

Adopted: May 21, 1996

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PROCEDURES
FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW

AS-461-96jPRAIC

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

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

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review
and Improvement Committee

PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW

The purpose of external program review is to provide the opportunity for outside input on academic programs, resulting in suggestions for program improvement. It is recommended that external review occur every five years, preferably taking place the year before the program is scheduled for review by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee.

The Review Panel

The review panel will be composed of 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 Vice President of Academic Affairs will prepare a list of at least six potential reviewers. The list of potential reviewers will be developed in consultation with the department and its respective dean. The department will then select review team members from this list. If it is impossible to constitute a review panel from the original list, another list will be prepared.

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

Preparation for 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 mission, goals, and objectives.
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. 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
 8. Involvement with the professional community and industry

Campus Visit

The department will develop a schedule for the campus visit. The campus visit should include meetings with department faculty individually or in small groups, meetings with appropriate administrators including the Department Chair/Head, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and a meeting with representative students. The campus visit should conclude with an exit interview with the Department Chair/Head, the Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Reviewer Guidelines

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

1. Department Objectives
 - a. What are the program goals of the department for the next five years?
 - b. Are department goals and objectives judged to be appropriate given general trends in the discipline?
 - c. How does the department plan to meet its five-year goals?
2. Academic Program
 - a. Program
 - i. How does the academic program compare to that of comparable institutions?
 - ii. What are the distinguishing features of the academic program?
 - iii. What significant changes have been made in the academic program in the last five years?

- b. Curricular Content
 - 1. Are there emerging trends or areas within the discipline which should be included or expanded in the curriculum?
 - n. 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?
 - n. What evidence is there about the degree to which students attain these objectives?
- e. Strengths and Weaknesses
 - 1. **In** what ways could the program be strengthened and improved?

3. Faculty

- a. Are the faculty active in curricular development, instructional design, and university service.
- b. Is there an appropriate level of professional development across the department faculty?
- c. What research projects are each of the department faculty pursuing?
- d. What consulting and special projects are each of the faculty pursuing, and how are they linked to the academic program?
- e. Is there an appropriate faculty recruitment plan that addresses gender and ethnic diversity goals?

4. Summary

- a. Is the department 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?

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 for an accuracy check of factual information at least 10 days prior to submission of the final report. The final written report should be submitted no later than 45 days after the review. The report will be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, with copies to the Dean and Department Chair.

Expenses

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will cover the expenses of external review.

Post Review Recommendations

The President or his/her designee will respond to the department, 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, 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 response and action plan shall be presented to the Program Review and Improvement Committee, which will work in consultation and collaboration with the department to implement the plan and monitor its progress.