SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Guidelines for Academic Program Review
September 2006 Edition

Prepared by

The Office of University Analysis, Reporting, & Assessment

and

The Office of Academic Affairs

Page Intentionally Left Blank

The core values of Salisbury University are excellence, student-centeredness, learning, community, civic engagement, and diversity. We believe these values must be lived and experienced as integral to everyday campus life so that students make the connection between what they learn and how they live. The goals and objectives of our strategic, academic, facilities, and enrollment plans, as well as our fiscal commitments, reflect our fundamental values. In addition to these principal values, the University embraces the long-honored tradition of honesty and mutual regard that is and should be a defining characteristic of higher education.

I.   Introduction

The principal goals of Academic Program Review (APR) are to demonstrate continuous quality improvement in program curriculum and instruction, to validate the achievement of program-relevant student learning outcomes, and to affirm that a program's current and future plans and vision are congruent with its school and the University. Accomplishing secondary objectives, the APR engages the faculty and administration in a process that validates academic rigor and program viability to internal and external observers.

Academic Program Review should be meaningful, providing periodic opportunity for rigorous evaluation that advances programmatic excellence. Both ongoing assessment and Academic Program Review should inform academic and curricular planning from year-to-year. Additionally, Academic Program Review, typically scheduled for all programs on a seven-year cycle, should be used to focus strategic planning, to inform the institutional budgeting process, and to meet both internal and external reporting objectives.

II.   Overview of the Academic Program Review Process

> The focus of Academic Program Review is the academic program, not the department. Distinct reviews are expected for each concentration (not track) at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

With the exception of programs that earn a specialized accreditation through rigorous external review, all academic programs should attempt to submit an APR that is approximately 20—25 pages in length. Supporting documentation, including annual reports, may be appended without modification and referenced as appropriate.

Non-accredited Programs

> All non-accredited programs shall conduct a comprehensive academic program review every seven years. New programs should conduct an initial review after five years and every seven years thereafter.

In order to maximize reporting consistency from year-to-year and across programs, the following guidelines should be used to focus and structure Academic Program Review. The guidelines are neither restrictive nor exhaustive. A wide latitude is granted to the individual program to structure a report and program review according to specific pedagogical and disciplinary constructs.

The APR should include the following essential elements, each of which will be discussed in later sections of the guidelines.

A. qualitative analysis and discussion of the academic program;

B. evidence of an ongoing program assessing student learning outcomes;

C. evidence of student learning; and,

D. external peer review.

Timeline:

− August: academic programs are notified by Academic Affairs that they are scheduled to conduct an academic program review;

− September: programs commence academic program review;

− November: programs identify external reviewers;

− January: programs submit a formal report to external reviewers and the school dean;

− February: external reviewers conduct an on-site program review;

− March: external reviewers submit formal comments to the program director/program faculty and the school dean;

− April: programs submit the final report to the school dean;

− May: the school dean reviews all program materials;

− June 1: the school dean submits a formal executive summary of each academic program review, as well as all materials, to Academic Affairs;

− August: Academic Affairs submits a formal executive summary to the USM Board of Regents;

− September: Academic Affairs provides formal feedback to each reviewed program;

− September: Academic Affairs archives all program review materials with the Office of University Analysis, Reporting, & Assessment.

Accredited Programs

➢ Accredited programs shall conduct a comprehensive Academic Program Review on a schedule that is congruent with their accreditation reviews and, minimally, at least every seven years.

Programs that maintain specialized accreditations with accrediting agencies may substitute the formal accreditation standards of the respective agency in lieu of the SU APR guidelines **provided the accrediting agency is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and/or the U.S. Department of Education (ED)**. Programs not recognized by the CHEA or ED may use their accrediting agency's standards to *supplement not substitute for the* Salisbury University APR guidelines.

Meeting the above criteria, an academic program accredited with a specialized accrediting agency must submit the following to Academic Affairs:

A. its accreditation reports/self-study;

B. visiting team comments;

C. formal rejoinder;

D. formal acknowledgement of accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation;

E. evidence of an ongoing and continuous program assessing student learning outcomes; and,

F. evidence of student learning.

Timeline:

− August: academic programs are notified by Academic Affairs that they are scheduled to conduct an academic program review and that their accreditation process substitutes for the SU APR process;

− June 1: the school dean submits a formal executive summary of each academic program review, as well as all materials, to Academic Affairs;

− August: Academic Affairs submits a formal executive summary to the USM Board of Regents;

− September: Academic Affairs provides formal feedback to each reviewed program;

− September: Academic Affairs archives all program review materials with the Office of University Analysis, Reporting, & Assessment.

III.   Guidelines for Academic Program Review

A. Qualitative analysis and discussion of the academic program

A qualitative analysis and discussion of the academic program forms the core of the APR. All programs must structure the qualitative discussion against standardized professional criteria and/or best practices that are discipline appropriate. As such, the report must be aptly comprehensive while highlighting measures, content, constructs, and outcomes that are indicative of academic rigor. A thorough and introspective review will candidly assess, evaluate, and summarize the past seven years of the academic program; assess and evaluate its current strengths, potential weaknesses, and challenges; and, will offer a realistic, if not visionary course for the program's growth and enhancement. Included within any forthright discussion should be a realistic assessment of any factors that may impede program quality as well as plans to enhance the program in specific directions.

➢ The Academic Program Review should be the product of the combined efforts of all members of the academic program. It should reflect the **results** of *ongoing student learning assessments* AND any curricular or instructional changes attributed to the results of those assessments.

➢ Although comprehensive by design, the final APR document should be as succinct as possible. As a result, **ATTACHMENTS** should be appended as appropriate and referenced as supporting materials. Attachments should strengthen any narrative presented within the APR. In making use of previous and ongoing documentation, it is hoped to eliminate duplicative and unnecessary repetition of work. As such, it is the qualitative discussion and planned enhancements that should focus the narrative.

The APR should include and discuss the following (where appropriate):

1. Succinct program description

   ▪ Append or embed the program statement of purpose (mission), program statement of educational philosophy, and core academic values.
   ▪ Identify how the program and the program curriculum support the mission of Salisbury University.
   ▪ *Summarize* the previous seven years, emphasizing major trends.
   ▪ Highlight changes that resulted as a direct response to the previous Academic Program Review.

2. Comparable academic programs and professional standards

   ▪ Identify comparable academic programs at other institutions.
   ▪ Identify the qualitative and quantitative factors used to identify comparable academic programs at other institutions.
   ▪ Identify the professional standards used to benchmark programmatic functions and structure.

- Discuss how the unit benchmarks its performance against comparable programs and professional standards.

3. Program curriculum

- Discuss the rationale for the sequencing of courses and the organization of requirements. (Documentation that describes the curriculum and rationale may be appended and referenced as appropriate).
- Discuss how the program design and requirements compare to comparable programs.
- Discuss key decisions that have focused the breadth and depth of the curriculum.
- Discuss how student learning assessments have influenced the curriculum and instruction.
- Discuss the changes made to the curriculum over the past seven years. Reference and append supporting documentation as appropriate.
- Identify and discuss how the curriculum might be enriched both now and over the next seven years.
- Discuss how expected learning outcomes are communicated at the course level.
- Discuss how information literacy, i.e. "acquiring and processing information in the search for understanding"(2006, Middle States Commission on Higher Education, Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, , p. 42; expanded list of information literacy skills, p. 42) is incorporated into the program and how such skills are assessed.

4. Evidence of intellectual and creative challenge

- Identify primary program-specific student learning outcomes.
- Append a detailed list of program-specific student learning outcomes and evidence demonstrating an ongoing program of student learning assessment.
- Discuss the evidence that is indicative of program-specific student learning.
- Describe any "special" program characteristics (e.g., program admission criteria that are more rigorous than University admission criteria, semester abroad requirements, passing of nationally standardized exams as a requirement to graduate, etc.).
- Discuss any applied educational activities that enhance the learning process.
- Describe how the curriculum provides opportunity for students to engage in and reflect upon complex issues from diverse perspectives.
- Provide evidence that your graduates demonstrate facility with program-relevant outcomes.

5. Salisbury University Student Learning Goals

- Describe the program's role in supporting SU's "Student Learning Goals" (Appendix C) with respect to the skills, knowledge, and dispositions of non-majors.
- Discuss any curricular initiatives in support of interdisciplinary programs, foundation courses, honors, new-student experiences, or external collaborative programming.
- Provide evidence that the program's role in support of SU's "Student Learning Goals" (Appendix C) fosters intended outcomes.

6. Enrollment patterns

- Discuss enrollment trends, including majors, second majors/minors, student credit hours generated, demographic patterns, time-to-completion of graduates, program retention and other factors that quantify the program's service group(s).
- Compare and contrast the program's enrollment patterns with those of peer institutions.
- Discuss the program's initiatives to attract, retain, and graduate students.

- Identify and discuss the program's enrollment aspirations for the future. Identify the challenges to success and potential obstacles.
- Discuss the program's initiatives to recruit and support a diverse student population.

7. Faculty and staff

- Discuss faculty expertise and experience and any alignment issues between that expertise and the current curriculum. (up-to-date vitae of program faculty should be appended to the APR).
- Highlight faculty activity in the areas of scholarship, awards and honors, internal and external grants, special service, etc. Discuss how faculty activities support the program and the curriculum. (Annual reports may be referenced and/or appended as appropriate).
- Compare and discuss faculty workload, to include academic instruction, advising, and extra-instructional activity, with that of your peers. The workload of all faculty groups should be highlighted.
- Describe and substantiate future staffing initiatives in light of enrollment aspirations, curricular innovations, and peer review.
- Describe the program's efforts to foster workforce diversity, including the recruitment and retention of faculty from diverse backgrounds.
- Discuss faculty and staff development activities.

8. Advising

- Discuss how the program's advising practices support the overall quality of the educational experience.
- Discuss how the unit assesses its advising performance.
- Discuss how the advising experience promotes intellectual stimulation and assists students in selecting courses to meet their educational goals? (See a current edition of the *Advising Handbook* for reference materials)

9. Resources

- Discuss budget patterns and unit resources, including equipment, technology, personnel, facilities space, supplies, and other key resources necessary to operate the program.
- Discuss the unit's expenditures and identify opportunities to improve efficiencies.
- Discuss and substantiate faculty and program resources at levels to enhance program quality and academic rigor.
- Discuss how the unit's resources compare with those of comparable programs.

10. Focus on the future

- Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program when compared against comparable programs or professional standards.
- Highlight the program's primary initiatives over the next seven years.
- Discuss external and internal threats to program growth, curricular change, and resource allocation.
- Discuss potential shifts in programmatic demand as a result of internal, institutional, and/or external initiatives.
- Discuss your alumni's involvement with the program as well as their post-graduate experiences.

B. Evidence of an ongoing program assessing student learning outcomes

Academic programs must demonstrate that an ongoing student learning outcomes assessment process is well established and continuous. The "Five-Core Components" of assessment (1995,

Nichols) adopted by the University Academic Assessment Committee and referenced in *Salisbury University: A Handbook of Student Learning Assessment (January 2002)* were instituted to guide the University's assessment process. Additionally, the Academic Program Review Guidelines, Section A, "Qualitative analysis and discussion of the academic program," ask for a discussion of program-specific student learning outcomes, inquire about evidence of academic rigor, and require detailed (appended) evidence highlighting the unit's ongoing program of student learning assessment. A discussion of these sections might answer the following:

– What measures are utilized to assess program-specific student learning outcomes?

– What evidence demonstrates that the methods to assess program-relevant student learning outcomes are valid and appropriate?

– What are the criteria and standards for evaluating whether or not objectives have been met?

– What do the analyses of assessment data indicate?

– How do program completers demonstrate facility with program-relevant student learning outcomes?

– How are assessment results utilized to improve learning?

By the end of the 2004 calendar year, ALL academic programs (and administrative units) should have progressed through the five core assessment components and be actively engaged in an **ongoing** program of student learning outcomes assessment. If the program has not progressed through all five core components OR is not actively involved in **ongoing** student learning outcomes assessment, the program is failing to meet a primary performance standard and must include the following:

1. A detailed discussion regarding the issues and obstacles that have hindered or prevented the implementation of an ongoing process of student learning outcomes assessment.

2. A detailed student learning outcomes assessment implementation plan, including realistic milestones and time table.

3. A detailed discussion regarding the specific resources and personnel assignments associated with the implementation plan.

C. Evidence of student learning

Academic programs must provide program-specific evidence of student learning. The "Five-Core Components" of assessment (1995, Nichols) adopted by the University Academic Assessment Committee and referenced in *Salisbury University: A Handbook of Student Learning Assessment (January 2002)* were instituted to guide the University's assessment process. Additionally, the Academic Program Review Guidelines, Section A, "Qualitative analysis and discussion of the academic program," ask for a discussion of program-specific student learning outcomes, inquire about evidence of academic rigor, and require detailed evidence (appended) highlighting the unit's ongoing program of student learning assessment. Evidence of student learning might include, but are not limited to, the following:

– Measured gains in knowledge and or competencies;

– Student performance on local or nationally-normed assessment instruments;

– Capstone experiences;

– Licensure pass rates;

- Portfolio assessment;
- Self-evaluations;
- Surveys and questionnaires;
- Simulations or performance appraisals; and,
- Classroom research

D. External peer review

External peer review provides the opportunity to obtain objective qualitative assessment from respected colleagues. Ideally, reviewers should be drawn from institutions and or academic programs that are similar to SU and the program(s) under review. Reviews must be able to apply standards of evaluation that are consistent with the goals, expectations, and educational context of the University as well as the standards identified by the program under review.

Each program under review must provide external reviewers with a base of relevant information concerning the program. This information will normally include current or recent course syllabi, representative examples of course materials (exams, assignments, etc.), the department's student learning outcomes plan and Academic Program Review, evidence of student learning, the current course catalog, peer comparison data as appropriate, and any other materials that will provide an adequate stock of resources from which to assess the program. The on-site visit provides the opportunity for the reviewer to test and critically evaluate the program in an applied manner that cannot be achieved to the same degree through a rigorous review of supporting documentation.

➤ By November, the <u>academic program</u> must provide a list to the school dean of potential external reviewers. In nominating individuals or groups to perform this function, programs should specify the individual's or group's qualifications and reasons why he/she/they are appropriate.

➤ In consultation with the program chair/director, the dean will select the reviewer.

➤ In consultation with the dean, the program chair/director will coordinate all of the arrangements for visiting reviewers.

The following describes some activities that may need to occur when the reviewers are visiting the University:

1. individual and/or group meetings with all program faculty (including part-time faculty if possible);

2. meetings with the faculty of collaborative programs;

3. meetings with students;

4. the opportunity to review program resources, i.e. offices, library holdings, information technology, classrooms, labs, etc.;

5. the opportunity to examine additional documentation that may not have been included in the pre-visit information packet, but are deemed relevant by the reviewers and/or the program; and,

6. visitations to representative classes of both lower and upper-division course offerings.

➤ Reviewers should attempt to affirm the strengths and weaknesses of the program, validate the evidence addressing student learning outcomes, critically evaluate program capabilities and resource needs, and address the issue of academic rigor. Reviewers should also evaluate the overall quality of the educational experience for program

graduates. A written report detailing the reviewer's conclusions must be submitted by each reviewer or review team to the program chair/director and the school dean. This report is an essential supporting document and critical resource for future planning. See *Appendix A* for the ***Criteria for Evaluation by External Review***.

E. Finalizing the APR

➢ As mentioned previously, the reviewer or reviewing team's report(s) are essential to the academic program review. The report should be submitted to the school dean and the program chair/director. Afterwards,

− The dean and the chair should meet to discuss the report;

− The dean and the chair should meet with program faculty to discuss the reviewer's comments;

− The program should prepare its rejoinder within 30 days;

− The APR, the reviewer's comments, the program's rejoinder, and all supporting materials should be forwarded to the school dean;

− The school dean should prepare a two-page executive summary addressing program strengths and challenges, forwarding the entire portfolio to Academic Affairs by June 1.

F. Roles and Responsibilities

There are a number of primary participants in assessment and Academic Program Review. These include, in no particular order: program faculty members, the program director or chair, the school dean, the associate provost, the provost, and the director of university analysis, reporting, & assessment.

▪ Program faculty is active participants in all academic initiatives, including APR.

▪ The program director or chair (or an agreed upon designee) coordinates assessment and academic program review initiatives.

▪ The dean:

− ensures that the APR meets the qualitative standards detailed in the guidelines or as identified by the profession and/or specialized accrediting agencies;

− ensures that the APR is delivered to Academic Affairs on schedule;

− ensures that the APR is used to strengthen the academic program.

▪ The director of university analysis, reporting, & assessment provides information to be used for program analyses, as well as any appropriate research and assessment support.

▪ Academic Affairs, and specifically the associate provost and provost review the APR, providing written feedback to the individual programs. The Provost documents to the President and the Board of Regents that the individual program meets institutional, internal, and external qualitative standards.

G. Significant Dates

Precise target dates vary annually. The milestones for the Academic Program Review cycle are as follows:

− August: academic programs are notified by Academic Affairs that they are scheduled to conduct an academic program review;

- September: programs commence academic program review;

- November: programs identify external reviewers;

- January: programs submit a formal report to external reviewers and the school dean;

- February: external reviewers conduct an on-site program review;

- March: external reviewers submit formal comments to the program director/program faculty and the school dean;

- April: programs submit the final report to the school dean;

- May: the school dean reviews all program materials;

- June 1: the school dean submits a formal executive summary of each academic program review, as well as all materials, to Academic Affairs;

- August: Academic Affairs submits a formal executive summary to the USM Board of Regents;

- September: Academic Affairs provides formal feedback to each reviewed program;

- September: Academic Affairs archives all program review materials with the Office of University Analysis, Reporting, & Assessment.

Frequently Asked Questions

Is a separate APR required for graduate and undergraduate programs within the same discipline?

It is essential to review both graduate and undergraduate programs thoroughly. Each should be considered a separate review.

How should a review of multiple tracks/concentrations within the same discipline be managed?

An APR is required of all programs and concentrations, but not tracks. Where there are differences in programs due to concentrations, those differences should be identified and discussed. Attention should be directed toward significant differences in learning outcomes, curricular differences, faculty expertise, resources, and noteworthy trends. The program should discuss its method of allocating resources among the concentrations and the rationale behind those allocations. This is consistent with the student learning outcomes assessment guidelines.

Academic programs already participate in several reporting activities. How can we incorporate those processes into the APR to avoid duplication of work?

Duplication of previous work is to be avoided wherever possible. As a result, the APR provides for the liberal use of appendices. The APR need only reference appended documentation as appropriate.

Approximately how many pages should the APR be and in what format should it be delivered?

It may take 20—25 pages or more to discuss adequately your program and to address minimally those questions and/or analyses listed in the guidelines. You may attach supporting materials as you feel appropriate and reference them in your report.

> ➢ *Please deliver both a hard copy and a Microsoft WORD e-file of your APR. Both are necessary to ensure appropriate record-keeping.*

The new APR requires a completely different level of review. What can academic programs expect from the review?

The *Guidelines* outline the primary purposes of the APR process. Beyond those listed, your APR will be critically reviewed by the dean, the provost, and supporting staff of the Office of Academic Affairs. The review is expected to foster constructive dialogue regarding the strengths and weaknesses of your program, as well as any recognizable threats or opportunities. When supported by evidence, issues that emerge may become the focus of future initiatives, while demonstrable accolades may be promoted in public forums.

When we completed our last program review, we received no formal response or feedback. As a result, we will not be able to address any previous comments.

Unfortunately, that may be true. However, unlike previous cycles, the academic officers of Salisbury University will critically assess your academic program and provide you with a formal, constructive evaluation.

We are asked to compare ourselves with other institutions. Which institutions and how many?

It is generally helpful to have a *minimum* of seven (7) peer programs. The following list of *institutional peers* may serve as the starting point for your comparisons. However, please do not limit yourself to this list. Since the level of review is the academic program, you and your faculty have the best insight into comparable programs nationally. The sole stipulation: please be able to justify your peer selection with qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.

Salisbury University's *performance* peers are:

Central Washington University	**SUNY Oswego**
Eastern Illinois University	**SUNY Plattsburgh**
Humboldt State University	**University of Massachusetts Dartmouth**
Northern Michigan University	**University of North Carolina: Wilmington**
Sonoma State University	**Western Oregon University**

Salisbury University's *aspirational* peers are:

Appalachian State University
College of New Jersey
Rowan University
Truman State University
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

The APR Guidelines focus on several primary topics, for instance, student learning outcomes and strategic planning. How do we address issues that are in various stages of progress at both the institutional and programmatic level?

The APR Guidelines define what is expected of Salisbury University's academic programs in a manner that is consistent with those of our profession. It is understood that there will be different levels of activity along a continuum relative to primary educational initiatives like student learning outcomes assessment. You should describe your progress to date AND your plans, including a timeline to implement change that embeds these activities into the everyday structure of your program. Additionally, it is expected that all academic program reviews be conducted with the same attention to detail and rigor that are expected of anyone who has the responsibility to educate others and to validate learning.

What else is expected regarding student learning outcomes assessment?

ALL programs should have an ongoing program of student learning assessment. Academic programs that are not yet providing evidence of student learning and/or using assessment data to improve student learning are deficient in their accountability obligations to students, the School, the University, the State of Maryland, and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Are there any other guidelines on how we should select peer *reviewers*?

> The *Guidelines* provide some direction. Additional stipulations include:

> - **reviewers may be selected from your peer group or institutions similar in caliber;**
> - **a review team will consist of at least two reviewers**

Are external reviewers to be paid?

> That depends. During each scheduled review cycle, it is expected that all programs in each school undergo an onsite visit. However, although the cost associated with this exercise is well worth the value, budget issues may compel some modification to the guidelines. Reviewers should be paid a small honorarium as well as all traveling expenses. In all cases, the expenses are to be absorbed by the *Provost's* budget. There is a cap set on all honorariums.

The APR suggests that we include all faculty in the process. To what degree do you expect us to involve full- and part-time faculty?

> How you include faculty is entirely up to you, but you should involve them in a proportion equivalent to their involvement in your program. Some of your programs rely heavily on part-time faculty and it would seem appropriate to include them as time and opportunity permit. Regardless of whether faculty is full- or part-time, **essential** questions that must be answered, include:

> > How is curricular integrity assured? What proportions of your courses are taught by which faculty at the upper and lower divisions? What efforts are made to include all faculty, both full- and part-time, in the teaching and learning process? How do program meetings foster intellectual exchange among the faculty? Are student learning outcomes in anyway affected by whether the faculty is full or part-time?

When is my academic program scheduled for review?

> Academic programs are scheduled for review every seven years or on a schedule that aligns with a specialized accreditation cycle. A schedule of Academic Program Review is attached as *Appendix B*.

Resources to assist with Academic Program Review:

> One of your best sources of information is the Office of University Analysis, Reporting, & Assessment and/or its website: http://www.salisbury.edu/iara . The website will take you to editions of the Fact Book, APR support materials, assessment and planning materials, and other possible links.

Contacts:

> Dr. Bob Tardiff, Associate Provost, x84085

> Mr. Bryan Price, Director of University Analysis, Reporting, & Assessment, x36023

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Appendix A
Criteria for Evaluation by External Review

Although the Academic Program Review should answer the previous guideline instructions, it is expected that the external reviewers should evaluate the program on the merits of the following questions:

1. Is the program's mission and long-term vision consistent with the School's and the University's? Whether in statements of affirmation or in practice, are there potential areas of conflict?

2. What evidence indicates a sufficient understanding of the trends over the past seven years and their overall impact on the program?

3. What critical changes were made as a result of the past Academic Program Review?

4. Has the program identified a realistic set of current peers and are the comparative criteria appropriate?

5. Does the program provide adequate evidence to indicate sufficient academic rigor as well as ongoing student learning?

   a. What evidence indicates whether a sufficient number and variety of courses are offered?

      i. What evidence indicates whether there is an appropriate balance between breadth and specialization?

      ii. What evidence indicates whether course offerings meet student needs?

   b. What evidence indicates that the pedagogical approaches are appropriate for program content?

   c. What evidence indicates that the curriculum is intellectually demanding and academically engaging?

   d. Is the evidence for student learning consistent with the program's student learning outcomes?

   e. Is the evidence for student learning of significant depth and breadth to validate that the program is accomplishing its student learning objectives?

   f. Are student learning outcomes consistent with those at comparable institutions?

   g. What "best practices" are used?

   h. What curricular and pedagogical modifications would enhance student learning?

6. What evidence indicates that current resources are both effectively and efficiently used?

7. What evidence indicates whether the program has the appropriate expertise and staffing numbers to serve its students and accomplish its student learning outcomes?

8. What evidence indicates whether classrooms and/or labs are adequately structured and equipped to meet the curricular and student learning outcomes?

9. What evidence indicates whether library and other information resources (including information technology) are appropriate to support the program?

10. Identify a priority of resources to enhance the program, reallocations to restructure the program, or cuts to streamline efficiencies.

11. Highlight the programs strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

12. What strategic and annual initiatives, complete with appropriate milestones, might be pursued in order to strengthen the academic program?

13. Does the University demonstrate sufficient commitment to the program, its students, its faculty, and the resources necessary to ensure academic rigor?

Academic Program	Last Review Submitted to USM	Last Program Accreditation Visit	Next Program Accreditation Visit	APR Submitted to Academic Affairs
AY 2006-07				
Biology	2001			
Conflict Analysis & Dispute Resolution				
Environmental Health	2001		NEHSPAC: 2004	
Medical Technology*	2002	1999	NAACLS: 2006	
Music*	2003		NASM: 2005	**Jun-07**
Physics	2001			
Political Science	2001			
Respiratory Therapy*	1994	1998	CAAHEP: 2006	
Sociology	2001			
AY 2007-08				
Chemistry	2004			
Communication Arts	2001			
Communication Arts				
Theatre				
Computer Science				
English: (Undergraduate)	2001			
Creative Writing				
Film				
Folklore				
Linguistics				
Literature				**Jun-08**
English: (Graduate)	2001			
Composition, Language, Rhetoric				
TESOL				
Literature				
Mathematics	2001			
Statistics				
Computer Science: Conc.				
Philosophy	2001			
Theatre				

Academic Program	Last Review Submitted to USM	Last Program Accreditation Visit	Next Program Accreditation Visit	APR Submitted to Academic Affairs
AY 2008-09				
Accounting*	2002	2004	AACSB: 2008	
Athletic Training	2003	2003	CAAHEP: 2008	
Business Administration*	2002	2004	AACSB: 2008	
Business Administration: UG				
Business Administration: GR				
Bus. Admin: International Conc				
Economics*	2002	2004	AACSB: 2008	
Exercise Science	2003			
Finance*	2002	2004	AACSB: 2008	
Information Systems*	2002	2004	AACSB: 2008	
Management*	2002	2004	AACSB: 2008	**Jun-09**
Marketing*	2002	2004	AACSB: 2008	
Nursing*				
Undergraduate	2002	2003	CCNE: 2008	
Graduate	2002	2003	CCNE: 2008	
Psychology	2002			
Social Work*				
Undergraduate	2005	2005	CSWE: 2004	
Graduate	2005	2005	CSWE: 2004	
AY 2009-10				
History				
Undergraduate	2003			
Graduate	2003			**Jun-10**
Interdisciplinary Studies	2003			
Women/Gender Studies				
Anthropology				
AY 2010-11				
Art:				
Art	2004			
Fine Art	2004			
Geography	2004			**Jun-11**
Modern Language:				
French	2004			
Spanish	2004			
To Be Determined:				
Environmental Issues				
Health Care Management				
International Studies				
Teaching & Learning w/ Tech: CAS				

*Programs should submit their APR according to the guidelines for accredited programs.
Note: The APR schedule may be modified to fit discipline-specific accreditation schedules.

Building on the foundation provided by the University's Mission Statement and the "Attributes Document" accepted by the Faculty, the General Education Task Force proposes the following principles and goals for General Education at Salisbury University. The principles and goals represent the concepts embedded in the Mission Statement and the Attributes Document. They will help guide the development of the general education program.

Learning Principals

The general education program is designed to foster the personal, intellectual, and social development of the Salisbury University student and is based on the following set of principles.

> **The liberally educated person:**
>
> - **communicates effectively in diverse situations;**
>
> - **uses multiple strategies, resources, and technologies for inquiry and problem solving,**
>
> - **demonstrates qualities related to personal, social and professional integrity,**
>
> - **integrates knowledge from the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences to broaden perspectives;**
>
> - **reasons quantitatively and qualitatively,**
>
> - **demonstrates global awareness in order to function responsibly in an interdependent world.**

These principles are expressed by the following set of student learning goals.

Student Learning Goals

A. Skills *Acquire the personal and intellectual skills necessary for productive membership in contemporary society.*

1. Critical Thinking: Acquire abilities to engage in independent and creative thinking and solve problems effectively.

2. Command of Language: Acquire abilities to communicate effectively—including reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

3. Quantitative Literacy: Acquire abilities to reason mathematically.

4. Information Literacy: Acquire abilities to use libraries, computer applications, and emerging technologies.

5. Interpersonal Communication: Acquire abilities to relate to and work effectively with diverse groups of people.

B. Knowledge *Possess knowledge and understanding commensurate with that of a well educated person.*

    1.   Breadth of Knowledge: Possess knowledge from and familiarity with modes of inquiry and creative processes used in a variety of disciplines including:

        a. Visual and performing arts (art, music, dance, theatre)
        b. Literature (English, foreign language-based)
        c. Civilization: cultural and historical perspectives
        d. Contemporary global issues (peoples, cultures, institutions)
        e. Second language or culture
        f. Mathematics
        g. Social and behavioral sciences
        h. Biological and Physical Sciences

    2.   Interdependence Among Disciplines: Possess an awareness of the interdependence among disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

C. Dispositions *Examine qualities that contribute to personal well-being and social and professional integrity.*

    1.   Social Responsibility: Tolerance and respect for diverse groups of people and a disposition toward responsible citizenship and a connection to the community.

    2.   Humane Values: An informed regard for humane values and the ability to make judgments based on ethical and environmental considerations.

    3.   Intellectual Curiosity: A propensity for reflection and life-long learning.

    4.   Aesthetic Values: An awareness of and appreciation for aesthetics.

    5.   Wellness: Issues of personal well-being.