**Intro “speech” about APM 220 (read on 02/12/24)**

1. The main change to APM is the abbreviated program review, which starts on page 5, item VIII. This is for programs that  
     
   complete their national accreditation process through an official accrediting organization, inclusive of a site visit,   
     
   Note that  
     
   Except for special instances (e.g., interdisciplinary programs), program reviews include evaluation of all undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the unit.  
     
   Where a department is undergoing both a graduate and an undergraduate program review, separate self-study coordinators should be selected.  
     
   At California State University, Fresno, the Dean of the Division of Research and 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.  
     
   I believe that the Interim Dean of Research and Graduate Studies has a friendly amendment regarding this.
2. Also, we eliminated a lot of procedural text, and directed the reader to PROGRAM REVIEW: Procedures & Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs, which is housed at the Division of Academic Affairs  
   <https://academics.fresnostate.edu/curriculum/prog-review/index.html>  
   These guidelines will follow what APM 220 says.
3. There are five different levels of recommendations given to programs.

**1.  Recommendation to Approve a Program with Notation of Exceptional Quality**

**2.  Recommendation to Approve a Program of Quality and Promise**

**3.  Recommendation to Approve a Program for Conditional Continuation**

**4.  Recommendation to Suspend a Program**

**5.  Recommendation to Discontinue a Program**

**Suggestions from Senate meeting on 02/12/24**

1. Make sure that the program review committee is mentioned in the APM, explicitly.  
   **This is already in the APM, under VI, University 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 will then interview representatives of the program and the administration as appropriate, and provide one of the following recommendations based on the reports provided*  
   **It is also mentioned earlier**  
   *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.*  
   **The only thing deleted from the APM regarding this committee is**   
   *The Committee will identify strengths and weaknesses of the program, and make a recommendation for program status.*
2. Above IV, add the role of the coordinator and chair. Maybe it is because the chair is mentioned loosely.  
   **Undeleted paragraph saying**  
   *Since the department chair1 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.*  
   **Then delete what had replaced that paragraph.**  
   *Communication to all participants in the process is essential, including department faculty.*
3. Get rid of highlighting, it is distracting.  
   **Gone. Except text at the beginning of VI. Don’t know how to do that.**
4. Appendix A does not seem to have been deleted completely.  
   **Sorry, but I am not sure what this was about.**
5. Page 4. Why have the definitions been removed?  
   **This was put back in the document, what replaced it (just the names of the actions) was removed.**  
   **Also,***Refer to "PROGRAM REVIEW: Procedures & Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs" for descriptions of these recommendations.*  
   **was deleted. See Item 9 below.**
6. Who is the coordinator? Add definition?   
   **There is no all-encompassing definition of the coordinator. However, the actions and duties they have to follow are listed in the APM:**
   1. *A self-study coordinator, selected from the department faculty by the department faculty, will oversee preparation of the report.*
   2. *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.*
   3. *The self-study coordinator and chair work together with the faculty to complete a written response to the review panel’s report.*
   4. *In consultation with the dean, the department chair and/or program coordinator will draft an action plan,…*

**There is more of the same for the shortened review.**

1. V title**:**Responses to the Self-Study or something else, the text and the title do not match.  
   David Lent says: The dean is responding to the program review team's review and the departmental response.  
   **Undeleted some text, now the whole section is**  
   *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. 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 departmental faculty.***Now the title and the text match. It also coincides with what Dr. Lent mentioned in the meeting.**
2. APP says: Shall we delete “procedures” from the APM title?
3. APP says: Add a line that says where the procedures may be found?

*Refer to "PROGRAM REVIEW: Procedures & Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs" for descriptions of these recommendations.*

1. APP says: The last paragraph of the APM contains an amendment from the Graduate Committee. **The original text said**  
   *Review Process*

*Upon receipt of the above materials, the Program Review Coordinator will review the documents for content and forward them to the appropriate University Committee (the Undergraduate Academic Program Review Subcommittee or University Graduate Committee). The UAPRS or UGC will review the materials as part of their consent calendar. Should committee members have any questions about the program, the committee chair will follow up with program representatives. If any issues or concerns remain, the committee will issue recommendations to be considered for implementation in the program’s subsequent five-year action plan, as described in section VII above.*

**We had originally struck all language about UAPRSG and UGC from this paragraph but UGC said they did want to be a part of this process. Hence, only UAPRS was deleted from it (text in red above).  
  
The deletion of UAPRS in this paragraph only bypasses UAPRS for accredited programs that receive a full accreditation for a number of years, which differs based on the accrediting body. All other programs go through the full accreditation process including UAPRS. So, as long as the national/state/regional accrediting body grants full accreditation again, UAPRS will not get involved; they felt it was redundant to go through another review when the accrediting body is already a very extensive review process.**