements it will be returned to the program with a specified due date for changes. When all required elements of the self-study have been addressed, the review officer will notify the program to submit one hard copy and an electronic copy of the program self-study.

Accredited programs should submit one hard copy and an electronic copy of the accreditation self-study along with a revised student outcomes assessment plan.

Site visit and report by a panel of external evaluators

For non-accredited programs, the site visit will be conducted by a team of at least three consultants including an external expert in the discipline under review who has experience with student outcomes assessment in that discipline, a faculty member from within the school or college of the department, and a faculty member from the campus but outside the school or college of the department. The department may elect to include a fourth member of the team representing the alumni, community members, or other accreditation experts. The department submits the names of 2-3 faculty from the college/school but not associated with the program and the names of 2-3 faculty from outside the school/college to the dean for consideration. Additionally, the department completes an online form for 2-3 individuals from off campus to serve as the external reviewer. After the dean approves, the program review officer(s) contact the review team members and schedules the visit. The university provides a stipend to the off-campus disciplinary consultant. This individual serves as the chair of the review team.

For non-accredited programs, the review officer(s) and the department work together to schedule the review panel site visit. The department will provide the team with an office for use during the visit, as well as a computer and printer. In addition, space should be provided for scheduled meetings of the team with the various groups. It is the unit’s responsibility to arrange tours of its facilities; a tour of the library; time for reviewing course syllabi and student work (including randomly selected theses/projects/comprehensive exams); and to schedule the appropriate meetings with faculty, students, and alumni as appropriate. The site visit should conclude with an exit meeting of the Associate Provost, School/College Dean, the program review officer(s), department chair, and/or graduate program coordinator. If only one program is being reviewed, the panel will complete its work in a single day. For review of multiple programs (e.g., undergraduate and graduate), a two-day site visit is needed. Sample site visit agendas are provided below.

Sample One-Day Site Visit Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>Designated faculty member picks up out-of-town site visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Review officer(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Academic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Assoc Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Tour of facilities and library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Meeting and lunch with program/departmental faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Additional meetings as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Review of course materials, student work, and report discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Exit meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Two-Day Site Visit Schedule**

**First Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>Designated faculty member picks up out-of-town site visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Review officer(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Academic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Assoc Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Tour of facilities and library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Meeting and lunch with program/departmental faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Alumni/employers/advisory council, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Department chair and/or self-study coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Additional meetings with faculty, etc. as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Review of course syllabi, student work, theses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Additional meeting as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Report discussion/preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Exit meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For accredited programs, the department works with the accrediting agency to schedule the visit and notifies the program review officer(s) as soon as the date has been selected.

**Description of Site Visit Sessions.**

1. Visit with Review Officers
One of the first meetings scheduled for the review panel will be with the review officers. The purpose of this meeting is to orient the Site Visit Team to the purpose of their visit and to answer any questions they might have on the procedures for the Academic Program Review and/or their role in the review.

2. Visits with students
Some of the most helpful meetings are those with students. Students often bring up questions for which the site visitors will want to seek answers; these meetings should be fairly early in the schedule. Class visits also work well. After the reviewers are introduced and the purpose of the visit explained, unit faculty members should leave so that students feel free to discuss issues. Since undergraduate and graduate students may have different concerns, a separate meeting should be arranged for each group. It is important to have a substantial number of students in each group.

3. Visits with faculty members
Depending on the size of the department, two or three small group meetings (or individual meetings, where possible) might be desirable so that most faculty members will have a chance to express their opinions. In addition, there should probably be a small meeting with the faculty members who prepared the report and with the graduate advisory committee or other committees whose work relates to the program review. The department chair should not attend the meetings with faculty.

4. Visits with the department chairs
At least an hour should be scheduled for the site visitors to meet with the department chair. Because site visitors will usually have questions from their conversations with students and faculty, some time with the department chair should be made available rather late in the schedule.

5. Visits with university administrators
Since the recommendations of the site visitors will affect planning by the unit and college, a session with the school/college dean is critical. As part of an effort to incorporate review results into general university planning, meetings will be scheduled with the Associate Provost, and the Academic Affairs Budget Officer.

6. Review panel’s report (Appendix B)
Time needs to be reserved during the site visit to allow the consultants to organize and begin drafting a report summarizing their program evaluations and recommendations. The off-campus discipline expert serves as the organizer and chief author of the team report and is responsible for submitting the report to the Program Review Officer. A separate report should be prepared for each undergraduate and the graduate program, delivered electronically to the review officer(s). The report(s) will be distributed to the college/school dean and to the department.

7. Exit meeting
The concluding exit meeting provides the site visit team with the opportunity to communicate key findings to the Associate Provost, the review officer(s), the college/school dean, department chair, the self-study coordinator and/or graduate program coordinator (if a graduate program).

A Note on Hospitality. Please coordinate faculty members to serve as local hosts, who will pick up out-of-town visitors at their hotel, escort them to meetings, arrange return transportation, and lend general assistance. On the second day, please arrange for out-of-town visitors to check out.
of the hotel before noon so that the university is not charged for an extra day, unless the visitors have asked to stay over a third night. Most local hotels will provide shuttle service to the airport, but if time is tight it may be better for someone in the unit to give the visitor a ride. The Site Visit Team will have two busy days and will likely appreciate a few hours of quiet. Please leave the evening hours free. Also, no funds have been set aside for entertainment. Lavish entertaining is not expected or encouraged. If faculty members wish to go out to dinner or lunch with the visitors, they will be responsible for their own expenses.

**Outline for the Review Team Report**
Content and length of review panel’s report typically vary, depending on the nature and size of the program and on personal preferences of the reviewers. Consultants are welcome to comment on any aspect of the program that they consider important to program quality and future development. From an organizational standpoint, it is often useful to begin the report with an overall view of the program and to conclude with a summary and specific recommendations, where appropriate. Please consider whether or not the mission of the program is clearly stated and whether the activities of the program are consistent with the stated mission. A separate report is required for each degree program being reviewed.

The best way to assist an academic unit is to make useful recommendations within the current budget. Thus, if a major initiative is needed, corresponding reductions should be suggested. In addition, it is helpful to suggest what the unit might be able to accomplish with a 3 to 5 percent increase in funds or what might best be eliminated with a 3 to 5 percent decrease in funds.

A review team report template is provided to review team members (See Appendix B)

**Responses to the Review Panel’s Report**
Within two weeks of receipt of the review panel’s report, the department provides a written response that addresses issues raised in the report and which may also discuss significant changes or developments that have taken place in the program subsequent to the self-study. The department chair’s response needs to address each of the review panel’s recommendations. The departmental response is submitted to the college/school dean and the review officer(s).

The college/school dean should address the issues raised in the review panel report and the department chair’s response. The dean’s response shall be submitted within one week to the chair and to the review officer(s), and distributed to the departmental faculty for review.

I. Specific Issues to be Addressed
   A. Issue 1 (identify issue)
      1. Proposed Action, Expected Outcome
      2. Cost/Resource Implications
      3. Source of Funds/Resources
      4. Benchmark and Time Line for Solution
   B. Repeat for Additional issues

II. Additional Information
    List and discuss any other changes and developments in this program in response to the site visitors’ reports and/or since the self-study was submitted.
University Senate committee review
The campus program review committees will examine the review panel's reports and the
departmental and dean's responses. The program review committees may interview
representatives of the program and the administration as appropriate, and provide committee
recommendations based on the reports provided. They should also comment on the outcomes
assessment process in the department and on the updated Student Outcomes Assessment Plan.
The committee report should be completed within one to two months following receipt of the
material and should be communicated to the department chair with copies to the review officer(s)
and the college/school dean. The following are categories for committee recommendations:

Approve a Program for Continuation with Notation of Exceptional Quality
Approval is recommended without reservation and with a notation of specific areas of program
promise and excellence. Programs recommended in this category may be considered for an
award for program excellence. These are programs that exhibit special strength in all aspects of
the review process and reflect the very best attributes of commitment, quality, and promise.

Approve a Program for Continuation with Notation of Exceptional Quality
Approval is recommended without reservation and with a notation of specific areas of program
promise and excellence. Programs recommended in this category may be considered for an
award for program excellence. These are programs that exhibit special strength in all aspects of
the review process and reflect the very best attributes of commitment, quality, and promise.

Approve a Program for Continuation
Program approval is recommended with identification of specific areas that need to be further
developed, and a notation of specific areas of achievement. These programs meet all evaluative
measures of quality, but nonetheless could improve in substantial ways (e.g., absence of a strong
student recruitment plan or incomplete implementation of learning outcomes assessment.)

Approve a Program for Conditional Continuation
Conditional approval is recommended with identification of specific areas requiring significant
improvement, including the conditions and a reasonable time frame for such conditions to be met
in achieving unconditional approval. Conditional continuation is appropriate for a program that
fails to meet expected quality standards and for which additional time and/or implementation of
planned actions to address these weaknesses could be expected to eliminate such deficiencies
without impairing student progress (e.g., the need to obtain space or equipment.)

Suspend a Program
A recommendation for suspension of a program is appropriate upon receipt of a conditional
continuation in the most recent program review and when two conditions occur: (1) when the
program fails to meet established standards of quality that insure an appropriate academic
experience for students and (2) when there is evidence that these deficiencies may be corrected
over a specified period of time. Those standards of quality include but are not limited to a
minimum critical number of faculty, a minimum critical number of students, adequacy and
frequency of required courses, adequate library holdings, and appropriate physical facilities.
Please note that a recommendation to suspend a program could lead to administrative action.
Administrative action to suspend a program: (1) places a moratorium on new student admissions;
(2) requires students currently in the program be accommodated so that they may complete the
program; (3) places a moratorium on reappointment of faculty to graduate faculty status, if
pertinent to a graduate program; and (4) removes program catalog copy. The degree title may be
retained on the trustee-approved campus Academic Plan. If evidence suggests that the program
may be successfully reconstituted at a later date, then conditions to be fulfilled in order to fully reopen the program should be identified along with a process to support the removal of a recommendation for suspension. Note that discontinuation may result if the program is unable to satisfy the conditions for successful reconstitution as identified.

**Discontinue a Program**

A recommendation to discontinue a program is appropriate upon receipt of a conditional continuation in the most recent program review and when the program fails to meet established standards of quality that ensure an appropriate academic experience for students, and at the same time when there is no evidence that deficiencies have been corrected over a specified period of time. Please note that a recommendation to discontinue a program could lead to administrative action. Administrative action to discontinue a program: (1) places a moratorium on new student admissions; (2) requires students currently in the program be accommodated so that they may complete the program; (3) places a moratorium on reappointment of faculty to graduate faculty status, if pertinent; and (4) removes program catalog copy. A separate process for review of the implications of program termination is implemented. This second and separate level of review follows University policy and includes an assessment of the implications for the University and its service area, faculty, facilities, students, and resources if the program is discontinued.

**The Action Plan**

Soon after the senate review committee(s) has submitted their recommendations, the department chair and/or program coordinator will draft an action plan in consultation with the dean. The action plan is based on the department’s draft plan included in the self-study, the review team report, and the senate committee(s)’ recommendations. The action plan includes a vision for the program(s), and for each action item the following: (1) Proposed action and expected outcome, (2) Cost/resource implications, (3) Source of funds or resources, and (4) Timeline for accomplishing the proposed action. For your convenience, a template for the action plan is available (See Appendix C)

This document will be discussed at a Planning and Implementation Meeting called by the Provost and including the chair, college/school dean, review officer(s) and a representative from the site visit team (if requested by the department) to consider all recommendations and comments. The purpose of this meeting is to prioritize the action plan and obtain commitments for any resources needed to achieve the high priority goals. The dean and the Provost may propose additional action items. The department may be requested to revise the action plan and another action plan meeting may be called if needed. The finalized action plan is signed by the chair, the dean, the program review officer, and the provost.

Each year a progress report on the items in the action plan will be included in the Department Chair’s Annual Report to the Provost.
# Appendix A Self Study Template

**ENTER DEGREE NAME**  
(e.g., B.S. in Biology)

**PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY**

**DEPARTMENT OF**

## I. Introduction and Overview of the Program

Enter Introduction/Overview

*Guide: What text here?*

## II. Previous Action Plan or Recommendations from Prior Review

Enter previous action plan/recommendations

*Guide: What text here?*

## III. Departmental Description and Evaluation of the Program

### A. Mission and Goals of the Program

1. Enter text: Alignment of the Program and University's Missions and Goals

2. Enter text: Alignment of the Program and the College/School Goals

3. Enter text: Reflection of Any Recent Changes in the Discipline

### B. Effectiveness of the Instructional Program

1. Enter text: Student Learning as Assessed Through the Program's Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (SOAP)

2. Curriculum
   
   a. Enter text: Structure/Cohesion of Instructional Program

   b. Enter text: Cooperative Efforts with Other Academic Programs – Joint Degrees, Service Courses, General Education Courses

   c. Enter text: Program Faculty
d. Enter text: Research on Effectiveness of Teaching and Learning

III. Departmental Description and Evaluation of the Program (continued)

3. Enter text: Recruitment, Retention, and Student Services

4. Enter text: Community Interactions (Professional, Disciplinary, Industry/Regional)

C. Faculty Effectiveness in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

1. Enter text: Teaching and Advising

2. Enter text: Scholarship and Research

3. Enter text: University Service

4. Enter text: Community Service

D. Resources

1. Enter text: Financial/Budgetary

2. Faculty/Staff
   a. Enter text: Adequacy and Availability
   b. Enter text: Professional Development/Travel Support

3. Enter text: Implementation and Currency of Technology

4. Enter text: Other

IV. Plan for the Next Review Period

A. Recommended Changes to Mission and Goals of the Program

1. Enter Change

2. Enter Change (if necessary)

3. Enter Change (if necessary)

B. Effectiveness of Instructional Program
1. Enter text: Curriculum

2. Enter text: Recruitment, Retention, and Student Services

IV. Plan for the Next Review Period (continued)

3. Enter text: Community Interactions (Professional, Disciplinary, Industry/Regional)

C. Resources

1. Enter text Financial/Budgetary

2. Enter text Faculty/Staff

3. Enter text Implementation and Currency of Technology

4. Enter text Other

V. Additional Issues

Enter text: Additional Issues
Appendix B. Review Team Report Template

Enter Program Name

Review Team Report

Introductory section

Comments and observations on strengths or weaknesses which need to be addressed in addition to conclusions presented in Self-Study Report. Consider any of the following that may be relevant

1. Curriculum design and relevance to university mission
2. Program long-range plans
3. Admissions procedures
4. Classification and advancement procedures, if a graduate program review
5. Faculty quality, achievements, needs, commitment to program
6. Students' quality, achievements, needs
7. Assessment Activities
8. Research and/or professionally related activities
9. Facility adequacy, unique advantages, ancilliary units
10. Resource utilization, planning, augmentation
11. Technology Implementation and currency
12. Administrative commitment, support, leadership, and concerns for program
13. Service and community interaction
14. Other

Comments and observations

Summary of evaluation

Is this program offered at an appropriate degree level? Choose one. Please elaborate
Is the current program viable? Choose one. Please elaborate
What are the attitudes of faculty, students, and administrators toward this program?
Attitudes toward program
Do resources which support this program ensure that students receive a degree program of quality? Choose one. Please explain

IV. Recommendations

This report was prepared by: Name of Outside Reviewer

Enter date

Institution: Outside Reviewer's Institution

Signature:

COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVE: Name of Reviewer from the College/School

I have read the Review Team Report and Choose One
Reviewer's concerns (if any): List reservations or areas of disagreement
Signature: ___________________________
Date: ___________________________
UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVE: Name of Campus Reviewer from outside the college/school

I have read the Review Team Report and Choose One
Reviewer's concerns (if any): List reservations or areas of disagreement
Signature: ________________________________
Date: ________________________________

Other team members if any: Names of other team members

I have read the Review Team Report and Choose One

Reviewer's concerns (if any): List reservations or areas of disagreement

Signature(s): ________________________________  Date: ________________________________

______________________________  Date: ________________________________
## Appendix C. Action Plan Template

**Enter Degree Name**

**Enter Name of Department**

### ACTION PLAN

#### V. Vision for the Program

Enter Vision Here

*What changes in direction or new initiatives do you anticipate as a result of the review?*

#### II. Specific actions to be taken to achieve the vision

1. Enter Action 1
   - a. Enter Expected Outcome
   - b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   - c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   - d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action

2. Enter Action 2
   - a. Enter Expected Outcome
   - b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   - c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   - d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action
ACTION PLAN

II. Specific actions to be taken to achieve the vision (continued)

3. Enter Action 3
   a. Enter Expected Outcome
   b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action

4. Enter Action 4
   a. Enter Expected Outcome
   b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action

5. Enter Action 5
   a. Enter Expected Outcome
   b. Enter Cost and resource implications
   c. Enter Source of funds/resources
   d. Enter benchmark and timeline for action
This template provides space for five action items, but programs may add more items by adding rows. Simply copy the five rows above and paste them into the template after item 5d above. You can then renumber the items as 6, 7, 8, 9, etc.

III. Additional information the department may wish to include

1. Enter additional information
Policy for the Periodic Review of Academic Programs

I. Introduction and Overview

Periodic program reviews provide a mechanism for faculty to evaluate the effectiveness, progress, and status of their academic programs on a continuous basis. It is an opportunity for the department (or program) to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses within the context of the mission of the university and of current and emerging directions in the discipline and to plan for the future. For the purposes of program review, a program is defined as a course of study leading to a degree. All undergraduate and graduate programs are usually reviewed at least once every seven years or at the time of external accreditation. The College/School Dean, Graduate Dean, or Undergraduate Dean may call for the review of an academic program in the interim years if program viability is a concern. New programs are reviewed in five years of the onset of the program. Except for special instances (e.g., interdisciplinary programs), program reviews include evaluation of all undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the unit.

The primary purpose of program review is to improve the program by thoroughly and candidly evaluating:

- the mission and goals of the program and their relation to the mission and strategic priorities of the institution,
- the curriculum through which program mission and goals are pursued,
- the assessment of student learning outcomes, program revisions based upon those outcomes, and plans for future assessment activities,
- the range and quality of research activities, emphasizing those involving students,
- the quality and diversity of faculty and staff and their contributions to program mission and goals,
- the quality of entering students (for graduate programs and others with restricted enrollment),
- libraries and other educational resources,
- physical facilities, and
- service and contributions to the community.

These reviews provide an opportunity for faculty to highlight program strengths and achievements, to identify needed improvements, and to address these needs through long-range plans that will endure through short-term administrative changes or budget crises. Program reviews are integral to planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making within the university. Regular program reviews also allow the university to account publicly for its use of public resources and to develop support among its various constituencies.

At California State University, Fresno, the Dean of the Division of Graduate Studies, or designee, serves as the review officer for graduate programs and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, or designee, as the review officer for undergraduate programs.

II. Elements of Program Review.
In order to allow for reflection and input, the program review process is long and involved. The department prepares a self-study for each program under review. A review panel examines the self-study, visits the program, and prepares a report. The department and dean are afforded the opportunity to comment on the review panel’s report. The report and comments are forwarded to the appropriate university-level committee for review. After receiving committee recommendations, the department writes a plan that describes actions to be taken in response to recommendations coming out of the reviews. An action plan meeting is held in which the department, dean, and central administration agree upon priorities and resources for a final action plan.

A. Self-Study

The self-study is a comprehensive written report prepared by the academic program scheduled for a review. For accredited programs, it is the report prepared for the accrediting body with a supplement containing the information below if it is not required by the accrediting agency. If the department undergoing review has multiple degrees, a separate self-study should be prepared for each degree, although a common set of supporting materials may be included in multiple reports. The self-study examines the current status of the academic program based on its activities and achievements since its last program review; identifies strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction, student performance, and student learning outcomes; activities over the period since the prior review. It presents a revised student outcomes assessment plan (SOAP) for the period until the next review; discusses faculty contributions in teaching, research/creative activities, and service; analyzes resource availability and needs; and serves as a vehicle by which the department, in conjunction with the university, can plan for the future. Goals for program improvement, a plan to achieve those goals, and strategies for measuring progress towards goal achievement should be included. The college/school dean will review the program’s self-study, provide comments to the self-study coordinator, and work with the department to address any concerns that arise.

B. Site Visit and Report by a Panel of External Evaluators

For non-accredited programs, a site visit will be conducted by a team of at least three consultants including an external expert in the discipline under review who has experience with student outcomes assessment in that discipline, a faculty member from within the school or college of the department, and a faculty member from the campus but outside the school or college of the department. The department, in consultation with the dean, nominates members of the team. The dean approves the nominees. For accredited programs, the composition of the team is determined by the accrediting agency.

The team drafts a report summarizing their program evaluations and recommendations and presents preliminary findings to the department, school/college, and university prior to the end of the visit.

C. Responses to the Team report

The department provides a written response to the team report that addresses issues raised in the report and which may also discuss significant changes or developments that have taken place in the program subsequent to the self-study. The departmental response is submitted to the college/school dean and the review officer(s). The college/school dean addresses the issues raised in the review panel report and the chair’s response in a response to the department and the review officer(s).
D. University Committee Review

The campus program review committees examine the review panel's reports and the departmental and dean's responses. The program review committees may interview representatives of the program and the administration as appropriate. They comment on the outcomes assessment process in the department and on the updated Student Outcomes Assessment Plan, and provide recommendations to the department. They make one of the following recommendations:

1. **Approve a Program with Notation of Exceptional Quality**. Approval is recommended without reservation and with a notation of specific areas of program promise and excellence. Programs recommended in this category may be considered for an award for program excellence. These are programs that exhibit special strength in all aspects of the review process and reflect the very best attributes of commitment, quality, and promise.

2. **Approve a Program for Continuation**. Program approval is recommended with identification of specific areas that need to be further developed, and a notation of specific areas of achievement. These programs meet most evaluative measures of quality, but nonetheless could improve in substantial ways (e.g., absence of a strong student recruitment plan or incomplete implementation of learning outcomes assessment.)

3. **Approve a Program for Conditional Continuation**. Conditional approval is recommended with identification of specific areas requiring significant improvement, including the conditions and a reasonable time frame for such conditions to be met in achieving unconditional approval. Conditional continuation is appropriate for a program that fails to meet expected quality standards and for which additional time and/or implementation of planned actions to address these weaknesses could be expected to eliminate such deficiencies without impairing student progress (e.g., the need to obtain faculty, space or equipment, or implement learning outcomes assessment.)

4. **Suspend a Program**. A recommendation for suspension of a program is appropriate upon receipt of a conditional continuation in the most recent program review and when two conditions occur: (1) when the program fails to meet established standards of quality that insure an appropriate academic experience for students and (2) when there is evidence that these deficiencies may be corrected over a specified period of time. Recommendation to suspend a program could lead to administrative action which: (1) places a moratorium on new student admissions; (2) requires students currently in the program be accommodated so that they may complete the program; (3) places a moratorium on reappointment of faculty to graduate faculty status, if pertinent to a graduate program; and (4) removes program catalog copy. The degree title may be retained on the trustee-approved campus Academic Plan. If evidence suggests that the program may be successfully reconstituted at a later date, then conditions to be fulfilled in order to fully reopen the program should be identified along with a process to support the removal of a recommendation for suspension. Note that discontinuation may result if the program is unable to satisfy the conditions for successful reconstitution as identified.

5. **Discontinue a Program**. A recommendation to discontinue a program is appropriate upon receipt of a conditional continuation in the most recent program review and when the program fails to meet established standards of quality that insure an appropriate academic experience for students, and at the same time when there is no evidence that deficiencies have been corrected over a specified period of time. Recommendation to discontinue a program could lead to administrative action which: (1) places a moratorium on new student
admissions; (2) requires students currently in the program be accommodated so that they may complete the program; (3) places a moratorium on reappointment of faculty to graduate faculty status, if pertinent; and (4) removes program catalog copy. A separate process for review of the implications of program termination is implemented. This second and separate level of review follows University policy and includes an assessment of the implications for the University and its service area, faculty, facilities, students, and resources if the program is discontinued.

E. The Action Plan and follow-up.
In consultation with the dean, the department chair and/or program coordinator will draft an action plan, providing for the highest priority issues identified during the review. This document will be discussed at a Planning and Implementation Meeting called by the Provost. This meeting will prioritize the action plan and obtain commitments for any resources needed to achieve the high priority goals. Each year a progress report on the items in the action plan will be included in the Department Chair’s Annual Report to the Provost.
Interim Policy, Procedures, and Guidelines for the Periodic Review of Academic Programs

1. Introduction and Overview

Periodic program reviews provide a mechanism for faculty to evaluate the effectiveness, progress, and status of their academic programs on a continuous basis. It is an opportunity for the department (or program) to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses within the context of the mission of the university and of current and emerging directions in the discipline to plan for the future. For the purposes of program review, a program is defined as a course of study leading to a degree. All undergraduate and graduate programs are usually reviewed at least once every five to seven years or at the time of external accreditation. The College/School Dean, Graduate Dean, or Undergraduate Dean may call for the review of an academic program in the interim years if program viability is a concern. New programs are reviewed in five years of the onset of the program. Except for special instances (e.g., interdisciplinary programs), program reviews include evaluation of all undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the unit.

The primary purpose of a program review is to improve the program by thoroughly and candidly evaluating:
- the mission and goals of the program and their relation to the institution's mission and strategic priorities;
- the curriculum through which program mission and goals are pursued;
- the assessment of student learning outcomes, program revisions based upon those outcomes, and plans for future assessment activities;
- the range and quality of research activities, emphasizing those involving students;
- the quality, diversity, and contributions to program mission and goals;
- the quality of entering students (for graduate programs and others with restricted admission);
- libraries and other educational resources;
- physical facilities; and
- service and contributions to the community.

These reviews provide an opportunity for faculty to highlight program strengths and achievements, to identify needed improvements, and to address these needs through long-range plans that will endure through short-term administrative changes or budget crises. Program reviews are integral to planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making within the university. Regular program reviews also allow the university to account publicly for its use of public resources and to develop support among its various constituencies.

At California State University, Fresno, the Dean of the Division of Graduate Studies, or designee, serves as the review officer for graduate programs and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, or designee, as the review officer for undergraduate programs.
II. Elements of Program Review

In order to allow for reflection and input, the program review process is long and involved. The department prepares a self-study for each program under review. A review panel examines the self-study, visits the program, and prepares a report. The department and dean are afforded the opportunity to comment on the review panel's report. The report and comments are forwarded to the appropriate university-level committees for review. After receiving committee recommendations, the department writes a plan that describes actions to be taken in response to recommendations coming out of the reviews. An action plan meeting is held in which the department, dean, and central administration agree upon priorities and resources for final action plans. Appendix A provides a timeline for completion of program review activities, in the form of a checklist summarizing the responsibilities of the various participating parties.

III. Initial Steps

In September of the academic year before the review is due, the review officer will notify the chair of the academic department and the appropriate dean that a review has been scheduled. By late October, the chair of the academic department will notify the review officer and the appropriate dean of the chair of the coordinator of the self-study. In November, the review officer(s) will schedule an orientation session for school or college deans, department chairs, self-study coordinators, and, if desired, additional department faculty, for all departments participating in a self-study.

Appendix B provides a detailed outline of the self-study, which should be submitted to the college/school dean no later than November 1. The self-study is a comprehensive written report that is prepared by the academic program scheduled for a review. For accredited programs, it is the report prepared for the accrediting body with a supplement containing the information below if it is not required by the accrediting agency. If the department undergoing review has multiple degrees, a separate self-study should be prepared for each degree, although a common set of supporting materials may be provided for inclusion in multiple reports.

Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (IRAP) and the program review officer(s) will provide a standard data set to be included in the self-study. IRAP and the Center for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) offer technical assistance in updating the assessment plan and planning and evaluating surveys. The review officer(s) can provide guidance and answer questions about the program review process.

The self-study examines the current status of the academic program based on its activities and achievements in its last program review. The document should identify, classify strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction, student performance, and student learning outcomes activities over the period since the prior review. It presents revised student outcomes assessment plan (SOAP) for the period until the next review. The document identifies contributions to teaching, research/creative activities, and service; analysis of resource allocation and needs; and special features or services provided by the department. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it should serve as a vehicle by which the department, in conjunction with the university, can plan for the future. Goals for program improvement, assessment plan to achieve those goals, and strategies for measuring progress toward goal achievement should be included.

Thus, the self-study should include mechanisms for solving current problems and avoiding projected problems, for building on existing strengths, and for maximizing opportunities that are
likely to develop within the discipline in the near future. The allocation of resources is an important matter to all programs. However, if the self-study report becomes primarily a judge report, the unit misses an excellent opportunity to provide the campus information on its strengths, weaknesses, plans, and goals. Moreover, an overly self-serving document in some measure loses credibility. The report is likely to have the most favorable impact on readers if the unit misses the opportunity for creative thinking about place.

A self-study coordinator selected from the department faculty by the department faculty will oversee preparation of the report. When a department is undergoing both a graduate and an undergraduate program review, separate self-study coordinators should be selected. All program faculty members should be involved in preparation of the self-study and consulted prior to the preparation of the final draft. Since the department chair is responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the self-study, the chair should continually and actively oversee the preparation of the report. It is the responsibility of the self-study coordinator to meet periodically with the college/school dean to review progress on the self-study to share the content of the self-study as it develops, and to report to the department faculty the comments and recommendations of the dean.

The college/school dean will review the program’s self-study, provide comments to the self-study coordinator, and work with the department to address concerns that arise. When satisfied with the quality and content of the self-study, the dean will forward the self-study with a memorandum of approval to the review officer(s) normally no later than November 30. The review officer(s) will review the self-study for conformity with university guidelines, if all required elements of the self-study have been addressed, the review officer(s) will notify the department to submit copies of the program self-study.

IV. B. Site Visit and Report by a Panel of External Evaluators

For non-accredited programs, a site visit will be conducted by a team of at least three consultants including an external expert in the discipline under review who has experience with student outcomes assessment in that discipline, a faculty member from within the school or college of the department, and a faculty member from the campus but outside the school or college of the department. The department, in consultation with the dean, nominates members of the team. The dean approves the nominees. For accredited programs, the team will consist of two faculty members from within and one from outside the school or college; composition of the team is determined by the accrediting agency. The department may elect to include a fourth member of the team, representing the alumni, community members, or other accreditation experts. The chair of the academic department, in consultation with the department faculty and the appropriate dean, submits the program review officer(s) a list of three potential external consultants in each category by the end of September of the review year (Appendix C). The review officer(s) will promptly notify the chair, coordinator, and panel members of these selected. The CEP office will provide suggestions for consultants if needed. The university provides transportation to the external consultant. The department, in consultation with the dean, nominates members of the team.

The review officer(s) and the department work together to schedule the review panel site visit to be held preferably prior to spring break. The department will provide the team with an office for use during the visit, as well as a computer and printer. In addition, space should be provided for scheduled meetings of the team with the various groups. It is the unit’s responsibility to arrange tours of its facilities; a tour of the library; time for reviewing course syllabi and student work
# Sample Two-Day Site Visit Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Review office(s)</td>
<td>TAd 120A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Academic Resources</td>
<td>TAd 111A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Provost/VPAA</td>
<td>TAd 116A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Exit meeting</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Site Visit Sessions

1. **Visit with Review Officers**
   
   One of the first meetings scheduled for the review panel will be with the review officers. The purpose of this meeting is to orient the Site Visit Team to the purpose of their visit and to answer any questions they might have on the procedures for the Academic Program Review and their role in the review.

2. **Visits with Students**
   
   Some of the most helpful meetings are those with students. Because students often bring up questions for which the site visitors will want to seek answers, these meetings should be set up fairly early in the schedule. Class visits also work well. After the visitors are introduced and the purpose of the visit explained, unit faculty members should leave so that students feel free to discuss issues. Since undergraduate and graduate students may have different concerns, a
separate meeting should be arranged for each group. It is important to have a substantial number of students in each group.

3. Visits with Faculty Members
   Depending on the size of the department, two or three small group meetings (or individual meetings, where possible) might be desirable that the faculty members will have a chance to express their opinions on their own. In addition, there should probably be a small meeting with the faculty who prepared the report and with the graduate advisory committee or other committees whose work relates to the program review.

   The department chair should not attend the meetings with faculty.

4. Visits with the Department Chairs
   At least an hour should be scheduled for the site visitors to meet with the department chairs. Because site visitors will usually have questions from their conversations with students and faculty, some time for this visit with department chairs should be saved rather late in the schedule.

5. Visits with University Administrators
   As part of an effort to incorporate review results into general university planning, meetings will be scheduled with the Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Resources, and the dean of the supervising college or school. Since the recommendations of the site visitors will affect planning at the unit and college, the dean's interaction is crucial. Scheduled times for these visits will be arranged approximately one month prior to the review to allow for planning. The review officer will be the conference chair.

   The report summarizing their program evaluations and recommendations is submitted to the provost, the department chair, the associate provost for academic resources, and the dean of the supervising college or school. This report will be distributed to the college/school dean and the department chair, the associate provost, and the dean of the supervising college or school.

7. Exit Meeting
   On-site visit concludes with an exit meeting comprised of the provost, the department chair, and the site visitors. In addition, the college/school dean, graduate dean (if a graduate program), and graduate program coordinator (if a graduate program) will attend.

   A. Notes on Hospitality. Please coordinate faculty members to serve as local hosts, who will pick up out-of-town visitors at their hotel, escort them to meetings, arrange taxis, transportation, and general assistance. On the second day, please arrange for out-of-town visitors to check out of the hotel before noon so that the university is not charged for an extra day unless the visitors have asked to stay over a third night. Most local hotels will provide shuttle service to the airport, but it is tight, so it may be better for someone in the unit to give the visitor a ride. The site visit team will have two busy days and will likely appreciate a few hours of quiet. Please leave the evening hours free. Also, no funds have been set aside for entertainment. Lavish entertaining
is not expected or encouraged. If faculty members wish to go out to dinner or lunch with the visitors, they will be responsible for their own expenses.

C. Responses to the Self-Study Team Report

The self-study coordinator and chair work together with the faculty to complete a written response to the review panel's report. The departmental response should be a good faith effort to address each of the issues raised in the report and may also discuss significant changes or developments that have taken place in the program subsequent to the self-study. The departmental response is to be submitted to the college/school dean and the review officer(s), within two weeks after receipt of the visiting panel's report.

The college/school dean should address the issues raised in the review panel report and the chair's response in a response to the department and the review officer(s). The dean's response shall be submitted within one week to the chair and to the review officer(s) and distributed for review by the department faculty.

D. University Committee Review

The campus program review committee will examine the review panel's report and the departmental and dean's responses. The program review committee will then make recommendations on the outcomes assessment process in the department and on the updated Student Outcomes Assessment Plan, and provide committee recommendations to the department, based on the reports provided. They may also comment on the outcomes assessment process in the department and on the updated Student Outcomes Assessment Plan. The committee report should be completed no less than one month following receipt of the material and should be delivered/recommended to the department chair with copies to the review officer(s) and the college/school dean. The following are categories for recommendations:

1. **Approve a Program with Notation of Exceptional Quality.** Approval is recommended without reservation and with a notation of specific areas of program promise and excellence. Programs recommended in this category may be considered for an award for program excellence. These are programs that exhibit special strengths in all aspects of the review process and reflect the very best attributes of commitment, quality, and promise.

2. **Approve a Program for Conditional Approval.** Program approval is recommended with identification of specific areas that need to be further developed and a notation of specific areas of achievement. These programs must exhibit evaluation measures of quality, but nonetheless could improve in substantial ways (e.g., absence of a strong student recruitment plan or incomplete implementation of learning outcomes assessment).

3. **Approve a Program for Conditional Continuation.** Conditional approval is recommended with identification of specific areas requiring significant improvement, including the conditions and a reasonable time frame for such conditions to be met in achieving unconditional approval. Conditional continuation is appropriate for a program that fails to meet expected quality standards and for which additional time and/or implementation of planned actions to address these weaknesses could be expected to
eliminate such deficiencies without impairing student progress (e.g., the need to obtain faculty, space or equipment, or implement learning outcomes assessment.)

4. **Suspend a Program.** A recommendation for suspension of a program is appropriate upon receipt of a conditional continuation in the most recent program review and when two conditions occur: (1) when the program fails to meet established standards of quality that ensure an appropriate academic experience for students; and (2) when there is evidence that these deficiencies may be corrected over a specified period of time. Recommendation to suspend a program could lead to administrative action which: (1) places a moratorium on new student admissions; (2) requires students currently in the program to be recommended so that they may complete the program; (3) places a moratorium on appointment of faculty to graduate faculty status, if pertinent; and (4) removes program catalog copy. The degree file may be retained on the graduate-approved campus Academic Plan. If evidence suggests that the program may be successfully reconstituted at a later date, then conditions to be fulfilled in order to fully reopen the program should be identified along with a process to support the removal of a recommendation for suspension. Note that discontinuance may result if the program is unable to satisfy the conditions for successful reconstitution as identified.

5. **Discontinue a Program.** A recommendation to discontinue a program is appropriate upon receipt of a conditional continuation in the most recent program review and when the program fails to meet established standards of quality that ensure an appropriate academic experience for students, and at the same time there is no evidence that deficiencies have been corrected over a specified period of time. Recommendation to discontinue a program could lead to administrative action which: (1) places a moratorium on new student admissions; (2) requires students currently in the program to be recommended so that they may complete the program; (3) places a moratorium on appointment of faculty to graduate faculty status, if pertinent; and (4) removes program catalog copy. A separate process for review of the implications of program termination is implemented. This second and separate level of review follows University policy and includes an assessment of the implications for the University and its service areas, faculty, facilities, students, and resources if the program is discontinued.

---

**University Committee Recommendations to Approve a Program:**

1. **Recommendation to Approve a Program with Notion of Exceptional Quality.**
   - Approval is recommended without reservation and with notation of specific areas of program promise and excellence. Programs recommended in this category may be considered for an award for program excellence. These are programs that exhibit special strength in all aspects of the review process and reflect the very best attributes of commitment, quality, and promise.

2. **Recommendation to Approve a Program of Quality and Promise.**
   - Program approval is recommended with identification of specific areas that need to be further developed, and a notation of specific areas of achievement. These programs meet all evaluative measures of quality, but nonetheless could improve in substantial ways (e.g., absence of a strong student recruitment plan).

3. **Recommendation to Approve a Program for Conditional Continuation.**
   - Conditional approval is recommended with identification of specific areas requiring significant improvement, including the conditions and a reasonable time frame for each condition to be met in achieving unconditional approval. Conditional continuation is appropriate for a program that
fails to meet expected quality standards and for which additional time and/or implementation of planned actions to address these weaknesses would be expected to eliminate such deficiencies without impacting student progress (e.g., the need to obtain space or equipment). Other University Committee Actions:

Recommendation to Suspend a Program:

A recommendation for suspension of a program is appropriate when a program does not meet established standards of quality that ensure an appropriate academic experience for students and when there is evidence that deficiencies may be corrected over a specified period of time. These standards of quality include but are not limited to a minimum critical number of faculty, a minimum critical number of students, adequacy and frequency of required courses, adequate library holdings, and appropriate physical facilities. Please note that a recommendation to suspend a program would lead to administrative actions.

Administrative actions to suspend a program: (1) place a moratorium on new student admissions; (2) require students currently in the program be recommended so that they may complete the program; (3) place a moratorium on reappointment of faculty to graduate faculty status; if pertinent; (4) graduate program; and (4) remove program catalog copy. The degree titles may be retained on the major-approved campus Academic Plan. If evidence suggests that the program may be successfully reconstituted at a later date, then conditions to be fulfilled in order to fully reopen the program should be identified along with a process to support the removal of a recommendation for suspension. Note that discontinuation may result if the program is unable to satisfy the conditions for successful reconstitution as identified.

Recommendation to Discontinue a Program:

A recommendation to discontinue a program is appropriate upon receipt of a conditional continuation in the most recent program review and when the program fails to meet established standards of quality that ensure an appropriate academic experience for students, and at the same time when there is evidence that deficiencies have been corrected over a specified period of time. Please note that a recommendation to discontinue a program could lead to administrative actions. Administrative actions to discontinue a program: (1) place a moratorium on new student admissions; (2) require students currently in the program be recommended so that they may complete the program; (3) place a moratorium on reappointment of faculty to graduate faculty status; if pertinent; and (4) remove program catalog copy. A separate process for review of the implications of program termination is implemented. This second and separate level of review follows University policy and includes an assessment of the implications for the University and its service areas, faculty, facilities, students, and resources if the program is discontinued.

E. The Action Plan and Follow-up

In consultation with the dean, the department chair, and program coordinator, the following action plan, providing for the highest priority issues identified during the review in the following: (1) Proposed action and expected outcome, (2) Cost/resource implications, (3) Sequence of tasks or resources, and (4) Timeline for accomplishing the proposed action. This document will be discussed at a Planning and Implementation Meeting called by the Provost and including the chair, college/school dean, review officer(s), and a representative from the site visit team (if requested by the department). The purpose of this meeting is to develop and prioritize the action plan and obtain commitments for resources needed for its implementation.
to achieve the high priority goals. The dean and the provost may propose additional action items. The minutes of the meeting will document the formal agreement among parties. The department may be requested to revise the action plan and another action plan meeting may be called if needed. The finalized action plan is signed by the chair, the dean, and the provost. Each year a progress report on the items in the action plan will be included in the Department Chair's Annual Report to the Provost.

Revised, November 2007

Appendix A: Checklist and Timeline for Program Reviews

Academic Unit,

- Select self-study coordinator (September, year one)
- Attend orientation meeting (October/November, year one)
0. Suggest external and on-campus reviewers (September, year two)
0. Suggest dates for site visit (September, year two)
0. Complete self-study (November to November, years one to two)
0. Cooperate with review officers to arrange site visit schedule (full year two)
0. Supervise site visitor during visit (spring year two, preferably prior to spring break)
0. Distribute site visitors' report to faculty (spring year two)
0. Schedule faculty meeting to discuss review and prepare response
0. Forward response to dean (within two weeks)
0. Attend Senate committee meetings as needed (spring year two or following academic year)
0. Attend planning/implementation session (spring year two or following academic year)
0. Review actions to be taken with supervising dean (within two weeks)

Academic Dean
- Attend orientation meeting (October, year one)
- Work with the department in preparing the self-study (November to November, years one to two)
- Receive and review self-study (November, year two)
- Meet with review panel (spring year two, preferably prior to spring break)
- Read review panel's report and department response (spring year two)
- Forward dean's response to review officers (within two weeks)
- Attend Senate committee meetings as needed (spring year two or following academic year)
- Attend planning/implementation session (spring year two or following academic year)
- Review with department actions to be taken (within two weeks)

Review Officers
- Notify unit about review (September, year one)
- Obtain names of self-study coordinators from chair (October, year one)
- Conduct orientation session (November, year one)
- Review, process and distribute self-study (November to December, year two)
- Select program review panel (September to October, year two)
- With unit, arrange program review panel's schedule (December to February, year two)
- Conduct entrance interview (spring, year two)
- Conduct exit interview (spring year two)
- Obtain and distribute program review panel's report (spring year two)
0. Schedule review for Univ. Graduate or Undergraduate Review Committee (spring year two or subsequent year)

0. Schedule planning/implementation meeting (spring year two or subsequent year)

0. Coordinate final record of program review (spring year two or subsequent year)

Revised November 2007
Appendix B: Outline for Program Review: Self-Study

The following outline is recommended for a self-study prepared for a program review.

Introduction and Overview of the Program

The description should orient the reader to your program, including items such as degree offerings, general education courses, and service courses. Describe major events in your program history, such as major affiliations, degrees, faculty composition, mission, etc.

Previous Action Plan or Recommendations from Prior Review

Briefly outline the major findings, recommendations, and action plans of the previous review and the responses to them. What actions were taken as a result of the recommendations?

Departmental Description and Evaluation of the Program

Data provided to the program from various sources should be summarized in appendices. Supporting documents may be provided by Web reference.

Reminder: Data collected through student outcome assessment processes do not need to be reported but may be referenced in explaining curricular changes (APM 201).

A. Mission and Goals of the Program

State the mission and goals of your program, noting any changes since the prior review.

1. Alignment of the Program and the University Mission and Goals

How does the program mission statement support the mission(s) and goals of the university?

2. Alignment of the Program and the College/School Goals

How does the program mission statement support the mission(s) and goals of the college/school?

3. Reflection of Any Recent Changes in the Discipline

Have there been any significant changes in the academic discipline area(s) relating to the program that require changes in the program's structure, focus, or emphasis?

B. Effectiveness of the Instructional Program

1. Student Learning Outcomes as Developed in the Program's Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (SOAP)

While preparing the self-study, program faculty should review and comment on the SOAP and related activities. Note any changes in the learning outcomes since the prior review. What actions have you taken as a result of what you have learned during assessment planning or as a result of assessment data? Consider the following questions and respond to those not answered elsewhere in the self-study. How does your plan authentically address your educational effectiveness with your students? How does your SOAP reflect your effectiveness as a program? What progress have you made in
implementing the SOAP? What outcomes have been conducted since the last program review? What learning outcomes did they assess? How has the evidence you collected affected decisions made about the program or the SOAP?

2. Curriculum
   a. Structure/Coherence of Instructional Program
      Assess the structure, currency, comprehensiveness, adequacy, coherence, and delivery of the curriculum as appropriate. Describe any changes made in the program's curriculum in response to outcomes assessment. Self-studies may report on recognitions/wins for innovative curriculum and/or outstanding student, external funding for curricular innovation or reform, or university writing requirements. Include in an appendix to the self-study and commentary on the course offering and enrollment tables provided by the Office of Institutional Research. For graduate programs, include information on the program's Graduate Writing Requirement, and include the written policy as an appendix. For culminating experiences other than theses, include written guidelines or policies for projects (Capstone comprehensive examination in an appendix).

3. Cooperative Efforts with Other Academic Programs—Joint-Degree, Service Courses, General-Education Courses
   Evaluate your effectiveness in cooperatively offering joint-degree programs, service courses, and/or General-Education courses.

4. Research on Effectiveness of Teaching and Learning
   Please document the scholarly work and creative activity of your faculty and comment on the impact of their scholarly work and creative activity on the curriculum and on student engagement and learning.

3. Recruitment—Retention—Student Services
   Comment on any recruitment, retention, and support services for students (e.g., advising, mentoring of undergraduate students, career development, student placement). Comment on your efforts in terms of the quality, success, and diversity of your students.

4. Community Interactions (Professional/Local, Disciplinary, Industry/Regional)
   Summarize opportunities for student internships, employment, and/or continuing/educational paths of program graduates, as well as the ways in which external community interacts with students and/or the curriculum. Comment on ways in which program faculty, students, and the various communities they serve interact. In specific, include comments on any programmatic interactions with the off-campus regional community, any related professional communities, and/or the broader disciplinary community. Self-studies may report employer satisfaction.

5. Effectiveness of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
   Assess curriculum vitae of tenure track and tenure faculty members as an appendix. Summarize your department's collective strengths in the following areas:
   - Teaching and Advising
   - Scholarship and Research
   - University Service
   - Community Service

6. Resources
1. Financial/Budgetary
   Include in an appendix to the self-study and comment upon the table of the Budget.
   Book provided to you by the Office of Academic Resources.

2. Faculty/Staff
   Include in an appendix to the self-study and comments upon the report of faculty fundraising
   in the department and the program, as provided to you by the Office of Academic
   Personnel. For graduate programs, identify the criteria employed by the department in
   the assignment of faculty to teach graduate courses, to serve on committees that
   administer the culminating experience (thesis, project, comprehensive examination,
   as applicable) and for determining graduate faculty and members of the graduate
   program faculty association group.

Adequacy and Availability
   Using objective evidence, evaluate the quality, currency, match of strengths to
   program goals, with the diversity of the collective faculty and staff (e.g., evidence
   of leadership in national and regional organizations in the discipline, awards for
   outstanding teaching, scholarship and creative activity, external funding, either for
   individual or collaborative efforts, evidence of success in recruiting faculty and
   staff from underrepresented groups). Comment on any curricular areas for which
   the department has difficulty hiring.

3. Professional Development/Travel Support
   Comment on the adequacy and availability of institutional support and outside
   funding for professional development and travel.

4. Implementation and Currency of Technology
   Discuss the program’s use of technology in classrooms, faculty offices, and labs, and
   comment on the adequacy and currency of technical resources in use.

4. Other:
   Space - Classrooms, Laboratories, Offices
   Are the classrooms and laboratories allocated for curricular offerings sufficient and appropriately
   sized?

b. Library/Assets
   Comment on library holdings as they support the academic program, its faculty and students.

IV. Plan for the Next Review Period
   A. Recommended Changes to Mission and Goals of the Program
   B. Effectiveness of Instructional Program

1. Student Learning Outcomes as Developed in the Program's Student Outcomes
   Assessment Plan (SOAP)
   What changes should be made to your assessment plan? Include an updated student
   outcomes assessment plan for the next program review cycle.

2. Curriculum
   a. Structure/Coherence of Instructional Program
b. Cooperative Efforts with Other Academic Programs
   Joint Degrees, Service Courses, General Education Courses

2. Recruitment, Retention, and Student Services

4. Community Interactions (Professional, Disciplinary, Industry/Regional)

C. Resources

1. Financial/Budgetary
   Based upon the self-study process, what are your plans within existing resources?
   What important improvements in your program could be made with additional resources?

2. Faculty/Staff

a. Adequacy and Availability
b. Professional Development/Travel Support
c. Professional Achievements/Contributions
3. Implementation and Currency of Technology
4. Others

a. Space
   Classrooms, Laboratories, Offices
b. Library Assets

V. Additional Issues

This section contains responses to issues that may have been raised by the supervising dean or review officers in the Self-Study Orientation Meeting.

VI. Appendices

A. Visiting team report/recommendations from prior review
B. Report on assessment activities (information should be available in annual reports since the last review)

C. Standard Data Set
1. Course Offering and Enrollment Table
2. Student Data
3. Grades
4. Departmental Data from Budget Book
5. Faculty Profile (number, tenure/tenure track, ex. part-time, efficiency)
6. Faculty Teaching Loads and Assigned Time

D. Faculty-Visa

E. Updated Student-Outcomes Assessment Plan

F. Other
Appendix C. Review Panel Nomination Form

Please submit a form for each nominee.

Q. Disciplinary Specialist  Q. College Representative  Q. University Representative
(OFF-Campus) (Outside of Department) (Outside of College)

Q. Alumni/Community Representative (optional)

Academic unit being reviewed:

Name:

Title or Rank:

Current position:

Degree Subject/Major University/Institution:

Address/MailStop:

Telephone: (please verify phone number): Email: Fax number:

For off-campus members, describe the qualifications that make this person an appropriate review panel member for your unit.

Appendix D. Guidelines for Preparing the Review Panel Report(s)

Content and length of review panel's report typically vary, depending on the nature and size of the program and on personal preferences of the reviewers. Consultants are welcome to comment on any aspect of the program that they consider important to program quality and future development. From an organizational standpoint, it is often useful to begin the report with an overall view of the program and to conclude with a summary and specific recommendations, where appropriate. Please consider whether or not the mission of the unit is clearly stated and whether the activities of the unit are consistent with the stated mission.

The best way to assist an academic unit is to make useful recommendations within the current budget. Thus, if a major initiative is needed, corresponding reductions should be suggested. In addition, it is helpful to suggest what the unit might be able to accomplish with a 2 to 3 percent increase in funds or what might best be eliminated with a 2 to 3 percent decrease in funds.

Outline for the Review Panel's Report:

1. Introductory section

2. Statement of mission and goals

3. Organizational structure and personnel

4. Program evaluation

5. Financial status

6. Summary and recommendations

7. Appendices
II. Comments and observations on strengths or weaknesses which need to be addressed in addition to conclusions presented in Self-Study Report:
A. Curriculum design and relevance to university mission
B. Program long-range plans
C. Admission procedures
D. Classification and advancement procedures, if a graduate program
E. Faculty quality, achievements, needs; commitment in program
F. Student quality, achievements, needs
G. Assessment Activities
H. Research and/or professionally related activities
I. Facility adequacy, unique advantages, facilities
J. Resource utilization, planning, augmentation
K. Technology implementation and currency
L. Administrative commitment, support, leadership, and concerns for program
M. Service and community interaction
N. Other

III. Summary of Evaluation:
A. Is this program offered at an appropriate degree level? Please elaborate.
B. In the current program viable? Please elaborate.
C. What are the attitudes of faculty, students, and administration (and possibly alumni and employees) toward this program?
D. Do resources which support this program ensure that student receives degree program of quality? Explain.

IV. Recommendations

V. Signature Page (see Appendix E)

Appendix E: Signature Page for External Consultants

Each member of the external review panel should complete the form below, attach it to a copy of the Program Review Report, and return it to: Program Review Officer, California State University, Fresno, 5241 N. Maple Ave, MSTAS1 Fresno CA 93740-8023

DISCIPLINARY SPECIALIST
This report was prepared by
Signature Date

Institution: COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVE
I have read the Program Review Report for the program and
a) agree
b) disagree with the following reservations:
I disagree and have attached a statement
Printed Name (College Representative):
Signature Date

UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVE
I have read the Program Review Report for the program and

- concur
- concur with the following reservations:
- disagree and have attached a statement

Printed name (College Representative):

Signature: ___________________________ Date:

ALUMNI/COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE

I have read the Program Review Report for the program and

- concur
- concur with the following reservations:
- disagree and have attached a statement

Printed name (College Representative):

Signature: ___________________________ Date:
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