



## University Policy Statement

### UPS 410.200

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW POLICY

### I. PRINCIPLES

- A. A fundamental role of the University is the examination and analysis of ideas and institutions. With this perspective, it is appropriate that the faculty of California State University, Fullerton shall evaluate their own programs in order to assure that curricular offerings and instructional methods are meeting the needs of the various constituencies served. This evaluation can be accomplished by Program Performance Review, the periodic, systematic analysis of the objectives and performance of an academic unit. Undertaken seriously, it can improve the general health of the University and strengthen its teaching and curricula.
- B. The vitality of the institution is dependent on the commitment of its faculty. One form of commitment is a willingness to evaluate candidly the programs and activities the faculty directs. Program Performance Review is a central component of that evaluation. It is based on a thorough self-study which involves the participation of the faculty and which results in a Program Performance Review Report.
- C. Program Performance Review encompasses all academic units (academic departments, divisions, and programs including joint degree programs) and examines the total operation of those units, including any participation in joint degree programs. When a degree program is university-wide or involves more than one college, each participating academic unit shall participate in the review.
- D. Because of the size and diversity of the campus, the initiation of this important process is the responsibility of the dean of each college. The review process shall be considered interactive between the faculty, the program chair (or coordinator), and the respective dean.

### II. PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW

- A. Preliminary to Preparation of Report
  - 1. Each dean, in consultation with each program chair (or coordinator) and any review committee, shall designate a team consisting of internal and external reviewers. Internal reviewers are defined as any faculty from within the university. External reviewers are defined as any faculty or individuals with commensurate disciplinary experience from outside the university.

2. Each dean shall call a general orientation meeting of all chairs (or coordinators) of programs undergoing review at which time the procedures and deadlines for the review process would be presented.
  3. The topics to be included in the report shall be communicated to the program under review by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- B. Preparation of Report
1. The program under review shall prepare a self-study following the current Guidelines and Procedures provided by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  2. The team of internal and external reviewers with reference to the Program Performance Review Guidelines and Procedures provided by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs reviews the self-study, evaluates the program, and prepares a report. This report is submitted to the chair or coordinator, the respective dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  3. The chair or coordinator shall provide a written response to the report of the team of internal and external reviewers.
  4. Statistical data for inclusion in the self-study shall be provided to the program from university and CSU sources.
- C. Review of the Report
1. The dean (and any other reviewers) shall read the report and write recommendations for the program. The dean shall review all recommendations and meet with the chair (or coordinator) to discuss the recommendations.
  2. The dean shall write a summary of the major findings and recommendations and send copies to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the chair (or coordinator), attaching the self-study, the report of the internal and external reviewers, and the chair's response.
  3. The Vice President for Academic Affairs convenes a culmination meeting consisting of the respective dean, chair (or coordinator), the faculty of the program, and the director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness.
  4. The Vice President for Academic Affairs sends follow-up comments to the chair (or coordinator), copying the respective dean.

### **III. SUBSTITUTION OF AN ACCREDITATION REPORT**

- A. Any currently accredited academic unit subject to Program Performance Review may request, with the approval of the dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, consent to substitute an accreditation report for a Program Performance Review.
- B. The Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee's) basis for determining whether or not to accept an accrediting report in lieu of a review will be whether or not the accrediting agency is approved by the Council on Post-Secondary Accreditation.
- C. If only one degree, for example the bachelor's, is accredited in an academic unit that offers several programs or degrees, the academic unit must submit Program Performance Reviews for the non-accredited programs or degrees.
- D. The Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) in agreeing to accept an accreditation report in lieu of a review may require that certain questions, unique to the Program Performance Review, be answered and submitted with the accreditation report. For example, the campus may require that reports include sections on educational effectiveness.
- E. The cycle for the submission of Program Performance Reviews is every seventh year. Where accreditation is granted for more than seven years, an interim report shall be submitted to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- F. The accreditation report shall be reviewed per II. C. above.

**EFFECTIVE DATE: July 11, 2011**  
Supersedes: UPS 410.200 dated 12-12-92  
and ASD 11-128

Source: UCC 2-11-11  
Source: Grad Ed Com 4-29-11