



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDE

Policies & Procedures

Contents

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	3
Goals of Academic Program Review	3
Principles and Assumptions	3
Academic Program Review Process.....	4
Process Exception: Specialized Accreditation	4
Full Program Review: Steps and Timeline	4
Procedural Summary: The Self-Study	5
External Review Procedures	6
Responses to the External Review Report	6
Program Review Panel Procedures	7
Program Review Commentaries will consist of three segments:.....	7
Introduction:	7
Findings and Major Issues:.....	7
Recommendations:	7
Expectations of Administrators	7
Summary for Chancellor's Office	8
Appendix A	9
Appendix B	13
Appendix D: Summary Meeting Agenda	16
Appendix E: Summary Agreement Template	17
Participating:.....	17

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

California State University, Dominguez Hills is committed to the development and delivery of excellent academic programs that reinforce our position as a comprehensive model urban university. An important element in fostering program excellence and a vigorous university is a policy of regular self-assessment and planning, implementation, and evaluation. Classroom and programmatic change grounded in this policy are the foundation of the review process. Program review includes analyses of the achievement of each program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examinations and placement, and evidence from community members such as employers and professional organizations. The policy and procedures described in this document are consistent with requirements of the CSU Chancellor's Office and current accreditation requirements.

Goals of Academic Program Review

1. To document the congruence of the goals of academic programs with the University's Strategic Plan.
2. To provide evidence of high quality academic programs from internal and external sources.
3. To assess areas of strength and areas needing improvement in academic programs.
4. To encourage creativity in the teaching and learning environment while ensuring academic integrity.
5. To identify resources needed to maintain high-quality academic programs and to achieve program improvement.

Principles and Assumptions

The program review process is guided by the following set of principles and assumptions:

1. Planning and development in the instructional areas is a collegial process. At CSUDH, the responsibility for establishing academic programs based on the assessment of student learning and program outcomes, community needs and the exercise of professional judgment concerning what constitutes a high quality program is placed on the faculty and dean of each college.
2. The college, as well as individual programs, benefit from program review. An examination of the issues, strengths and problems of the various programs yields greater understanding of the character and quality of the college. This examination also provides an opportunity for the college dean, working in conjunction with the faculty to establish and/or revise the college's priorities, thereby further defining its mission.
3. Balance between flexibility and uniformity is desirable. Diversity should be accommodated; however, procedures should provide enough consistency and structure to guide those who participate in the review.
4. Program review is an open process facilitating the presentation of issues, problems, and areas of strength as well as the creation of realistic solutions and plans for maintaining high quality. The process should encourage cooperative planning within the college as well as between the college and the designated program review body.

Academic Program Review Process

Each academic program shall complete a full review once every six years. The Program Review Process involves six steps:

1. The preparation of a self-study report by program faculty;
2. A site visit by a qualified external reviewer, who provides a written evaluation of the program on the basis of the self-study as well as additional materials consulted during the site visit;
3. A departmental response to the report of the external reviewer;
4. Recommendations from the college dean;
5. Recommendations from the Program Review Panel;
6. A planning meeting involving program faculty (full-time and adjunct), the college Dean, a representative of the Program Review Panel, and the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.

The Office Academic Affairs initiates the program review process. No later than September 15, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the elected chair of the Program Review Panel will organize preliminary meetings with the Chairs of programs scheduled for review and the relevant instructional Deans. Participants will discuss the findings from previous program reviews and their potential relevance to the current review cycle; initiate the search for qualified external reviewers; identify any special themes or items to be highlighted in the self-study; and identify data needs beyond what is provided annually by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (i.e., the Academic Unit Profile).

Process Exception: Specialized Accreditation

Some programs are subject to periodic specialized accreditation. The self-studies produced for specialized accreditation are typically exhaustive and generally include the information required by the six-year program self-study. Accreditation reports may be substituted for the campus Self-Study Report, **but they must include a completed chart indicating where specific self-study elements are discussed in the accreditation materials and they must address all items required by the CSUDH Self-Study Report, even if that necessitates the preparation of a supplemental report (see Appendix B).** Programs preparing self-studies for accreditation are encouraged to consult with the Program Review Panel Chair and the Associate Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment **at the beginning of the accreditation process.** Otherwise, programs subject to accreditation follow the steps outlined above. In particular, program faculty and instructional deans must submit responses to the reports of external reviewers to facilitate the formulation of recommendations for program improvement relevant to and beyond accreditation requirements.

All reports and supplemental documents (i.e., appendices) should be emailed directly to Lilliana Sanchez (lsanchez166@csudh.edu) in the Office of Academic Programs.

Full Program Review: Steps and Timeline

The chart below provides a timeline and a more detailed description of the review process. Timely completion of the process requires consistent attention over three successive academic terms (fall, spring, and fall).

Steps	Timeline
1. The Chair/Coordinator of the program under review, the relevant instructional Dean, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and the chair of the Program Review Panel meet to review the results of the previous review, to initiate the search for qualified external reviewers, and to plan the upcoming review. After the meeting, the program chair, with her/his dean, reaches out to potential external reviewers.	No later than the 2 nd Friday in September
2. After confirming their willingness to serve, the program Chair/Coordinator provides a list of potential external reviewers – with a brief CV for each – to her/his Dean. If the Dean accepts the candidates, she/he passes along the list to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Office of Academic Programs, who will contact the external reviewer and schedule the site visit.	No later than the 3 rd Monday in October
3. Data and evidence pertinent to the review are collected, summarized, and analyzed by the division/department/program faculty for inclusion in the Program Self-Study Report (See Appendix A). A draft Self-Study Report should be made available to all full- and part-time faculty for input.	
4. The Self-Study Report is submitted to the Office of Academic Programs with a copy sent to the College Dean. All full-time faculty members shall sign the cover page of the Self-Study Report, indicating that they have reviewed the document and are aware of its contents.	No later than 2 nd Friday in December
5. After having reviewed the Self-Study Report, one or more external reviewers visit the campus to meet with relevant faculty, students, staff, and administrators.	All visits should be scheduled no later than the 1 st week in March
6. The external reviewer shall submit the External Review Report, due to the Office of Academic Programs no more than two weeks after the campus visit.	2 weeks
7. The division/department/program faculty submit a response to the External Review Report to the Office of Academic Programs no more than two weeks after its receipt.	2 weeks
8. The College Dean submits his/her response to the External Review Report, to the Office of Academic Programs within two weeks of receipt of the division/department/program's response to the External Review Report.	2 weeks
9. The Program Review Panel composes a commentary that summarizes the major findings and issues raised by the review and prioritizes the resulting recommendations. The approved commentary is submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, with copies to the College Dean and Program faculty.	No later than 2 weeks following receipt of external reviewer's report
10. A planning conference is convened to review the results of the review and establish planning priorities for the upcoming review cycle. The participants include the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, the College Dean, the Associate Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, a representative of the Program Review Panel, and program faculty (adjunct faculty are to be invited), the Undergraduate Dean, and the Graduate Dean (when appropriate). The conclusions of this discussion are summarized in a memo of understanding to be signed by the Provost, the Dean, and the program Chair.	No later than one month following approval of PRP Commentary

Procedural Summary: The Self-Study

The purpose of the self-study (see Appendix A) is to provide a systematic assessment of program quality and effectiveness. Programs have broad discretion in organizing the preparation of the self-

study, but certain principles apply to all. It is to be an inclusive process, providing all stakeholders with opportunities for meaningful involvement. Participants – especially faculty and students – should be given ample time for reflection and discussion of issues relevant to the major issues raised by the self-study.

If a department offers more than one instructional program, a separate analysis for each degree program must be included in the final Self-Study Report. Programs of limited size (e.g. minors and certificates), that have no faculty appointments and are not housed in a department, conduct a more limited self-study and write a shorter Self-Study Report. Additionally, for the campus general education program, the General Education Committee and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies compose a Self-Study Report and coordinate an external review.

External Review Procedures

After the self-study process is completed, each program participates in an external review conducted by faculty from universities who have expertise in the relevant discipline(s).

After consultation with the program, the College Dean submits the names of at least two nominees and their vitae to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. If more than one reviewer will be employed, at least one should be faculty at a CSU campus. Program faculty and the College Dean should also indicate whether a one-day or two-day visit is required. In consultation with program faculty and the College Dean, the Associate Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment will confirm the selection of the external reviewer(s) and initiate site visit planning.

External reviewer nominees must meet the following *minimum* criteria:

- Evidence of experience in program review;
- Evidence of currency, including teaching and expertise in the field under review; and
- Terminal degree in the appropriate discipline.

The Office Academic Affairs will provide the external reviewer(s) with a copy of the Program Review Guide and the program's Self-Study no less than four weeks prior to their visits. During visits of one or two days, reviewers meet with program faculty, staff, students, alumni (when possible), and the College Dean. Further, they may conduct a physical inspection in order to assess program facilities (classrooms, offices, labs, rehearsal facilities, etc.). External reviewers then prepare a report that identifies program strengths and weaknesses, evaluates the plans for program improvement outlined in the self-study, and offers additional recommendations for program improvement, including an assessment of unmet resource needs (see Appendix C for guidelines).

The External Review Report should be emailed to Lilliana Sanchez (lsanchez166@csudh.edu) within two weeks of the site visit. An honorarium of \$1000 will be sent upon receipt of the report.

Responses to the External Review Report

Program Response

Program faculty review the report of the external reviewer and submit a written response to it within two weeks. In this brief document, the program should explain why it does or does not concur with the assessment and recommendations of the external reviewer.

Dean's Response

The College Dean then composes a brief commentary that summarizes the main findings of the review and identifies supported recommendations. This commentary should be submitted no later than two weeks after receipt of the department's response to the External Review Report.

Program Review Panel Procedures

Typically, the Program Review Panel will prepare its commentary and recommendations based on the Self-Study Report, the External Review Report, the program's response, and the commentary provided by the College Dean. However, if the departmental response to the external review and the report of the College Dean are not received in a timely fashion (i.e., within one month of the submission of the external reviewer's report), the panel will prepare its commentary and recommendations using only the Self-Study and the report of the external reviewer.

Each program undergoing review will be assigned a Program Review Team composed of at least two members of the Program Review Panel. The Program Review Team acts as an outside neutral party, which provides a total university perspective, independent of the program, the dean, and external reviewers. The Program Review Panel Commentary will synthesize the findings and recommendations outlined in the self-study, External Review Report and other supporting documents. All panel members then have the opportunity to discuss the draft commentary during a first reading. Recommended amendments to draft commentaries will be approved by a simple majority of voting members. Commentaries will receive formal approval, again by majority vote, after a second reading. The approved commentary will be sent to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs with copies to the College Dean and program faculty.

Program Review Commentary

Program Review commentary shall consist of the following three segments:

Introduction:

This section should provide a short description of the program and how it contributes to the realization of the university's mission. Comments on the thoroughness of the self-study, the quality of the supporting evidence and analysis, and the prioritization of plans should also be included here.

Findings and Major Issues:

This is the body of the report. Based on the evidence presented in the Self-Study Report and other documents, the tour of physical facilities, if applicable, and the external review report, the team should identify the most significant issues affecting the quality and effectiveness of the program. The team should identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement. The team should highlight recommendations supported by all parties as well as instances in which program faculty, external reviewers, and/or deans disagree regarding program needs.

Recommendations:

Panel recommendations generally mirror proposals advanced by program faculty, external reviewers, and/or college deans. In such cases, the panel's recommendations should identify priority actions. Panel recommendations should also indicate whether specific initiatives would require outside resource support. If the panel does not support or significantly modifies a recommendation supported by the parties to the review, it must provide a clear rationale.

Expectations of Administrators

The review process requires that active support of College Deans and Academic Affairs personnel, including the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. Deans are expected to act as a liaison between academic programs and the Program Review Panel. Deans should update the PRP regularly regarding the accreditation reporting schedules of programs in their colleges; they should facilitate the timely completion of self-study reports and external review site visits; and they should submit their recommendations to the Program Review Panel in a timely fashion.

Reflecting on Program Review Findings

When the panel has completed its deliberations, The Office of Academic Affairs will schedule a meeting to discuss its recommendations (see Appendix D for exemplary agenda). At this meeting, program faculty, the College Dean, and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will endorse or revise and prioritize the recommendations of PRP and have an opportunity to formulate additional recommendations in a collegial setting. The goal of such discussions is to facilitate the implementation of supported recommendations. Toward that end, the outcome of such deliberations will be recorded in a Memo of Understanding signed by the program Chair, the College Dean, and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (see Appendix E).

Summary for Chancellor's Office

In addition to the team report outlined above, a shorter half page summary for submission to the Chancellor's Office should be written by the Program Review Team for the annual fall report to the Chancellor's Office on campus academic program reviews.

Appendix A
SELF-STUDY: THE BASIS OF PROGRAM REVIEW
Required Components of the Self-Study Report

Instructions

The template provided below represents a comprehensive list of issues that may affect academic programs at CSUDH. However, it is understood that not all items will be relevant to every program. Self-study authors may disregard items not relevant to their programs, or simply answer “NA.” If an item is addressed in one of the appendices, authors should refer the reader to the appropriate source.

The self-study and all appendices should be entered directly into the Campus Labs Program. (The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment will facilitate regular trainings in Campus Labs at the beginning of each academic year.). The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will notify external reviewers when self-study reports become available. (As a rule, an external reviewer should have access to these materials no less than four weeks prior to her/his scheduled site visit.).

Organization and required elements of the Self-Study

- I. Cover page
 - a. Program name
 - b. Name of chairperson, coordinator, or director
 - c. Name of all degree programs, options, concentrations, minors, certificates, and credentials to be reviewed
 - d. Date of last program review
 - e. Names of report authors
 - f. Date report was submitted
 - g. Signatures of the chair as well as all full-time faculty, indicating that they have reviewed the report.

- II. Introduction
 - a. The authors of the report should be identified, and a brief description given of the sources utilized to prepare the self-study.
 - b. Provide a brief, but complete description of the degree programs under review, including, when relevant, a description of physical facilities and equipment supervised by the program.
 - c. Describe program responses to recommendations generated by the most recent program review.

- III. Program and Curricular Quality
 - a. How do the program’s mission, goals and student learning outcomes objectives align with the university strategic plan and support its realization.
 - b. Does the program lead to a broad, well-integrated knowledge of the subject?
 - i. Are the requirements appropriate for a high quality program?
 - ii. Are there important areas of expertise or aspects of the discipline that are not adequately covered?
 - c. Are program curricula sufficiently aligned with the Program’s Student Learning Outcomes objectives?

- d. Describe and assess curriculum and program modifications prompted by assessment.
- e. Discuss student demand for the program. Is there demand for additional certificate, undergraduate or graduate programs?
- f. Using data from the Academic Unit Profile, analyze the program’s retention and graduation rates. What trends are evident? How do program graduation rates compare to the 2025 targets that the Chancellor’s Office established for CSUDH? (Note: programs are responsible for reporting on the under-represented minority gap and Pell gap only if those data are available in the Academic Unit Profile.).

Chancellor’s Office 2025 Graduation Rate Goals for CSUDH ¹	
Metrics	CSUDH Targets
FTF (enter 2019) six- year graduation rate	55%
FTF (enter 2021) four- year graduation rate	31%
Transfer student (enter 2023) two- year graduation rate	40%
Transfer student (enter 2021) four-year graduation rate	75%
Under-represented Minority Gap for six-year graduates	0%
Pell Gap for six-year graduates	0%

- g. Has the program sought accreditation? If so, with what results?
- h. Describe the program’s curricular contributions to other academic programs, including General Education.

IV. Teaching and Learning

- a. Over the last review cycle, has the program met its program student learning outcomes goals? (Note: for this item, reviewers are also referred to Appendix A, the program’s most recent student learning outcomes assessment report).
- b. What is the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty in the program? What is the Student-to-Faculty ratio (SFR) for the program? How does the use of part-time faculty or graduate teaching assistants affect the consistency of curricular offerings?
- c. How does the program encourage instructional improvements?
- d. What modes of instruction does the program deploy? How does the program measure the relative effectiveness of traditional, hybrid, and online modalities?
- e. How does the program integrate “high impact practices” (HIPS) into program courses and/or General Education offerings?
- f. Are existing campus resources, facilities and institutional support services (including instructional technology facilities and support services) sufficient to the program’s instructional needs?

V. Faculty Resources and Activities

- a. Does the program employ a sufficient number of faculty of appropriate qualifications, rank, and experience to realize its mission and objectives? If no, describe the program’s faculty needs and outline a six-year recruitment plan. (If the program has already

¹ The California State University. Graduation Initiative 2025 Goals, CSU Dominguez Hills.

prepared a recruitment plan, it may be attached as an appendix).

- b. Describe the organizational procedures by which the department supports program leadership, curriculum development, faculty evaluation, student advising, and extracurricular activities.
- c. How do faculty maintain currency in their field(s)? Discuss the research achievements and/or creative activities of program faculty (including scholarly publications, exhibits, performances, consulting, professional memberships, contributions to professional associations, and other relevant professional activities).
- d. How does the program support and reward faculty scholarship?
- e. How does the program support faculty development?
- f. How do program faculty contribute to shared governance at CSUDH and in the CSU (discuss service on college, university and system-wide bodies)?
- g. How does the program integrate part-time faculty?
 - i. Are adjunct faculty provided with any kind of orientation or training?
 - ii. Are adjunct faculty offered opportunities for professional development?

VI. Serving Student Needs

- a. Can students complete the program in a timely fashion? How does the program identify and manage bottleneck courses?
- b. How does the program ensure student access to advising? How do students receive information about academic requirements, class scheduling, co-curricular activities, research or internship opportunities and other program updates?
- c. Does the program support student internships? Describe the involvement of undergraduate and/or graduate students in faculty research.
- d. Describe co-curricular programs supported by the department and other department practices designed to make student life meaningful and vibrant. How do these activities promote the personal and professional development of students?
- e. How does the program encourage and recognize student achievement (honors, awards, scholarships, Student Research Day, etc.)?
- f. Does the program solicit feedback from students? Does student feedback inform scheduling, efforts to improve instruction or program/curriculum modifications?
- g. Does the program solicit feedback from alumni? What information can be provided regarding student performance on graduate or professional school entrance exams, the professional achievements of alumni, or alumni perceptions of the value of their degree?

VII. Service and Outreach Activities

- a. What efforts are made to assess the community's need for service functions provided by the program?
- b. Discuss service activities or programs that the program offers for the campus

and/or the community.

VIII. Supplemental Information for Graduate Programs

- a. How are graduate students recruited? What percentage of graduate students completed their undergraduate degrees at CSUDH?
- b. Describe admission requirements and procedures. How do students advance to candidacy?
- c. What is the normative time to completion of the degree? What is the average time to completion of degree? Does class scheduling reflect the needs of the student population? What is the policy for validating out-of-date coursework?
- d. How is the Title V requirement for an independent culminating experience met (thesis, project, or comprehensive oral or written examination)? How are program standards for the culminating experience established and maintained?
- e. How are faculty chosen to teach the graduate courses? How does the use of part-time faculty affect curricular quality?
- f. If the program leads to a professional degree, what kinds of field placements or internships are available?
- g. What information can be provided regarding the achievements of alumni, or alumni perceptions of the value of their degree?

IX. Conclusion

- a. Provide a brief, frank self-appraisal of the program; identify major trends that shaped its development during the period under review.
- b. Describe major objectives for the upcoming review cycle, including an implementation plan.

X. Appendices

- a. Most recent Program Student Learning Outcomes Report submitted to USLOAC and USLOAC's most recent evaluation of assessment activities.
- b. Brief (1-2 page) Curriculum Vitae for all full-time faculty.
- c. Program's Academic Unit Profile Data.
- d. Other data generated by IEA or internally.

Appendix B

Cover sheet indicating alignment of program accreditation report with the CSUDH self-study (Please fill in text box and attach to accreditation report's Table of Contents)

Self-Study Items	Location in Accreditation Document(s)
Introduction: Program Description and History, including responses to recommendations from previous review cycles	See pp.?
III. Program and Curricular Quality a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h.	For IIIa, see pp....
IV. Teaching and Learning a. b. c. d. e. f.	For B1, see...
V. Faculty Resources and Activities a. b. c. d. e. f. g.	
VI. Serving Student Needs a. b. c. d. e. f. g.	
VII. Service and Outreach Activities a.	

b.	
F) Supplemental Information for Graduate Programs a. b. c. d. e. f. g.	
Conclusion Summary: Self-Appraisal and Implementation Plans a. b.	

Please provide additional information in the following cases:

1) If accreditation documents do not address issues to be addressed by the CSUDH Self-Study Report.

2) If the accreditation documents contain important information about your program not solicited by the CSUDH Self-Study.

Appendix C
Guidelines for External Reviewers

Please identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program in each major field of evaluation (marked by capitalized Roman numerals). Supporting commentary need not address program responses to each individual item in the self-study, but should explain fully the reasons for the evaluation. Please submit the completed report to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, ideally within two weeks of the site visit. Thank you again for your contributions to improved student success at CSUDH.

- I. Introduction: Identify the sources utilized to prepare the external review report.
- II. Program and Curricular Quality
Assessment:
- III. Teaching and Learning Activities
Assessment:
- IV. Faculty Resources and Activities
Assessment:
- V. Serving Student Needs
Assessment:
- VI. Service and Outreach Activities
Assessment:
- VII. Additional Issues Relevant to Graduate Programs
Assessment:
- VIII. Conclusion: Summative Assessment and Recommendations
 - a. Provide a brief, frank self-appraisal of the program; identify major trends that shaped its development during the period under review.
 - b. Are the program's goals and objectives for the upcoming review cycle appropriate and feasible? Should the program consider any additional goals? Are current resource levels adequate, or will implementation require significant additional investments?

Appendix D: Summary Meeting Agenda

AGENDA

Date:

Time:

Location: WH D-442

1. Call to Order (PRP Chair)
2. Introductions
3. Review of PRP Recommendations
4. Additional Recommendations
 - a. Program Faculty
 - b. Deans/AVPs
 - c. Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs
5. Closing Remarks (Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs)
6. Adjournment

Appendix E: Summary Agreement Template

Program Review Summary Agreement

Completed summary agreement is due two weeks after follow-up meeting.

Participating:

PRP Recommendations	Recommendations as Prioritized through Consultation
•	

Reviewed & approved

Chairperson _____

Dean _____

Nam

Nam

AVP of IEA _____

Provost _____ 17