**Academic Program Review**

There are many steps involved in program review at Cal Poly. Though no step is more critical than the work, reflection, and dialog surrounding the self-study, we’re providing the list below to help the department navigate the many steps involved in the process.

All items noted in blue font can be downloaded from Cal Poly’s [Academic Program Review website](http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/general).

* The department downloads the self-study and appendices templates.
* The department selects a program theme (optional) and submits the program-specific theme proposal form.
* The department begins working on its self-study.
* The department creates a potential list of reviewers and completes reviewer nomination forms. Visits typically include two external reviewers (outside Cal Poly) and one internal reviewer (inside Cal Poly but outside the college of the program under review). The department’s potential nominees should include at least four external and two internal options.
* The department submits reviewer nomination forms to the Dean’s office and the office of Academic Programs and Planning.
* The Dean’s office selects the review team from the nominees and notifies the department and Academic Programs.
* In collaboration with the Dean’s office and the review team, the department proposes site visit dates and submits them to Academic Programs for final approval. Site visits typically occur between November and March.
* When finalizing dates for the site visit, the department determines the availability of the Dean for entrance and exit meetings, and Academic Programs determines the availability of the Provost (see further details below).
* Once the site visit dates are finalized, the department consults with the Dean’s office to arrange for stipends, travel, lodging, etc. **Note:** All costs associated with the site visit are the responsibility of the department/college.
* The department submits an *initial draft* of the self-study to the Associate Dean, Academic Programs, and the office of Graduate Education (as applicable) at least two months prior to the site visit.
* The department receives feedback and revises the initial draft as appropriate.
* The department submits a *final draft* of the self-study to the Associate Dean, Academic Programs, and Graduate Education (as applicable) approximately one-month prior to the site visit.
* Academic Programs sends the review team the final draft of the self-study along with a formal welcome letter and reviewer guidelines.
* In collaboration with the Dean’s office, the department develops a draft itinerary for the site visit. A sample site visit schedule can be found on the program review website.

The following are **mandatory** components of the site visit:

* + Entrance meeting: This should be the first formal meeting on day one. The meeting should be scheduled in collaboration with Academic Programs and should include the following participants:
    1. Dean
    2. Associate Dean
    3. Mary Pedersen, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
    4. Bruno Giberti, Interim Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs & Planning
    5. Richard Savage, Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable)
    6. Review team
  + Exit meeting: To best accommodate the Provost’s schedule, *Academic Programs schedules this meeting* when the site visit dates are initially determined. This meeting occurs at the end of day two and should include the following participants:
    1. Provost
    2. Dean
    3. Associate Dean
    4. Mary Pedersen
    5. Bruno Giberti
    6. Richard Savage (as applicable)
    7. Review Team
  + Departmental report out: Typically, this immediately follows or precedes the exit meeting and typically includes the following participants:
    1. Associate Dean
    2. Department Head/Chair
    3. Faculty
    4. Staff
    5. Review team

The following are **recommended** components of the site visit:

* Meeting with the department head/chair
* Meeting with tenure-line faculty
* Meeting with lecturers
* Collective meeting with staff
* Collective meeting with students
* Tour of facilities, equipment, and information resources significant to the program (i.e. labs, smart rooms, student space, library, etc.)
* Meals with stakeholders
* Time for reviewers to confer with one another, work on their report, or complete the necessary paperwork for stipends and reimbursement
* Display or presentation of student work
* Other meetings as requested by the review team or accrediting agencies (as applicable)

Additional factors to consider when developing your itinerary:

* The site visit should be planned for two full work days to make for a better schedule — full, but manageable. Flight times permitting, reviewers can be taken to the airport at the end of the second day.
* Meetings should be scheduled on Cal Poly time (i.e., start at ten minutes after the hour) since participants may be coming from a class or another meeting.
* If the numbers permit, meetings with the faculty may be scheduled by position (i.e., tenured and tenure-track). Remember to include lecturers in the process.
* Meetings with stakeholders should not include participants who might inhibit honest conversation (i.e., instructors at student meetings, chairs/heads at staff meetings, and senior faculty at junior faculty meetings).
* Lunch and dinner should be seen as opportunities for the review team to meet with small groups of stakeholders.
* Once completed, the department submits the draft itinerary to Academic Programs for approval and confirmation of the entrance and exit meetings. The department shares a copy with the Dean’s office.
* Once finalized, the department reserves meeting spaces and adds locations to the itinerary.
* Approximately two weeks prior to the visit, the department emails the final itinerary to the review team, the Dean’s office, Academic Programs, and Graduate Education (as applicable).
* The department shares the itinerary with the faculty, staff, students, and other relevant stakeholders.

**After the Site Visit**

* Within one month of the site visit, the review team submits its initial report to Academic Programs.
* Academic Programs sends the initial report to the department head/chair and the Associate Dean for a review for factual errors.
* The department head/chair indicate no errors were found, or they submit suggested revisions and/or clarification questions to Academic Programs.
* Academic Programs notifies the review team of any suggested revisions and/or questions and requests a response within two weeks. It is up to the discretion of the review team whether or not to incorporate the department’s suggested corrections.
* Academic Programs sends a final copy of the reviewer report to the Dean, the Associate Dean, and the department head/chair.
* Academic Programs notifies the review team that their responsibilities have been met.
* The department ensures that reviewer stipends are processed.
* Following receipt of the finalized reviewer report, the department develops a draft action plan and schedules an action plan meeting.
  + The action plan meeting should include the following participants:
    - Dean
    - Associate Dean
    - Mary Pedersen
    - Bruno Giberti
    - Richard Savage (as applicable)
    - Jack Phelan, Academic Assessment Director
    - Amy Robbins, Program Review Coordinator
    - Department faculty and staff as appropriate
* After receiving input from the Dean and others in attendance at the action plan meeting, the department finalizes their action plan and submits a copy to Academic Programs.
* The department implements the action plan and revisits/updates it annually.