WHEREAS, The current process of five-year reviews of "existing degree programs" required under AB 82-1 has not been effective in assessing the academic environment at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, Academic program reviews under AB 82-01 are largely internally-generated and lack the perspective and objectivity of broader peer review, and

WHEREAS, Budgetary allocations have not been linked to academic program reviews under AB 82-1, and

WHEREAS, In response to budgetary shortfalls in the 1991 academic year, the academic program review process conducted by faculty to identify programs at risk, created an environment of apprehension and tension amongst the faculty and staff, and

WHEREAS, Budgetary problems have continued and are anticipated to continue over an extended number of years, and

WHEREAS, The faculty have a responsibility to both review academic programs and provide input into the budgetary decision making process, and

WHEREAS, The faculty are responsible for curriculum and academic programs, and

WHEREAS, The quality of the academic programs at Cal Poly needs to be a primary consideration in academic program review, and

WHEREAS, The administration is responsible for allocation of funds between and among programs, and

WHEREAS, The administration may use program review recommendations in determining the allocation of resources; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt and recommend to the President the attached "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process as the university's means for comprehensive academic program review at Cal Poly; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the intent of the "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process is to improve the quality of academic programs at Cal Poly; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate appoint an interim "Academic Program Review Committee" for the 1992-93 academic year in accordance with the attached guidelines; and be it further

RESOLVED: That an interim committee be charged with initiating the implementation of the "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process; and be it further
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RESOLVED: That the interim committee report back to the Academic Senate, by Spring Quarter 1993, for Academic Senate approval, any changes in the criteria or process which have been identified as appropriate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That during the 1993-1994 academic year, the Academic Senate establish a standing committee of the Senate to be known as the Academic Program Review Committee, following the guidelines established by this resolution.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: January 28, 1992
Revised: April 14, 1992
By memos dated April 29 and May 6, Charles Andrews transmitted the subject resolutions which were adopted by the Academic Senate. As noted in the transmittal memo, AS-385-92/C&BC dealing with Committee Reporting is internal to the operations of the Academic Senate and requires no action on my part.

Based upon a review and recommendation from Vice President Koob, I am pleased to approve the Change of Grade resolution, AS-384-92/IC.

Vice President Koob and I have also reviewed in detail AS-383-92/EX on Academic Program Reviews. Overall, the document is quite comprehensive and will be very helpful. I am very pleased with the Academic Senate’s concerns and efforts in this critical area as we move forward with our strategic planning efforts.

With the addition of reference to the Cal Poly Mission Statement being included as a basis for evaluation under Section I.A. -- Mission, Goals and Objectives -- the resolution is approved. At the present time, "the special mission of Cal Poly" is included, but the only references to this Mission is Title 5 language in the detailed guidelines. I believe the official Mission Statement of the University should also be utilized.
Introduction

The process below was developed to evaluate academic programs in order to strengthen them. This process is meant to allow all programs campuswide to show their strengths. Items that are underlined were identified as important ones common to all programs. These items must be addressed by each program in some fashion. The other items should be addressed as relevant or appropriate to each program. Therefore, each program can reflect some uniqueness in the information provided. In doing this, some steps have been included which may not apply to all programs.

Each program will be evaluated separately. Graduate programs are to be evaluated in the same manner as undergraduate programs, using the same process as applicable. Since the process asks that all programs be compared to similar peer programs, graduate programs will be compared to other graduate programs for evaluation.

As a program prepares data for this evaluation, it is encouraged to comment on the data, particularly information which may be helpful to the evaluation committee. The program administrator should feel free to include any special explanations for data which might otherwise be interpreted negatively.

Academic program can be defined as a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective; i.e., degree, certification, credential, or group of courses for a specific purpose (Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, Extended Education, etc.).

A more detailed explanation of each step is supplied in the Guidelines attached. (* Indicates data to be provided by the Institutional Studies Office).

I. MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

A. Relevance of the program to the special mission of Cal Poly, and/or the mission of the CSU
B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met
C. Contribution to the community, state, and nation

II. PROGRAM QUALITY

A. Curriculum
   *1. Appropriate sequence, patterns of delivery, and size of class
   2. Appropriate comparison with similar peer programs
   3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives
4. Quality evaluation method
   a. accreditation
   b. outside evaluation
   c. other

5. Currency
6. Professional support
7. Professional service
8. Evidence of interdisciplinary activity
9. Evidence of use of senior project as a learning tool
10. Contribution to G,E & B program at Cal Poly
11. Student Advising

B. Faculty

*1. Demographics (gender, ethnicity)

2. Specific qualifications appropriate to discipline

3. Diversity of faculty
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise

4. Professionalism & professional work experience

5. Evidence of teaching excellence

6. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty

7. Service to the university, school and community

*8. Percent of tenure-track versus non-tenure track faculty

C. Students

1. Student profile
   * a. Average SAT scores of enrolled students
   * b. Average GPA of transfer students
   * c. Gender and ethnicity
   d. Honors, awards, scholarships
   e. Number of students transferring into and out of major
   * f. Average quarterly unit load carried by major students
   g. Evidence of student involvement in program

2. Evidence of successful program completion
   *a. Student graduation rates
   *b. Student persistence rates
   *c. Average length of time for students to graduate
   d. Percent of graduate placement
      1) Other graduate school
      2) Graduate programs at Cal Poly
      3) Job requiring college degree
      4) Unknown
   e. Other evidence of success relevant to field

3. Alumni evaluations (5, 10, 15 year post-graduation evaluations)
   a. Strengths of program
b. Weaknesses of program

c. Adequacy of knowledge acquired for entry level jobs

d. Adequacy of program to provide for the overall university experience

D. Academic Support Resources

1. Adequacy of facilities/services
2. Adequacy of equipment inventories
3. Adequacy of access to library resources
   a. Quality and quantity of library collection
   b. Relationship to program

III. PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY

A. Efficient Use of State Resources

1. Faculty positions used and faculty positions generated by your program for each of the last five years
2. Staff positions used and staff positions generated by your program for each of the last five years
3. Administrative time used and administrative time generated by your program for each of the last five years
4. Average total cost (salary, O&E, equipment, travel, telephone, etc.) per annual SCU taught for your program for each of the last five years
5. Average total cost per FTE major student for your program for each of the last five years
6. Average annual WTU taught per FTEF for your program for each of the last five years (for each faculty member)
7. Average quarterly faculty contact hour load for your program (for each faculty member)

B. Generation and Use of Non-State Resources

(It should be acknowledged that there is not equality of opportunity for all programs in this regard)

1. Provide a list of all grants and contracts submitted and funded by your faculty for each of the last five years (give title and dollar amount)
2. For each of the last five years, list the amount of money generated via your program’s fund raising efforts. Also indicate how this money was spent.
3. For each of the last five years, list the gifts of equipment, supplies and services received by your program
4. List all other non-state income generated for each of the last five years and indicate how that money was spent.

IV. PROGRAM NEED
A. Job market need
B. Program uniqueness
C. Integral Component to State University Education
D. Student Demand

V. SELF ASSESSMENT
I. MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

A. Relevance of the program to the special mission of Cal Poly, and/or the mission of the CSU
See the attached Title 5 description (subchapter 2, Articles 1 and 2), and the mission statement of the California State University-A, B.

B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met
List the program mission, goals, and objectives. Include your departmental priorities. (See attached list of examples of instructional priorities for reference-C).

C. Contribution to the community, state, and nation
In what general ways does the program contribute to each of these? Are the graduates of particular service?

II. PROGRAM QUALITY

A. Curriculum
   1. Appropriate sequence, patterns of delivery, and size of class
      Using data provided by Institutional Studies, identify low/over enrollment courses and explain circumstances for each. Low enrollment defined by Administrative bulletin 82-1. Low enrollment courses defined as less than 13 students for lower division, less than 10 students for upper division, and less than 5 for graduate courses and, frequency of offering of these courses for the last two years. Identify graduate courses with high undergraduate enrollment and explain circumstances for each one. Describe structure of curriculum including actual or possible course taking sequences and patterns (demonstrate with flow chart).

      What other programs on campus have an impact on the ability of your students to graduate on time?

   2. Appropriate comparison with similar peer programs
      Summarize and compare with identical or similar programs.

   3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives
      Do your course offerings meet the stated goals and objectives of your department?

      List all major concentrations currently offered and specify the number of students enrolled in each.
4. Quality evaluation method
Provide information on how your program is evaluated by the appropriate means including one or more of the following methods:

a. accreditation
   Indicate if accreditation agencies exist for your program evaluation. Is your program accredited? Provide summary report form last accreditation review.

b. outside evaluation
   Indicate any other foundations, professional associations or societies, or external peer reviews that are used to evaluate your program.

c. other
   If used, indicate occurrences and formal procedures for student and alumni evaluation.

5. Currency
Describe how your curriculum has responded to factors such as changing emphasis in the discipline, new technological development, changing character of society, current national curricular trends, demands by the profession and employers, etc.

6. Professional support
What support (nonmonetary) is provided by your profession in contributing to the enhancement of your curriculum.

7. Professional service
List the service or in-service activities sponsored by your program during the past five years and list the number of people accommodated in each activity. Were these activities offered for credit?

8. Evidence of interdisciplinary activity
List any interdisciplinary/problem-based studies or activities emphasizing the unity of knowledge and the cooperative contributions of individual disciplines.

Briefly, describe any courses developed by two or more departments for a major in your program or any cooperative arrangements that have been explored.

Briefly, describe the inter-relationship of your program with other programs.

9. Evidence of use of senior project as a learning tool
Is senior project an essential component of your curriculum? What role does it play as a part of your major? How is senior project organized and managed in your department? How many students do not successfully complete senior project in your majors?
10. Contribution to G, E & B program at Cal Poly
If your program provides G, E & B courses, please identify those courses.

11. Student Advising
Summarize the academic, professional, and career advising service that your program offers and its effectiveness.

Are advising responsibilities shared by all faculty? Briefly, describe the department's procedures to ensure that students receive accurate and timely academic advising.

B. Faculty
Many of the faculty professional activities can be summarized in a table format. See attachment D for example of a form to use.

1. Demographics
   a. affirmative action target goals
   * b. gender
   * c. ethnic diversity

2. Specific qualifications appropriate to discipline

3. Diversity of faculty
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise
   c. appropriate faculty expertise related to professional background

4. Professionalism & professional work experience

5. Evidence of teaching excellence for past five years

6. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty for past five years

7. Service to the university, school and community for past five years

* 8. Percent of tenure-track versus non-tenured track faculty

C. Students
1. Student profile
   a. Average SAT scores of enrolled FTF students
   b. Average GPA of new transfer students
   c. Gender and ethnicity
   d. Honors, awards, scholarships
   Are the trends of items a-d over the last five years of any significance to the program?

   e. Number of students transferring into and out of major
   What percent of your students leave your program as internal transfers per year? What percent of your students are internal transfers? Identify any major difficulties students transferring in may have in completing the program?
f. Average quarterly class load enrolled in by major students
What percent of your students are primarily full-time students? Are significant numbers of students part-time because of program or institutional policy?

g. Evidence of student involvement in program (i.e. clubs, extra projects, etc.)

2. Evidence of successful program completion
a. Student graduation rates
Do the trends over the last five years of the percentages of majors graduating indicate any significant changes in the program? Over the last five years, indicate the number of majors who have filed for graduation and the number who have completed their degree.

b. Student persistence rates
How many students who enter eventually complete the program?

c. Average length of time for students to graduate
Why are students not completing their degrees according to projected time frames?

d. Percent of graduate placement (over the last five years)

1) Graduate programs at other universities
What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at other schools?

2) Graduate programs at Cal Poly
What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at Cal Poly?

3) Jobs requiring your or a similar college degree
What percent of your graduates are currently employed in a field utilizing your or a similar college degree?

4) Jobs requiring any other college degree
What percent of your graduates are currently employed in a field utilizing any other college degree?

5) Unknown
Of your graduates, what percent is there status unknown?
e. Other evidence of success relevant to field
   What are the pass rates for professional
   registration or certification, acceptance
   rates to graduates internships, etc?

3. Alumni evaluations (5, 10, 15 year post-graduation
   evaluations)

   a. Strengths of program
      What input have you received from alumni
      regarding the strengths of your program?

   b. Weaknesses of program
      What input have you received from alumni
      regarding the weaknesses of your program?

   c. Adequacy of knowledge acquired for entry level
      jobs
      Do the students have an adequate level of
      knowledge acquired for entry level jobs?

   d. Adequacy of program to provide for the overall
      university experience
      How does your program keep in contact with
      alumni? How do the responses from the
      different post-graduation ages differ?

D. Academic Support Services

   1. Adequacy of facilities/Services
      How adequate are your facilities such as classrooms,
      offices, laboratories, etc?

   2. Adequacy of equipment inventories
      How adequate is your equipment inventory including
      computers, lab equipment, and maintenance of this
      equipment?

   3. Adequacy of access to library resources
      How adequate is your access to the resources
      available to the library?
      a. Quality and quantity of library collection
         Is the library's collection sufficient in quality
         depth, diversity and currentness to meet the needs
         of the academic program?

      b. Relationship to program
         Is the library's collection structured in direct
         relationship to the nature and level of the academic
         program's curricular offerings, including graduate
         courses?
III. PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY

A. Efficient Use of State Resources
1. Faculty positions used and faculty positions generated by your program for each of the last five years
2. Staff positions used and staff positions generated by your program for each of the last five years
3. Administrative time used and administrative time generated by your program for each of the last five years
4. Average total cost (salary, O&E, equipment, travel, telephone, etc.) per annual SCU taught for your program for each of the last five years
5. Average total cost per FTE major student for your program for each of the last five years
6. Average annual WTU taught per FTEF for your program for each of the last five years (for each faculty member)
7. Average quarterly faculty contact hour load for your program (for each faculty member)

B. Generation and Use of Non-State Resources
(It should be acknowledged that there is not equality of opportunity for all programs in this regard)
1. Provide a list of all grants and contracts submitted and funded by your faculty for each of the last five years (give title and dollar amount)
2. For each of the last five years, list the amount of money generated via your programs fund raising efforts. Also indicate how this money was spent.
3. For each of the last five years, list the gifts of equipment, supplies and services received by your program
4. List all other non-state income generated for each of the last five years and indicate how that money was spent.

IV. PROGRAM NEED

A. Job market need
Are graduates from the program in demand? If applicable, what is the ratio of requests for graduates at the placement center to actual graduates?

B. Program uniqueness
1. What is the need for the program at Cal Poly, in the state of California, nationwide? Compare enrollment to other programs in the state.

2. Are there courses offered in your department that are similar to courses offered in other departments? If so, what is the specific need for these courses within your department?
c. Integral Component to State University Education

Is your program essential to the CSU education?

d. Student Demand

Provide data on the number of applicants to your program and the number of students accommodated. Include any other relevant information on these students if appropriate.

V. SELF-ASSESSMENT

Identify the strengths, weaknesses and any constraints existing for your program. Draw from the information compiled in the preceding sections of this document. Indicate strategies or plans designed to improve the areas of weakness and future areas of strengthening for your program.
Title 5  
Board of Trustees of the California State Universities  
§ 40101

Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities

Chapter 1. California State University

Subchapter 1. Definitions

§ 40000. Campus.
As used in this Chapter, the term "campus" shall mean any of the institutions included within the California State University and Colleges, as specified in Section 89001 of the Education Code.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600 and 89030, Education Code.

1. New Subchapter 1 (Section 40000) filed 8-22-72; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 72, No. 35).
2. Amendment of section and NOTE filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).
3. Amendment of NOTE filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

Subchapter 2. Educational Program

Article 1. General Function

§ 40050. Functions.
The primary function of the California State University and Colleges is the provision of instruction for undergraduate students and graduate students through the master's degree, in the liberal arts and sciences, and in applied fields and in the professions, including the teaching profession. Presently established two-year programs in agriculture are authorized, but other two-year programs shall be authorized only when mutually agreed upon by the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California, or jointly with a private institution of higher education accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, provided that in the latter case, the doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the California State University and Colleges and the facilities provided for that function.


1. Renumbering of Subchapters 1-6 to Subchapters 2-7, inclusive. Amendment and renumbering of Section 40000 filed 8-22-72; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 72, No. 35). For prior history, see Register 71, No. 1.
2. Amendment of section and NOTE filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).
3. Amendment of NOTE filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

§ 40051. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and California Polytechnic State University, Pomona, Special Emphases.
In addition to the functions provided by Section 40050, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and California Polytechnic State University, Pomona, shall each be authorized to emphasize the applied fields of agriculture, engineering, business, home economics and other occupational and professional fields. This section shall be liberally construed.


§ 40100. Authorization to Establish Curricula.
A campus may be authorized by the Board of Trustees to establish and maintain curricula leading to the bachelor's degree, and the master's degree, and the doctoral degree; provided, that in the case of the doctoral degree, the requirements of Section 40050 are satisfied.


1. Amendment filed 12-29-70; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 1).
2. Amendment and renumbering of Section 40001 filed 8-22-72; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 72, No. 35).
3. Amendment of NOTE filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

Article 2. Curricula

§ 40100.1. Cooperative Curricula.
Curricula leading to the bachelor's or master's degree may be established cooperatively by two or more campuses. The Chancellor is authorized to establish and from time to time revise such procedures as may be appropriate for the administration of this section.


1. New section filed 8-22-72; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 72, No. 35).
2. Amendment filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

§ 40100.2. The Consortium of the California State University and Colleges.
The Consortium of The California State University and Colleges ("The Consortium") is hereby established. Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter to the contrary, The Consortium shall conduct academic programs utilizing combined faculty and program resources of The California State University and Colleges, and degrees authorized in Article 6, Subchapter 2 of this chapter may be awarded by The Consortium in the name of the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor is authorized to establish and from time to time to revise such provisions as may be appropriate for the administration of this section. The Chancellor shall report annually to the Board on such provisions issued pursuant to this section, commencing at the first meeting of the Board following July 1, 1974.


1. New section filed 6-21-73; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 73, No. 25).
2. Amendment of NOTE filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).
3. Amendment of NOTE filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

§ 40101. Authorization to Recommend for Teaching Credentials.
A campus may establish and maintain courses leading toward fulfillment of requirements for one or more public school service credentials, and when a campus is approved by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, the campus is authorized to recommend qualified applicants to the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing for the credential.

The Mission of The California State University

I. The mission of The California State University is:

To advance and extend knowledge, learning, and culture, especially throughout California.

To provide opportunities for individuals to develop intellectually, personally, and professionally.

To prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California’s schools, economy, culture, and future.

To encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study.

To offer undergraduate and graduate instruction leading to bachelor’s and higher degrees in the liberal arts and sciences, the applied fields, and the professions, including the doctoral degree when authorized.

To prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society.

To provide public services that enrich the university and its communities.

II. To accomplish its mission over time and under changing conditions, The California State University:

Emphasizes quality in instruction.

Provides an environment in which scholarship, research, creative, artistic, and professional activity are valued and supported.

Stresses the importance of the liberal arts and sciences as the indispensable foundation of the baccalaureate degree.

Requires of its bachelor’s degree graduates breadth of understanding, depth of knowledge, and the acquisition of such skills as will allow them to be responsible citizens in a democracy.

Requires of its advanced degree and credential recipients a depth of knowledge, completeness of understanding, and appreciation of excellence that enables them to contribute continuously to the advancement of their fields and professions.

Seeks out individuals with collegiate promise who face cultural, geographical, physical, educational, financial, or personal barriers to assist them in advancing to the highest educational levels they can reach.

Works in partnership with other California educational institutions to maximize educational opportunities for students.

Serves communities as educational, public service, cultural, and artistic centers in ways appropriate to individual campus locations and emphases.

Encourages campuses to embrace the culture and heritage of their surrounding regions as sources of individuality and strength.
Examples of Instructional Priorities

Please rank in descending order of priority the following instructional priorities as your unit now performs them:

- Provide liberal arts and/or general education.

- Provide undergraduate educational preparation through majors, minors, options, concentrations, and special emphases. Please rank in descending order of priority any options, concentrations, and special emphases you offer. (An option, concentration or special emphasis requires University approval and is defined as "an aggregate of courses within a degree major designed to give a student a specialized knowledge, competence, or skill.")

- Provide core courses within school/division.

- Provide service function for other programs.

- Provide graduate study through the master's degree. Please rank in descending order of priority any options, concentrations, and special emphases you offer.

- Provide professional/pre-professional training (e.g., teacher education, pre-law).

- Provide extended education, consortium, off-campus, or external degree programs.

- Provide in-service training for those currently employed.

- Other (please identify).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Attend.</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Papers Presented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Offices Held</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Held</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Speaking (Local)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELECTION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS FOR REVIEW

The selection process for programs to be reviewed should be in accordance with the following steps:

1. Develop a MASTER FILE on all programs subject to the Program Review process, both undergraduate and graduate.

2. Identify those programs that are subject to accreditation review and the dates when such review is to next occur.

3. Project the Program Reviews over a five-year period, and insure that programs subject to accreditation have congruent times for the accreditation reviews as well as the internal Program Reviews; thus, minimizing demand upon resources.

4. In each year, by May 1, the Academic Senate office shall solicit programs for those wishing to be reviewed, either because of accreditation or other external reviews, or for other reasons.

5. If a sufficient number of programs are not identified in #4, then the Academic Senate Executive Committee shall select additional programs, from those subject to review on a current basis, using random selection.

6. A listing of programs to be reviewed in the next academic year shall be completed by the Academic Senate by June 1, with said list being submitted to the Vice-president for Academic Affairs and the affected programs. Every effort should be made to provide notice of review at least one academic year in advance.

7. Assure there is a mix of programs between those that are subject to accreditation as well as those that are not.

8. No school shall have all of its programs reviewed in the same year, irrespective of accreditation review or other external review.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

1. The Committee shall consist of 8 tenured full professors; one from each of the seven schools, one from the Academic Senate, and a non-voting ex-officio person appointed by the Vice-president for Academic Affairs. The University Center for Teacher Education shall be included with a school of their choice for the selection of the representative from that unit.

2. Each School caucus shall forward the names of three nominees to the Academic Senate Office. The Academic Senate Executive Committee members shall receive a ballot of these nominees
and shall have five days to vote and return their marked ballots to the Academic Senate office for counting of the returns by the Academic Senate Elections Committee. The name of the person receiving the highest number of votes from each school shall be the person elected to serve on the Program Review Committee.

The person receiving the second highest number of votes from his school shall be the alternate to the committee, if from a different department. If the person receiving the second highest votes is from the same department as the persons with the highest number of votes, then the third person on the ballot will be considered to be the alternate, if from a department different from the department of the highest vote receiver.

3. No member of the committee shall participate or be present when a program sponsored by that representative's department is under consideration by the committee. In such instances, the alternate, whom shall be from a department other than the one under review, will represent that school until the program review is completed and a report forwarded to the Academic Senate.

4. Committee members shall be elected for a two year term, and may be reelected for a second consecutive term.


7. Should a vacancy occur the replacement shall be elected in the same process as described in section 2, and shall complete the term of the person replaced.

8. Should a vacancy occur in the first year of the term for that position, the replacement person shall be eligible for one addition consecutive term. Should the vacancy occur after the first year of a term, the replacement will be eligible for two consecutive terms following the completion of the term as a replacement.

9. Persons excluded from eligibility for the 1991-92 election only, are those persons who served on the program review task force in 1990-91 and those who served on the 1991-92 Ad Hoc Committee for Program Review Criteria.
10. The Administration shall be expected to provide the necessary support staff to enable the Program Review Committee to carry out its responsibilities.

11. Members of the Program Review Committee should be provided with released time in which to perform this responsibility.

IMPLEMENTATION OF REVIEW AND REPORT FORMAT

1. The office of the Vice-president for Academic Affairs shall provide all program heads with a copy of the University Academic Program Review Criteria and the guidelines that are to be used to evaluate academic programs. (This document, once approved, should remain largely unchanged from year to year.)

2. The review process shall be conducted by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), with the composition and selection of the Committee in accordance with other parts of this document.

3. Programs selected by the Academic Senate Executive Committee will prepare information packages for evaluation by the APRC. These packages shall be formatted in conformity with the criteria and guidelines instructions. The completed packages will be submitted to the Academic Senate office for distribution to the APRC, with a copy also being forwarded to the appropriate School Dean.

4. The evaluation process shall be a review and assessment of the materials pertaining to a program. The Committee will prepare a list of Findings based on the materials contained in the package submitted.

5. Members of the program being reviewed shall be given the opportunity to meet with the APRC and to discuss the Findings, and to submit written Responses to the Findings.

7. After receiving the Responses, the APRC will prepare Recommendations. In developing the Recommendations, the APRC shall give careful consideration to the Responses received.

8. The APRC shall prepare a report to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, with a copy to the program administrator and the appropriate school.

9. The report will be structured in the following order:

   FINDINGS
   RESPONSES
   RECOMMENDATIONS

The original package of materials provided by the program
under review will be included in the report to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

10. Following review by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the completed report will be submitted to the Academic Senate for review and comment.

11. After review by the Academic Senate, the report, with recommendations from the Academic Senate, will be forwarded to the Vice-president for Academic Affairs and the appropriate program administrator and school dean.

12. The responses of the Academic Senate should be limited to broad policy issues raised by the Review process, rather than focusing on recommendations concerning specific aspects of a program.

13. The Vice-president for Academic Affairs shall have the responsibility for responding to the recommendations made concerning specific programs.

14. Any action taken by the administration, which is based upon the recommendations of the APRC shall be communicated to the parties involved and to the Academic Senate.
State of California

Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren B. Baker
   President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS AS-383-92/EX,
         AS-384-92/IC AND AS-385-92/C&BC

AUG 25 1992

By memos dated April 29 and May 6, Charles Andrews transmitted the
subject resolutions which were adopted by the Academic Senate. As
noted in the transmittal memo, AS-385-92/C&BC dealing with
Committee Reporting is internal to the operations of the Academic Senate
and requires no action on my part.

Based upon a review and recommendation from Vice President Koob, I
am pleased to approve the Change of Grade resolution, AS-384-92/IC.

Vice President Koob and I have also reviewed in detail AS-383-92/EX on
Academic Program Reviews. Overall, the document is quite
comprehensive and will be very helpful. I am very pleased with the
Academic Senate’s concerns and efforts in this critical area as we move
forward with our strategic planning efforts.

With the addition of reference to the Cal Poly Mission Statement being
included as a basis for evaluation under Section I.A. -- Mission, Goals
and Objectives -- the resolution is approved. At the present time, "the
special mission of Cal Poly" is included, but the only references to this
Mission is Title 5 language in the detailed guidelines. I believe the
official Mission Statement of the University should also be utilized.