

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

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

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

15
16 In 1999, the Provost appointed and charged the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and
17 Learning Assessment “to propose a systematic and coordinated approach to addressing academic
18 (and larger institutional) accountability and assessment issues” consistent with our institutional
19 mission and values. The need to build upon, integrate and implement the perspective and
20 approaches contained in existing Cal Poly documents, and the desire to keep these approaches
21 clear, concise and simple were also emphasized. The revised academic program review process
22 drafted by the Task Force, and attached to this resolution, is submitted for your consideration.

23
24 WHEREAS: The CSU has established policies requiring periodic review of the following
25 academic programs: major programs, graduate programs, and general education.
26 These policies have been reaffirmed in [The Cornerstones Report](#), the
27 [Cornerstones Implementation Plan](#), and [The CSU Accountability Process](#).

28
29 WHEREAS: Cal Poly’s Academic Senate has also established procedures and guidelines for
30 the conduct of academic program reviews, as evidenced by Senate resolutions:
31 [Academic Program Reviews](#) (AS-383-92), [Academic Program Review and](#)
32 [Improvement Guidelines](#), [Academic Program Review and Improvement](#)
33 [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