

## Senate Policy 24-11 Academic Program Review Policy

Motion: To approve the Academic Program Review Policy

Passed at the April 29, 2025 meeting of the Academic Senate

### Approvals:



Christina Smith (May 23, 2025 07:44 PDT)

Christina Smith, PhD  
Chair, Academic Senate

05/23/2025

Date



Richard Yao (May 28, 2025 05:08 PDT)

Richard Yao, PhD  
President

Date



# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS POLICY MANUAL

**Division of Academic Affairs**

**Policy Number: SP 24-11**

**Approved By: Academic Senate**

**Effective Date: Fall 2025**

**April 29, 2025**

**Approved By: Richard Yao, President**

**Total Pages: 11**

## Academic Program Review Policy

### **PURPOSE:**

The creation of a policy for academic program review will provide a timeline, guidance, and accountability to ensure all academic programs are conducting regular program reviews on a five-year cycle to promote student success and continuous improvement. This will also fulfill requirements outlined by the California State University (CSU) Chancellor's Office (CO), as well as program specific and regional accrediting bodies.

### **BACKGROUND:**

This policy formally codifies a timeline and set of requirements for academic program review. Together with the Assessment and General Education (GE) Assessment policies, it provides guidance for how academic programs can evaluate success by recommending direct and indirect measures and adhering to proposed timelines.

### **POLICY:**

#### **Accountability:**

All academic degree programs shall be subject to program review within the guidelines of this policy.

The Provost, in consultation with the department chair, program director or coordinator and Associate Vice President of Academic Programs and Continuous Improvement (APCI), shall determine the appropriate Dean(s) or administrator are for a particular review.

#### **Applicability:**

This policy applies to all academic degree programs, including those with accreditation requirements. It outlines the responsibilities of faculty, departments and programs, administrative staff, and oversight bodies in the program review process.

### **Definitions:**

**Program assessment:** The assessment of student achievement of program learning outcomes (PLOs) through a variety of direct and indirect measures of student learning.

**Program review:** Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) defines periodic program review as, “a systematic process of examining the capacity, processes, and outcomes of a degree program or department in order to judge its quality or effectiveness and to support improvement.”

**Program review cycle:** Program review will be conducted on a five-year cycle that is between Action Plans, per guidelines set by the CSU CO.

**Self-study report:** A report that articulates the nature of assessment conducted, the analysis of that data collected for the assessment, and the strategies for improvement (closing-the-loop). Self-study reports typically follow the campus self-study template. Specific exceptions for programs that undergo program specific accreditation have access to an exemption, as those accreditation reports can be submitted for program review in lieu of utilizing the template. The goal of a self-study is for faculty in the program to engage in self-reflective analysis of a number of national metrics of student success, faculty and student demographics, changes in the discipline, and student learning outcomes achievement.

**Assessment plan:** A plan that illustrates a program’s alignment of learning outcomes as well as a schedule for assessing outcomes over an accreditation or review cycle.

**Action Plan:** The Action Plan (historically referred to as the Program Review MOU) is a strategic and forward focused plan that responds to and reflects upon the knowledge gained through the self-study and external review visit. It considers both the strengths of the program, as well as opportunities for improvement, transforming the recommendations from the self-study and external review into achievable goals for the program.

### **Policy Text:**

All non-accredited academic programs at Cal State Channel Islands are required to participate in a five-year cycle of academic program review. Programs that undergo program specific accreditation will operate on the schedule of the accrediting body. Self-study shall follow the assessment policy based on the program’s assessment plan. A program review self-study will follow the Program Review Template (Appendix) or for programs that undergo specific accreditation, the format outlined by their accrediting body can be utilized.

### **Academic Program Review Components & Timeline**

Academic program review includes the following components divided across 6 stages of the program review process. Key elements are further described in this policy. A more detailed schedule/timeline can be obtained in conversation with the Faculty Director of Assessment and Program Review (FDAPR) or the AVP APCI.

## SP 24-11: Academic Program Review Policy

### Phase 1: Initiation (Spring semester)

- Communication from APCI to start program review;
- Program chair/director/coordinator informs program faculty, sets up the self-study working group and plans the program review process;

### Phase 2: Planning, Data Collection, and Assessment (Spring semester)

- Program identifies, compiles, and analyzes data for self-study;
- Program identifies external reviewer(s) and communicates with Dean for approval;
- Program invites reviewers and sets up campus visit dates;

### Phase 3: Self-Study (Fall semester)

- Program drafts self-study;
- Program presents draft self-study for faculty feedback;
- Program revises self-study as necessary;
- Final self-study sent to Dean, AVP APCI, Faculty Director of Assessment and Program Review (FDAPR), and external reviewer(s);
- Program prepares external review schedule;

### Phase 4: External Review and Final Report (Spring semester)

- Reviewers review self-study prior to campus visit;
- Program sets up dates for campus meetings with Dean and Provost;
- Reviewers visit campus;
- Reviewers submit written report to the AVP APCI who will then share it with Program faculty, Dean, , FDAPR, and Provost;

### Phase 5: Action Plan Report (Spring semester)

- Dean provides written feedback after the external visit;
- Program and Dean meet to discuss external report and Dean feedback;
- Program drafts action items for Action Plan (MOU);
- Program faculty discusses action items and drafts Action Plan (MOU);
- Program chair sends draft Action Plan (MOU) to Dean, Provost, AVP APCI, and FDAPR;

### Phase 6: Action Plan Review (formerly known as MOU) and Feedback (Summer/Fall semester)

- Dean and Provost discuss recommendations;
- Final Action Plan meeting occurs with Program faculty, Dean, Provost, AVP APCI, and FDAPR;
- Once a year the Continuous Improvement Committee shall review all Action Plans for current academic program review cycle and compile a summary of the recommendations which is sent to the AVP APCI to be included in the report to the Chancellor's Office.

## SP 24-11: Academic Program Review Policy

The program review cycle and deadline for the final Action Plan (MOU) meeting may be adjusted as needed by consent of the program, Dean, and Provost, and with agreement from the Chancellor's Office.

### Program Review Schedule

Per the CSU CO, academic programs are reviewed on a five-year cycle. This five-year cycle extends from the prior Action Plan (MOU) to the next Action Plan (MOU) – e.g. if a Program completes its Action Plan (MOU) in Spring 2024, then it completes the Action Plan (MOU) from its next program review in Spring 2029.

The AVP APCI shall ensure that the academic programs are reviewed in a timely fashion and that there is appropriate dissemination of information and recommendations. The cycle may be adjusted as needed by consent of the program, Dean, and Provost, and with agreement from the CSU CO. The AVP APCI shall report action items in yearly reports to the CSU CO.

### The Continuous Improvement Committee

The Continuous Improvement Committee is a Division of Academic Affairs committee serving as the primary advisory body to the Academic Senate and University administration on matters relating to the assessment and academic program review. The committee is composed of 4 members chosen from the Local Curriculum Committees. The committee creates and approves procedures and guidelines related to the Program Review process. They recommend updates and improvements to Program Review process, procedures, policies, and regulations for recommendation to the Academic Senate for approval. The committee reviews programs' self-studies and external reviews at the time of program review, determining whether a program review is complete, and providing constructive feedback to the programs on their action plan progress. In addition to its role in program review, the Continuous Improvement Committee will also oversee broader assessment of institutional learning outcomes, university-wide student success, engagement with institutional mission goals and progress, and continuous improvement.

### Academic Program Self-Study and Recommendation

The Academic Program undergoing review determines the faculty lead to serve as the point of contact and composition of their own Academic Program Self-Study working group. The name(s) of the faculty lead and working group will be submitted to the Dean, FDAPR, and AVP APCI. The faculty lead will meet with the AVP APCI and the FDAPR to discuss substantive and procedural questions. Those attending shall indicate any specific areas or issues needing to be addressed, so that these may be given special attention in the review process. Programs interested in obtaining support (e.g. release time) for the faculty lead overseeing the self-study should contact the appropriate Dean.

The academic program prepares a Self-Study that will serve as a basis for subsequent reviews and recommendations. In this Self-Study, the academic program describes and assesses all program subplans (concentrations/emphases/tracks). Programs identify a faculty lead, assures that the Self-Study working group is formed, that the Self-Study is completed on the Program Review timeline, and that the findings and recommendations of the Self-Study are disseminated to the program faculty and staff.

## SP 24-11: Academic Program Review Policy

The program review faculty lead creates opportunities for widespread program faculty participation in the Self-Study, completes the Self-Study, and forwards the completed Self-Study to the Chair, the Dean, AVP APCI, the FDAPR, and the external reviewers.

The Self-Study addresses the substantive areas indicated in the most current Self-Study template. Self-studies must contain evidence of the assessment of the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), demonstrating the connection between PLOs and Institutional Learning Outcomes and Mission Pillars for CSUCI. Programs are encouraged to add to the existing Self-study template any additional assessment unique to supporting their program goals or authentic to their field.

Programs that include courses designated as General Education (GE) should develop course assessment plans for assessing their GE learning outcomes on a five-year review cycle following the GE Assessment Policy guidelines. Academic programs with GE courses will collect syllabi and compile direct assessment data (e.g. signature assignments, rubrics, course grades) and make these available to the AVP APCI and FDAPR for GE assessment. Academic Programs may include assessment of GE courses and GE learning outcomes in their Academic Program Review Self-Study.

### External Review and Report

The External Review shall be conducted by a one or two reviewers with at least one from outside of the University. This external viewpoint is valuable for offering a fresh perspective on continuous improvement efforts. One of the External Reviewers will be from within the CSU system, such as a Chair or faculty member of a similar program at a different CSU or CI. In the event that only one reviewer is from outside campus, the CI reviewer must be from a different academic program. Reviewers are expected to have experience and familiarity with the elements and needs of the academic program they will be reviewing and will be chosen based on recommendations by the Program, working together with the appropriate Dean. The Dean shall forward the names and addresses of the chosen reviewers to the AVP APCI. The AVP APCI or designee shall send the formal invitation letter to the reviewers with the timeline and compensation.

The AVP APCI and the FDAPR shall provide support with coordinating the External Review. Reviewers will receive a copy of the program's Self-Study and supporting documents and shall come to campus and interview students, faculty – both tenure-track and lecturer faculty, and administrators; and then shall prepare a report of findings and recommendations. The external reviewers shall meet with the appropriate Dean(s) and Provost as part of their External Review, meeting with the Provost in the form of an exit interview. The External Review report and responses shall become part of the Program Review File and be sent to the Program chair, and to subsequent levels of review.

### Internal Review and Feedback

The appropriate Dean(s) shall review the Program Review File and submit the Dean's report feedback with additional comments and recommendations. These shall be submitted to the AVP APCI, the FDAPR, and to the Program chair, and will become part of the Program Review File. The Continuous Improvement Committee shall carefully review each program's

## SP 24-11: Academic Program Review Policy

Program Review File and compile a summary of recommendations to be sent to the AVP APCI. The complete Program Review File will be stored in a CI-only accessible repository.

### Action Plan (formerly known as MOU)

The Academic Program will review all reports and feedback to create action items that delineate future goals and outcomes associated with a timeline and updated assessment plan. The Action Plan shall be finalized via a meeting with the Program faculty, the Dean(s), the Provost, the AVP APCI, and FDAPR. The approved Action Plan will be disseminated and kept in the program review repository. This agreement shall be in effect until the completion of the next review cycle.

Guided by the action plan, program assessments should be conducted, and continuous improvements should be made in between formal program review periods. The Program should be prepared to provide updates to the Continuous Improvement Committee on progress made on action plan items in between program reviews.

The AVP APCI shall annually report information gathered and continuous improvements suggested as the result program review to the CSU CO as required by policy.

**Appendix:**

Example of a Program Self-Study Template

<b>Element One: Program Purpose and University Goals</b>		
<b>CRITERION FOR REVIEW</b>	<b>INQUIRY</b>	<b>Self-Assessment</b>  <b>SCORE</b>
A. Program Mission and Operating Practices	Does the program have a mission statement or statement of program goals that is appropriate? Does the program have an organizational structure and procedures for its key activities such as advising, scheduling, chair selection and review?	
Evidence and Comments:		
B. Program Relation to University Mission	Is the program supportive of the University's mission and strategic goals? Is its program integrated and supportive of the campus's four mission centers, its general education program, and Academic Affairs and University's strategic priorities?	
Evidence and Comments:		
C. Dissemination of Program Mission and Goals	Has the program disseminated information about itself to key constituencies, including faculty, professional colleagues, current and prospective students, and the community?	
Evidence and Comments:		
<b>Summary Recommendations for Element One:</b>		



## SP 24-11: Academic Program Review Policy

II. Element Two: Achieving Educational Outcomes		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	SCORE
A. Curriculum Requirements and Expectations for Learning	Do the program's curriculum and degree requirements reflect high expectations of students? Is that curriculum reflective of current standards in the discipline?	
Evidence and Comments:		
B. Course and Program Learning Outcomes	Has the program developed assessable learning outcomes for its courses and for the program? Are course learning outcomes aligned with program outcomes?	
Evidence and Comments:		
C. Learning Outcome Data and Analysis	Does the program regularly collect course and program learning data? Is that data analyzed, available, and used for program improvement?	
Evidence and Comments:		
D. Timeliness of Degree Attainment	Do students in the program attain the degree in a timely fashion?	
Evidence and Comments:		
E. Involvement of Students in Curricular Activities	Are students active participants in the learning process? Does the program provide opportunities for students to participate in curricular-related activities, such as clubs, fieldtrips, competitions, research and creative opportunities, service learning experiences, performances, and internships?	
Evidence and Comments:		

## SP 24-11: Academic Program Review Policy

F. Advising and Academic Support	Does the program provide adequate student advising? Are its students supported in other venues such as EOP, career services, and disability accommodation?	
Evidence and Comments:		
G. Articulation, Transfer and Retention	Does the program have policies and procedures that facilitate articulation with community colleges? Are transfer students accommodated and integrated into the program? Are native and transfer students in the program being retained in the major and by the University?	
Evidence and Comments:		
<b>Summary Recommendations for Element Two:</b>		

<b>III. Element Three: Developing Resources to Ensure Sustainability</b>		
<b>CRITERION FOR REVIEW</b>	<b>INQUIRY</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
A. Faculty Resources and Scholarship	Does the program have faculty in sufficient number, and with appropriate rank, qualification, and diversity, to support its academic program in a manner consistent with its objectives? Is there evidence of the faculty involvement in scholarship and creative activities at a level appropriate to the discipline and University?	
Evidence and Comments:		
B. Professional Staff	Does the program employ professional staff --support coordinator, technicians, lab assistants – sufficient to support the academic program?	
Evidence and Comments:		
C. Faculty Workload and Evaluation	Is faculty workload aligned with the program's goals for effective teaching, scholarship, and University and community service? Are part and full time faculty evaluated regularly and according to University policies and practices?	

## SP 24-11: Academic Program Review Policy

Evidence and Comments:		
D. Faculty Development	Do faculty have and use professional development plans (PDPs)? Does the program support faculty development opportunities sufficient to improve teaching, learning and scholarship?	
Evidence and Comments:		
E. Fiscal and Physical Resources	Does the program have the budgetary resources needed to support its educational program? Are its facilities, including offices, labs, practice and performance spaces, adequate to support the program?	
Evidence and Comments:		
F. Developing External Resources	Does the program seek and receive extramural support, including grants, gifts, contracts, alumni funding?	
Evidence and Comments:		
G. Information Technology	Does the program have access to information resources, technology, and expertise sufficient to deliver its academic offerings and advance the scholarship of its faculty?	
Evidence and Comments:		
H. Community Involvement and Liaison	If appropriate, does the program have an advisory board or other links to community members and professionals? Does the program maintain a relationship with its alumni?	
Evidence and Comments:		
<b>Summary Recommendations for Element Three:</b>		

IV. Element Four: Creating a Learning Centered Organization		
CRITERION FOR REVIEW	INQUIRY	SCORE
A. Program Planning	Does the program engage in planning activities which identify its academic priorities and examine the alignment of its core functions with those of the institution?	
Evidence and Comments:		
B. Integration of Planning Resources	Does program planning successfully align its curricular, personnel, and budgetary resources? Are its planning goals informed by student learning outcome data? Is program planning integrated into the Academic Affairs budgeting process?	
Evidence and Comments:		
C. Professional Accreditation	If the program holds or is seeking professional accreditation, are its practices and resources consistent with that objective?	
Evidence and Comments:		
Summary Recommendations for Element Four:		

### Summary Comments and Recommendations

Instructions: First, summarize key program strengths and areas of improvement identified in the self study elements above. Second, list and explain recommendations identified in the self study, and describe actions that the program our University can undertake to respond to these recommendations. These recommendations should be grouped as two-year and five-year actions.

Submitted by \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_