

Academic Programs Review and Modification Policy

Title:	Academic Programs Review and Modification Policy
Policy Number:	AC 101.11.2010
Effective Date:	November 28, 10
Issuing Authority:	The University Council

1. Rationale

In a dynamic world, where advancement in technology and changing market needs are fueling rapid changes in all matters of life, it is imperative that higher education institutions offer relevant and effective academic programs capable of integrating latest technologies and methods and accommodating new curricular components that promote academic excellence that translate directly into students learning outcomes. The sound of truth in the notion that the quality of higher education translates into a better quality of life is becoming louder by the day. The stakes are too high and institutions of higher learning must be held accountable to the quality and relevancy of the academic programs they offer by institutionalizing periodic reviews of these programs.

2. Purpose

The framework of academic quality is a comprehensive and systematic process by which all academic programs at DU are reviewed periodically. The process, dubbed as the Academic Programs Review and Modification (APRM) process, entails: (1) thorough evaluation of the current program conditions, practices, resources, and directions; (2) insightful assessment of the alignment of the program with the institutional mission and objectives, and program's students learning outcomes; (3) Qualitative and quantitative analysis of all inputs and feedback received from all stakeholders to craft a set of reasonable recommendations to remedy weaknesses, correct deficiencies, determine priorities, and set strategic directions; (4) concoction of a plan to institute the recommendations and ensure that analysis of results are wisely used to improve the program effectiveness.

This policy addresses cyclical program review as suggested by OAAA and other accreditation agencies. As programs continue to evolve in response to internal and external factors, minor changes in any component of an academic program are left to the discretion of the department concerned. In all cases due process must be followed to secure appropriate approvals of the proposed changes.

In case a provision in this policy contradicts its MOHE counterpart, the provision of the MoHE takes precedence.

3. Policy

The APRM process shall conform to the following policy:

- Each undergraduate program at DU shall be subjected to the APRM process on a 5-year cycle.
- The APRM process shall be completed within a 12-month period. It shall begin at the start of the sixth year since the initiation of the current program and shall be finalized by the end of the academic year.

- A university APRM committee (APRMC) shall be formed of: the Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC) for Academic Affairs (committee chair), Director of Quality Assurance Board, two faculty members from each College, one faculty member from the Arts and Science unit, and the Director of the Foundation Program. Faculty members serving on the APRMC shall be selected by the Dean/Unit Director in consultation with the DVC. The APRM committee shall be responsible for program review oversight.
- The APRM process shall be scheduled to complement other related and concurrently occurring activities such as strategic planning, external accreditation visits, etc.
- A Program Review Team (PRT) shall be formed for each program under review. The PRT shall consist of three members: one recognized expert in a related field from outside the University and two from within the university but not members of the APRM committee nor members of the faculty of the program under review.
- The PRT shall be responsible to: assess programs' portfolio, conduct an onsite visit, and submit a report to the APRMC Chair.
- The DVC shall oversee the APRM process and ensure that this policy is adhered to.

4. The APRMC Process

- The DVC for Academic Affairs through the College Dean shall notify the departments of pending program reviews one month in advance of the start of the APRM process.
- The department prepares and submits a portfolio for each program under review. The portfolio shall include a comprehensive self-study report and an action plan to institute changes. The report is due 7 months after the department is notified. The Dean shall support the department in the preparation of the portfolio.
- The DVC in consultation with the Dean and Department chair shall assemble a PRT two months before the due date of the portfolio and selects a team leader to coordinate the review effort and activities.
- The APRM Chair provides the PRT with the program portfolio one month before the team conducts an onsite visit.
- The PRT reviews the program portfolio and supporting materials to ensure its quality, completeness and concurrence with the University guidelines. The PRT then conducts an onsite visit and submits a report to the chair of the APRMC one month after their onsite visit.
- The DVC, Dean, Department Chair, and Chair of the APRM committee meets to discuss the PRT report and draft preliminary recommendations and modification and/or improvement plan.
- The DVC prepares and submits a final report to the Vice Chancellor (VC) for final action.
- All review reports are catalogued and kept for future use

5. Timeline

The timeline to accomplish the APRM process is as follows:

- September 10 – Departments notified of pending program reviews
- October 1 thru March 31 – preparation of the portfolio
- December 31 – PRT formed and team leader selected
- April 1 - PRT receives portfolio of program to review
- April 20 - May 1 – PRT conducts on site visit
- May 31 - PRT submits its report
- June 15 – APRMC meets and discusses PRT reports
- July 1 – DVC submits report to the VC

6. The Self-study report

The self-study report should include a narrative of maximum 20 pages (excluding Appendices) that addresses all facets of the academic program. The program components that should be addressed in the self-study report must conform to the template prepared by Quality Assurance Board.

7. Approval and Review

Stakeholders

1. Policy Proposed By:
2. Reviewed and forwarded by:
3. Colleges and Foundation Program
4. DVC for Academic Affairs
5. Quality Assurance Board

8. Final Approval

Approved as policy by University Council on:

Approved by the BOT (if required) on:

Dates of Official Enactment:

Dates of Amendments:

History:

Cross Reference:

Next Revision Date:

Vice Chancellor

Signature:

Date: