GUIDELINES FOR THE FOURTH CYCLE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Academic Senate Policy S89-161

At its meeting of May 9, 1989, the Academic Senate approved the following policy for guidelines for the fourth cycle of Academic Program Review:

The purpose of academic program review at San Francisco State University is to assess the University's academic degree programs in order to assure that they are of the highest possible quality. The review should provide information, analysis, and evaluation that will help all elements of the University plan and make decisions about the maintenance, enhancement, reduction, consolidation, or discontinuance of baccalaureate, master's, and joint-doctoral degree programs.

Academic program review in the fourth cycle will include the following four components:

Instructional Unit Self-Study and Recommendation

External Review and Recommendation

School Evaluation and Recommendation

University Review and Decision-Making

At the start of the process for a given School, representatives from the instructional units, the School, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) will meet to discuss substantive and procedural questions. Those attending should indicate any specific areas or issues needing to be addressed, so that these may be given special attention in the review process.

Instructional Unit Self-Study and Recommendation

Every instructional unit which offers academic programs leading to baccalaureate, master's, or joint doctoral degrees shall prepare a self-study that will serve as a basis for all subsequent reviews and recommendations. In this self-study, the unit should describe and assess each degree program it offers, following the guidelines that appear as Attachment A.

The unit should forward its completed self-study to the external reviewers and to the School Office for their respective review and recommendations. Self-studies prepared for the purpose of program or School accreditation may, if appropriate
External Review and Recommendation

The purpose of external review is to help each instructional unit improve the quality of its degree programs and to add an additional perspective to the recommendations made in the self-study. It is anticipated that the external reviewers will provide evaluative assistance and support for program goals.

Units whose degree programs are accredited or seeking accreditation (see Attachment B) may substitute the visit of an accrediting team for this external review requirement. Units not subject to accreditation will have a campus-initiated external review. Typically, the review will be conducted by a team of at least two members, representing both a CSU and a national perspective.

Reviewers will be chosen by the unit and the School Dean in concert, with names forwarded by the Dean to the Academic Vice President for his/her concurrence.

Reviewers will receive a copy of the unit’s self-study and supporting documents and are expected to spend two days on the campus interviewing students, faculty, and administrators and to prepare a report of findings and recommendations. Copies of this report shall be sent to the unit and to the School. It will become part of the unit’s program review file evaluated by the School, the Academic Program Review Committee, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Upon receipt of the report, the University will pay the reviewers an honorarium (in addition to travel costs and other expenses).

School Evaluation and Recommendation

The School Dean is responsible for coordinating and monitoring both the internal and the external review process for all units in his/her School. In addition, after reviewing each unit’s self-study, external review report, and other data that the unit may provide, the School will comment on all recommendations made and add recommendations as needed. These comments and recommendations shall be sent directly to the unit and added to the program review file that will then be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for transmission to the Academic Program Review Committee.

University Review and Decision-Making

In order to provide a University-wide faculty perspective and assist in University-wide planning, the Academic Program Review Committee will carefully review each unit’s self-study, external review report, and School evaluation. APRC will meet with the School Dean and other School representatives to ensure that it fully understands all recommendations made. APRC will accept additional data and recommendations from the units at this time. It will then proceed to evaluate all recommendations.
and send its report to the Chair of the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for transmission to all interested parties. APRC will also send any policy recommendations and its annual report to the Academic Senate.

After the faculty of the instructional unit, the School administration, and the Academic Vice President's Office have had an opportunity to study all reports and recommendations, representatives of these three areas will meet to discuss recommendations and agree on actions to be taken. This agreement will be embodied in a memorandum of understanding which will be in effect until the completion of the next review cycle. Relevant portions of this memorandum of understanding will be transmitted to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to University administrators.

Operation

Attached to this document is the timetable for the fourth cycle of academic program review (Attachment C). A number of comments are in order:

1. The timetable delineates a six-year program review cycle, with all of the units in a given School reviewed simultaneously.

2. Insofar as possible, program reviews will be connected to School and program accreditation processes.

3. Although Liberal Studies and General Education are not included in the timetable, these programs will also undergo review during the fourth cycle.

4. In the semester prior to commencement of self-studies, representatives of the School, the Office of Academic Affairs, and APRC will meet with units preparing for academic program reviews to explain the purpose of the review process, to raise issues, and to answer questions.

Reporting guidelines for individual instructional units are appended as Attachment A. Additional guidelines will be developed for use by external reviewers.

Widespread participation and response are essential elements of program review. During the review process:

a. Department chairs and program heads should assure that there is widespread faculty participation in the self-studies and the faculty are made aware of all findings and recommendations.
School Deans should assure that their Schools' programs are reviewed

b. in a timely fashion and that there is appropriate dissemination of information
   and recommendations.

APRC should review all recommendations in a timely fashion and submit

c. its findings to appropriate units as expeditiously as possible.

Copies of reports made at each stage of the review process should be

d. distributed to all parties involved.

** APPROVED BY PRESIDENT CORRIGAN ON JUNE 21, 1989**