

Policy on the Procedures and Guidelines for the Periodic Review of Academic Programs

I. Introduction

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 ongoing and emerging directions in the discipline at the regional and national levels and in the context of the mission of California State University, Fresno. For the purposes of this policy, a program is defined as a course of study leading to a degree. Academic programs are reviewed at least once every five-seven years. Except for special instances (e.g., interdisciplinary programs), program reviews include evaluation of all undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the unit.

II. Purpose

The primary purpose of program review is to improve the program. It seeks to do this by thoroughly and candidly evaluating:

- the mission and goals of the program and their relation to the mission of the institution,
- the curriculum through which program mission and goals are pursued,
- the assessment of student learning outcomes, the program revisions based upon those outcomes, and the 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.

III. Components of an Academic Program Review (see Appendix A)

The academic program review consists of:

A. A self-study prepared by the program

1. Definition

The self-study is a comprehensive, written report that is prepared by the academic program scheduled for a review. 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 activities over the period since the prior review and a student outcomes assessment plan (SOAP) for the period until the next review; faculty contributions in teaching, research/creative activities, 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, an action 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-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.

2. Organization of the Self-Study

See **Appendix B** for the complete outline of the self-study.

3. Responsibility for preparation

A self-study coordinator, selected from the department faculty by the department faculty, will oversee preparation of the report. 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, and the college/school dean and review officer(s) should be consulted throughout the preparation of the self-study. 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. Information to assist the department in preparing the self-study is available from Institutional Research and other university offices on such matters as undergraduate students and graduate students (admissions data, majors, minors, GPA, etc.); grant proposals processed by the Grants and Research Office; and budget and enrollment. CETL and Institutional Research also offer technical assistance in developing the assessment plan and planning and evaluating surveys. It is the responsibility of the self-study coordinator to meet periodically with the college/school dean to review progress on the report, to share the content of that

¹

All references to chair are meant as the department chair or program coordinator. Department heads in the library are not the equivalent to department chairs in instructional units.

CSU, Fresno

report as it develops, and to report periodically to the department faculty the comments and recommendations of the dean.

4. Submission of the Self-Study (see Appendix A, Paragraph 6)

The department should submit the self-study to the college/school dean no later than November 1. The college/school dean will review the program's self-study and provide comments to the self-study coordinator, the department chair and the departmental faculty. 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) 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 will notify the department to submit ten copies of the program self-study.

B. A site visit and report by a team of external evaluators

1. Evaluation team

The site visit will be conducted by a team of at least three consultants including:

- one external expert in the discipline under review who has experience with student outcomes assessment in that discipline,
- one faculty member from within the school or college of the department, and
- one faculty member from the campus but outside the school or college of the department.

a. Selection of the team

- i. The chair of the academic department, in consultation with the department faculty and the appropriate dean, will submit a list of three potential external consultants to the Associate Provost and/or the Dean of Graduate Studies by the end of September (Appendix F). Nominees should be from the discipline under review and be knowledgeable about student learning outcomes assessment. Their qualifications should be briefly summarized. The CETL office provides suggestions for consultants if needed and the university provides a stipend to the external consultant.
- ii. The department faculty will nominate 3 candidates for each of the internal evaluation team members: a faculty member from the same college or school but from outside the department being reviewed, and a faculty member from the campus but outside the college or school.
- iii. If the department elects to have a fourth member of the team representing the alumni, community members or other accreditation experts, three nominees for this additional member should be forwarded (See Appendix G).

2. The site visit

See **Appendix C** for a detailed outline of the site visit.

C. Departmental and college/school dean's responses to the site visit report

1. The chair's response

Based upon the recommendations and comments that have come forward to date, the chair should prepare an outline and written response to the review team's report (Appendix E). The chair's response should be a good faith effort to address the issues raised in the review team's report. The chair's response should be submitted to the college/school dean and the review officer(s), with an open copy to the department for review by the departmental faculty.

2. The dean's response

The college/school dean should review the chair's response and address the issues raised in the review team report and the chair's response. The dean's response shall be submitted to the chair and to the review officer(s), with an open copy to the department for review by the departmental faculty.

D. University committee review

The campus program review committees will review the reports provided, interview representatives of the program and the administration as appropriate, and provide their recommendations based on the reports provided. They should also comment on the outcomes assessment process in the department and on the SOAP. 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). The following are categories for committee recommendations:

University Committee Recommendations to Approve a Program:

1. Recommendation to 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.

EXAMPLE: 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.

EXAMPLE: Programs that 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 such conditions to be met in achieving unconditional approval.

EXAMPLE: A program fails to meet expected quality standards 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.)

Other University Committee Actions:

4. Recommendation to 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.

EXAMPLE: Programs failing to meet standards of quality.

5. 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 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. 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.

E. Development of an action plan

The Provost will schedule a planning and implementation meeting with 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 chair will draft a plan to take to this meeting for discussion. The chair will briefly introduce recommendations listed in the self-study, the review team's report, the chair's response, and the dean's response. The dean will provide an assessment of the general nature of the review team's report and the chair's response. The dean should indicate support of or disagreement with the issues and associated actions listed by the chair. If the program is scheduled for an upcoming accreditation review, the dean and chair will evaluate the probability of a successful outcome and note any issues, other than those previously mentioned, that may present a problem. The college/school dean and the Provost may also propose elements of an action plan based on the recommendations and comments from the review committees and site team. The minutes of the meeting will reflect the discussion, prioritization, consensus, and timeline for implementation of an agreed-upon action plan, and document the formal agreement among parties.

F. Implementation of the action plan

A final meeting of the Provost, the review officer(s), the college/school dean, the department chair, and faculty representatives of the department will be called to review the action plan and the timeline for its implementation. 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. Procedures and Timeline

Recommended Timeline for Review of Academic Programs

Program Review Planning Calendar	First year			Second year							Later
	Sep	Oct	Nov	Sep	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	
Notification and Planning											
Department notified by Provost	+++										
Department Designates self-study coordinator		+++									
Orientation meeting for self-study coordinator, chair, etc.			+++								
Select Site Visit team				+++							
Self-study											
Preparation of the self-study report			+++	+++	+++						
Submit self-study, send to team					+++						
Site Visit											
Conduct visit									+++		
Respond to visit team report										+++	
Wrap-up											
Committee Review											+++
Draft Action Plan											+++
Planning and implementation meeting											+++
Agreed upon action plan											+++

Appendix A. Procedures and Timeline (continued)

- 1. Notification of the Review (September 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 (October, 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 (November, year before)**
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 (November through November)**
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 (September 30, 2nd year)**
Review officer(s) will promptly notify the chair, coordinator, and team members of those selected.
- 6. Submission of the Self-Study (November, 2nd year)**
The department should submit the self-study to the college/school dean no later than November 1. The college/school dean will review the program's self-study and provide comments to the self-study coordinator, the department chair and the departmental faculty. 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) normally no later than November 30. The review officer(s) will review the self-study for conformity with University guidelines for self-study and requirements. If all required elements of the self-study have been addressed, the review officer will notify the department to submit ten copies of the program self-study.
- 7. Site Visit (Spring, 2nd year)**
The review officer(s) will work with the department to schedule the review team site visit to be held 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, 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 comprising the Provost, Associate Provost, dean, Graduate Dean, department chair and/or graduate program coordinator, to be scheduled by the review officers.

8. Site Visitors' Report

The review team's report (see Appendix D) 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, both electronically and in hard copy, 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

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

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 copies to the college/school dean and the Provost two weeks before the planning/implementation meeting occurs. The Provost will schedule the planning/implementation meeting with the chair, program coordinator, college/school dean, review officer(s) and a representative from the review committees (if requested by the department) to consider all recommendations and comments. During this meeting, the college/school dean and the Provost may also propose elements of the action plan based on the recommendations and comments from the review committees and site team during the meeting. An agreed-upon action plan will be developed, laying out the various actions and responsibilities entailed.

Appendix B. Outline for Program Review Self-Study

The following outline is recommended for a self-study prepared for a program review. Additional topics may be included, but the self-study report should not exceed twenty pages, excluding appendices. Departments with programs subject to external accreditation reviews requiring substantial reports may elect to submit the report prepared for accreditation and accreditation review reports as major elements in the self-study. In these instances, a cover memorandum should be provided, clearly indicating, in the order specified below, where the appropriate material may be found, either in the accreditation report or in attachments to the memorandum. Any areas listed below not discussed in the accreditation document should be discussed in a supplement or attachment to the self-study.

I. 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 program history, such as administrative affiliations, degrees, faculty composition, mission, etc.

II. 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?

III. 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 outcomes assessment processes do not need to be reported but may be referenced in explaining curricular changes (APM 204).

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's Missions and Goals

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

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

How does the department 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 broader academic disciplinary area(s) relating to the program that require changes to 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 educators? What progress have you made in implementing the SOAP? What assessment activities 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 recognition/awards for innovative curriculum and/or outstanding students, external funding for curricular innovation or reform, or university writing requirements. Include in an appendix to the self-study and comment upon the course offering and enrollment tables provided by the Office of Institutional Research.

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

Evaluate your effectiveness in cooperatively offering joint degree programs, service courses, and/or General Education courses.

c. Research on Effectiveness of Teaching and Learning

Please document the scholarly work and creative activities of your faculty and comment on the impact of their scholarly work and creative activities on the curriculum and on student engagement and learning.

3. Recruitment, Retention, and Student Services

Comment on any recruitment, retention, and support services for students (e.g., advising, mentoring of students; career development; student placement). Comment on your efforts in terms of the quality, success, and diversity of your students.

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

Summarize opportunities for student internships, employment, and/or continued educational paths of program graduates, as well as the ways in which external communities interact with students and/or the

curriculum. Comment on ways in which program faculty, students and the various communities they serve interact. In specific, of interest are 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.

C. Effectiveness of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

Attach Curriculum Vitae of tenure-track and tenured 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

D. Resources

1. Financial/Budgetary

Include in an appendix to the self-study and comment upon the tables out 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 comment upon the report of faculty teaching 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 consultation group.

a. 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 individuals 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.

b. Professional Development/Travel Support

Comment on the adequacy and availability of institutional support and outside funding for professional development and travel.

3. 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 technological resources in use.

CSU, Fresno

4. Other:

a. 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. Recommended Action Plan for the Next 5 – 7 Year 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

3. 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. Other:

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.

Appendix C. The Site Visit

I. Arranging the site visit

The review officer(s) will work with the department to schedule the review team site visit to be held in the spring. 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 will be provided for scheduled meetings of the team with the various groups. It is the unit's responsibility to arrange tours of its facilities and the campus library, as well as to schedule time for the team to review course syllabi and student work (including randomly selected theses), and to meet with faculty, students, and alumni.

A. Elements of the site visit

1. Visit with Review Officers

At the beginning of the Site Visit Team's day, a meeting will be held 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. 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 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 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 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 by 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. These appointments will be arranged by the review officer's assistant.

6. Review team's report (see Appendix D)

CSU, Fresno

During the site visit, the consultants draft a report that summarizes their program evaluations and recommendations. 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, delivered, both electronically and in hard copy, to the review officer(s), the college/school dean, the department faculty via the chair, and the self-study coordinator.

7. Exit meeting

Site visits conclude with an exit meeting comprised of the Provost, the review officer(s), the college/school dean, graduate dean (if a graduate program), 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. Visitors will be reimbursed for reasonable costs and need to save original receipts.

A Sample Site Visit Schedule:

<i>First Day</i>		Location
7:45	Designated faculty picks up out-of-town site visitors	
8:00	Department chair and/or self-study coordinator	
9:00	Review officer(s)	TAd 130*
10:00	Academic Resources	TAd 111*
10:30	Provost/VPAA	TAd 110*
11:00	Meeting and lunch with program/departmental faculty	
1:30	Dean	
2:30	Undergraduate Students	
3:30	Graduate Students	
5:00	Alumni/employers/advisory council, etc.	
5:30	Dinner	
<i>Second Day</i>		
8:00	Additional meetings as needed	
9:00	Tour of facilities and library and facilities	
10:30	Review of course syllabi and student written work	
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Report preparation	
4:00	Exit meeting	TBA*

Appendix D. Guidelines for Preparing the Visitation Team Report(s)

Content and length of review team'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 3 to 5 percent increase in funds or what might best be eliminated with a 3 to 5 percent decrease in funds.

Outline for the Review Team's Report

I. Introductory section

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. Admissions procedures
- D. Classification and advancement procedures, if a graduate program review
- E. Faculty quality, achievements, needs, commitment to program
- F. Students' quality, achievements, needs
- G. Assessment Activities
- H. Research and/or professionally related activities
- I. Facility adequacy, unique advantages, ancillary units
- 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. Is the current program viable? Please elaborate.
- C. What are the attitudes of faculty, students, and administrators (and possibly alumni and employers) toward this program?
- D. Do resources which support this program ensure that students receive a degree program of quality? Explain.

IV. Recommendations

V. Signature Page (see Appendix G)

**Appendix E. Outline for the Department Chair's Response
to the Site Visit Report**

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. Issue 2 (identify issue)

- 1. Proposed Action, Expected Outcome**
- 2. Cost/Resource Implications**
- 3. Source of Funds/Resources**
- 4. Benchmark and Time Line for Solution C.**

... etc.

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.

Appendix F. Review Team Nomination Form

Please submit a form for each nominee.

Disciplinary Specialist
(Off-Campus)

College Representative
(Outside of Department)

University Representative
(Outside of College)

Alumni/Community Representative (optional)

Academic unit being reviewed:

Name:

Title or Rank:

Current position:

Degrees

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 team member for your unit.

Appendix G. Signature Page for External Consultants

Each member of the external review team 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. M/S TA51 Fresno CA 93740-8027

DISCIPLINARY SPECIALIST

This report was prepared by:

Signature:

Date:

Institution:

COLLEGE 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:

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:

Appendix H. Checklist For Program Reviews

Academic Unit

- Select self-study coordinator (September, year one)
- Attend orientation meeting (October, year one)
- Suggest external and on-campus reviewers (September, year two)
- Suggest dates for site visit (September, year two)
- Complete self-study (November to November, years one to two)
- Cooperate with review officers to arranging visit schedule
- Supervise site visitors during visit
- Distribute site visitors' report to faculty
- Schedule faculty meeting to discuss review and prepare response
- Forward response to review officers
- Attend Senate committee meeting
- Attend planning/implementation session
- Review actions to be taken with supervising dean

Academic Dean

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Attend orientation meeting | <input type="checkbox"/> Forward response to review officers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Work with the department in preparing the self-study | <input type="checkbox"/> Attend Senate committee meeting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Receive and review self-study | <input type="checkbox"/> Attend planning/implementation session |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Meet with review panel | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read review panel's report | |

Review Officers

- Notify unit about review (September, year prior)
- Consult with chairs to appoint self-study coordinators (October, year prior)
- Conduct orientation session (November, year 1)
- Review, process and distribute self-study
- Select program review panel
- With unit, arrange program review panel's schedule
- Conduct entrance interview
- Conduct exit interview
- Obtain and distribute program review panel's report
- Schedule review for Univ. Graduate or Undergraduate Review Committee
- Schedule planning/implementation meeting
- Coordinate final record of program review