Georgia State University Policy

2.30.02 Academic Program Review

Policy Summary

Each University System institution shall conduct academic program review on a periodic basis to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic programs. The cycle of review for all undergraduate academic programs shall be no longer than seven years and for all graduate programs no longer than ten years.

Full Policy Text

Each University System institution shall conduct academic program review on a periodic basis. Consistent with efforts in institutional effectiveness and strategic planning, each University System institution shall develop procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic programs to address the quality, viability, and productivity of efforts in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service as appropriate to the institution’s mission. Institutional review of academic programs shall involve analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, and institutions must demonstrate that they make judgments about the future of academic programs within a culture of evidence. Planning and conduct of academic program reviews shall be used for the progressive improvement and adjustment of programs in the context of the institution’s strategic plan and in response to findings and recommendations of the reviews. Adjustment may include program enhancement, maintenance at the current level, reduction in scope, or, if fully justified, consolidation or termination.

Except for programs requiring a formal accreditation review, an institution’s cycle of review for all undergraduate academic programs shall be no longer than seven years and for all graduate programs no longer than ten years. Newly approved programs should automatically be reviewed seven years after launch. If successfully reviewed, the new program will then become part of the regular institutional cycle. If unsuccessful, the institution wil present a plan of action to the System Office. Programs accredited by external entities may not substitute an external review for institutional program review, but material submitted as part of an external accreditation process may be used in the institutional review. Institutions may align program review cycles with required external accreditation review, so long as no program review cycle at any level exceeds ten (10) years. Institutions must also review General Education every five (5) years; learning outcomes for each Area A-E of institutional core curricula must be approved by the Council on General Education. Institutions are also encouraged to review Learning Support programs.

Each USG institution shall provide a web link outlining institutional comprehensive program review procedures and shall post program review results on a password protected institutional web site, which shall include the institutional review cycle and an summary of current institutional reviews.

Academic Affairs staff will perform periodic analyses on the posted institutional comprehensive program reviews to ensure that reviews are being used to inform institutional decision-making on the issues of program quality, productivity and viabilitu. The System Office staff will continue to
provide data on programs with low enrollment for institutional information.
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Rationale or Purpose

Planning

• Opportunity for unit self-assessment, planning and change
• Opportunity to inform College and University planning

Review and Evaluation

• Assessment by external experts credible to unit and administration
• Assessment by university peers (APACE review)

Communication

• Information sharing among unit, dean, and provost
• Creation of knowledge base for College and University decision-making
• Improved understanding of other units as result of APACE program review committee and faculty senate involvement
• Sharing of administrative response to action plan commitments through public queue
• Increased external visibility in the discipline as result of external reviewers involvement

Accountability

• Cyclic review of unit progress on self-study goals
• Inclusion of responsiveness to self study goals and action plan commitments as part of deans' and provost's triennial evaluations

Additional Information

Each institution shall submit an annual program review report to the University System chief
academic officer, which shall include a list of academic programs reviewed and a summary of findings for programs reviewed during the previous year. The institution must summarize actions taken both as the result of current reviews and as follow-up to prior years’ reviews. For each review, institutions must establish that the program has undergone review and is meeting rigorous standards. The report must identify (1) quality, viability, and productivity parameters measured, and (2) findings relative to internal standards, the institution’s strategic plan, and, as appropriate, external benchmarks. The University System chief academic officer shall monitor annually a small number of performance indicators for academic programs and shall initiate dialogue with the chief academic officer of the institution when programs do not meet the guidelines defined by the indicators. If further investigation justifies additional study, the institution may be asked to conduct an off-cycle review of such programs.

**Additional Helpful Resources**

Please see the Office of Institutional Effectiveness web page for additional resources, including the self-study template.
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