

### **The Proposed Regulation 3-26: Revision Highlights**

1. The proposed document provides the Academic Program Review policies without going into the detailed procedures. By separating policies from procedures, it is easier to adjust specific procedures which may change. A document that suggests procedures aligned with this policy document may be developed as needed.
2. The purpose of program review is re-articulated in alignment with the [recently revised HLC accreditation criteria](#), particularly three, four, and five. While the current regulation emphasizes the external needs for the program review, the proposed regulation shifts the focus to the need for the regular and ongoing process for a program to: analyze the past and current performance; to receive independent feedback from the external reviewer; generate a actionable strategic plan for continuous improvement drawing upon the evidence obtained through these review processes; and contribute to the university-level decision making process (see 1. "Introduction").
3. The need to utilize data and information from IPAR and other sources in conducting a self-study is clearly addressed (see 2-A. "Overview of the Process"). IPAR's role in providing a common data set to all programs in a timely manner is also indicated (see 2-A. Overview of the Process" and 2-B. "Timeline").
4. The timeline is revised to ensure the timely completion of the program review process. The timeline also indicates specific deadlines for improved accountability (see 2-B. "Timeline").
5. The process for adjusting the program review process to each program's situation is more clearly addressed (see 2-C. "Accredited Programs").
6. The self-study report is substantially revised so as to focus on issues most relevant to the programs (see 3. "An Overview of the Program Self-Study Report").
7. The external reviewer selection process is refined to ensure the independent nature of the external review (see 4-A. "Selection of an External Reviewer").
8. The content of the external review report is simplified but with focus on key questions that would provide useful information to the programs (see 4-B. "External Review Report").
9. The process to "close the loop" is expanded to ensure the effect of the program review in the continuous improvement process at the program and university levels (see 5. "Program Response and Administrative Response").