UNC Program Review Purpose
Program review at the University of Northern Colorado is intended to support, develop, and maintain high quality programs. It is a collaborative process involving faculty, administrators, and students that respects the diversity of program missions and cultures while also recognizing the primacy of institutional mission. The program review process involves collecting and synthesizing program information to evaluate quality, identify opportunities, and make recommendations on actions and resources necessary to realize desired levels of excellence. Program review outcomes are used by faculty and administrators to promote campus goals and objectives, support strategic planning and decision-making, and inform budget and resource allocation.

UNC Program Review Guidelines for Non-Degree Granting Programs
The primary process through which program review is conducted at UNC is the comprehensive self-study. The self-study provides program faculty, administrators, staff, and the provost an opportunity to reflect on the historical role and outcomes of the program, evaluate the current program strengths and weaknesses, and strategically plan for the future of the program. These guidelines are intended to provide a consistent framework for conducting the self-study and presenting the findings. While the process through which programs conduct the self-study are left to the discretion of the program personnel working in consultation with the assistant vice president/dean, programs should address each of the topics identified within the guidelines following the report format described herein. These guidelines represent the institutional requirements for program review. Individual divisions may expand on these requirements as recommended by the division’s personnel.

Definition of a Program
A non-degree granting program is defined as a co-curricular organizational and budgetary unit that is responsible for delivering services, specialized programs, and/or courses not leading to a degree. For purposes of program review, personnel within each division, working collaboratively with the assistant vice president/dean, identify what programs exist within their respective division. This collaborative process provides flexibility to organize the review process so that it produces meaningful contributions to budget and strategic planning decisions.

Timeline
Each program should complete a comprehensive review every five years. Division personnel and the assistant vice president/dean should prepare a review schedule for each ten year period between regional accreditation. For professionally accredited programs the schedule should align UNC program review to accreditation timelines wherever possible.

CAS Standards
UNC has selected the CAS Standards to serve as the framework upon which programs will be reviewed. The CAS Standards consist of twelve components identified by the national Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) that together comprise essential characteristics of high quality programs. These standards are:

- Mission
- Program
- Organization & Leadership
- Human Resources
- Ethics
- Law, Policy, & Governance
- Diversity, Equity, & Access
- Institutional & External Relations
- Financial Resources
- Technology
- Facilities & Equipment
- Assessment & Evaluation
Programs should use the guidelines and rating scale developed by CAS to assess program strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities. Documentary evidence to support the evaluation of services and demonstrate program efficacy should be provided in a binder or electronic portfolio as an addendum to the self-study report.

**Accredited Programs**

Programs that are professionally accredited or those that operate under other nationally recognized standards may substitute those standards for the CAS Standards. The accreditation site team’s report may serve as the external review report, and the accreditation self-study, including any supporting documents, may substitute for the evidence binder. Programs seeking to use an accreditation report are required to provide an executive summary of the report that describes the following: (1) how the program supports the university mission and goals of the Academic Plan; (2) a brief discussion of significant program strengths and challenges; (3) goals for the next review period; and (4) discussion of resources necessary to achieve future goals.

**External Review**

External review of programs is expected and may be fulfilled through any of the following options:

- External accreditation site visit/review;
- Program-area expert external to the University; or
- Individual or review team comprised of industry experts and/or employers.

Programs should consult with the assistant vice president/dean to determine the appropriate option for conducting the external review. After selecting a review option and reviewer(s), programs should provide the assistant vice president/dean with a list of the proposed reviewers, including the reviewers’ current affiliation(s), qualifications for conducting the review, and estimated costs. It is the responsibility of all involved to avoid conflicts of interest that would prevent an objective review of the program. Programs should avoid selecting reviewers with any of the following characteristics: (1) former employees or program participants; (2) individuals with a financial interest in the outcomes of the review (vendor representative, for example); or (3) individuals with a personal relationship to any employees in the program. The assistant vice president/dean will review the list to identify any budget limitations or conflict of interest issues. Upon approval of the list, programs should contract with a reviewer using the University’s Independent Contractor Procedures.

Reviewers should provide the program with a written evaluation of the program’s strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for improvement within 30 days of completion of the review.

**Annual Progress Report**

The annual progress report supports the comprehensive review process by documenting progress toward program goals, alignment to the CAS Standards, and resource needs. The annual progress report provides an explanation for any significant changes that have occurred within the program, a concise summary of the actions taken during the previous year in support of program goals, and a discussion of any resource needs or issues relevant to the program’s ability to maintain progress toward its goals.

The timeframe for the annual progress report is based on the previous academic year (summer, fall, spring), and the deadline for submission will be December 31. Programs should provide a copy of the annual progress report to the assistant vice president/dean. Program personnel and the assistant vice president/dean should meet to identify any resource needs, assess progress toward the goals established in the most recent comprehensive review, and use the results reported in the annual progress reports to develop the annual budget.
Comprehensive Program Review Documentation

The final Comprehensive Program Review self-study report consists of a narrative report and supporting documentation. The narrative report should be no more than 25 pages and is comprised of the following sections:

1. Program’s role, mission, and relationship to the University’s mission
2. Program’s alignment to the goals identified in the University’s Academic Plan
3. Outcomes for the goals identified in the prior comprehensive review
4. Program’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats based on the CAS Standards (or professional accreditation standards)
5. Future goals identified through analysis of the program’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats
6. Resources necessary to support future goals and program improvement

In addition to the narrative report, programs should provide the following supporting documents:

1. Data tables of any relevant program or institutional data used in the self-study
2. Documentary evidence to support conclusions in the report (binder or electronic portfolio)
3. External reviewer report
4. Assistant vice president’s/dean’s recommendations

Program Review Data

Programs should identify institutional and program-level data necessary for completing the self-study. Any data used should be reported in data tables that include information from the most recent three to five years.

Program review data to consider include the following:

Activities, Services, and Participation Rates
- Number of students served by program
- Demographic characteristics of students served
- Number of activities and sponsored events provided by the program
- Retention and graduation rates of students served by program
- Student credit hour production (for programs that deliver credit-bearing courses)

Financial data
- Personnel costs by employee classification (including student employees)
- OCE
- Travel
- Number and amount of extramural awards

Personnel
- Number of full-time and part-time classified, exempt, and/or faculty employees
- Number of student hourly/salaried employees, graduate/research assistants, and/or teaching assistants
- Staff awards and recognitions, publications, and/or conference presentations.

Comprehensive Program Review Process

The annual progress reports compiled by programs should be used to document progress toward program goals, compliance with CAS Standards, and resource needs. These annual reports should assist
programs in their preparation of the comprehensive program review self-study report. The comprehensive review process involves review by the following individuals and bodies: (1) Assistant vice president/dean; (2) External reviewer(s); (3) Director of Assessment; and (4) Provost.

The steps for completing the comprehensive review process are as follows:

**Step 1.** Initial meeting with program director and personnel, assistant vice president/dean, and director of assessment. The purpose of this meeting is to clarify the process and establish a schedule for completing the remaining activities associated with the comprehensive review.

**Step 2.** Select and schedule the external reviewer(s). Programs should consider any associated costs for external review in the annual budget request for the year in which the review will occur.

**Step 3.** Complete first draft of the self-study document. The program director is responsible for distributing the self-study draft to the assistant vice president/dean.

**Step 4.** Review of the self-study document. The self-study document will be reviewed by the assistant vice president/dean. The reviewer(s) will provide written feedback with recommendations for improvement and commendations for program strengths no later than one week prior to the meeting described in Step 5 below.

**Step 5.** Meeting with the program director and staff. Prior to completing the final comprehensive program review report, program personnel will meet with the assistant vice president/dean to discuss the recommendations from the reviewers, agree upon goals for the next review period, and identify any resources needed to improve and/or maintain program quality.

**Step 6.** Submission of comprehensive program review report to the Office of Assessment. Programs should submit a copy of the comprehensive program review (including supporting documents) to the Office of Assessment no later than August 1.

**Step 7:** Meeting with the Provost. The provost and director of assessment will review the comprehensive program review report and meet with the assistant vice president/dean and the program’s director to discuss the comprehensive review. Following the meeting, the provost and assessment director will prepare a memorandum describing the outcome of the meeting, deadlines for any specific actions the program will take as a result of the program review, and any resource commitments.

**Step 8.** Using the results. The assistant vice president/dean and program personnel are expected to use the results of the comprehensive review to guide program planning, decision making, and requests for resources. During the fall of the year following the comprehensive review, the program should meet with the Office of Assessment to update the program’s assessment plan.

Approved January 6, 2010
Abe Harraf, Provost

Revised March 13, 2012, to reflect organizational restructuring

Revised July 12, 2013, to reflect changes to the CAS Standards
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1 In cases where the program reports to someone other than the AVP, the report should also be reviewed by the program director’s supervisor, who should also be included in all meetings described in the process.