UNC Program Review Policy

Program review at the University of Northern Colorado is intended to support, develop, and maintain high quality academic programs. It is a collaborative process involving faculty, administrators, and students that respects the diversity of disciplinary 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 Accredited Programs

The primary process through which program review is conducted at UNC is the comprehensive self study. The self study provides program faculty, college administrators, 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 faculty working in consultation with the unit leader[1] and 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 colleges may expand on these requirements as recommended by the college's faculty.

Definition of a Program
A program is an organizational and budgetary unit that is responsible for delivering an approved plan of study leading to completion of any one or more of the following: undergraduate minor, undergraduate degree, graduate degree, and/or licensure or certification. For purposes of program review, faculty within each college, working collaboratively with department chairs, school directors, and the dean, identify what programs exist within their respective colleges. This collaborative process provides flexibility for faculty and college administrators to organize the review process so that it produces meaningful contributions to budget and strategic planning decisions.

Timeline
Each program should be reviewed at least once between ten-year regional accreditation visits. Faculty, department chairs, school directors, and the dean should prepare a review schedule for each ten-year period that aligns UNC program review to disciplinary and professional accreditation timelines.

Substitution of External Accreditation Report[2]
Programs subject to external accreditation may elect to substitute the accreditation report for the self study report. Programs selecting this option should provide a supplemental summary document addressing specific criteria relevant to UNC's internal program review requirements.

Program Review Team
Each College should appoint a Program Review Team comprised of faculty from across the College. The

---

[1] Unit leader refers to Department Chair or School Director
[2] See document titled "Program Review for Accredited Programs" for additional information about substituting the accreditation report.

chair of the Program Review Team will be selected by the members of the team. The Program Review Team is responsible for reviewing the initial draft of the comprehensive review self study and providing written feedback to the College Dean and to the program.

External Review
External review of programs is expected for all UNC programs. For professionally accredited programs, the site-team visit meets this requirement. The team's report and findings should be included in the final document submitted to the Provost.

CDHE Policy for Low Demand Programs
The Colorado Department of Higher Education (CDHE) has statutory authority for defining criteria for low demand programs (CDHE, Policies and Procedures, Section 1, Part G, March 4, 2004).   CDHE has established minimum thresholds for undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded and outlined the actions institutions of higher education must take when a low demand program is identified. The CDHE policies will be applied through the annual and comprehensive program review processes.

Annual Progress Report
The annual progress report supports the comprehensive review process by documenting progress toward program goals, evidence of program quality, key performance indicators, and resource needs. The annual progress report provides an explanation for any significant changes in 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 Office of Institutional Reporting and Analysis Services will provide program review data to each program by August 15 of each year. The deadline for submitting the annual progress report will be established by each College. Because the information provided from the annual progress report is intended to assist in developing College budgets, Colleges should consider budget timelines when establishing deadlines. Programs should provide a copy of the annual progress report to the Dean. Program faculty and the unit leader should meet to identify any resource needs and to assess progress toward the goals established in the most recent comprehensive review. The Dean should consider the results reported in the annual progress reports when developing the annual budget.

Program Review Documentation – Accredited Programs

The Comprehensive Program Review self study report for professionally accredited programs consists of the following sections:

1. The accreditation self study report (narrative report only)
2. Accreditation site-team report and findings
3. Supplemental summary document
    a. discussion of productivity/efficiency data[3]
    b. performance on prior goals
    c. discussion of future goals
    d. identification of resource needs
4. Program review data (Insight report)

---

[3] See document titled "Program Review for Accredited Programs" for information about requirements related to productivity/efficiency data.

5. (Graduate Programs only) Additional indicators of quality for graduate programs – programs offering graduate degrees should include a section that explicitly addressed the following questions:
   a. What aspects of the program make it unique when compared to similar programs at other institutions?
   b. How do the program's required coursework, experiential activities, and mentorship support students on their career paths?
   c. What steps are being taken to evaluate and maintain or improve the quality of the program?
   d. How do you students demonstrate professionalism through participation in professional activities and/or professional organizations/societies?

Program Review Data
The Provost and Deans identified essential program review data related to program productivity and efficiency that are included in the annual and comprehensive review processes. These data will form the basis of the data tables to be included in the self study report. Program review data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Reporting and Analysis Services (IRAS) and the Office of Assessment by August 15 of each year. Programs should report data for each academic year since the last comprehensive review.

Program review data to be reported include the following:

Required (undergraduate and graduate programs)
Data will be provided by IRAS by August 15 each year
- Number and percent of full-time, part-time, and total faculty by rank and tenure
- Student credit hours taught by the program (upper and lower division undergraduate and graduate)
- Average class size
- Demographic diversity of students by race/ethnicity and gender
- Number and FTE of majors (undergraduate, master's and doctoral)
- Retention and graduation rates (total and by race/ethnicity and gender)
- Number and type of degrees awarded
- Internship placement (IRAS will provide data on all credit-bearing internships. Programs will need to track and document any non-credit internships if they wish to include these in their reports.)
- Number and percent of courses delivered by adjunct faculty and teaching assistants

Data will be provided by the Office of Assessment by August 15 each year
- Student satisfaction[4]
- Alumni satisfaction
- Student placement one year following graduation
- Number and amount of extramural research awards[5]

Data to be collected and maintained by the program each year

---

[4] Based on results from the College Senior Survey. Programs with fewer than 5 respondents will not receive data for that year.
[5] Based on data collected and reported by the Office of Sponsored Programs.

- Faculty academic credentials – number and percent with doctorate, terminal degree, master's, etc.
- Number of books, creative works, juried publications, and professional presentations
- Awards for excellence (student, faculty, and staff)

Additional required data for graduate programs
- Average entering test scores (GRE, GMAT, etc. IA will provide GRE scores. Programs requiring other admission tests will need to track and document scores for these tests.)
- Acceptance ratios
- Funding support for graduate students (number and percent receiving funding and average amount)

Recommended Data
Although not required, programs may want to consider also reporting on the following data:
- Average entering ACT/SAT scores
- Acceptance ratios for undergraduate programs with selective admission
- Performance on licensure/certification exams
- Professional accreditation(s)
- Number and percent of faculty holding graduate faculty status
- Number and percent of students involved in service learning, civic engagement, undergraduate research, and/or study abroad
- Average GPA

Comprehensive Program Review Process

The annual progress reports compiled by programs should be used to document progress toward program goals, evidence of program quality, program review data, 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) School Director (for programs housed within a school); (2) College Dean; (3) College Program Review Team; and (4) Provost. Graduate programs are also reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council.

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

Step 1. Initial meeting with program faculty, unit leader, College Dean, and Director of Assessment. The purpose of this meeting is to clarify the process, establish a schedule for completing the comprehensive review, and setting a deadline for final submission to the Office of Assessment (this meeting should be held during fall semester of the academic year prior to the year in which the comprehensive program review is due).

Step 2. Complete accreditation self-study document. The program completes the accreditation self study as per the requirements of its accrediting body. Requests for program data in addition to the "Program Review Data" described in this document should be submitted to the Office of Institutional Reporting and Analysis Services as early in the review process as possible to ensure timely delivery of reports.

Step 3. Accreditation site-team visit. The accreditation site-team visit is completed, and the site-team prepares its written report.

Step 4. Preparation of supplemental summary report. After the program receives the site-team's report, the supplemental summary report is completed. Programs should use information from the accreditation self study, the site-team's report, and program review data to develop future goals and identify resource needs.

Step 5. Internal review of the program review documents. The program review report will be reviewed by the School Director for programs housed in a school (unless the Director is the author), the College's Program Review Team, and the College Dean. The Dean of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council will also review the report for graduate programs. Reviewers will provide written feedback to the College Dean and to the program with recommendations for improvement and commendations for program strengths.

Step 6. Meeting with program faculty, unit leader, Program Review Team Chair, and Dean. Prior to meeting with the Provost, program faculty and the unit leader will meet with the Program Review Team Chair and Dean to discuss the recommendations from the reviewers, agree upon goals for the next review period, and identify any additional resources needed to improve and/or maintain program quality.

Step 7. Submission of comprehensive program review report to the Office of Assessment. Programs should submit a copy of the comprehensive program review report to the Office of Assessment by the agreed-upon deadline. Programs may request an extension if necessary by contacting the Office of Assessment.

Step 8: Meeting with the Provost. The Provost will review the report and meet with the Dean, unit leader, faculty representative(s) from the program, and the Director of Assessment to discuss the review. Following the meeting, the Provost will prepare a memorandum of understanding that will delineate the specific actions the program will take as a result of the program review and establish a timeline for completion. This meeting will occur by the end of the semester in which the report is submitted.

Step 8. Using the results. Deans, unit leaders, and program faculty 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 March 25, 2009
Provost Abe Harraf

Revised August 18, 2010, to reflect changes in organizational structure

Revised November 17, 2011, to provide clarification for professionally accredited programs

Revised May 1, 2013, to reflect additional requirements for graduate programs