Supersedes AS-461-96/PRAIC

Adopted: April 14, 1998

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

AS-497-98/PRAIC
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate approved a resolution (AS-461-96/PRAIC) outlining procedures for External Review of Academic Programs, which was approved by the President's office, but with a number of procedural changes, and

WHEREAS, the Program Review and Improvement Committee in 1997 further revised the resolution to improve coordination between accreditation and internal Program Review, but the revised Resolution was returned to the Program Review and Improvement Committee by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, thus leaving the status of the original resolution unresolved, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the attached procedures and guidelines for external program review be approved, and be it further

RESOLVED, the attached procedures and guidelines for external program review be forwarded to the President for approval and implementation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review
and Improvement Committee
Proposed: January 23, 1998
Revised: April 14, 1998

PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW

The purpose of external program review is to provide the opportunity for outside evaluation of academic programs and departments, resulting in suggestions for program improvement. The purpose of this document is to provide minimum standards for external review of programs which are not accredited.

Coordination between Internal Review and External Review

The schedule for internal review will be coordinated with external review. It is recommended that internal review by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee occur the year after the program is scheduled for external review, so that the effort is not duplicated.

Accredited programs (or programs seeking accreditation) with accreditation schedules of four, five, or six years will undergo internal Program Review the year after their accreditation review. Programs with three year accreditation cycles will undergo internal program review after every other accreditation review, and the two most recent reviews will be submitted with the internal program review material. Programs with accreditation cycles of seven or more years will undergo internal review the year after accreditation, as well as at least once between accreditation reviews, so that no more than five years will elapse between internal reviews.

Programs which are not accredited by a major accrediting agency in their discipline will undergo external review every five years, followed by internal review the following year. Thus, all programs, whether accredited or unaccredited, will undergo external review on a regular basis.

The Review Panel

The review panel will be composed of at least three persons not affiliated with Cal Poly. The panel will include at least one academic representative of the discipline from another institution, and may include a representative from industry or a public agency where appropriate. The panel may also include an academic member from a closely related discipline or an academic administrator.

The selection of reviewers should involve consultative offices beyond those of the department chair(s) and dean(s), and should include national professional associations, accrediting bodies, other institutions, and appropriate organizations to identify qualified reviewers. The list of reviewers should be determined through mutual agreement of the department, college and Chief Academic Officer.

One of the members of the review team (preferably an academic member) will be selected to chair the committee. The chair will be responsible for submitting a final report.

Preparation for Review

A valuahle component of the program review process will be a self-study conducted by the faculty and staff of the program. Such a self-study, which is required as part of the process for specialized accreditation, goes beyond the mere collection of data and entails a thorough examination of the various aspects of the program. A self-study should be conducted as part of an external program review.

In preparation for external review, the following items are to be submitted to the reviewers at least one month prior to their campus visit:

1. Faculty vitae

2. Statement of department/program mission, goals, and objectives. This should be accompanied by an assessment of how well the program has met its mission and accomplished its goals and objectives. This assessment might take a variety of forms and address several measures, such as those suggested in the WASC material on assessment, in "Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism," the discussions of the Cal Poly Plan, and other campus documents. This information should be consistent with information requested in program and course proposals.

3. Curricular requirements, including a comparison to similar programs in California and the nation.

4. An expanded course outline, statement of learning objectives, and syllabus for each course offered by the department/program. Samples of course materials, student work, exams and other assessments, grading policy, and grade distributions need not be sent prior to the visit unless requested by the review team, but should be available for review during the campus visit.

5. Description of relevant facilities, including library and computer facilities.

6. Program data, including:
    1. Faculty demographics and faculty recruiting plan
    2. Student demographics and student recruitment efforts
    3. Demand for the program, including number of applications received and percent admitted.
    4. Average GPA and SAT scores for entering students and MCA criteria
    5. Retention and graduation rates
    6. Assessment of job market for graduating students
    7. Awards and honors received by students (please specify)
    8. Involvement with the professional community and industry

Campus Visit

The department/program will develop a schedule for the campus visit. The campus visit should

include meetings with department/program faculty individually or in small groups, meetings with appropriate administrators including the Department/program Chair/Head, Dean, and Chief Academic Officer, and a meeting with representative students. The campus visit should conclude with an exit interview with the Department/Program Chair/Head, the Dean, and the Chief Academic Officer.

Reviewer Guidelines

Reviewers should consider the following issues in conducting their review, and should address these issues in their report:

1. Department/Program Objectives

    a. What are the program goals of the department/program for the next five years?
    b. Are department/program goals and objectives judged to be appropriate given general trends in the discipline?
    c. How does the department/program plan to meet its five-year goals?
    d. How will the department/program assess how well it has met the goals and objectives listed above?

2. Academic Program

    a. Program

        1. How does the academic program compare to that of comparable institutions?
        11. What are the distinguishing features of the academic program?
        111. What significant changes have been made in the academic program in the last five years?
        IV. Is the department/program offering the number and variety of courses appropriate to the size of the faculty and program needs--that is, neither too many nor too few courses.
        v. What is this program's relationship to the co-curriculum, and Student Affairs?

    b. Curricular Content

        1. Are there emerging trends or areas within the discipline which should be included or expanded in the curriculum?
        11. Are there out-of-date elements which should be phased out or deleted?

    c. Instructional Methods

1. Are instructional methods employed and use of technology appropriate given the learning objectives of the program?

d. Learning Objectives

1. Are course learning objectives appropriate and linked to observable behaviors that demonstrate or imply competence?
11. What evidence is there about the degree to which students attain these objectives?

e. Strengths and Weaknesses

1. What are the strengths of the program and how can they be maintained?

11. In what ways could the program be strengthened and improved?

3. Faculty

a. What is the quality of teaching in the department/program and how is it measured?
b. What are the department/program's statement/s and definitionls of activities acceptable as professional development, scholarship, research, and creative activity?
c. Are the faculty active in curricular development, instructional design, and university service?
d. Is there an appropriate level of professional development across the department/program faculty?
e. What research and creative projects are each of the department/program faculty pursuing?
f. What consulting and special projects are each of the faculty pursuing, and how are they linked to the academic program?
g. Is there an appropriate faculty recruitment plan that addresses gender and ethnic diversity goals, consistent with the principles in the Mission Statement of the University?

4. Summary

a. Is the department/program meeting its program, instructional, and learning objectives?
b. What are the strengths and achievements of the program?
c. What suggestions for improvement can be made?
d. What are the most important challenges facing the department/program?

Written Report

The chair of the review team is responsible for the written report organized around the above guidelines. A draft report should be submitted to the Department/Program for an accuracy check of factual information at least 10 days prior to submission of the [mal report. The final written report should be submitted no later than 45 days after the review. The report will be submitted to the Chief Academic Officer, with copies to the Dean and Department/Program Chair.

The process for responding should complement the regular review schedule of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Expenses

The Chief Academic Officer will cover the expenses of external review.

Post Review Recommendations

The President or hislher designee will respond to the department/program, the college dean, and the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee within six months regarding the recommendations of the external review team. The department /program, in consultation with the Dean, will respond to any concerns, problems, or issues identified in the external review and in the President's response by developing an action plan that addresses these issues. The department's/program's response and action plan shall be presented to the Program Review and Improvement Committee, which will work in consultation and collaboration with the department/program to implement the plan and monitor its progress.

RECEIVED

SEP 22 1998

Academic Senate

State of California
Memorandum

CAL POLY

SAN LUIS OBISPO
CA 93407

To: Myron Hood
Chair, Academic Senate

Date: September 18, 1998

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Copies: Paul J. Zingg
Harvey Greenwald

Subject: AS-497-98/PRAIC-Resolution to Approve Procedures for External Program Review

---

Based upon the recommendations of the Provost's staff, I am pleased to approve the above Resolution of the Academic Senate. This Resolution is an important complement to AS-496-98/PRAIC that ensures all academic programs receive external review. This Resolution establishes the procedures to implement AS-496-98/PRAIC. In addition AS-497-98/PRAIC ensures coordination between the internal review and the external review. It also establishes guidelines for the external review and provides for post-review recommendations. These post-review recommendations will contribute valuable feedback to the academic programs undergoing review.

The Academic Senate and the Program Review and Improvement Committee are to be commended for their review of this issue and for developing the appropriate procedures for an external component to all program reVIews.