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Introduction

What is Academic Program Review?
Academic program review (APR) is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of all academic programs offered on the campuses of the three Arizona state universities. Arizona Board of Regents’ (ABOR) policy 2-208 (Academic Program Review) states that academic departments are the basic unit of review. Both departmentally based programs and programs administered by committees are reviewed at least once every seven years. According to Board policy, the standard review consists of a self-study, followed by a review that includes experts from outside the University. An academic program review is not a review of the unit head.

Purpose
According to ABOR policy, academic program review fulfills several purposes. The process is designed to assess program quality and facilitate program improvement where appropriate and to assist in achieving the best use of institutional resources. The information gathered in the course of the review will assist in University and State planning efforts.

The primary purpose of academic program review is to examine, assess, and strengthen programs. The areas in which program quality is evaluated include, but are not limited to: (a) the quality of educational programs, including an assessment of student outcomes; (b) the quality of research, creative activity, or scholarly work; (c) the quality of outreach activities and service to the University, the profession, and the community; (d) the contribution or importance of the program to other campus programs; and (e) the potential and future expectations for the program. The review is intended (1) to enhance the quality of a program and to assist in determining a program’s ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities, (2) to evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and thus, determine future priorities, and (3) to aid in shaping the strategic plan for the program.

APR Administration at the UA
Academic program reviews are overseen by the Senior Vice President and Provost. For departments/programs in the Health Sciences (Colleges of Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Public Health), the Vice President for Health Affairs will also provide oversight of the review. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs administers the process. Members of the Office of Curricular Affairs serve as consultants to academic units, particularly as questions arise in the preparation of self-studies, and provide assistance to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in the culminating phases of the review process.

Seven-Year APR Schedule and Accreditation Reviews
The seven-year APR schedule is developed in consultation with the deans of the various colleges and conforms to ABOR calendar requirements. Under exceptional circumstances and with the approval of the dean and the Provost, a review may be extended or postponed. When possible, the schedule is coordinated with other review and accreditation obligations of the programs. It is important to note that accreditation reviews are conducted for other purposes and might not take the place of the academic program review. However, elements of and preparation for these reviews may overlap. Many accreditation or other reviews have a self-study that requires many if not most of the items suggested for the APR self-study in Appendix B, and the APR self-study
or the accreditation/other review self-study can be tailored to meet the needs of the other. In some instances, the review teams have been the same for both reviews.

**The Process**

The academic program review process includes the five major steps outlined below. These steps are: (1) initial planning, (2) self-study, (3) joint internal/external review, (4) discussion of findings, and (5) the report to the Arizona Board of Regents. The explanation of each step includes guidelines for the review process. While the guidelines are not binding and may be adapted to the needs of the individual program under study, they should be followed as closely as possible.

The timetable required for the review of an academic program should be one academic year. A model timetable for the entire review process is found in Appendix A. Actual time for each step will vary according to the department. It is critical that the review process be accomplished within the proposed time frame so that required reports can be submitted to ABOR.

**Initial Planning**

The academic program review process will be initiated each academic year by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

- In the spring semester that precedes the academic program review year, letters will be sent to the appropriate deans notifying them of the programs under their purview scheduled for review.
- Late in the spring or early in the fall semester, deans, unit heads, and appropriate staff will be invited to participate in an orientation workshop to launch the academic program review process. This workshop will serve as an introduction to the APR process and its purposes, and it will provide guidelines for successful completion.

As with any review process, there is a need for support, ranging from secretarial assistance to payment of expenses for external reviewers. It is expected that such support for the APR will be provided by the program being reviewed, its college, or a combination of the two. Costs should be part of the department head-dean discussion at an early date. Hotel and travel arrangements for out-of-town APR committee members should be made as early as possible to avoid increased costs and limited availability due to conflicts with other events such as Rodeo Days and the Gem and Mineral Show.

**The Self-Study**

**A. Guidelines**

A thorough and thoughtful self-study will candidly assess a program’s past and present efforts and will outline a realistic course for the program’s future. The self-study provides the basis for the entire review process. Therefore, it is critical that the study cover all aspects of the academic program. It is of particular importance that the self-study pays special attention to measures of quality. If a self-study has been undertaken within the previous year for accreditation or other purposes, it is possible, with appropriate modifications and updating, to adapt parts of that study for academic program review purposes.
The areas and issues to be covered by the self-study are reflected in the *Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline* (Appendix B). The self-study should:

- Go beyond the issues and questions raised in the outline, as necessary.
- Disregard questions not pertinent to the program.
- Provide the general framework of the review.
- Be augmented by whatever supplemental information is deemed necessary to create an effective self-assessment.
- Be succinct, yet thorough.

**B. Composition and Appointment of the Self-Study Committee**

- Membership of the self-study committee generally is recommended by the program head with final appointments made by the dean.
- Membership usually consists of three or more faculty from the unit being reviewed, but may include all faculty working through subcommittees.
- It is recommended that committee members be selected from among those faculty with a good understanding of the department, as well as of the discipline/profession.
- This group should include both junior and senior faculty, staff, and student representatives.

**C. Procedures**

- The self-study should be started immediately following the orientation workshop so that it can be completed in time for a detailed review by the Office of Curricular Affairs and then mailed to the review team at least three weeks before the review (see Appendix A).
- The model timetable allows sufficient time for the completion of a comprehensive report.
- No specific procedures have been established for how the self-study is to be conducted.
- By following the outline provided in Appendix B and expanding upon those areas of special relevance to a particular review, the report will be responsive to the requirements and intent of the academic program review process.
- It is important that every effort be made to ensure that the process and the resulting report are comprehensive.
- It is also essential that the process and results be open and available to all members (faculty, students, and staff) of the department or program.

**D. Data for the Self-Study**

It is recommended that:

- The self-study committee should make a special effort to gather all relevant data and present the findings clearly in ways that serve as a basis for the review;
- Interview all faculty and selected representative students and alumni;
- Gain information from other campus and non-campus resources, as appropriate.

Data for the report should include information about the students, faculty, and staff (see Appendix B). Most of the student data for the seven-year APR period may be pulled by a designated member of your unit or APR Committee from an *APR Dashboard in UAccess Analytics*. Data stored in UAccess Analytics includes the number of majors, minors, and graduates from the program, department and college. The person designated to pull student data from UAccess Analytics will need “Medium Level” authorization to access this dashboard.
Please notify Celeste Pardee by mid-July with the name and e-mail address of the APR data contact for your unit.

Student data for the seven-year APR period ending in June (to include May graduates) will be available from the Dashboard in early August. Rachel Serrano will schedule APR Dashboard training sessions for the designated users in August – September.

Data that is not available in UAccess Analytics will be pulled from the Integrated Information Warehouse (IIW) by Celeste and sent to the data contact for the unit. For example, for 2012 it will have 2 years of data on personnel (i.e., faculty, staff, graduate assistants) and will be available on the APR Dashboard; the first 5 - 6 years of data will be pulled from the IIW. Data on student FTE and SCH might be available on the Dashboard; if not, Celeste will obtain these data from the IIW. Data on funding by the State and revenue from sponsored projects are not available on the Dashboard, but your business manager may obtain funding data from UAccess Financials.

Questions about the APR data may be directed to Celeste, cpardee@u.arizona.edu or 621-5375. Questions about the APR Dashboard may be directed to Rachel, at rstclair@email.arizona.edu or 621-9273.”

Information about data presentation:

- Please include only information available since the last APR report.
- Note that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), prohibits releasing any personal data on a student, i.e., grade point averages, standardized test scores, etc., without written permission from the student (http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/), but this information can be presented collectively if individual students cannot be identified.
- ABOR has a policy on the number of degrees that need to be produced. Low-degree producing programs (see Appendix D) will be notified by the Office of Curricular Affairs and provided with information that will need to be included in the self-study.

E. Review of Self-Study Report

- A working draft of the self-study report should be sent electronically to Celeste Pardee (cpardee@u.arizona.edu), in the Office of Curricular Affairs, no later than 8 weeks prior to the site visit.
- An initial review will be performed and feedback will be provided. This step gives the self-study committee an opportunity to polish the report before it is submitted to the college dean.
- Once completed and approved by the dean, two hard copies and one electronic copy of the self-study report should be sent to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for review at least 3 weeks before the visit.
- A copy of the self-study report should also be sent to each member of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee at least three weeks before the visit. Consider asking whether they would prefer an electronic copy or a hard copy.
Joint Internal/External Review Committee

A. Selection of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee
Prior to completion of the self-study and no later than late August, the self-study committee should suggest possible nominees for the Joint Internal/External Review Committee. The recommendations should be made to the unit head who will convey the recommendations to the dean. The recommendations to the dean should include at least two possible reviewers for each position described below.

B. Joint Internal/External Review Committee Composition
The review committee should include seven members:

- 3 external committee members (selected from the unit’s current and aspirational peers)
- 2 internal committee members
  - one from within the college of the department under review
  - one from a college other than the department’s college
- 1 community member
- 1 recent alumnus

Characteristics of the External members of review committee:
- Represent the various academic areas covered by the program and be familiar with the various research specializations or scholarly work of the faculty.
- Be full professors or department heads with a national stature.
- Be free of conflicts of interest that would prevent them from conducting an objective review; should not be alumni from the program or have collaborations with members of the program.
- Should include members of underrepresented groups and women

Characteristics of the other members of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee:
- Community committee members could be members of advisory groups (college, unit, or University) or professionals in a related field working in the community. They should not have an appointment in the department under review.
- Alumni can be community members working in the area, but should not be a current member of the department under review.
- Internal committee members should be – one from another college and one from another department in the same college, should generally be full professors, and should not have a joint appointment in or collaboration with faculty the unit under review.

C. Selection of Possible Dates for the Site Visit
- By October 1st, it is the responsibility of the unit head to establish two sets of possible site visit dates with the dean and then with the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- Consult with Barbara Martinez, Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (626-4099: bmarti@email.arizona.edu), to ensure that the potential dates for the site visit work for the Senior Vice President and Provost (and the Vice President for Health Affairs if appropriate) and for the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Two suitable site visit dates will be reserved on their calendars.
- The site visit takes two full days and must be completed by late April in order to prepare reports for ABOR.
D. Selection Process for the Reviewers

- The department head should contact the possible external and internal, community and alumni review committee nominees informally very early in the process to determine their interest and availability for two sets of possible site visit dates. The nominees should be informed that the site visit is two full days.
- Every effort should be made to consider diversity when assembling the list of potential reviewers.
- Two nominees for each position on the site visit committee should be submitted to the dean for review and approval. (See Appendix A)
- Following approval from the dean, the list of 14 nominees (two candidates for each position on the site visit committee) is then submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- The list of nominees must include a brief biosketch and complete contact information (mailing address, email address, and phone number).
- The committee chair will be selected by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- When the review team membership and site visit dates are confirmed, the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will send letters formally appointing the chair and review committee members. This mailing will include the website address for the Procedures Manual for Academic Program Reviews and a list of committee members invited to serve.

E. Communication with the Internal/External Review Committee

- The unit head should mail the self-study, faculty CVs, and other appropriate material to the reviewers following their acceptance of appointment, but at least three weeks prior to the visit.
- Some reviewers may also want this information in an electronic format (sent as attachments to an email); please check with reviewers about their preferences.
- No specific guidelines have been established for the remuneration of external reviewers. This matter is the responsibility of and at the discretion of unit heads and deans.
- The unit head should make arrangements for hotels and transportation with the review committee members from out of town. Payment for these expenses is the responsibility of the program being reviewed, its college, or a combination of the two.

F. Itinerary for the Site Visit

- As early as possible in the fall semester, it is the unit's responsibility to schedule the Joint Internal/External Review Committee's meetings with the Senior Vice President and Provost, (and the Vice President for Health Affairs if appropriate) and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (see suggested itinerary Appendix C).
- The Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will assist with scheduling these meetings.
- Three weeks before the visit, a draft site visit review committee itinerary should be prepared and sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, (bmarti@email.arizona.edu) for review.
- After the draft itinerary has been approved, the final review committee itinerary should be prepared and sent to the reviewers no later than two weeks before the visit.
• The schedule should be sufficiently flexible to allow the inclusion of additional appointments at the committee’s request.
• The visit should span two full days to allow sufficient time for reviewers to meet with administrators, faculty, students, staff, and others; to visit facilities; and to prepare a draft of their review report.
• It is appropriate for the unit head to meet with the review committee for one breakfast or one lunch, but generally not more. The committee needs time alone for discussion.
• The committee will review the self-study in depth, and interview faculty members, staff, students, and other individuals as appropriate (college and university administrators, faculty and/or department heads of related departments, and public or private groups with whom the department interacts).
• The review committee may request additional information or data that may be deemed necessary and appropriate to do a complete review.

G. Joint Internal/External Review Committee Should Examine:
• Undergraduate and graduate programs and student quality, as appropriate.
• Student outcomes assessment.
• Research, teaching, and academic outreach efforts of the faculty.
• Fiscal and physical resources.
• Recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented ethnic or minority groups and women.
• Academic and administrative organization.
• Inter- or cross-disciplinary cooperation with other units.

These suggestions are not exhaustive. The Joint Internal/External Review Committee is encouraged to be responsive to other issues that come to the fore in the course of the review. It is expected that the review committee will make specific recommendations for improvement of the quality of the program, as well as identify those aspects of the program(s) that are exemplary.
• The external reviewers, as experts in the discipline, will be encouraged to evaluate the program in its national context.
• Attention should be given to the depth and breadth of faculty scholarship, the quality of undergraduate and graduate education, the status of the department as a learning community, and the commitment of individuals to support the department, college, and university vision.
• The reviewers should feel free to respond to the findings of the self-study and comment upon any other issues that bear upon the quality of the academic program.

H. Joint Internal/External Review Committee Final Report
• The committee should provide its final report to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs within three weeks of the conclusion of the site visit.
• The report will be distributed to the Senior Vice President and Provost, the dean and unit head, and, if appropriate, the Vice President for Health Affairs.
• The final report should include: a) Introduction, b) Strengths, c) Weaknesses, and d) Recommendations.
• The report of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee should make specific suggestions for improvement of the program.
• When the report is forwarded to the University of Arizona, it will be considered a public document that will be shared with faculty, students, staff, and others upon request.

Discussion of the Findings: Conclusions and Recommendations

• Following the receipt and subsequent distribution of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee’s report, a concluding conference with the Senior Vice President and Provost (and, as appropriate, the Vice President for Health Affairs), the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the dean, and the program head will be scheduled.
• The unit self-study and review committee report will provide a basis for discussion at this meeting. Additionally, an evaluation of the self-study section on student learning outcomes assessment (undergraduate and graduate) will be given to the program head. The Assistant Vice Provost for Instruction and Assessment will then contact the program head to schedule a discussion on steps that can be taken to improve assessment.
• The unit head may also provide a short letter of response to the dean, Senior Vice President and Provost (and, as appropriate, the Vice President for Health Affairs), and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs regarding the conclusions and recommendations in the report from the Joint Internal/External Review Committee prior to this final meeting.
• This meeting will be scheduled by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
• The purpose of the meeting is to consider the findings and recommendations of the review.
• The decisions reached at the concluding conference are documented in the report to ABOR.

Report to the Arizona Board of Regents

The final step in the Academic Program Review process is preparation of a summary report on the year’s academic program reviews for the Arizona Board of Regents. Upon ABOR request, a three-page narrative summary report will also be prepared for the Board and will include: (a) a description of the program; (b) an outline of the most recent previous review and responses; (c) procedures used in the review process; (d) major findings and conclusions of the review; (e) future plans for the program; and (f) a follow-up monitoring and reporting plan. A data summary will be appended to the narrative. A copy of the report will be sent to all those involved in the process.
# APPENDIX A

## ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TASK GUIDELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who/What</th>
<th>When (Deadline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Head</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends APR Orientation</td>
<td>Late Spring, early Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits recommendations for self-study committee members to Dean</td>
<td>Late Spring, early Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures progress on Self-Study Report (SSR)</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and contacts 14 Joint Internal/External Review Committee nominees and reserves dates for 2-day site visit</td>
<td>Late September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves two sets of site visit dates on Vice Provost, Provost &amp; Dean’s calendars</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwards list of 14 willing and available review committee nominees to Dean</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirms dates for site visit with Vice Provost &amp; Provost’s Office &amp; Dean’s office</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwards draft copy of SSR to Celeste Pardee in the Office of Curricular Affairs</td>
<td>8 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends Self-Study Report to Dean for approval</td>
<td>4 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends 2 hard copies &amp; 1 electronic copy of approved Self-Study Report to Vice Provost</td>
<td>3 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends Self-Study Report to all Joint Internal/External Review Committee members</td>
<td>3 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends draft site visit itinerary to Vice Provost for review</td>
<td>at least 3 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends final itinerary for site visit to Vice Provost and review committee members</td>
<td>2 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE VISIT</td>
<td>no later than April 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends final meeting with Dean, Vice Provost, and Provost</td>
<td>shortly after receipt of review cmte report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who/What</th>
<th>When (Deadline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoints self-study committee</td>
<td>Late Spring, early September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves 14 Joint internal/External Review Committee nominees and forwards list to Vice Provost</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures progress on Self-Study Report</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends final meeting with unit head, Vice Provost &amp; Provost</td>
<td>September - November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who/What</th>
<th>When (Deadline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Vice Provost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates self-study report on learning outcomes assessment, meets with unit head or program directors to discuss an assessment plan for units after final meeting</td>
<td>Shortly after receipt of review cmte report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who/What</th>
<th>When (Deadline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with unit for initial planning when requested by unit</td>
<td>as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews list of Joint Internal/External Review Committee nominees</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects the 7 members of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifies department of the selection of review committee members</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends invitation letter to the review committee members</td>
<td>Late December-Early January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwards feedback on draft itinerary to the unit</td>
<td>Shortly after receipt of itinerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributes review committee report to unit head, Dean, and Provost</td>
<td>Shortly after receipt of review cmte report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends final meeting with unit head, Dean, and Provost</td>
<td>Shortly after receipt of review cmte report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes final report for ABOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who/What</th>
<th>When (Deadline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Vice President and Provost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with review committee on last day of site visit</td>
<td>Preferably, no later than the end of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds final meeting with unit head, Dean and Vice Provost</td>
<td>Shortly after receipt of review cmte report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who/What</th>
<th>When (Deadline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Curricular Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides consulting to units in the preparation of self-study</td>
<td>Summer through Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides some institutional data for self-study</td>
<td>Summer - Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and forwards feedback on draft Self-Study Report to the unit</td>
<td>shortly after receiving report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends SSR to Assistant Vice Provost for evaluation (learning outcomes assessment)</td>
<td>when final self-study is ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares summary for final meeting with Provost</td>
<td>one week prior to the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares summary for ABOR following site visit</td>
<td>Summer following the review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY GUIDE

A. SELF STUDY SUMMARY

Provide a short summary that includes:

1. Short statement about the administrative home of the unit (School, College, etc).
2. List the number of faculty at various ranks.
3. List of the number of lecturers, adjunct instructors, and post-doctoral fellows.
4. List of the academic programs for undergraduates, graduate students, and professional students, as appropriate, and indicate number of students enrolled in each program.
5. Briefly summarize the strengths and challenges of the unit—those that will be discussed in more detail in other sections.

B. UNIT DESCRIPTION AND GOALS

Briefly describe the unit under review, including research centers sponsored by the unit, with statements on:

1. Mission, role, and scope.
2. Major goals or strategic directions for the next 5 years (may append a strategic plan)
3. Relationship of goals to the University Strategic Plan and Mission as expressed in the University of Arizona’s Five-Year Strategic Plan [http://plan.web.arizona.edu/strategic-plan.pdf](http://plan.web.arizona.edu/strategic-plan.pdf)

C. UNIT HISTORY

1. Describe any major changes that have occurred in the unit since the last review including new academic programs and programs that have been renamed, merged, or disestablished.
2. Provide a summary of the recommendations of the previous academic program review and changes made in response to the recommendations.

D. OVERVIEW OF THE UNIT’S ACADEMIC QUALITY

1. Outline the indicators and sources of information by which the unit is judged including:
   a. Resources indicators, e.g., student selectivity or demand; faculty prestige, training, and teaching loads; grants and contracts; library; equipment; and support staff
   b. Reputational indicators, e.g., national or international ranking, or other judgments of the program’s students, faculty, resources, and productivity
   c. Outcome indicators, e.g., unique faculty scholarly productivity, awards and honors, research contributions, teaching performance, service to state
and nation; student gains in knowledge, students’ professional achievements, placement, personal or career development; and program alumni opinion.

2. Identify the top five programs in the field among public research universities. Describe how this unit compares and the sources of information used for the comparison.

E. FACULTY

1. Describe the overall nature and breadth of the faculty’s research and other scholarly contributions in the generation of knowledge, exemplary practice or creative performance with an appraisal of the most significant contributions to advancing the field or discipline.

2. Describe the faculty’s participation, leadership, and influence in the academic profession through such avenues as professional associations, review panels, and advisory groups.

3. Describe the teaching activities of the faculty. Provide documentation (may be placed in the Appendix) about the quality of the teaching activities by faculty and lecturers in this unit.

4. Describe recent faculty recruiting and planned directions for future faculty hires. Provide a table for the last seven years outlining the number of faculty at all ranks who were hired, retired or resigned, and reviewed for promotion and tenure (including results).

5. Provide a table showing faculty compensation range and average comparisons by rank with relevant peer institutions named in section D-2.

6. Provide a table with the number of faculty by gender and race/ethnicity. Describe efforts to recruit and retain faculty from underrepresented groups.

7. Provide short biographical sketches (may be included in an appendix) of faculty that includes recent publications or listing of scholarly work, current grant funding, recent invited lectures, honors, major service or committee assignments, etc.

F. UNIT ADMINISTRATION

1. Provide an organizational chart for the unit and describe the governance structure and involvement of faculty.

2. Provide a table of classified staff and professional staff by appointment type. Comment on any unusual annual turnover rates in the years since the last APR. List the members by gender and race/ethnicity. Describe efforts to recruit and retain staff and appointed personnel from underrepresented groups.

3. Comment on the adequacy of staff support and any plans for reconfiguration.
G. UNIT RESOURCES

1. Describe and appraise support services for the unit: (a) teaching program(s), (b) research, creative production, and other scholarly activities, (c) outreach, including professional and community service, and (d) administration.

2. Describe any specific resource needs, e.g., library, laboratory, classrooms, classroom support, office space, technology support, office personnel, research assistants, and how they are typically funded.

3. Comment on projected changes in unit activities and quality outcomes if additional resources were available.

H. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS, DEGREE PROGRAMS AND OUTCOMES

(If none, please so indicate) The goal of this section is to provide descriptions and supporting data for undergraduate program outcomes assessment and assessment of student learning outcomes.

When reporting student data, please follow FERPA guidelines, available at http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/.

1. Identify the undergraduate degree program(s) offered by the unit, including tracks or options within your programs. List the CIP codes for each program.

   The CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is a six-digit code developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify the primary discipline of an academic program. CIP codes are widely used in both national surveys and studies, and are the accepted government taxonomy standard for higher education program classification. It is recommended that units cross reference their unit with the CIP code on the NCES web site (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55) to confirm alignment of unit’s mission with current CIP code. Current CIP codes can be obtained from Celeste Pardee.

2. Describe enrollment trends for each undergraduate degree program, providing student data pulled from the APR Dashboard in UAccess Analytics.

3. Describe the contributions of the unit to offering proficiency/foundations/general education courses including who teaches, how quality is assessed, and how updating is monitored. Describe the planning process and how these courses are coordinated with other courses.

4. Undergraduate Programs - major(s) and minor(s) curricula and courses

   a. Describe how the undergraduate curriculum reflects the basic goals of the academic program. If there are options or tracks in the degree program, describe these. Include the program and/or courses available at UA South, if applicable.

   b. Does an accrediting body prescribe the curriculum(s)? If yes, briefly summarize the outcome of the most recent accreditation.
c. Describe how the degree programs compare to similar programs nationally and any plans that are underway to change or strengthen courses or course sequencing in the curriculum.

d. Discuss whether courses in the undergraduate program(s) are sufficient and balanced among the various specialties, tracks, options or career directions to meet student needs and interests.

e. Discuss any challenge with course availability in your program and in other programs that are needed by your students.

f. Describe active learning strategies that are used within each degree program, including internships, practica, work-study, or seminars.

g. Describe the use of instructional technology within program courses. For example, do your faculty use: 1) D2L for content delivery and to receive student assignments, 2) response devices (clickers), 3) podcasting, 4) UA YouTube presentations, 5) Elluminate for voice, video, or text sharing online, 6) Second Life, 7) Instructional Blogging, etc.

h. Discuss whether online courses are available for required or elective courses.

5. Undergraduate Students:

a. Summarize available data on how the quality of students selecting unit degree programs for a major compare with the quality of students, graduation rates, and time to degree in other fields at the University of Arizona.

b. Provide information on gender and race/ethnicity composition of the students in the unit (majors). FERPA rules require that you do not list students by name. Describe activities enacted for recruiting and retaining students from underrepresented ethnic groups, the challenges, and the successes.

c. Describe any efforts being done to attract and retain well qualified undergraduate students.

d. Explain how undergraduates majoring in the unit’s program(s) are advised and any challenges to the process or plans for change.

e. Summarize any data on how alumni of the undergraduate degree programs view their educational experience. List data on graduation outcomes (percent attending graduate school, types of jobs obtained following graduation, etc.)

6. Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Address bullets a-d in this section of the self-study. Refer to bullet e for additional requirements on regular program assessment reporting.

a. EXPECTED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: State the expected student learning outcomes for each undergraduate degree program offered in the unit.

b. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: List and briefly discuss the activities used to measure the expected student learning outcomes. Activities should include direct and indirect measures of outcomes. Describe how faculty, staff, and students are involved in the development and implementation of the activities.
c. **ASSESSMENT FINDINGS:** Report and discuss the actual findings from program assessment activities. Examples of findings may include summaries of rubric scores, exit exam scores, survey responses to targeted questions, or narrative responses.

d. **CHANGES MADE IN RESPONSE TO FINDINGS:** Indicate how the assessment findings are used to: 1) improve student learning and classroom instruction, 2) assist in strategic program planning, and 3) review, evaluate, and modify the curriculum in your programs. See Figure 1.

e. Examine the information for your academic unit on the UA assessment website at [http://www.assessment.arizona.edu](http://www.assessment.arizona.edu). Before submitting the self-study, be sure the website has been updated with all of the information you have reported in this section. For assistance with website information, contact Becky Perez at rperez@email.arizona.edu. Programs are expected to update assessment websites annually.

![Figure 1: A Faculty-Driven Process for Program Level Assessment of Student Outcomes](image)

### I. GRADUATE STUDENTS, DEGREE PROGRAM(S) AND OUTCOMES

(If none, please indicate this) The goal of this section is to provide descriptions and supporting data for graduate program outcomes assessment and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Please follow FERPA guidelines, [http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/](http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/) when reporting student data.

1. **Overview:**

   Describe the graduate degree program(s) offered by this unit. Include, as appropriate, approved options within your programs, dual degrees, joint degrees, accelerated masters programs and post-baccalaureate and/or graduate certificate programs. Describe any changes that have occurred in recent years and changes planned for the future.

   The CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is a six-digit code developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify the primary discipline of an academic program. CIP codes are widely used in both national surveys and studies, and are the accepted government taxonomy standard for higher education program
classification. It is recommended that units cross reference their unit with the CIP code under the NCES web site (http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/ciplist.asp) to confirm alignment of unit's mission with current CIP code. Current CIP codes can be obtained from Celeste Pardee.

2. Graduate Program - Curriculum and Courses:
   a. Describe the extent to which the courses in the graduate degree program(s) are sufficient and balanced among various specialties, options, tracks, or career directions to meet student needs and interest.
   b. Describe active learning strategies that are used within each degree program, including internships, practica, teaching internships, and/or assistantships.
   c. Describe the use of instructional technology within program courses. For example, do your faculty use: 1) D2L for content delivery and to receive student assignments, 2) response devices (clickers), 3) podcasting, 4) UA YouTube presentations, 5) Elluminate for voice, video, or text sharing online, 6) Second Life, 7) Instructional Blogging, etc.
   d. Discuss whether online courses are available for required or elective courses.
   e. Comment on the adequacy of the resources available for graduate students to carry out their studies, e.g., office and lab space, supplies, travel, photocopying, etc.
   f. Comment on the proportion of PhD students in your program who take courses or complete minors in other disciplines and the proportion of PhD students from other disciplines who take courses or complete a minor in your programs. Discuss any coordination problems.

3. Graduate Students:
   a. Describe mechanisms used to recruit students, and how well the program is competing for the top students. Compare the quality of students in this (these) graduate program(s) with students in other similar programs and the quality since the last APR review (based on GREs, GPAs, or other admissions criteria).
   b. Describe enrollment trends for each graduate degree program, providing student data pulled from the APR Dashboard in UAccess Analytics.
   c. Provide data on gender and race/ethnicity composition of the current graduate students with majors in the unit and comment on similar graduate programs at other schools.
   d. Comment on the number and adequacy of the stipends and assistantships. In addressing this, indicate the percentage of graduate students in the program(s) that have a teaching or research assistantship; the salary range of stipends for half-time research assistantships and teaching assistantships; travel support provided to students presenting scholarly papers.
   e. Comment on the average ratio of student/faculty thesis and dissertation supervision and the time to degree in each graduate program since the last APR and compare to other programs in this discipline. Indicate the six and eight year
completion rates. Summarize information from exit interviews in your programs. Provide a list of the graduate student placements since the last APR.

f. Discuss the scholarship activities of your graduate students (being mindful of FERPA policy), such as conference presentations and publications.

4. Graduate Student Learning Outcomes Assessment:
   Address bullets a-d in this section of the self-study. Refer to bullet e for additional requirements on regular program assessment reporting.

a. EXPECTED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: State the expected student learning outcomes for each graduate degree program offered in the unit.

b. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: List and briefly discuss the activities used to appropriately measure the expected student learning outcomes. Activities should include direct and indirect measures of outcomes. Describe how faculty, staff, and students are involved in the development and implementation of the activities.

c. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: Report and discuss the actual findings from program assessment activities. Examples of findings may include summaries of rubric scores, exit exam scores, survey responses to targeted questions, or narrative responses.

d. CHANGES MADE IN RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: Indicate how the assessment findings are used to: 1) improve student learning and classroom instruction, 2) assist in strategic program planning, and 3) review, evaluate, and modify the curriculum in your programs. See Figure 1.

e. Examine the information for your academic unit on the UA assessment website at http://www.assessment.arizona.edu. Before submitting the self-study, be sure the website has been updated with all of the information you have reported in this section. For assistance with website information, contact Becky Perez at rperez@email.arizona.edu. Programs are expected to update assessment websites annually.
5. **Post-Doctoral Fellows**
   Describe your post-doctoral fellowship program, if applicable. How many post-docs have positions in your unit? In what ways do your post-doctoral fellows contribute to the unit? List the range of time and mean length of time that post-docs stay in your unit. List the positions post-docs have taken when they leave the program.

**J. ACADEMIC OUTREACH**

Outreach refers to educational efforts, leadership, and sharing of knowledge off-campus, for example in the local community and throughout the State.

1. Describe the nature and outcomes of academic outreach activities in this unit.
2. Comment on these activities and support with the goal(s) of the unit and the particular needs of Arizona.

**K. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER UNITS**

Outline the main collaborations of your unit with other departments, schools and/or colleges, include joint or dual degrees and Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs, as appropriate.

**L. FACULTY PLANNING**

1. What is the faculty’s collective view of the program’s future, its desired directions, and its means for reaching these objectives?
2. How do planning and incentives direct the program to these ends?

**M. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: THRESHOLD FOR DEFINING PRODUCTIVE PROGRAMS**

ABOR requires that programs with low degree production (degrees produced below established threshold, see table below) do an evaluation and report the results to ABOR as part of the APR. Units with programs that have failed to attain the required number of degrees over the three years will be notified by the Office of Curricular Affairs. Methodology for this report is found in Appendix D. Contact the Office of Curricular Affairs if you have questions. Discuss this issue in the self-study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Degree</th>
<th>3-Year Degree Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>24 or more degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>9 or more degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6 or more degrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Threshold for Defining Productive Programs
Arizona University System
APPENDIX C
SAMPLE ITINERARY

Day 1
8:00 – 8:30 a.m.   Orientation with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
8:30 – 9:00 a.m.   Meeting with Dean
9:00 – 9:30 a.m.   Meeting with Self-Study Committee
9:30 – 9:45 a.m.   Break
9:45 – 10:45 a.m.  Meeting with junior faculty members
10:45 – 11:45 a.m. Open meeting with graduate students
11:45 – 1:00 p.m.  Lunch with Department Head
1:00 – 2:00 p.m.   Time to take a tour of facilities and/or for additional meetings
2:00 – 3:00 p.m.   Meeting with senior faculty members
3:00 – 4:00 p.m.   Meeting with other Department Heads in the College
4:00 – End of Day  Review committee begins draft report

*Include meeting with Graduate College Dean etc., as appropriate*

Day 2
8:00 – 9:00 a.m.   Meeting with staff
9:00 – 10:00 a.m.  Meeting with undergraduate students
10:00 – 10:15 a.m. Break
10:15 – 12:00 p.m. Meeting with chairs of undergraduate or graduate programs, other campus individuals, or time to work on the report
12:00 – 1:30 p.m.  Working lunch
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.   Meeting with Dean
2:30 – 3:00 p.m.   Travel to Administration Building
3:00 – 4:00 p.m.   Exit interview with Senior Vice President and Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (and Vice President for Health Affairs as appropriate)
4:00 – End of Day  Write report

*Include meeting with community members and alumni, as appropriate.*
APPENDIX D
METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING LOW PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS

As part of the Academic Program Review, degree programs will be reviewed for degree productivity using the methodology outlined below. Reports on low productivity are provided to the Arizona Board of Regents each year following the APR and potentially at other times, when requested.

Identify Programs with Degree Production below Thresholds

Undergraduate

Institutions will review degree information for each academic program for the most recent three years for which degrees-awarded data are available. Each degree and each major earned by a given student will count as a degree for this purpose (following IPEDS).

- Academic programs are expected to award twenty-four or more undergraduate degrees over the three-year period.
- Degrees with differing titles (e.g., B.A., B.S., etc.) for a given major will be combined for purposes of the threshold analysis if substantial overlap of course work exists among the different degrees.
- Degrees granted to students with dual majors are counted with each major.
- The review of undergraduate programs excludes interdisciplinary programs.

Graduate

For programs granting degrees at the masters or doctoral level, institutions will review the number of degrees granted in the most recent three years for which degrees-awarded data are available.

- Academic programs are expected to grant nine or more masters degrees and six or more doctoral degrees over the three-year period.
- In programs that offer both master’s and doctoral degrees, the doctoral degree numbers will be used to identify productivity of the program (i.e., if the number of doctoral degrees awarded is above the threshold, the masters program need not meet or exceed the threshold for masters degree programs.
- Degrees with differing titles (e.g., M.A., M.S., etc.) for a given major will be combined for purposes of the threshold analysis if substantial overlap of course work exists among the different degrees.
- Dual degrees granted to a student are counted separately.
- The review of graduate programs excludes interdisciplinary programs.

Low degree production may occur because:

- The program no longer accepts students and is in the process of being phased out or has temporarily suspended admissions to undergo restructuring.
- The program was approved by the Arizona Board of Regents and implemented by the institution within the last six years. (Central office staff will provide each university with the year of ABOR approval).
• The program is offered at an off-campus location or at an alternate campus that offers unique degree programs or is an on-line program that is unique from other programs offered at the University. Degrees from university programs that are offered at other sites are counted with the majors and degrees offered on campus. Justifications for the low degree production and a plan for improvements must be provided.

Programs with low degree productivity should be reviewed for viability. If a low productivity degree is duplicative, a plan should be developed to assess its viability relative to similar programs at other Arizona’s state universities and implement steps to modify or eliminate the program.

**Review Programs that Are Below the Low Degree Production Threshold for Criteria that Might Support Retention**

A program might be recommended for retention if one of a variety of institutional priorities is met. These recommendations may be made by the Provost in a report to the ABOR. These might include:

• **Basic academic subject:**
  The program is considered a basic academic subject offered by a majority (8 or more) of our peer institutions. The most recent IPEDS Degree Completion report should be used to compare CIP code and degree levels at the peer institutions.

• **Program quality:**
  Quality may be demonstrated by student, faculty, or overall program quality. Examples of measures include evidence of instructional effectiveness, student performance and outcomes, employer satisfaction, student placement, research/scholarship/creative/artistic excellence, external funding, external recognition and national rankings, and accreditation.

• **Centrality to university mission:**
  Universities have complex missions with multiple goals. A program’s contribution to the university mission is evidenced by identifying the university goal that the program fulfills.

• **Contribution to other programs in the university:**
  Universities have responsibilities to provide students access to courses and programs of study that support both broad educational goals (such as general education) and specific student needs (such as certificate programs). Evidence of a program’s contribution to other programs in the university includes the number of student credit hours (or full-time equivalent students -- FTE) taught, courses taught that meet general education requirements, students completing minors, students completing certificates, courses required by other majors, and non-majors in courses required of majors.

• **Contributions to workforce development:**
  The program prepares graduates that are valuable and needed by industry, business, and other stakeholders in Arizona.

• **Program uniqueness:**
  The program is important to Arizona by virtue of its unique educational contribution. Uniqueness is evidenced by a distinctive program focus (such as community partnerships, internships, interdisciplinary, or unique intellectual focus).
- **Program Growth:**
  The program has recently been modified and there has been a significant increase in the number of students entering this major such that the number of degrees is expected to meet threshold within the next six years.

- **Program/unit revenue:**
  The unit housing the program generates significant revenue that can be used to support the program.

- **Access**
  The program provides opportunities to earn degrees to students that, for geographic or other reasons, would not be able to participate in other programs. The measure of access will be the number of students enrolled in the program from rural or otherwise under represented populations.

- **Other**

**Recommendations**

**Recommendations for programs not meeting any of the above conditions**

Based on the information provided from the reviews outlined above, the University will provide a recommendation to ABOR for each program that does not produce enough degrees to meet threshold. Recommendations may include that the program should be retained, eliminated, merged, or in some way modified.