

FLORIDA	OFFICIAL
POLYTECHNIC	UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY	ACADEMIC POLICY

Subject/Title: Academic Program Review
FPU Policy Number: FPU-5.0062AP
<input type="checkbox"/> New Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major Revision of Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Technical Revision of Policy
Date First Adopted: June 4, 2015
Date Revised: January 6, 2026
Responsible Division/Department: Academic Affairs
Initiating Authority: Dr. Brad Thiessen, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs

A. APPLICABILITY/ACCOUNTABILITY:

This policy applies to all degree-granting programs administered by the University.

B. POLICY STATEMENT:

Florida Poly is committed to educational excellence, academic rigor, and the thoughtful, coordinated and effective delivery of high-quality academic degree programs. Ongoing assessment is one method of measuring program effectiveness, but periodically, every program must undergo a full-scale comprehensive self-study and review to determine where it is succeeding and where attention must be put to effectively achieve its outcomes. For programs with specialized accreditation, or those preparing to seek it, the external accreditation cycle fulfills this requirement. The results of these program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level and, when appropriate, at the state level.

1. Schedule

- a. At a minimum, the University will review each academic program within six years of the program implementation date, and at least once every six years thereafter. (More often, if necessary, as determined by the Provost.)
- b. The University's program review schedule will ensure that all programs receive sufficient review, with appropriate input from external academic experts, within the established review cycle.

2. Core Components of Internal Program Reviews

Internal program reviews must include the following components:

- a. The review of the mission(s) and purpose(s) of the program within the context of the university mission;
- b. Changes made since the previous program review;
- c. Offerings and program engagement;
- d. Demand and comparison to peer programs;
- e. Faculty expertise, productivity, and coverage;
- f. Graduate assistantship responsibilities and support;
- g. Curricular offerings and instructional modalities;
- h. Assessment of learning outcomes and improvement efforts;
- i. Student success initiatives
- j. Academic advising;
- k. Library utilization; and
- l. Physical, human, and fiscal resources

3. Action Plan

An action plan report will be completed for every program. Each summary report will include the following components:

- a. The date of the last review of this program;
- b. A summary of the current strengths of the program;

- c. A summary of the current weaknesses of the program;
- d. A summary of the recommendations and/or proposed goals to be made as a result of the review; and
- e. The Provost's signature verifying that the program review included all of the outlined processes and was conducted according to approved University policies and procedures.

A copy of all full program review reports will be maintained at the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

4. Institutional Process

- a. For accredited programs, the University contact is notified per the schedule kept according to the accrediting agency and that agency's process is followed. Upon conclusion of the visit, a copy of the self-study and final report are maintained by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.
- b. For non-professionally accredited programs:
 - i. The Provost's Office notifies the Academic Program on or about February 1st of the program's 6th academic year in the cycle that a self-study must be conducted.
 - ii. The program completes its review on September 30th (or first business day after), providing a copy to the Provost's office for preliminary review and delivery to the Academic Assessment Committee for review.
 - iii. The Provost or designee may, at his or her discretion, request additional review by external partners.
 - iv. Upon receipt of the Academic Assessment Committee's review, the program provides an action plan to the Provost, who may choose to accept the report or require additional revisions.
 - v. The process concludes upon the Provost's satisfaction that the program has completed its work successfully.
 - vi. At end of year three of the six-year cycle, the program may be required to submit a status update report to the Academic Assessment Committee and Provost regarding progress towards the action plan's goals. Mid-cycle reports are due if recommended by the AAC and signed off by the Provost.