

Guidelines for  
Academic Program Review

Winston-Salem State University

## **Procedure for Academic Program Review**

### **Purpose**

The Academic Program Review is designed to be a collaborative process that includes an objective evaluation of program quality that provides an avenue for programs to enhance their educational impact. Academic programs that have accreditation processes that include evaluations of student success (including student learning outcomes), quality of curriculum, and quality of faculty may use the accreditation self-study for the Academic Program Review. However, if an accredited program is deemed Low Producing by the standards set by the Board of Governors, it will need to undergo a separate review addressing the low productivity. Low Productivity Reviews are usually conducted in the spring of odd numbered years as part of Long Range Planning by UNC.

### **Principles**

- The program review is part of an overall assessment plan that provides a portrait of program strengths and limitations and should result in program improvement.
- The process should be broadly participatory.
- The process should facilitate assessment planning, curricular development, faculty workload and scholarship responsibilities, and resource allocation.
- The program review process allows WSSU to account for its use of resources, develop support among its various constituencies, and provide collegial and objective review to ensure academic program quality.

### **Review Criteria:**

WSSU's mission is to offer high quality academic programs. In order to offer high quality programs, an institution must be able to offer curricula that have appropriate breadth and depth; are taught by faculty who are recognized experts in their fields and who employ effective pedagogy; and are offered in facilities that have effective learning environments with up-to-date equipment and technology. High quality programs require adequate resources and the institution must guard against stretching itself too thin as quality, student learning, and student competitiveness for jobs and graduate programs will suffer. High cost (facilities, equipment, faculty)-low demand programs must demonstrate that they are critically important or unique as to justify the continued infusion of resources to keep them at high quality. The institution is mindful that students need adequate experience in a variety of disciplines in order to be prepared for 21<sup>st</sup> Century careers; however, exposure to certain courses and disciplines can be accomplished through well developed general education offerings and through collaboration with other institutions and do not always require the institution to provide the resources to maintain a major or to even teach certain courses.

### **Schedule of Academic Program Reviews**

Undergraduate and graduate academic programs usually will be reviewed every five years. In no case shall the time between reviews exceed ten years. Programs that have attained professional accreditation normally will be reviewed in accordance with the schedule set by the accrediting agency. Wherever possible, both undergraduate and graduate components of a program will be reviewed simultaneously.

The Provost's Office with the assistance of the academic deans will establish a master calendar for program review. Any adjustments or modifications to the existing review calendar require approval from the appropriate academic dean and immediate notification to the provost.

### **Review Process: Phase I**

Notification of Departments Scheduled for Academic Program Review – By February 1<sup>st</sup>, each department chair and respective dean will be reminded by the Provost's Office that they are scheduled for an Academic Program Review during the next academic year. This schedule is also posted on the Provost's Office website. Accredited programs will usually be reviewed in the cycle after they have completed the self-study for the accreditation process but this can be negotiated with the dean.

The Review Committee. The dean of the school/college shall establish a review committee in consultation with the appropriate department chair. Each review committee must consist of at least three members from within WSSU. The review committee members will have no official affiliation with the program under review and at least one member must be from outside the program's school/college. The review committee may include no more than one non-faculty member. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, will designate one faculty member of the committee to serve as chair. In addition, the review committee may add supplemental committee members in non-voting status. The Dean will communicate the chair and members of the committee to the Provost by April 1<sup>st</sup> in the spring before the review cycle.

The program coordinator, chair, dean, provost, and review committee will agree upon the criteria and format for the review by April 30<sup>th</sup>. The timeline should be filed with the Provost's Office by April 30. The voting members of the committee will conduct the review and write a formal report detailing their findings and substantive recommendations and suggestions.

Academic Self-Study. The program under review must compile an Academic Program Self-Study that includes the basic elements outlined below. The self-study is critically important to the review process. It should be viewed as an opportunity to explore and reflect upon the program's directions, celebrate the program's achievements, and consider the learning outcomes of students. It should involve a description of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges for the program. Because of its nature, the self-study requirements are flexible, allowing for the department to determine for itself the critical aspects and important challenges that face the program. This Self-Study must be submitted to the provost by December 15 of the review year. Programs that have attained professional accreditation may submit their accreditation or reaffirmation materials to fulfill this requirement upon recommendation of the dean.

The Review. The review committee will receive the program Self-Study from the Provost by January 15<sup>th</sup> of the review year. The Review Committee will analyze the Self-Study, hold meetings with program faculty, staff, and students to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the program, and delineate issues stemming from these resource materials. From this, the Review Committee will write a draft report with substantive suggestions and recommendations. The Review Committee will submit this draft to the Provost by March 15<sup>th</sup> of the review year. A meeting with the dean, department, chair, members of the Review Committee, and the assistant provost for IPAR/Director of Assessment will be scheduled to discuss the draft report of the committee's findings. The program Self-Study and the final report of the review committee will be forwarded to the department chair, the dean of the school/college, and the provost no later than April 15<sup>th</sup>.

The Report and Response. A formal briefing will be scheduled with the department chairperson, the dean, the Director of Institutional Assessment, the Assistant Provost for IPAR, and the Provost to discuss the review committee's findings and the program's initial response by May 15<sup>th</sup>. The program under review will submit a formal action plan addressing the review committee's recommendations (no later than 30 academic days after the briefing) to the dean and provost. The dean of the school/college and the provost will, with discussion, approve the action plan and create a schedule and method of evaluation for assessing the success of the plan. The approved action plan will be given to the Department Chair and Director of Assessment. The action plan will form the foundation of the next review cycle as well as guide planning and interim assessments such as the department annual report and program assessment plans.

## **Review Process: Phase II**

Indication for Phase II. The dean and/or the provost may deem it necessary to further evaluate the program based on the findings of the Phase I review or the review of the action plan. They may extend the program review to

include an external review component. This does not preclude a department chair from requesting an external review at any time during the process, subject to approval from the dean of the school/college. Costs associated with external review are born by the Academic Affairs office.

Establishment of External Review Team. The dean and provost, following consultation with the department chair, will select the external reviewer(s). The external reviewer(s) must come from similar programs at accredited institutions. Team members will have no official affiliation with the program under review. The team will submit a formal report of the findings and substantive recommendations and suggestions.

External Review Criteria. Criteria for the external program review will be the same as those established for the internal review. The dean will make the criteria available to the external team members. The Academic Program Portfolio from Phase I will also be made available to the external review team upon their selection. As in the internal review, programs that have attained professional accreditation may submit their reaffirmation document to fulfill this requirement, but must provide any supplemental information requested by the review team.

External Review Process. The external reviewer(s) will review the Academic Program Self-Study. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, will schedule a two-day visit to the campus by the external reviewer(s). On the first day of the campus visit, the external reviewer(s) will hold separate meetings with the dean, the department chair, the provost, program faculty, and students to discuss the program and pose questions that may arise from the materials. On the second day of the campus visit, the external reviewer(s) will meet with the appropriate dean and department chair to discuss the preliminary findings. Within 30 days, the external reviewer(s) will submit a draft written report of its findings to the dean of the college. The dean of the college, in consultation with the department chair, will review the draft report and, where appropriate, suggest revisions to the external review team within 30 days. A final report from the external team will be forwarded to the department chair, the dean of the college, and the provost no later than 60 days from the date of the campus visit.

Report and Response. A formal briefing will be held to discuss the external review team's findings with the Department Chair, Dean, Director of Institutional Assessment, Assistant Provost for IPAR, and the Provost. The program under review will submit a formal action plan addressing the review committee's recommendations no later than 30 academic days after the briefing. The dean of the school/college and the provost will approve the action plan and create a schedule and method of evaluation for assessing the success of the plan. The action plan will form the foundation of the next review cycle as well as guide planning and interim assessments such as the department annual report and program assessment plans.

### **Calendar of Program Review Events**

February 1 <sup>st</sup> of Prior Year	Reminder of Program Review
April 1 <sup>st</sup> of Prior Year	Review Committee Named
April 30 <sup>th</sup> of Prior Year	Review Parameters Established by Chair, Dean, and Committee Chair
December 15 <sup>th</sup>	Self Study Submitted to Provost by Dean
January 15 <sup>th</sup>	Self Study Given to Review Committee
March 15 <sup>st</sup>	Draft of Program Review Results Completed and Submitted to Provost
Prior to April 15 <sup>th</sup>	Final Committee Report and Meeting with Review Team
Prior to May 15 <sup>th</sup>	Briefing to Discuss Program's Response
30 Academic Days Later	Program Action Plan Due to Dean, Provost and File Copy for TracDat

### **Academic Program Self-Study**

Critical elements for the program review will be determined by the dean and department chair, but the Academic Program Self-Study must address, at a minimum, the criterion areas noted below but it does not have to address each point. Enough information does have to be put together to show both the quality of the program, the demand for the program, and the quality and/or success of graduates.

## **ACADEMIC PROGRAM ANALYSIS QUESTIONS from Dickeson**

### **Criterion 1: History, Development, and Expectations of the Program**

1. Why was the program established?
2. What are its academic antecedents?
3. How has the program evolved over the years?
4. What were the institution's original expectations?
5. How have those expectations changed?
6. What were the origins of initial support?
7. What is the degree to which the program has adapted to meet change?
8. What is the maturity level of the program (new, building, mature)?
9. What is the overall visibility of the program?
10. Has the context changed within which the program is expected to operate, i.e., would this program meet the expectations for a new program approved today?

### **Criterion 2: External Demand for the Program**

1. What is the demand for this program (are there state or national statistics for student interest in program)?
2. What has been the regional demand trend?
3. How is demand being met by competing institutions that offer the same program?
4. Are other institutions in the same enrollment catchment zone experiencing the same kinds of proportionate numbers by program?
5. What is the likely potential for future enrollments—a demonstrated, documentable potential?
6. Are the resources for the program under- or over-allocated for the future?
7. Is the program offered at a level that corresponds to the demand (do we need a full-blown baccalaureate program to meet demand or will a minor do)?
8. Is the demand sufficient to mount (or dispose of) a master's degree in the subject matter?
9. What are the characteristics of patrons, clients, or customers, of the program?
10. Will their numbers and interest foretell a continuing need for the program?
11. What other forces are at work in the surrounding environment that affects this program?
12. Do external demands suggest that the institution continue this program?

### **Criterion 3: Internal Demand for the Program**

1. What are the enrollments in courses required for other programs?
2. What proportion of enrollment are for major, minor, general studies, or service purposes?
3. What programs would suffer, or possibly fail, without the service courses offered by another program?
4. Are there other internal claims on the program's resources that should be revealed?
5. Does the program produce services needed by other parts of the campus?
6. Is there potential for internal demand because this program may have pioneered new approaches to collaborative learning or uses of technology like to be emulated by other programs?

### **Criterion 4: Quality of Program Inputs and Processes**

1. Faculty and Staff:
  - a. What is the proportion of faculty with terminal degrees appropriate for the field; years of experience in the discipline; expertise in related fields that bear on the discipline; scholarly and creative contributions to the discipline and recognition accorded them; how intellectually current?
  - b. What is the percentage of instruction offered by full-time versus part-time faculty?
  - c. How available are qualified faculty and staff in this field? What are the potential personnel resources in this discipline, the market condition, and the trend lines?
  - d. Can we attract and retain the people necessary to make the program successful?

- e. How do our faculty and staff stack up against peer comparator institutions or competitor institutions?
2. Students – what is the congruence between the students in the program and the likelihood of their being successful (student academic demographics)?
3. Curriculum:
  - a. Is the curriculum of the program appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline?
  - b. How coherent is the curriculum?
  - c. Is it designed to provide integration, or is the student expected to do the integrating? To what degree does the curriculum meet the particular learning needs and styles of the students?
  - d. How dynamic is it?
  - e. When was the last reform or overhaul to ensure comprehension of the knowledge explosion?
  - f. How “internationalized” is the curriculum?
  - g. How is it subjected to meaningful analysis?
  - h. Does it enjoy or qualify for specialized accreditation?
  - i. Has the program successfully shifted the delivery of the curriculum to meet the changing needs of its clientele (intensive course; distance learning and/or evening and weekend formats)?
4. Adaptability to Technology – what is the degree to which this program has taken advantage of advancements in technology to enhance learning, reinforce computer skills and computer literacy to prepare students for the higher-tech world in which they will live and work, attract technological support to the institution, enhance research, and enhance program-related public service?
5. Equipment, Facilities, and Other Resources
  - a. How current are equipment and materials?
  - b. What is the degree of modernization of laboratories and specialized facilities necessary to ensure that students are adequately prepared ?
  - c. How significant are the program holdings in the library and other learning centers?
  - d. What is the degree of student and faculty access to electronic sources of program information?
  - e. To what extent are the facilities conducive to quality learning experiences?
6. What resources will it take to bring this program up to a high level of quality?

#### **Criterion 5: Quality of Program Outcomes**

1. What examples of exemplary performance does the program demonstrate?
2. In the area of student outcomes, what are the test scores on a nationally standardized instruments that measure attainment?
3. How have the graduates fared on the GRE, the LSAT, the MCAT and others?
4. What congruence exists between intended and actual learning outcomes?
5. Do alumni records and placement data give insights into program success?
6. What is the track record of the graduates on state professional licensure and certification examinations?
7. How successful are program graduates in seeking graduate and professional admission?
8. Our programs are designed for intellectual and social development; did they succeed?
9. What is the demonstrable effectiveness of the program in preparing students for the future?
10. How well do program faculty achieve in measures of teaching effectiveness?
11. What is the track record of the program faculty in producing research accept in juried publications of peer-reviewed electronic scholarship?
12. What recognition do faculty bring the program in the area of public service?
13. What can be documented for program quality?
14. Is there external validation of quality?
15. What evidence is there that the program has added value to the clientele it serves?
16. What is the degree to which the outcomes mirror best practices of similar institutions? Finally, how has the program brought beneficial recognition to the institution?

#### **Criterion 6: Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program**

1. How many students (clients, customers, patrons, as appropriate) are being served?

2. How many faculty and staff are assigned?
3. What other resources are committed?
4. What are the number of credit hours generated?
5. Degrees or certificates awarded? Services rendered? Research developed?
6. Creative efforts produced?
7. Attendance at performances?
8. How productive is the program?
9. What is the scope of the program?
10. Is the program of sufficient size and scope to affirm that it can be conducted effectively?
11. What is the minimum number of faculty, staff, and students required to be designated as a department?
12. Does information analysis suggest opportunities for consolidation or restructuring?

**Criterion 7: Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program**

1. Enrollments- What internal subsidy would be appropriate to account for the enrollment the program attracts?
2. Cross-Subsidies- What subsidy should the program receive for services it provides other internal programs? Is the program a net payer or a net receiver?
3. Research grants- From its research grant activity, what has the program generated for itself, and what does it receive as a result of overhead or indirect cost recovery for the institution? How reliant is the institution on this source of funds for purposes other than the direct program costs?
4. Fund raising- Is the institution a recipient of development or advancement dollars or other gifts because of the program? How significant are program-restricted funds, and should this be a factor in judging the relative worth of this program?
5. Equipment grants- Has the program attracted equipment or other capital items to the institution, and what is the use of these items by other programs? So these items represent outlays the institution would have had to make without them, and at what value?
6. Other sources- Does the program generate revenues from admission fee, special fee, laboratory fees, ticket fees, or by other means that help offset some or all of the expenses associated with the program?
7. Potential revenue- Are there conditions of anticipated gifts, bequests, or endowment that require maintaining the program?

**Criterion 8: Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program**

1. The criterion seeks to measure all relevant costs, direct and indirect that are associated with delivering the program and analyze costs against revenues.
2. What demonstrable efficiencies in the way the program is operated (or which could be inaugurated) are beneficial to the institution?
3. What investment in new resources will be required to bring the program up to a high level of quality?

**Criterion 9: Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program**

1. What impact has this program had or does it promise to have?
2. What are the benefits to the institution of offering this program?
3. What is the connecting relationship between the program and achievement of the institution's mission?
4. How essential is the program to the institution?
5. What is the relationship of this program to the success of other programs?
6. Does this program serve people in ways that no other program does?
7. Does it respond to a unique societal need that the institutional values?
8. To what extent does this program help the institution differentiate itself from the crowd of other colleges and universities?
9. How is this program linked with the institution's overall strategy?

**Criterion 10: Opportunity Analysis of the Program**

1. What external environmental factors affect the institution in such ways that opportunities are created?
2. Which among these might this program seize?
3. Are there opportunities for the program to continue, but in a different format?
4. Can we implement cost-containment measure due to restructuring or technological innovation?
5. What about cooperative or collaborative relationships with other programs? With other institutions?
6. What exciting, creative ways can program faculty and staff put their best case forward by advancing new ideas about the program?
7. What are the opportunities for combining courses or sections or other program units?
8. Where is duplication avoidable?
9. What is the potential for reengineering the way of the curriculum is delivered?
10. What is the relationship of the program to emerging trends in distance learning? To asynchronous learning?

### **UNC LOW PRODUCING PROGRAM REVIEW QUESTIONS**

(Number degrees awarded last two years is 15 or fewer, unless upper division enrollment in most recent year 25 or degrees awarded in most recent year exceed 10)

1. Has this program been required to develop a Low Productivity response within the last six years?
2. Have the recommendations that the program made in its response been addressed?

Please respond to the following questions:

#### 3. Centrality to University's Mission

How important to the mission of the institution is this program?

Would the elimination of this program have any adverse effect on the mission of the institution?

What is the societal need for the program?

Can this program be combined with a similar or related program in the present department or in another department?

#### 4. Quality of the Program

What is the quality of the program and what indicators are used to assess the quality?

Is the academic content of the discipline honestly represented with respect to breadth and depth?

How have graduates fared on the GRE, LSAT, MCAT etc?

How successful are program graduates in seeking graduate and professional admission?

What is the track record of graduates on state professional licensure and certification examinations?

Is the program accredited or has accreditation been sought?

#### 5. Faculty Involved

How many faculty members are teaching in this program?

How many graduate assistants and par-time faculty usually teach in this program?

How many of the faculties have appropriate terminal degrees?

What is the average teaching load of the faculty in the department?

What is the percentage of reassigned faculty time per semester?

Are there enough faculty with specialization within the discipline teaching at the upper level to provide appropriate breadth and depth of the discipline as compared to best practices in the discipline?

If this program should be discontinued, can the faculty member teaching in it be continued in this or a related area?

#### 6. Facilities/Equipment

Is the available space (classroom laboratory, etc.) adequate and appropriate for the program?

Is the necessary equipment available and in working order?

#### 7. Demand

For how many years has the program been in place? Is it serving the predicted number of students?



What are the job prospects for these graduates?

Are there courses in the program that are essential supporting courses for other program?

### 8.Costs

How many different concentrations or options are available in the program? Could some of them be consolidated or eliminated to reduce course proliferation and costs?

What is program productivity as it is reflected in course enrollments?

Given a threshold of at least 10 students for undergraduate courses and at least 5 students for graduate course, does the program have under-enrolled courses? How Many?

What are the yearly costs for specialized equipment and library resources to support the program?

If the space, equipment and library holding are not adequate, what would it cost to make them adequate?

Would the campus/department rather spend those dollars on other programs/activities?

### 9.Duplication

Can this program's objective be accomplished equally well through another program?

Are courses in the program duplicated in other programs/departments?

Has there been any effort to eliminate the duplication of these courses?

Could enrollment be increases by sharing some courses with another institution through distance education (with your institution as a provider or recipient)?

Is there an online option that might be pursued by your campus or with another campus or are online programs or courses available from other campuses?

Is this program distinctive in the UNC system? If yes, briefly indicate how.

Is there a location (geographic/demographic/cultural) advantage to the program?

### 10.Critical Mass

What would be the impact on the department if the program under review were eliminated? If it were delivered in part or entirely by another institution through distance education?

Would the department still exist? For what purpose?

What would be the impact on other departments or programs if the program under review were eliminated?

## **SACS Institutional Effectiveness Evaluator Guidelines (2009)**

### **PART II**

#### **Assessment in Educational Programs:**

##### **Issues to Explore**

While the following are not specifically required by the *Principles of Accreditation*, they represent a number of practices that would lead to effective assessment and use of assessment for educational programs.

- Do programs have a clear purpose statement linked to institutional mission?
- Do departments evaluate the effectiveness of their educational programs and services?
- Do programs leading to diplomas, certificates, and/or degrees have clearly defined student learning outcomes?
- Are they published and are they measurable or observable?
- Are the expectations for graduate programs reflective of the purposes of graduate education, and progressively more complex than undergraduate student learning outcomes in the same degree program?
- Do departments obtain data to assess the students' achievement of the learning outcomes?
- To what extent does the evidence presented rely on indirect measures such as surveys and self-reports?
- Is direct assessment of student learning a prominent feature in departmental assessment processes? (e.g., testing, evaluation of student work)
- Are the assessments being used directly related to the outcomes that are being evaluated?
- Do departments document that assessment results are used to change or sustain the excellence of program activities and further student gains in professional and attitudinal skills and experiences?
- Based on assessment results, do departments reevaluate the appropriateness of departmental purpose as well as the expectations for students?

**Table of Academic Programs, Accrediting Bodies, and Accreditation Dates**  
July 2009 (updated annually)

<b>Specialized Program Accreditation</b>				
	<b>Degree Title</b>	<b>Specialized Accreditation Entity</b>	<b>Optional/Mandatory</b>	<b>Period of Accreditation</b>
<b>College of Arts and Sciences</b>				
	Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communications	ACEJMC	Optional	Re-apply in 2011
	Bachelor of Science in Computer Science	ABET-Computing Accreditation Commission	Optional	2006-2012
	Bachelor of Science in Information Technology	ABET	Optional	
	Master of Science in Computer Science and Information Technology	ABET	Optional	2006-2012
	Bachelor of Arts in Spanish			
	Bachelor of Arts in Spanish Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Arts in English			
	Bachelor of Arts in English Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Master of Arts in English as a Second Language and Applied Linguistics	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies			
	Bachelor of Science in Biology			
	Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology			
	Bachelor of Science in Molecular Biology			
	Bachelor of Science in Mathematics			
	Bachelor of Science in Mathematics, Secondary Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Arts in Gerontology	AGHE	Optional	Program of Merit 2007
	Bachelor of Science in Chemistry	ACS	Optional	2007-2012
	Bachelor of Arts in Psychology			
	Bachelor of Social Work	CSWE	Mandatory	Commissioner visit II by Feb 28, 2010
	Bachelor of Arts in Political Science			
	Bachelor of Arts in Sociology			
	Bachelor of Arts in Art	NASAD		
	Bachelor of Art Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Science in Music Business	NASM	Optional	1998-2008
	Bachelor of Science in Music Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Arts in History			

	Bachelor of Arts in Social Studies	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Arts in Justice Studies			
	Bachelor of Arts in African & African American Studies			
<b>School of Business and Economics</b>		<b>AACSB</b>	Optional	2000-2010 Site Visit Feb 2010
	Bachelor of Science in Management Information Systems		Optional	
	Bachelor of Science in Finance		Optional	
	Bachelor of Science in Economics		Optional	
	Bachelor of Science in Business Administration		Optional	
	Bachelor of Science in Accounting		Optional	
	Bachelor of Science in Marketing		Optional	
	Bachelor of Science in Management		Optional	
	Master of Business Administration		Optional	
	Master of Healthcare Administration	CAHME	Mandatory	Planned for 2012
<b>School of Education and Human Performance</b>				
	Teacher Education Programs	<b>NCATE</b>	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Science in Special Education General Curriculum	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Master of Education in Elementary Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Science in Middle Grades Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Birth Through Kindergarten Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Master of Arts in Teaching	NCDPI	Mandatory	Review in 2014
	Bachelor of Science in Physical Education	NCDPI	Mandatory	2007-2014
	Bachelor of Arts in Physical Education Non Teaching	NASPE	Optional	2013
	Bachelor of Science in Sport Management	NASPE; NASSM	Optional	1999-2013

	Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science	NSCA	Optional	2009-2010
	Bachelor of Science in Therapeutic Recreation	NRPA Council on Accreditation	Optional	2007-2012
	Bachelor of Science in Rehabilitation Studies	CORE	Optional	2008-2013
	Master of Science in Rehabilitation Counseling	CORE	Mandatory	Site visit Feb/March 2010
<b>School of Health Sciences</b>				
	Bachelor of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science	NAACLS	Mandatory	2006-2013
	Bachelor of Science in Nursing	NCBON	Mandatory	(all) 2004-2009 Site Visit Nov 2009
	Master of Science in Nursing	NCBON	Mandatory	(all) 2004-2009 Site Visit Nov 2009
	Bachelor of Healthcare Management	AUPHA		Apply in 2011
	Master of Physical Therapy	CAPTE	Mandatory	2006-2013
	Master of Occupational Therapy	ACOTE	Mandatory	2007-2017