

Guiding Principles for Academic Program Review

Purpose:

- The purpose of Academic Program Review is to enhance the educational mission of the college by providing opportunities (i.e. organizational space) for programs and departments, and the college as a whole, to assess and improve its teaching, scholarship and service to the community.
- Each review offers an extraordinary opportunity for the unit and the campus to make a comprehensive examination of the unit, to evaluate its opportunities and challenges, to assess its future and connections to the rest of the college, and take action.
- The aim is to create and support a review process that allows the campus to pursue exciting new paths of teaching and scholarship while also sustaining excellence in each current disciplinary area.
- A central issue of all reviews should be the curriculum and support for students' learning to meet their academic goals.
- The potential of the program review process should be developed to promote key campus objectives within a decentralized organizational culture, and to provide critical grounded feedback on the college's current planning and strategic formulations, directions and objectives.

Self-Study Phase

- The centerpiece of the unit's review process is the unit's self-study.
- Each self-study should express the unit's unique culture, address student-learning outcomes in discipline-specific ways, and provide an opportunity for reflection on and critical assessment of the unit's scholarly directions and academic programs.
- A self-study should involve an assessment of strengths and deficiencies and a strategy and recommendations to meet the opportunities and challenges that the unit anticipates over the next significant period (up to eight years).
- An external review should be a component in each program review as is feasible and fits with the issues for in-depth examination in the self-study.
- Support for program review will include support for appropriate integration between external and internal reviews.

Recommendations and implementation phase

- Program reviews should emphasize forward planning informed by analysis of recent data trends with units identifying, through the self-study and the review process, the necessary steps in the form of recommendations to maintain excellence and to correct deficiencies.
- Program review should develop plans and recommendations in the self-study to address issues in a timely fashion following the review, rather than addressing issues in the course of the self-study phase.

- An implementation phase, connected to the self-study phase, will ensure optimal, timely implementation of recommendations and an appropriate return of the considerable investment of staff time and other resources in collaboration, research, and analysis.
- When implementation of specific recommendations is not possible, strategies and priorities will be formulated at the appropriate level of the college to deal with the issues raised by the lack of implementation.

Structure

- There should be centralized support for and oversight of program reviews.
- The college will maintain a program review process that is distinct from professional or specialized accreditation.
- Support for departmental/discipline self-study should be flexible and responsive to the individual needs of the department/discipline.
- The importance of statistical data in developing unit self-studies is assumed, and centralized support to departments/disciplines in preparation and interpretation of such data will be provided.

Process

- The program review process should take place efficiently and effectively with minimal interruption of the teaching mission of the program.
- Program reviews should be made in a timely manner on a well-defined cycle.
- Robust means to capture stakeholder feedback will be implemented to inform the self-study.
- If elements of the program review process break down, mechanisms are in place to get the process functioning again in a timely manner.

Responsibilities

- The program review process during the self-study phase will be faculty-led; both led by program faculty at the program level, and led collectively by faculty at the institution level, and co-led by faculty and administration during the implementation phase.
- The program review process will provide well-defined roles for the relevant deans, executive deans, and vice-presidents in raising issues for examination, promoting follow-up on recommendations, and engaging in supervisory and supportive action if the program review process, including implementation phase, breaks down.

Outline of the Academic Program Review Process, Responsibilities and Decision Making through the Implementation Phase

PRC – The **Program Review Committee** consists of the permanent faculty leads in the academic program/department and other faculty colleagues they choose. The PRC will, among other responsibilities, create the program **Self Study**, and create opportunities for widespread and quality feedback from all stakeholders in the success of the program.

APROC – The **Academic Program Review Oversight Committee** is a new faculty formation staffed by and affiliated with the **Faculty Council**. Following any founding appointments, its membership will be formally appointed by the Faculty Council and will include faculty representatives on the variety of academic councils and groups with faculty representation at the college. In addition, it will include three classified staff members involved with career/workforce outlook planning, instructional technology, and academic advising. They bring expertise and signal and ensure commitment to robust stakeholder participation by classified staff.

The APROC initiates the formal beginning of the program review process for the program/discipline and has responsibility for seeing that resources are provided to the PRCs, and monitoring the progress of the PRCs, and raising issues of PRCs failing to get resources or their failing to perform in a timely way and' based on any such problems, **initiating joint intervention** by the PRC, APROC, and **AMT (Administration/Management Team)**. The APROC chair and the ASA VP will engage in the timely development of guidelines for lead faculty support (e.g. release time). The scheduling will be guided by requests by faculty on behalf of department/discipline units, urgent requests to include department/units by administration, and considerations of representing academic units across the college and the value that model program reviews can play. The APROC also facilitates the creation and maintenance of the collection of Program Review Guidelines/Standards and Resources provided to the PRCs. Among the resources to support completion of the review process, maintained by the APROC, is a peer faculty network that can provide support to colleagues. The Faculty Council designates the APROC chair, who also serves as the liaison to the Faculty Council and IRAP.

IRAP – Institutional Research and Planning provides a centralized, institutional home for regular, routine staff support for academic program review. IRAP facilitates the collection, distribution, and archiving program review documents, and is a budgetary home for stipends and other forms of compensation that are allotted for program review. IRAP does not house or function as a leader of program review, the APROC liaison provides IRAP with timely, transparent understanding of the current status of program review. Support by staff within IRAP will be determined by the need for support for this crucial but limited role.

IEC – Institutional Effectiveness Committee provides the PRC through IRAP the following **IEC provided data**:

- the college's strategic directions and goals and relevant associated documents

BO – Budget Office provides the PRC through IRAP the following **BO provided data**:

- financial plans and a current best assessment of the financial conditions of the college for the next five years

D – The division Dean provides the PRC through IRAP with **division level data** regarding

- workloads over the previous decade and any current projections of constraints expected over the next five years
- courses and sections given throughout the division and comparator divisions
- financial analysis of the division
- division-level list of strategic directions and constraints set by the division
- division-level list of constraints set by the administration on the division or parts of it

PRC provides the AMT and the APROC with

- a list of **one to three PRC issues for in-depth examination** in the self-study.

AMT subsequently provides the PRC (copy to APROC)

- up to **two AMT issues for in-depth examination in the self-study**, and
- existing data that drives and frames the motivation for this in-depth examination.

The APROC subsequently provides the PRC

- up to **one APROC issue for in-depth examination in the self-study**, and
- existing data that drives and frames the motivation for this in-depth examination.

The PRC invites recommendations and suggestions for peer reviewers, and from these and its own professional connections and expertise selects an **External Peer Review Committee** along with a summary of expected expertise and disclosure of professional collaboration or friendships. It would be prudent for the PRC to make this selection from a wider list in case some members cannot participate. Given that the choice of peer reviewers has financial implications, the PRC and AMT must agree on expenses beyond established guidelines. The APROC chair and the ASA VP will develop guidelines for such expenses in collaboration with the current PRC chairs in fall 2015. Such guidelines may include models for distant collaboration where appropriate.

IC– The Invitation Committee consisting of the VP (or designee), the PRC chair (or designee) and the APROC liaison (or designee) craft a joint request to a **Committee of External Peer Reviewers**, the **EPRC** selected by the PRC to provide high quality feedback concerning the Self-Study with explicit reference to expected in-depth examination of the specific identified issues. If any IC party doubts the ability of the chosen Peer Reviewers to do an adequate job, the letter may request that if the reviewers do not believe they can do an adequate job within the time constraints that they contact the IC about engaging additional support or reviewers.

PRC completes its self-study, which includes preferred strategic options and recommendations for the next substantial period (up to eight years)

- informed by the up to five explicit issues of in-depth study identified previously
- informed by, and critically responding to, the list of college strategic directions and plans, and long term financial plans and financial assessments provided by the IEC
- informed by the data provided by the VP, D, IEC, and APROC, all of which will be combined into **a separate data document** (without synthesis) by the APROC for distribution to the EPRC
- informed by professional standards of the program faculty and discipline professional standards
- informed by strategic directions and the concrete situation of the program

The EPRC will receive the Self-Study having been invited by the IC to visit the campus to meet all parties in a standard protocol developed jointly by the VP, APROC, and PRC, which includes time for in-depth conversations with the PRC and VP and time for exit interviews with other parties directly related to the Self-Study.

The EPRC writes and issues its **External Peer Review Report** informed by the Self-Study, including the explicit issues for in-depth examination.

Within a short time, the APROC may complete any **Amendments**, including factual clarifications to the Self-Study, based on the External Peer Review Report. The AMT may also do the same. Based on all the feedback, the PRC will produce a final Amendment. The Amendments and External Peer Review Report added to the Self-Study and IRAP data report will form the **Complete Program Review Document**, which will be archived by the Program, Division, APROC, and VP.

Following the completion of this report, the VP-designee and PRC chair will convene an **Implementation Steering Team** for preparing implementation plans. The PRC will take primary responsibility for summarizing strategic options for moving the program forward that represented a **consensus** of the Self-Study and the External Peer Review; and the VP-designated members and the PRC-designated members will jointly summarize **initial viable financial options and potentially removable barriers** based on the initial data provided for the Program Review and the consensus program review recommendations. This will form the **initial report** of the Implementation Steering Team. Following this, the team will periodically meet to facilitate implementation of the recommendations coming from the Program Review. The meetings and progress in implementation will be regularly reported by the Steering Team to IRAP and the APROC.

The joint expectation shall be that lack of resources, barring major changes in demand for the program, is the main challenge the IST will need to deal with and that questions of recommendation merit have been adequately settled through the earlier program review progress. To the extent that resource issues are not an issue, implementation is expected to proceed quickly as is feasible. To the extent that resource issues exist, but are local in nature, the team is

expected to raise the issues locally among stakeholders, including any relevant Steering Teams, to set priorities for distributing resources and make plans for removing resource barriers.

To the extent that resource challenges are global, the team will raise these issues to the IEC as concrete matters for which there needs to be strategic college priorities set and college financial plans created, which are adequate to deal with these areas of program implementation. Creating such viable strategic priorities and financial plans for implementing the results of Program Review will be the **responsibility** of the IEC and/or other appropriate bodies. With the clarification or modification of strategic priorities, goals, approach or funding, the feasibility of implementing recommendations may change. In such cases, the IST will have responsibility to consider implementation progress under these new conditions.

The APROC will create and maintain ongoing summaries of the implementation efforts initiated through the Program Review Process. These summaries will be made in consultation with the IST and will be shared with IRAP, where they will be archived. The APROC may initiate intervention by the VP and PRC if the above processes or the IST process breaks down.

A collaborative assessment of the program review experience will be made by all participants in fall 2016 after the next cohort of PRCs have been identified to begin in that fall.

Academic Program Review Terms/Acronyms and Reports

Groups/Individuals

APROC	Academic Program Review Oversight Committee
FC	Faculty Council
IRAP	Institutional Research Assessment and Planning
D	Dean of division of unit carrying out program review
ED	Executive Dean to whom the Dean reports
VP	Vice President to whom the Dean reports
IEC	Institutional Effectiveness Committee
BO	Budget Office
PRC	Program Review Committee
AMT	Administration Management Team (D + ED + VP)
EPRC	External Program Review Committee
IC	Invitation Committee
IST	Implementation Steering Team

Reports/Documents

Self-study guidelines/standards/resources

Division-level data

College strategic directions and financial plans and data

Issues for in-depth examination

Data document (the above three combined without synthesis)

Self-Study

EPRR (EPRC Report)

Amendments by the APROC, AMT AND PRC

CPRD (the above four)

Consensus recommendations

Financial options and potentially removable barriers

Implementation reports

Changes to college strategic directions and financial plans and data

Description of the Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders within Academic Program Review

<p>PRC</p> <p>Program Review Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ permanent faculty lead is chair ◇ engages with program stakeholders ◇ identifies 1-3 issues for in-depth examination in the self-study ◇ creates and completes self-study; informed by and responds to: <i>strategic directions, program and discipline contexts, available data (including financial)</i> ◇ invites recommendations and suggestions from peer reviewers ◇ selects External Peer Review Committee and coordination with AMT to agree on associated costs ◇ produces final amendment (as needed) to self-study based on considerations from external peer review report, APROC, and AMT amendments ◇ completes Program Review Document: <i>includes summary of strategic options to move program forward and represents consensus from self-study</i>
<p>APROC</p> <p>Academic Program Review Oversight Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ facilitates procuring resources(i.e. data, guidelines, and support) for PRC ◇ appoints IRAP liaison ◇ creates and maintains Program Review Guidelines/Standards ◇ facilitates timely progression and completion of Self-Study ◇ faculty members are appointed by Faculty Council ◇ comprised of faculty and classified staff identifies 0-1 issue for in-depth examination in the self-study ◇ completes any amendments (as needed) to self-study based on external peer review report ◇ meets periodically with IST for progress monitoring ◇ creates and maintains ongoing summaries of college-wide Program Review implementation process and efforts: <i>consults with IRAP and IST</i> ◇ initiates intervention should Program Review process break down

<p>IRAP</p> <p>Institutional Research Assessment and Planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ centralized home for staff support collects, distributes, and archives program review documents ◇ meets periodically with IST for progress monitoring
<p>BO</p> <p>Budget Office</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ provides data to PRC: <i>financial plans, current/best financial conditions (5 yr forecast)</i>
<p>D</p> <p>Division Dean</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ provides division-level data (through IRAP) to PRN: <i>strategic directions and constraints set by administration and division, financial analysis, courses and sections (with comparators), workloads (historical and projected(5yr))</i>
<p>AMT</p> <p>Administration Management Team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ appointed by Executive Team ◇ identifies 0-2 issues for in-depth examination in the self-study ◇ provides existing data to support issues for further PRC investigation in self-study ◇ completes any amendments (as needed) to self-study based on external peer review report
<p>IEC</p> <p>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ provides data to PRC: <i>strategic directions and goals and relevant associated documents</i> ◇ may develop strategic priorities and plans for program review plan implementation
<p>IC</p> <p>Invitation Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ consists of VP (or designee), PRC chair (or designee) and APROC liaison (or designee) ◇ solicits requests to external peer reviewers
<p>EPRC</p> <p>External Peer Review Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ provides high-quality review and feedback to PRC; submits report ◇ explicitly references all issues identified for in-depth study ◇ may include campus visit, meetings, and exit interview

<p>IST</p> <p>Implementation Steering Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ prepares to implement plans from Program Review Document ◇ convened by VP designee and PRC chair ◇ generates an initial implementation report: <i>summarizes initial viable financial options and potentially removable barriers</i> ◇ facilitates and coordinates discussions with respective stakeholders (local and global) when resources limit implementation of Program Review Document plans ◇ periodically meets to facilitate implementation and progress monitoring; reports progress to IRAP and APROC ◇ adapts plan implementation in response to institutional changes in strategic priorities, goals, approaches or funding that impact feasibility
--	--

Academic Program Timeline

