

**Doctoral Academic Program Review**  
**6/AS/10/SEC**  
California State University, Stanislaus

**University Policy**

1. Doctoral programs are subject to periodic academic program review on a cycle not to exceed five years after program initiation and seven years thereafter. Earlier reviews may occur as deemed necessary by faculty or administration.
2. The college dean is responsible for assuring the APR is conducted effectively and in accordance with campus policy and procedures.
3. Participation of all doctoral program faculty in the development and review of the self study document is required.
4. Doctoral programs employ strategies for significant student participation in the assessment and review process, as appropriate for each discipline.
5. Program self study documents are timely (in accordance with established timelines for each phase of the review), comprehensive, reflective, analytical, and evaluative, and focus on the assessment of student learning objectives and use of assessment results for improving program quality.
6. The doctoral self study process aligns the academic program review and annual assessment processes and is implemented in accordance with the university's *Principles for the Assessment of Student Learning*.
7. The Office of Institutional Research provides annual data reporting, trend/longitudinal data, and benchmarked data from comparable institutions.
8. Assessment of the quality of the doctoral program occurs annually, including direct assessment of student learning outcomes, with appropriate action resulting from faculty deliberations of assessment results.
9. The use of one or more external reviewers, evaluators unaffiliated with the university, occurs, at a minimum, during the self study phase of the doctoral APR.
10. College faculty and administration evaluate doctoral academic program reviews using established college processes and criteria consistent with university policy and procedures and as required by disciplinary and regional accrediting agencies. Membership of the college's review committee is comprised of core and affiliated faculty, community members, current students, and alumni. The college determines the composition of the review committee.
11. The appropriate university governance committees employ processes and criteria to evaluate doctoral academic program reviews, consistent with requirements identified in the *Constitution of the General Faculty*.
12. Results from doctoral program reviews are integrated into planning and budgetary processes of the college and university.
13. Each stage of the review process results in a recommendation: recommend program continuance; recommend program continuance but with specific concerns for transmittal to the program; recommend the program remain under continuing review; recommend program discontinuation.

14. With delegated authority from the president, the provost makes final determination for doctoral program continuance or initiates process for possible program discontinuance, after conducting a doctoral program review meeting, receipt of a final implementation plan from the department chair, and recommendations from the college dean, college committee, and Graduate Council.
15. The program director/coordinator, in consultation with the college dean, provides a summary of the results of the APR and implementation plan to the college faculty, students, and other stakeholders.
16. Governance responsibility for implementing the development and periodic review of the effectiveness of the doctoral program review procedures is vested with the Graduate Council.
17. Responsibility for managing, evaluating, and improving the doctoral review process rests with the Vice Provost in consultation with the Council of Deans and the Graduate Council. Requests for delay of the APR should be made in rare and compelling circumstances and requires the approval of the dean and provost.
18. For programs subject to professional, disciplinary, or specialized accreditation, a request for the accreditation document to serve as a primary, but not sole, component of the self-study document may be submitted.
19. Any recommended policy changes are submitted to the Academic Senate for appropriate university action.

DMD:rl 2/12/10

Graduate Council Approved 2/18/10

Academic Senate Approved 06/AS/10 Resolution Doctoral Academic Program Review 4/13/10

President Approved 06/AS/10 Resolution Doctoral Academic Program Review 5/13/10