



Academic Program Review and Program Improvement Process

Accreditation Process

Many Alliant programs are further accredited by accrediting bodies specific to their professions. These include:

Psychology and Mental Health

The Clinical Psychology PhD and PsyD programs offered on the Fresno, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego and San Francisco campuses, individually accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) (750 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242; Phone: 202-336-5979; Email: apaaccred@apa.org; Web: www.apa.org/ed/accreditation).

The Marital and Family Therapy master's and doctoral programs are accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE), of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (112 S Alfred Street Alexandria, VA 22314; Phone: 703/838-9808; Email: coamfte@aamft.org).

Education and Teaching

The Teaching credentialing programs, approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC, 1900 Capitol Ave., Sacramento, Ca 95814, Phone: 888-921-2682).

Law

San Francisco Law School, accredited by the Committee of Bar Examiners of the California State Bar (180 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, 415-538-2000).

As part of these professional accreditation processes, a program may establish an improvement plan or make changes to improve program outcomes. More information on changes being made to improve the program, if such a plan exists, may be available from the program director.

University Program Review Process

A University Program Review process was developed during spring and fall 2008, and adopted in December 2008.

The overarching purpose of Alliant's Program Review process is to ensure that Programs take a planned and strategic approach to quality enhancement and improved student learning. During the Program Review, the Program will demonstrate how it is delivering its stated objectives related to Program effectiveness. The process is designed to promote:



1. Alignment of the Program with the School and University mission;
2. Program self-reflection, planning and change, based on determined strengths, weaknesses and data;
3. Strategic response to areas of challenge – either those previously identified by the Program itself or those identified by other reviews;
4. Program modifications and enhancements leading to improved student success;
5. Development and implementation of ongoing assessment plans and improved assessment practices;
6. Consistent incorporation of key data and performance indicators into Program decision making; and
7. Overall Program quality.

There are two parts to the process for each Program:

- Annual Reports; and
- Intensive Reviews.

Annual Reports

Annual Reports are submitted on an individual Program basis.

Many closely-related programs share basic contextual issues, academic leadership, and faculty as well as financial resources budget; they may have very similar or overlapping student learning outcomes/competencies. In such cases, these closely related Programs submit one report, covering educational effectiveness activities and reviewing financial and basic student and faculty data, including retention and graduation rates.

These Reports are reviewed by the Dean who provides written feedback to the Program on the Report and the Program's strengths, challenges, and areas for improvement or attention. The Annual Reports and the Deans' feedback documents are reviewed by the Provost, who then meets with each Dean to discuss overarching strategic issues and areas of Program improvement as indicated by the Dean and the Provost. The Program is expected to incorporate this feedback into its plans and goal-setting for the subsequent years in order to improve its effectiveness and student learning.

Intensive Reviews

Programs undergo Intensive Review every 6-7 years. Similar or systemwide Programs are reviewed collectively by discipline, and sometimes also by degree or degree level depending on the type of Program.

As part of the Intensive Review process, Programs submit self studies addressing history; mission/and vision, program context; planning and evaluation; philosophy; curriculum and distinctiveness; student



learning outcomes assessment; teaching and learning environment; scholarship; service; budget/revenue and resources; and basic core student and faculty indicators.

On site Reviews are held over a two-day period by a Review Team consisting of members of the Alliant community external to the Program. The Team writes a Report addressing program strengths and challenges, and laying out recommendations or items to consider for improvement. This Report is delivered to the Program. The Program works with the Dean to review the recommendations, and ensure that attention is paid to concerns or program challenges. Actions taken are documented in the Program's Annual Reports submitted between Intensive Reviews.

Changes made in the program curricula to improve the programs appear in the subsequent year Alliant catalog.