

Adopted: March 6, 2018

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-845-18**

**RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW**

**BACKGROUND:** In 2016, the Academic Senate convened the Program Review Task Force, consisting of faculty, college administrators, and representation from the office of Academic Programs and Planning to review current practice related to academic program review and recommend to the Senate revisions to the relevant policies and procedures. The Program Review Task Force obtained feedback from faculty recently or currently involved in program review about best practices. Careful consideration of this feedback strongly suggests that annual revisiting of the outcomes of the program review in action plans would allow for an extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years. Accredited programs should continue to conduct program review at least every five years according to the cycle for renewal of accreditation.

**WHEREAS,** The Academic Programs and Planning website provides information on academic program review, including revised templates developed for the current cycle and based on informed judgment about best practices in program review and feedback from faculty involved in program review; and

**WHEREAS,** Policies and procedures for academic program review were last formulated in 2000 (AS-552-00) and revised slightly in 2010 (AS-718-10); and

**WHEREAS,** Annual updates to program review action plans allow for the modest extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:** The Academic Senate adopts the attached "Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures" superseding all prior policies about academic program review.

Proposed by: Program Review Task Force

Date: January 25, 2018

Revised: February 8, 2018

## **ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Prepared by the Program Review Task Force  
Winter 2018

**Guiding Principles.** Academic program review (APR) is a comprehensive and periodic review of academic programs, including General Education and interdisciplinary programs. APR is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Deans, the Academic Senate, and the Dean of Graduate Education, and is coordinated by the office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP).

The goal of APR is to improve the quality and viability of each academic program by encouraging self study and strategic planning within programs. APR is not a review of academic departments as such, although it will inevitably address departmental issues. Each program, department, and college is responsible for making curricular decisions and programmatic offerings within existing resources. All such decisions shall be the purview of the faculty of the program, department, and/or college. Hence, APR should inform and be an essential component of academic planning and curriculum, budgeting, and accountability to internal and external audiences. APR provides information for planning decisions at every administrative level.

Academic program review of programs subject to professional or specialized accreditation or recognition will be coordinated to coincide with the accreditation/recognition review whenever possible. Documentation developed for accreditation/recognition reviews may already provide the essential requirements of APR, and, thus, may also be used for this purpose, but it is important to note that accreditation/recognition reviews can serve a different purpose than program reviews.

**Definitions.** The following definitions should help in distinguishing terms used throughout this document:

- **Academic Program:** a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective and usually leading to a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, or to a teaching credential. CSU policy defines General Education as an academic program.
- **Department:** an administrative unit that manages one or more academic programs.
- **Program Administrator:** the individual administratively responsible for the Program, whether a head, chair, or director.
- **Program Representatives:** the Program Administrator and other Program faculty members participating in the design and production of the self-study report.
- **Program Review Team:** the external reviewers appointed to conduct the site visit and compose the program review report.

**Roles and Responsibilities.** As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic programs should be reviewed every five to ten years. Wherever possible, APR will coincide with external accreditation/recognition. Programs with ten-year accreditation cycles will have an interim review. All non-accredited academic programs, including General Education, will be reviewed on a seven-year cycle. This schedule may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the Provost or College Dean, in consultation with the Program faculty, or in compliance with recommendations from prior program reviews. Programs in related disciplines or with similar missions may be reviewed on

concurrent cycles.

The Provost initiates APR through the Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with the College Dean and the Dean of Graduate Education.

Each APR is conducted by the Program Review Team (Team). Reviewers should be knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review while bringing a perspective that comes from outside of the college or institution. The Program Administrator submits reviewer nominations to the College Dean who makes the final Team selection. The Team will normally be composed of (at least) three members to be selected using the following guidelines:

- One member internal to Cal Poly from a college different than that of the program under review
- Two external members representing the discipline of the program under review

The Team Chair will be identified, and one Team member will be the designated assessment reviewer to ensure that appropriate attention is given to this topic. The composition of the Team may change when the academic program review coincides with an accreditation/recognition review. In these instances, the role of the internal reviewer will be negotiated based on allowances of the accrediting/recognition body.

The APR process is intended to close the circle of inquiry, review, and improvement. Program Representatives and the Program Review Team assume distinct roles in the APR process:

- The self-study report is completed by the Program Representatives.
- The review of the self-study report and the site-visit is conducted by the Program Review Team, which documents its findings in the Team report.
- The strategic action plan is prepared by the Program Representatives, based on the findings of the self-study and the Team reports.

**Elements of the Self-Study Report.** In preparation for the review, the Program will undertake a thorough self study that addresses the program's mission, capacity (resources available to fulfill the mission), and effectiveness (the degree to which a program achieves its mission), all within the context of the College and University. To accomplish this objective, the Inquiry-based self-study report consists of topics such as the following:

- Program Identity (e.g., history, context, mission, and progress since the last review)
- Program Elements (e.g., learning objectives, curriculum, and pedagogy)
- Program Resources (e.g., faculty, facilities, equipment, information resources, and budget)
- Program Effectiveness (e.g. student learning, persistence and graduation rates, student engagement, graduate success)
- Program Planning (e.g., admissions, instructional capacity, and employer demand)
- Program, University and/or System-Wide Themes (e.g., diversity and inclusion)

This outline is provided as an example. In the spirit of continuous improvement, specific elements of the self-study report template will be modified and improved as needed in response to institutional priorities and feedback provided by programs undergoing review. The current version of the self-

study report template will be accessible on the APP website.

Programs undergoing accreditation review may be asked to produce a supplemental document addressing the concerns of APR that are not addressed in the accreditation/recognition review.

APP will distribute the self-study report to the Team, College Dean, Provost, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

**Site Visit and Team Report.** Ideally, the Team will receive a copy of the self-study report around a month prior to the site visit. All Team members should read the self-study report and are encouraged to request additional materials as needed. A two-day site visit will be coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP.

During the site visit, the Team will have access to the faculty, staff, students, and administrators, as well as any additional documentation or appointments deemed necessary for completion of the review. During the site visit, the Team should be provided with sufficient time to discuss their findings amongst themselves. The Team should also be given the opportunity to meet with the Program Representatives, including the Program Administrator, the College Dean, and the Provost to discuss possible outcomes of the review at the end of the site visit. It is the responsibility of the Team Chair to ensure that members of the Team work together throughout the review and that the final report reflects the input of all reviewers.

Within one month of the site visit, the Team will provide a draft report to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). In addition to commendations, the report should address the major issues facing the Program and the Program's discipline and suggest strategies for improvement. The Program Representatives will review the draft report solely for accuracy. After this review, a final Team report will be submitted to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, the Dean of Graduate Education, and the Provost.

**Strategic Action Planning.** The effectiveness of APR depends on the implementation of the appropriate recommendations contained in the Team report as well as insights gained during the self-study process. Based on these factors, the Program Representatives will draft a strategic action plan that responds to the findings of the self-study and the Team reports. An action plan meeting will be scheduled by APP, to include the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the strategic action plan, obtaining input, feedback and support from the College Dean and others in attendance. Based on the feedback provided during the meeting, a finalized action plan is submitted to the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. The Program Administrator and Program Representatives review the strategic action plan, update it if necessary, and provide APP with a copy on an annual basis, where it becomes a part of the program's institutional record.



A copy of the self-study report, Team report, and the strategic action plan will be kept on file with APP for two APR cycles. An annual APR summary will be prepared by APP for the Academic Senate.

**Process Summary.** The APR process can be summarized as follows:

1. The office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP) notifies the programs to be reviewed during spring quarter of the academic year before the academic year in which the department will produce the self-study.
2. For each program under review, a Program Review Team (Team) is appointed. The willingness to ~~read the self-study report and conduct a site visit.~~ The willingness to be involved and the availability of the Team members for the entire review process should be secured well in advance. The procedures and charge to the Team, including reading the self-study and conducting a site visit, must also be communicated prior to the review.
3. The Program Administrator, College Dean, APP, and Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable) establish a schedule for completion of the review.
4. APP, in consultation with the College Dean, Program Administrator, and the Dean of Graduate Education will determine whether an accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements. As appropriate, a supplemental document may be required.
5. The Program Representatives conduct the self-study, and the Program Administrator submits copies of the initial draft of the self-study report to APP, the Associate Dean, and, the Dean of Graduate Education. Feedback on the initial draft is provided to the Program Administrator.
6. The Program Administrator submits a finalized self-study report to APP for distribution to the Team, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education around a month prior to the scheduled site visit.
7. The Team reviews the self-study report, requesting additional materials as needed, and conducts a two-day site visit. The visit is coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP, and should include meetings with the Program faculty, staff, students, as well as administrators within the Department, College, and University.
8. The Team submits a draft report to APP within one month of the site visit for distribution to the Program. The Program Representatives review the draft for accuracy, and the Program Administrator requests corrections from the Team as necessary.
9. The Team submits the final report (if revisions are required) to APP for distribution to the Program, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education.
10. The Program Representatives draft a strategic action plan based on the findings of the self-study and Team reports. The draft plan is submitted to the Department, the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education.
11. A meeting is scheduled to discuss the draft action plan with the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. Based on input provided during the meeting, revisions are made to the draft plan resulting in a finalized action plan that can be approved by the Dean.
12. The Program Representatives review and the Program Administrator updates the strategic action plan on an annual basis.
13. Copies of all finalized documents are kept on file with APP for two APR cycles.

**Program Review Task Force Membership**

D. Kenneth Brown (chair), Faculty Affairs Committee chair  
Doris Derelian, Food Science and Nutrition, CAFES  
Bruno Giberti, Faculty Coordinator for Policies, Assessment & Accreditation  
Kellie Hall, Associate Dean, CSM  
Brenda Helmbrecht, GE Governance Board chair  
Peter Livingston, Dept. Head, BRAE, CAFES  
Stern Neill, Associate Dean, OCOB  
Mary Pedersen, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Programs and Planning  
Steven Rein, CSM, STAT  
Geneva Reynaga-Abiko, Counseling Services  
Amy Robbins, Academic Programs and Planning  
Tal Scriven, Dept. Chair, PHIL, CLA  
Debra Valencia-Laver, Associate Dean, CLA

Adopted: November 21, 2000

ACADEMIC SENATE  
Of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-552-00/IALA  
RESOLUTION ON  
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

**Background:** In 1971, The California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees established an academic planning and program review policy (AP 71-32) requiring each campus to establish criteria and procedures for planning and developing new programs and conduct regular reviews of existing programs. CSU Executive Order No. 595 calls for "regular periodic reviews of general education policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs. The review should include an off-campus component." CSU Executive Order No. 729 also calls for periodic reviews of centers, institutes, and similar organizations. These policies have been reaffirmed in The Cornerstones Report and in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. In 1992 Cal Poly adopted the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines establishing procedures for the conduct of academic program reviews. These procedures and recommendations for external reviews of programs have since been modified. Currently, the information requested from programs that undergo internal review includes descriptions of educational goals, instructional designs and methods, assessment methods and the data so collected, and the procedures for utilizing the collected information.

In 1999, the Provost appointed and charged the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment "to propose a systematic and coordinated approach to addressing academic (and larger institutional) accountability and assessment issues" consistent with our institutional mission and values. The need to build upon, integrate and implement the perspective and approaches contained in existing Cal Poly documents, and the desire to keep these approaches clear, concise and simple were also emphasized. The revised academic program review process drafted by the Task Force, and attached to this resolution, is submitted for your consideration.

WHEREAS: The CSU has established policies requiring periodic review of the following academic programs: major programs, graduate programs, and general education. These policies have been reaffirmed in The Cornerstones Report, the Cornerstones Implementation Plan, and The CSU Accountability Process.

WHEREAS: Cal Poly's Academic Senate has also established procedures and guidelines for the conduct of academic program reviews, as evidenced by Senate resolutions: Academic Program Reviews (AS-383-92), Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines, Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines Change (AS-425-94), External Review (AS-496-98) and Procedures

34 for External Review (AS-497-98), Program Efficiency and Flexibility (AS-502-  
35 98), Program Review and Improvement Committee Bylaws Change (AS-523-99).

36  
37 WHEREAS: The implementation of the Academic Senate resolutions on academic program  
38 review has resulted in a duplication of processes and inefficient use of resources.

39  
40 WHEREAS: An effective academic program review should recognize program distinctiveness  
41 and different disciplinary approaches to student learning.

42  
43 WHEREAS: An effective academic program review should also include the direct participation  
44 of the Deans, as recently noted in by the WASC Visiting Team in the WASC  
45 Visiting Team Final Report.

46  
47 WHEREAS: Self-studies of interest and significance to the faculty are more conducive to  
48 program improvement than are formulaic exercises in compliance.

49  
50 WHEREAS: Accreditation processes conducted by highly respected national agencies for 27 of  
51 the Cal Poly Academic Programs may already provide all the essential  
52 requirements of program review, including learning outcomes and accountability  
53 with respect to program goals; therefore, be it

54  
55 RESOLVED: That all Cal Poly programs with accreditation or recognition review processes,  
56 which cover the essential elements of academic program review in accord with  
57 any CSU and Cal Poly mandated requirements should be able to fulfill all IALA  
58 program review requirements, using the same accreditation documents; and, be it  
59 further

60  
61 RESOLVED: That the Provost, in consultation with the college dean, the program administrator,  
62 and the Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) determine whether the  
63 accreditation process covers the essential elements of academic program review in  
64 accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements; and, be it further

65  
66 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate accept and adopt the academic program review process  
67 proposed in the "Report on Institutional Accountability: Academic Program  
68 Review."

Proposed by: The Task Force on  
Institutional Accountability and Learning  
Assessment (IALA)  
Date: October 3, 2000  
Revised: November 21, 2000

State of California

**CAL POLY**

**Task Force on Institutional  
Accountability and Learning Assessment**

21 November 2000

**REPORT ON INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY:  
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW**

**TASK FORCE ON INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY  
AND LEARNING ASSESSMENT**

Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Chair (Special Assistant to the Provost, Materials Engineering)  
Denise Campbell (Special Assistant to the Provost)  
W. David Conn (Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education)  
Susan Currier (Associate College Dean, College of Liberal Arts)  
James Daly (Statistics)  
Myron Hood (Academic Senate Chair, Mathematics)  
Steven Kane (Disability Resource Center)  
Roxy Peck (Associate College Dean, College of Science and Mathematics)  
Thomas Ruehr (Soil Science)



---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

After an extensive study of academic program review processes and practices statewide and nationwide, the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment proposes a revised academic program review process for Cal Poly. Some of the key features include:

- a mission-centric focus of program reviews
- a discipline-based program review that recognizes program distinctiveness and different disciplinary approaches to student learning
- a self-study that is defined, designed and conducted by the program faculty and encourages serious reflection on issues of interest and significance that is more conducive to program improvement
- the combination of internal and external reviews (peer review and/or specialized accreditation/recognition)
- the involvement of program faculty, students, community, campus administrators, and external experts in the discipline
- the involvement of College Deans in helping to design the review
- a program review team composed of (at least) four members who are knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review
- a 1-2 day site visit conducted by the program review team and
- a feedback loop that includes the development of an action plan for improvement, jointly written by the program, the Dean and the Provost
- a six-year cycle for periodic reviews of all academic programs, including General Education, and centers and institutes
- the alignment of academic program review with planning, budgeting, and Cal Poly's accountability process for the CSU

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

In 1971, the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees established an academic planning and program review policy (AP 71-32) requiring each campus to establish criteria and procedures for planning and developing new programs and conduct regular reviews of existing programs. CSU Executive Order No. 595 calls for "regular periodic reviews of general education policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs. The review should include an off-campus component." CSU Executive Order No. 729 also calls for periodic reviews of centers, institutes, and similar organizations. These policies have been reaffirmed in The Cornerstones Report and in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. In 1992 Cal Poly adopted the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines establishing procedures for the conduct of academic program reviews. These procedures and recommendations for external reviews of programs have since been modified. Currently, the information requested from programs that undergo internal review includes descriptions of educational goals, instructional designs and methods, assessment methods and the data so collected, and the procedures for utilizing the collected information. Thus, there is an increasing interest toward incorporating principles that make individual courses and the general programs in which they reside more accountable for student learning.

The Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment was appointed and charged by the Provost "to propose a systematic and coordinated approach to addressing academic (and larger institutional) accountability and assessment issues" consistent with our institutional mission and values. We have used as guiding principles the need to build upon, integrate and implement the perspective and approaches contained in existing (Cal Poly and CSU) documents, and the desire to keep these approaches clear, concise and simple. Establishing consistency, while maintaining flexibility, in internal accountability, external accountability and reporting is crucial. The Task Force has applied this approach in preparing this document, *Report on Institutional Accountability: Academic Program Review*, and used the following documents as resources:

Cal Poly Mission Statement

Cal Poly Strategic Plan

Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism

Academic Program Reviews (AS-383-92)

Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines

Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines Change (AS-425-94)

External Review (AS-496-98) and Procedures for External Review (AS-497-98)

Program Efficiency and Flexibility (AS-502-98)

Program Review and Improvement Committee Bylaws Change (AS-523-99)

Cal Poly Plan

Cal Poly's General Education Program

Cal Poly as a Center of Learning (WASC Self-Study)

Review of the Baccalaureate in the California State University

The Cornerstones Report

Cornerstones Implementation Plan

The CSU Accountability Process

Cal Poly's Response to the CSU Accountability Process

"Best Practices" Documents and Resources from Other Institutions

---

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND DEFINITIONS

---

Academic program review (APR) is a comprehensive and periodic review of academic programs, General Education, and centers and institutes. APR is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Deans and the Academic Senate, and is coordinated by the Vice-Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education (VP-APUE).

Academic program review has as its primary goal, enhancing the quality of academic programs. Hence, it is an essential component of academic planning, budgeting, and accountability to internal and external audiences. APR is not a review of academic departments or other such administrative units. Each program, department (administrative unit) and college is responsible for their curricular decisions and programmatic offerings within existing resources. All such decisions shall be the purview of the faculty of the program, department (administrative unit) and/or college. Interdisciplinary programs, centers, and institutes also fall within the purview of this policy.

Academic program review of programs subject to professional or specialized accreditation/recognition will be coordinated to coincide with the accreditation/recognition or re-accreditation/recognition review, whenever possible. The document(s) developed for professional or specialized accreditation/recognition reviews may already provide the essential requirements of APR and thus, may also be used for this purpose. Although some programs may choose to use the self-study developed for their professional accreditation/recognition as one of the elements of the APR, it is important to note that accreditation/recognition reviews serve a different purpose than that of institutional academic program reviews.

The following definitions should help in distinguishing terms used throughout this document:

- Academic program is a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective leading to a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, or to a teaching credential.
- Centers, institutes and similar organizations are entities under the aegis of an administrative unit that "offer non-credit instruction, information, or other services beyond the campus community, to public or private agencies or individuals."
- Department is an administrative unit which may manage one or more academic program, center, institute or similar organization.
- The term program is used to mean an academic degree program, General Education program, center, institute or similar organizations subject to institutional review.
- The Program Administrator is the individual responsible for administrative authority of the Program, and is usually referred to as the Program Head, Chair, or Director.
- The self-study is to be designed and prepared by the Program Administrator and representative Program faculty, referred to in this document as the Program Representative(s).
- The (time) schedule for every academic program review is based on business, not calendar, days.

---

## PURPOSE

---

The goal of academic program review is to improve the quality and viability of each academic program. Academic program review serves to encourage self-study and planning within programs and to strengthen connections among the strategic plans of the program, the College and the University. Academic program reviews provide information for curricular and budgetary planning decisions at every administrative level.

---

## PROCESS SUMMARY

---

The academic program review process is intended to close the circle of self-inquiry, review and improvement. The basic components of APR are:

- a *self-study* completed by the faculty associated with the Program,
- a *review and site-visit* conducted by a Program Review Team chosen to evaluate the Program, and
- a *response* to the Program Review Team's report, prepared by the Program Representative(s), the Program Administrator, the College Dean and the Provost.

Although details are contained throughout this document, the process can be summarized as follows:

1. The Provost and College Dean select and announce the programs to be reviewed at least one year prior to the review.
2. For each program under review, a Program Review Team (Team) is appointed and a schedule is established for the review. Willingness and availability of the Team members for the entire review process should be secured well in advance. Procedures and charge to the Team must also be communicated and acknowledged by each member of the Team prior to the review.
3. The Program representative(s), Program Administrator, College Dean and Provost negotiate the content or theme of the self-study and establish a schedule for completion of the review. An essential element of the self-study must address student learning.
4. The Provost, in consultation with the College Dean, the Program Administrator, and the Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) will determine whether the accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements.
5. The Program representative(s) conducts the self-study and submits copies to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Team, College Dean and Provost at least 45 days prior to the scheduled site-visit.
6. The Team reviews the self-study, requesting additional materials as needed, and conducts a 1-2 day site-visit of the Program. The site-visit is coordinated by the VP-APUE and should include meetings with the Program faculty, staff, students and administrators.
7. The Team submits a draft report to the VP-APUE within 21 days of the site-visit for distribution to the Program. The Program representative(s) reviews the draft for accuracy and facts of omission.
8. The Team submits the final report (consisting of findings and recommendations) to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Program, College Dean and Provost within 45 days of the site-visit.
9. The Program representative(s) prepares a formal response to the Team report within 21 days and submits it to the VP-APUE for distribution to the College Dean and Provost.

10. The Program representative(s), the Program Administrator, the College Dean and the Provost hold a "follow-up" meeting to discuss final APR report (the Program's self-study, program review Team report, and program response).
11. The College Dean, in collaboration with the Program Administrator, submits to the Provost an action plan consistent with the recommendations of the APR report and how the program fits into the College mission and strategic plan.
12. A copy of the APR report and the action plan is forwarded to the Academic Senate.

---

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

---

Academic program review is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Dean and the Academic Senate, and is coordinated by the VP-APUE. As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic programs "should be reviewed periodically at intervals of from five to ten years." While past campus practice required that program reviews be undertaken at five-year intervals, the inclusion of reviews of centers and institutes suggests that the review cycle be modified. Therefore, all academic programs, including General Education, centers, and institutes will be reviewed on a six-year cycle. This schedule may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the Provost or College Dean or in compliance with recommendations from prior program reviews. In addition to the selection of reviewers, the Academic Senate will have the opportunity to suggest programs or programmatic areas for review. Wherever possible, APR's will coincide with specialized accreditation/recognition, other mandated reviews, or with reviews for new degree programs. For example, engineering programs are subject to accreditation/recognition by ABET on a six-year cycle, whereas business programs are subject to accreditation/recognition on a ten-year cycle. Hence, it is appropriate to consider that engineering programs be reviewed every six years, and that business programs be reviewed every five years. Programs in related disciplines or with similar missions should also be reviewed concurrently.

Each academic program review is conducted by a singular Program Review Team. It is expected most reviewers be knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review. The Team will normally be composed of (at least) four members to be selected using the following guidelines:

- One member chosen by the Dean of the college whose program is under review. This person may be either a current Cal Poly faculty member (from a College different than that of the program under review) or an external reviewer.
- One or two current Cal Poly faculty members (from a College different than that of the program under review) chosen by the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
- Two external members representing the discipline of the program under review chosen by the President.

The composition of the Team may change when the academic program review coincides with a specialized accreditation/recognition review. In this case, it is incumbent on the individual(s) chosen by the Academic Senate Executive Committee to provide the necessary institutional review.

The VP-APUE will appoint one of the Team members to be Chair and will coordinate all reviews, in accordance with the established schedule, to ensure that the process is both efficient and fair.

The academic program review process can be summarized in three parts: *the self-study*, *the review and site-visit*, and *the response* (follow-up).



---

## ELEMENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY

---

In preparation for the review, the Program will undertake a thorough self-study that is defined and designed by the Program faculty in conjunction with the College Dean and Provost. It establishes the program's responsibility for its own mission, purpose and curricular planning within the context of the College and University missions. To accomplish this objective the report should consist of two parts:

Part I - A inquiry-based, self-study, the content or theme of which is to be proposed by the Program and negotiated with the College Dean and Provost. An important element of the content or theme chosen for the self-study must address student learning. To accomplish this, the self-study should include the following points as appropriate or relevant to the Program mission.

- Statement of purpose, quality, centrality, currency, and uniqueness (where appropriate)
- Principles and processes for student learning outcomes and assessment methods
- Strategic plan for program development, planning and improvement

Part II - General information that consists of data appropriate and relevant to the Program mission. (Most of this data is part of that already required for Cal Poly's Response to the CSU Accountability Process and may be obtained with assistance from the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis.)

- Faculty, staff and students engaged in faculty research, scholarship and creative achievement, active learning experiences and academically-related community service or service learning
- Integration of technology in curriculum and instruction
- Evidence of success of graduates (e.g., graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates, graduates engaged in teaching, government, or public-service careers)
- Description of adequacy, maintenance and upkeep of facilities (including space and equipment) and other support services (library, and technology infrastructure)
- Alumni satisfaction; employer satisfaction with graduates

When requested by a program, the Provost, in consultation with the College Dean, the Program Administrator, and the Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) will determine whether an accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements.

The Program will provide copies of the two-part, self-study to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Team, College Dean and Provost.

<h3>THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM SITE-VISIT AND REPORT</h3>
--

The Team will receive a copy of the Program's self-study document at least 45 days prior to a proposed site-visit. All members of the Team should read the self-study and are encouraged to request additional materials as needed. A 1-2 day site-visit will be coordinated by the VP-APUE, but travel arrangements and expenses for external reviewers are the responsibility of the College Dean whose program is under review. These might include travel, lodging, meals, and honorarium, etc.

The Team should also be provided with sufficient time to discuss among themselves how to proceed with the visit. This would preferably occur at the beginning of the site-visit. It is expected that during the site-visit, the Team will have access to faculty, staff, students and administrators, and any additional documentation or appointments deemed necessary for the completion of the review. The Team should also be given the opportunity to meet with the Program representative(s), the Program Administrator, the College Dean and/or Provost to discuss possible outcomes of the review at the end of the site-visit. It is the responsibility of the chair of the Team to ensure that all members of the Team work together throughout the review and that the final report reflects the recommendations of all reviewers.

Within 21 days of the site-visit, the Team will provide a draft of the report to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Program. The report should address the major issues facing the program and the program's discipline within the larger context of the College and University mission and strategic plan, and should suggest specific strategies for improvement. The Program representative(s) will then review the draft report solely for accuracy and facts of omission. The final Team report (consisting of findings and recommendations) should be completed within 45 days of the site-visit and forwarded to the VP-APUE for distribution to the Program, the College Dean and the Provost.

---

### **RESPONSE (FOLLOW-UP) TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW**

---

The effectiveness of academic program review depends on the implementation of the appropriate recommendations contained in the APR report. Hence, a follow-up meeting will be scheduled by the VP-APUE, to include the Provost, the Program Administrator, the Program Representative(s), and the College Dean. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the recommendations of the Team report, the Program's response, and to develop an action plan for achieving compliance and improvement by the program. The results of this meeting will be summarized in a written document to be prepared by the College Dean and distributed to the Program and the Provost. This document will inform planning and budgeting decisions regarding the Program.


A copy of the APR report and the action plan will be forwarded to the Academic Senate. The Provost will prepare a narrative summary of Cal Poly's academic program review activity for the CSU Chancellor's Office as part of the annual reporting for the CSU Accountability Process, with a copy to the Academic Senate.

---

## PROCESS FLOWCHART

---

A visual description of the academic program review process.



## A CHECKLIST FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

A sample timetable and checklist for the academic program review process is presented here. Some of these events may occur concurrently.

<b>TARGET DATE</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>RESPONSIBILITY</b>
October	Programs scheduled for review are selected and announced one year prior to the review, and a timetable is set.	College Deans and Provost
Prior to site visit	Program Review Team is appointed.	College Deans, Academic Senate Executive Committee, President
Prior to site visit	Participation of Team members is confirmed, Chair of Team is appointed	VP-APUE
Prior to site visit	Content/theme of self-study is proposed and negotiated.	Program representative(s), College Dean and Provost
Prior to site visit	If requested, determination of concordance between essential elements of APR and accreditation/recognition review process	Provost, College Dean, Program representative(s), and Academic Senate Chair (or designee)
Prior to site visit	Program representative(s) conducts the self-study.	Program
At least 45 days prior to site visit	Self-study document is provided to VP-APUE for distribution to Team, College Dean and Provost.	Program and VP-APUE
At least 45 days prior to site visit	Team reviews the Program's self-study.	Team
Site visit	The Team conducts a 1-2 day site-visit and is provided access to the Program faculty, staff, students and administrators.	Team, Program, College Dean, Provost and VP-APUE
At most 21 days after the site visit	Team's draft report is submitted to VP-APUE for distribution to the Program.	VP-APUE
At most 45 days after the site visit	Program representative(s) reviews the Team draft report for accuracy and facts of omission.	Program
At most 45 days after the site visit	Team submits final program review report to VP-APUE for distribution to Program, College Dean and Provost.	Team and VP-APUE
At most 60 days after the site visit	Program representative(s) prepares response to the Team Report and submits the response to VP-APUE for distribution to College Dean and Provost.	Program and VP-APUE
Within 90 days after site visit	Follow-up meeting to discuss academic program review report.	Program Administrator, College Dean, Provost and VP-APUE
Within 120 days after site visit	Action plan for Program improvement is submitted to the Provost and forwarded to the Academic Senate.	Program Administrator and College Dean
October (of following year)	Programs scheduled for review are selected and announced	College Deans and Provost

gd  
nk

RECEIVED

JAN 16 2001

CAL POLY

State of California


**Memorandum**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

SAN LUIS OBISPO  
CA 93407

To: Myron Hood  
Chair, Academic Senate

Date: January 8, 2001

From:   
Warren J. Baker  
President

Copies: Paul Zingg  
David Conn  
Army Morrobel-Sosa  
College/Unit Deans

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-552-00/IALA  
Resolution on Academic Program Review

---

I am pleased to approve the above-subject Resolution. I commend the Senate for adopting the Academic Program Review Resolution proposed by the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning (IALA). Specifically, the Resolution calls for:

- A discipline-based program review that recognizes program distinctiveness and different disciplinary approaches to student learning;
- The combination of internal and external reviews (peer review and/or specialized accreditation/recognition);
- The involvement of college deans in helping to design the review;
- A feedback mechanism that includes the development of an action plan for improvement, jointly written by the program, the dean, and the Provost and
- The alignment of academic program review with planning, budgeting, and Cal Poly's accountability process for the CSU.

The Provost's staff will begin the implementation stage immediately by meeting with each of the college/unit deans to determine an appropriate timeline for their respective program reviews.



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-718-10**

**RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION TO  
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES**

- 1 WHEREAS, Academic program review procedures for baccalaureate and graduate programs were first  
2 implemented in 1992 along with the formation of an Academic Senate Program Review and  
3 Improvement Committee; and  
4
- 5 WHEREAS, Procedures for adding and selecting internal reviewers (Cal Poly faculty members outside the  
6 program who are "knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review") and  
7 external reviewers (individuals from other educational institutions) to academic program  
8 review were drafted and approved in 1996; and  
9
- 10 WHEREAS, In 2000, after extensive study of academic program review practices nationwide, a new  
11 process for academic program review was proposed for Cal Poly by the Task Force on  
12 Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment; and  
13
- 14 WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process—which eliminated the Academic Senate  
15 Program Review and Improvement Committee—was approved by the Academic Senate on  
16 November 21 2000 as "Resolution on Academic Program Review," resolution number AS-  
17 552-00; and  
18
- 19 WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process calls for the Academic Senate Executive  
20 Committee to be the final approving body for the program's internal reviewers; and  
21
- 22 WHEREAS, A Kaizen ("continuous improvement") pilot project reviewed the current academic program  
23 review process in early 2010 and recommended "removing Senate [Executive Committee]  
24 approval" from the process in order to remove steps that resulted in redundant approval  
25 since the internal reviewer nominations are already "selected and vetted by the program  
26 faculty and endorsed by the college deans and the vice provost"; and  
27
- 28 WHEREAS, Waiting for Academic Senate Executive Committee approval often delays the appointment  
29 of the internal reviewer(s) and causes the academic program review process to run behind  
30 schedule; therefore be it  
31
- 32 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Executive Committee be removed as the final approving body in  
33 the appointment of internal reviewers for academic program review; and be it further  
34
- 35 RESOLVED: That the Academic Programs Office provide annual summaries to the Academic Senate on  
36 the findings of academic programs that underwent academic program review in that year,  
37 including a list of internal reviewers as part of the report.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: September 21 2010  
Revised: October 19 2010

State of California

**M e m o r a n d u m**

**CAL POLY**

SAN LUIS OBISPO  
CA 93407

To: Rachel Fernflores  
Chair, Academic Senate

Date: November 15, 2010

From: Robert Glidden  
Interim President



Copies: R. Koob, E. Smith

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-718-10  
Resolution on Modification to Academic Program Review Procedures

---

This memo acknowledges receipt and approval of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution.

# MEMORANDUM

Cal Poly | Office of the President



**To:** Dustin Stegner  
Chair, Academic Senate

**Date:** April 2, 2018

**From:** Jeffrey D. Armstrong  
President

**Copies:** K. Enz Finken  
M. Pedersen  
B. Giberti  
K. Brown

**Subject:** Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-845-18  
Resolution on Academic Program Review

This memo acknowledges my support of the above-entitled resolution. Upon review of the resolution and supporting documentation, please note the following:

- The extension of the program review cycle is being made with the understanding that each academic department will conduct an annual update of its strategic action plan, including annual program data.
- The review cycle for an individual program may be accelerated at the discretion of the dean or provost, in consultation with the department faculty.
- The Office of Academic Programs & Planning may need to exercise some discretion in managing the transition to a longer cycle, in consultation with the departments and colleges.

Please extend my thanks to the Academic Senate members and the Program Review Task Force for their attention to this matter.

