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Preamble

The Faculty Senate implemented the present system of Academic Program Review (APR) in 2001, the first round of reviews is nearly completed. The APR system was assessed as part of the University’s accreditation self-study process in 2007-2009. The assessment process is described on pages 22-27 of “Institutional Assessment at the University of Vermont, 2007-2008.” The assessment made clear the strengths and weakness of the APR system. The following principles¹ were agreed upon by the Provost’s Office, the Curricular Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Senate leadership for guiding revision of the system.

- The central role of the faculty will be maintained in peer review of academic quality, whereas some administrative tasks will be transferred to the Office of the Provost, as appropriate.
- APR findings will be better utilized to guide academic programming and planning.
- A nominal eight-year cycle for Full-Scale Reviews will be adopted in preference to the current five-year cycle.
- Follow-up reviews will be established to determine progress on recommendations in MOUs from Full-Scale APR. Follow-ups will occur two years from the year of site visit.
- The principles for the scheduling and clustering of programs will be revised to:
  - Provide a broad overview of like programs and disciplines
  - Achieve optimal coordination with professional program accreditation cycles
  - Permit review of new programs at five years from time of implementation to ensure viability
  - Review all programs within a school/college (except CAS) within a few years
  - Distribute complex clusters evenly over the 8-year period
- The roles and responsibilities of key individuals and groups in the APR process will be clarified.
- The charge to the unit under review will list explicitly the degree programs to be included in the self-study and indicate that all must be addressed.
- In addition to describing the present status of a unit’s programs, all self-study reports will include a vision for the future.
- All APRs will be Full-Scale Reviews; the present two-level system will cease to exist.
- All self-study reports will include external benchmarking.
- All Full-Scale Reviews will include external peer review with site visit.
- Site visits will address both:
  - The quality and infrastructure of academic programs

¹ Based in part on a draft document prepared by Prof. Dale Jaffe, June 15, 2009 in consultation with the Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.
➢ How the program fits in the overall scheme of school/college and university priorities
● When a unit has both graduate and undergraduate programs, the self-study report will describe the nature and extent of interaction between the two.
● Self-study reports that include graduate programs will provide a specific description of the graduate curriculum and the courses that comprise it.
● Self-study reports of graduate programs that are part of a trans-disciplinary research focus area will explain the program’s role in that focus area.
● When graduate programs are reviewed, at least one member of the APR review subcommittee will be a member of the graduate faculty.
● Self-study reports will incorporate consideration of service courses taught by the program and related planning for the future.
● An expectation for ongoing learning outcome assessment will be integrated into the APR standards.
● Abbreviated Reviews will be established for all for-credit certificate programs and undergraduate minors on an eight-year cycle according to criteria for
  ➢ Student demand
  ➢ Course offerings of sufficient variety and frequency
  ➢ Adequate faculty oversight and governance to ensure quality and currency of the curriculum
● The APR standards will be updated as needed.

The remainder of this document is based on these guiding principles and represents the first substantial revision of the “Academic Program Review at UVM” policy of 2001.
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I. FRAMING CONCEPTS

A. Definition

Academic Program Review is a cyclical process for evaluating and continuously enhancing the quality and currency of academic programs. The evaluation is conducted through a process of self-evaluation, followed by peer-evaluation by reviewers external to the program or department and, usually also external to the organization. It is a comprehensive analysis of program quality, utilizing a wide variety of data about the program. The results of this evaluation process are used to inform strategic planning and budgeting processes at program, department, college, and university levels. Program review operates on a nominal eight-year cycle, meaning that each program/department is reviewed every eight years. Academic Program Review is conducted through the Faculty Senate’s Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) in partnership with the Office of the Provost.

B. Purposes

The purposes of Academic Program Review are to:

- a) Ensure that academic programs are maintained at the highest possible level of quality
- b) Provide a basis for continuous quality improvement of academic programs
- c) Help ensure the viability of academic programs
- d) Guide strategic planning and decision-making regarding academic programs.
- e) Ensure that academic programs serve the mission and vision of the University

C. Essential Qualities

To be effective, the system of Program Review must be straightforward, objective, and transparent. It must be carried out in a timely manner and implemented deliberately.

II. TYPES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS REVIEWS AND REVIEW CYCLES

There are three types of Academic Program Review (APR) at the University of Vermont

1. Full-Scale Reviews

Full-Scale Reviews are for undergraduate majors and undergraduate or graduate degree programs. Every undergraduate major and undergraduate/graduate degree program will undergo full scale review on an eight-year cycle. The review process will span two full academic years, with the first year focused on the self-study process and the planning of a site visit, and the second year on the site visit itself and the development of a report that is fully vetted by all interested parties. UVM’s 100 undergraduate majors and 77 graduate degree programs (as of 6/1/09) will be clustered into 60-70 program reviews and distributed evenly over an eight-year cycle in order to produce a reasonable annual governance and administrative work load that requires a relatively modest annual expenditure. Full-Scale APR will be coordinated with discipline-specific accreditation reviews (see section IV on scheduling). The Program’s self study for accreditation will normally suffice for the purposes of APR, but the CAC will conduct a separate review and site visit using the procedures described here.

Two members of the CAC, comprising the Internal Review Subcommittee, will be paired with two external consultants to form a review team for each program review. Although their roles will overlap, the external consultants will have primary responsibility for drafting the report, and the CAC review subcommittee will have primary responsibility for ushering the draft through
the governance process. Review reports will include an analysis of each program under review, conclusions to be drawn from the analysis, and a set of recommendations. Much of this document describes the roles and processes associated with Full-Scale Review.

2. Follow-up Reviews:

Follow-up reviews will take place during the academic year two years after the issuance of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) at the end of the formal review process in which the Provost will summarize the status of the program and any conditions or actions to be taken. During the summer preceding the academic year of the follow-up review, the Provost’s Office will send the appropriate program representatives a list of the recommendations included in the CAC-approved review document along with a copy of the MOU prepared by Provost’s Office. Program representatives and, as appropriate, the Dean, Director or Chairperson will be asked to provide a written report describing progress made on each of the items in the MOU. CAC members will discuss progress on items in the MOU with representatives of the Program and school/college. One member of the Internal Review Subcommittee will present the follow-up report to the full CAC for discussion and one of the following actions:

a) Approve the report and transmit it to the Provost with a recommendation that the program(s)’ next review be at the standard eight-year interval.

b) Approve the report and transmit it to the Provost with a recommendation that the program(s)’ next review be sooner than the standard interval.

c) Table the report with a request to the program(s) that an additional follow-up report be prepared and submitted at a particular time with updated information regarding actions taken in response to the Full-Scale Review recommendations.

3. Abbreviated Reviews:

Abbreviated Reviews are for undergraduate minors and credit-bearing certificate programs. Undergraduate minors and certificate programs are coherent clusters of courses that serve primarily undergraduate majors and graduate degree programs respectively. Abbreviated reviews will be conducted for all undergraduate minors and credit-bearing certificate programs on an eight-year cycle to assess the extent to which the following standards are met:

a. Student demand for the program justifies its continued existence.

b. Course offerings are of sufficient frequency and variety to enable a student to complete the requirements in a reasonable period of time.

c. Faculty oversight and governance ensures adequate advising of students and quality and currency of the curriculum.

Each certificate program and minor will be scheduled for an abbreviated review during the same year as its most closely related major or degree program. Those interdisciplinary minors or certificates that do not obviously fit with a major or degree program will be scheduled for review at the discretion of the CAC. In the fall semester of the review year, the Office of the Provost will notify the appropriate administrative head of each program and request a brief written report containing evidence and analysis of student demand (enrollment and completion data since the previous review), course availability (course numbers, titles, instructors, and semesters in which relevant courses were offered since the previous review), and oversight (description of advising responsibilities, assessment, and any curricular reform since the previous review). Based on this report and an interview with the program administrator, one member of the CAC will present the review at the CAC meeting in the spring semester at which the “parent” program’s full review is discussed. As a result of this discussion, the CAC will vote on a formal motion regarding the continuation of the undergraduate minor or certificate
program. If the vote is to discontinue the minor or certificate program, the CAC will complete a Proposal for Termination and forward it to the Provost for consideration. At the Provost’s discretion the Proposal for Termination will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate president with request for review and recommendation by the full CAC.

III. Overview of the Program Review Process

The sequence of events in the review process is listed in Section IX.

All programs will undergo Full-Scale Review on a nominal 8-year cycle. In general, clusters of similar programs (related in terms of academic discipline or content) will be reviewed in a given academic year. To the extent possible, program reviews will be synchronized with the accreditation reviews of the various professional programs to provide a measure of efficiency.

The programs will prepare a self-study report that will be the basis of the review. The self-study report will address the established standards for relevance, quality and viability through the analysis of relevant data, to include metrics provided by the Office of Institutional Studies. All Full-scale reviews will include a site visit by a team of external reviewers.

The Curricular Affairs Committee will coordinate the review processes in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, which will provide administrative support for the process. The CAC will submit a Preliminary Report of findings and recommendations based on its assessment of the evidence, including the self study, the report of the external review team, and the data and testimony that has been brought forward. The Program faculty and administrators will be allowed to respond to the Preliminary Report of the CAC. The CAC will consider the response and then issue its final report of findings and recommendations. The final report will be discussed by the Provost, the CAC, the responsible dean(s) and department chair.

The Provost will make final determinations about the status of the Program and any conditions or actions to be taken. These will be recorded in a memorandum of understanding. In cases where actions to be taken or conditions have been set, the CAC will conduct a Follow-up Review two years from the year of the site visit to determine compliance with the MOU. The Follow-up report will be provided to the Provost, and the responsible dean(s) and department chair. If the Follow-up report indicates the conditions specified in the MOU have not been met, the Provost will meet with the CAC, the responsible dean(s) and department chair to discuss the situation. The Provost will make final determinations of actions to be taken at that point.

IV. Scheduling of Reviews

All programs will undergo a Full-Scale Review on a nominal eight-year cycle. In general, clusters of similar programs (related in terms of academic discipline or content) will be reviewed in a given academic year. To the extent possible, programs reviews will be synchronized with the accreditation reviews of the various professional programs to provide a measure of efficiency. Accreditation reviews of professional programs (to include the program’s self study, site visit by external reviewers and the accrediting body’s report) will normally serve as the APR report. The Program will be asked to respond only to those APR standards that are not addressed in the accreditation report per the determination of the CAC. The Provost will notify programs twelve months in advance of the due date of the self-study report. The eight-year schedule of programs to be reviewed will be posted biannually, although the schedule will be subject to modification with advance notice. Schedule modifications may be made.
a) in cases where changes in a program's curriculum are such that placement in a different program cluster is warranted or 
b) When circumstances otherwise warrant it.

The process of determining the programs and program clusters (encompassing both graduate and undergraduate programs) to be reviewed will include consideration of 1) current degree program listings; 2) which academic unit is responsible for the administration of the degree program; 3) the recommendations of each of the academic deans regarding logical clustering of related programs within their respective schools and colleges, and priorities for the timing of reviews within the eight-year cycle; and 4) the recommendations of the Provost regarding clustering and timing of program reviews, reflecting overall University needs, opportunities, and priorities. At all levels, the guiding principle to be used in determining a cluster of programs will be similarity in academic discipline and/or topic. Graduate and undergraduate programs related by discipline and/or topic will normally be reviewed simultaneously.

V. The Self-Study Report

All graduate and undergraduate programs will prepare a self-study, a succinct report (not to exceed 10 pages), according to the Report Form, which will be made available in hard copy and electronic formats. The self-study reports are to be prepared by the responsible faculty and department chairperson or director of the program under review. The self-study report will include relevant data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research (e.g. enrollments, FTE ratios, and data from surveys of graduates regarding job placement, success on licensing exams, etc.) as well as the Graduate College, (e.g., qualifications of applicants, matriculation rate, and time-to-degree data, etc.). In addition, the Graduate Executive Committee will provide a written assessment of the graduate program(s). The program will be expected to review the data and to explain the status of the program with respect to the following criteria, which are defined in Appendix B. Programs will be encouraged to present their own indicators and metrics in order to adapt the criteria to their particular circumstances and characteristics. The format and guidelines for self-study reports are contained in Appendix B: Self Study Components and Guidelines.

- Contribution to Mission
- Program Quality
- Demand
- Societal Need
- Quality Control Mechanisms
- Effectiveness

The deans’ recommendations should be based on a perspective consistent with the University’s strategic planning process. The deans will be asked to update their recommendations for program clusters and timing of reviews in the fall semester of each academic year.

In addition to addressing the criteria, the report should include a narrative (1,000 words maximum) to explain the meaning and implications of the data and to clarify any important qualitative characteristics and circumstances that may not be included in the data. Specifically, the narrative should answer the questions:
  - What are the program’s strengths and weaknesses?
  - What characteristics of the program should be maintained?
  - What characteristics of the program should be modified or abandoned?
  - What plans do the faculty, chairperson and dean have for the program over the next 3-5 years?
The academic dean(s) for the responsible faculty will provide written comments on the program's self-study report and the external reviewers’ assessment; these comments will be appended to the self-study report. In the case of graduate programs, the dean of the Graduate College will also review the self-study report and attached comments, and provide his/her own written remarks.

V. External Review

The CAC in consultation with the appropriate deans and chairs, will develop a list of peer and aspirant programs from whose faculty the Office of the Provost will develop a list of candidate external reviewers. From this list at least two external consultants will be recruited to serve as program reviewers. The qualifications of the potential reviewers (e.g., credentials, curricular and administrative expertise, and "arm's length" relationship to the program) must be documented by the program. "Arm's length" means the potential reviewers do not have significant personal or collaborative relationships with any program faculty or administrators. The program may, with sufficient justification, ask to have names removed from the list of potential reviewers.

Thirty days prior to the scheduled visit, the program self-study and supporting materials will be sent to each member of the external review team, along with a charge by the Curricular Affairs Committee. An identical information package will be provided to the CAC Internal Review Subcommittee, the responsible department chair, dean(s), and the Provost.

The external reviewer(s) will be asked to respond to a specific set of questions related to the standards and criteria and to submit a summary report of their findings.

The report of the external review team will be distributed to the department faculty and responsible administrators. The department will be asked to review the report within a brief time period and prepare a summary of perceived factual errors and misperceptions. This summary will become part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the CAC.

VI. Outcomes of Academic Program Review

A. Preliminary Report: The Curricular Affairs Committee will review all relevant documentation (self-study report, external review report, departmental response, if any) and, based on the evidence, write a preliminary report detailing the major findings and recommendations. The department chair, program director, or other appropriate program spokesperson(s) will be asked to provide clarification or additional information as needed. The Preliminary Report will contain a summary of findings and conclusions, a description of perceived strengths and weaknesses, a description of perceived opportunities and/or potential problems, and suggested directions to be pursued.

Representatives from the review subcommittee will meet with the academic dean and faculty of the program to discuss the preliminary report. The program may submit a response to the preliminary report within a four-week period in order to clarify specific points and bring to light any additional information pertinent to the review.

B. Final Report and Recommendation: The CAC Internal Review Subcommittee will consider in an open meeting(s) all information including the program's response to the preliminary report, and will prepare its final report and recommendations including the category of approval. The internal review subcommittee will determine in executive session, a recommendation per the categories listed below. The review subcommittee will submit its report and a memo of recommendation to the full Curricular Affairs Committee. The memo
of recommendation will summarize the findings and provide the rationale for the recommendation. Recommendations will fall into one of the following categories:

- **Approval**: The program meets the criteria. The recommendation will provide the supporting rationale and may also include:
  
  ➢ **Recommended actions to build on strengths and pursue opportunities** to improve program quality and effectiveness. Any additional resource investments necessary to implement the program advancement plan, and a schedule for implementation should be specified.

  ➢ **Recommended actions to maintain existing levels of quality and effectiveness.** Any additional resource investments necessary to implement the program advancement plan and a schedule for implementation should be specified.

- **Conditional Approval**: The program is deemed to be viable, but not in full compliance with one or more of the standards. The program must take action to address identified weaknesses within a specified timeframe. The recommendations will include the supporting rationale and may also include:
  
  ➢ **Recommended actions to build on strengths and pursue opportunities** to improve program quality and effectiveness. Any additional resource investments necessary to implement the program advancement plan, and a schedule for implementation should be specified.

- **Disapproval**: The program is significantly out of compliance with the standards and correction cannot realistically be expected within a two-year period. Disapproval will normally result in a review for termination. The recommendation will be accompanied by the supporting rationale and key considerations for a responsible phased termination. If the recommendation is to eliminate the program, the CAC will, at the request of the Provost, complete a Proposal to Terminate (Appendix C, Academic Policies and Procedures).

The Curricular Affairs Committee will vote in executive session to approve/disapprove the Final Report and Recommendations of the internal program review subcommittee. Committee members with a conflict of interest will abstain. Conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, an individual having a past or present appointment or vested interest in the program under review. In cases where the CAC does not approve the recommendation of the review subcommittee, the Chair of the CAC will prepare a written memo describing the reasons for the disagreement. The CAC will process Appendix C requests for termination as per its usual process.

C. **Integration of Findings**: The CAC program review subcommittee’s final report and the recommendations of the Curricular Affairs Committee will be forwarded to the Provost and the academic dean(s) and faculty for the program under review. The findings will subsequently be integrated into strategic planning and budgeting processes. It is intended that program review findings will inform the Provost and thereby guide resource allocation for academic programs. The Provost will make final budgeting decisions in consultation with the academic dean. The Provost will advise the Curricular Affairs Committee regarding final decisions and actions.
The responsible dean(s) will provide the Provost with a written response(s) to the Findings and Recommendations Report.

The CAC Internal Review Subcommittee and designated administrators (e.g., dean(s) and Provost) will meet with program representatives to discuss the outcomes of the review and action steps to be taken as a result of the review.

The program may be given full or conditional approval based on the final report. If the program is granted full approval, it will not be required to submit any further reports or documentation until the next program review. If there are serious issues that require immediate attention, the program may be granted conditional approval and given a plan for improvement.

Except in the case of disapproval, the plan that emanates from the program review should enable the program to focus on effective ways to achieve its goals. Many recommendations, such as a reorganization of curriculum or the addition of new courses will not require resource allocation or redistribution. Other changes, such as additional faculty or staff hires or equipment purchases will require substantial resource allocation, and in such cases, responsibility will be directed to the appropriate administrator i.e., the dean, the program director or the provost.

The outcomes of the meeting will be recorded in an MOU signed by the department chair, dean, and Provost. The MOU will outline the approval status, the plan, the responsible parties, a timeline with progress milestones, and any decisions regarding resource allocation.

VIII. Roles and Responsibilities

PROVOST’S OFFICE:

The Provost’s Office will be responsible for the administrative oversight of the entire Academic Program Review process, consistent with approved policies and procedures. Such oversight includes:

- Maintaining a master schedule of all review activities
- Ongoing communication with programs, external consultants, the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC), deans, and department chairs
- Arranging site visits with external consultants
- Managing the budget for Academic Program Review
- Moving CAC-approved review documents through the final stages of the process.
- Adjusting the schedule of reviews in collaboration with the Curricular Affairs Committee

CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (CAC):

This revision moves many of the administrative tasks into the Provost’s office and transfers the responsibility of drafting review reports to external consultants. Nevertheless, the amount of meeting time required of CAC members will remain substantial and will be less flexible than it is under the current process.

Full CAC Committee:

- Receives the reports from external consultants and internal review committees
- Adjudicates requests for modifications in review reports from Deans and Program Directors/Chairs
- Prepares transmittal memo to the Provost with a summary of the discussion and recommendations
- Provides written recommendations on two-year Follow-Up Reviews and Abbreviated
Reviews

- Collaborates with the Provost’s Office to adjust the schedule of reviews consistent with the approved policies and procedures

APR Coordinator (Member of the CAC):

- Assigns Committee members to serve as on Internal Review Subcommittees for each Full-Scale review
- Selects from among candidates nominated by the program an “outside” member for the review subcommittee, chosen to provide perspective on the program under review
- Monitors the progress of site visits
- Provides an annual report on APR activities

Members of CAC Review Subcommittees:

- Read and thoroughly understand the Program’s self-study
- Meet with the external consultants at the beginning and end of the site visit
- Attend as many of the site visit activities as their schedules permit
- Receive the reports of the external consultants
- Present the consultants’ report to the full committee for discussion and formal action

Individual Committee Members:

- Serve on at least one Internal Review Subcommittee each academic year
- Present Follow-up Review reports and Abbreviated Review reports

FACULTY SENATE OFFICE:

- Provides staff support to the CAC and Provost’s office in matters related to Academic Program Review
- Schedules meetings between the CAC and program and school/college representatives to discuss external reviewer’s report content and recommendations
- Distributes and archives program review documents

PROVOST’S OFFICE:

- Invites external reviewers and manages the logistics of their campus site visits
- Schedules meetings of external review committee with all constituents
- Establishes a Sharepoint website for each program review
- Provides staff support to MOU and follow-up meetings

PROGRAM UNDER REVIEW:

- Prepares self study and related materials according to guidelines specified in this document
- Participates in selection of external consultants as described in this document
- Nominates members of the UVM faculty, chosen to provide perspective on the program under review, to serve as “outside” members of the Internal Review Subcommittee
- Organizes and participates in program-specific site visit activities
- Responds to consultants’ report, as appropriate
- Attends CAC meetings at which reviews are discussed
- Prepares abbreviated review reports on minors and credit-bearing certificate programs
- Prepares Follow-up Review reports

EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS:

- Read the self study and associated materials prior to the site visit
During the site visit, interview program faculty, staff, administrators, and students; tour facilities and otherwise gather information to determine program compliance with APR standards and criteria.

Following the visit, collaborate in the preparation of a report according to the established guidelines.

**PROVOST:**

- Meets with the Dean of the relevant college and, if appropriate, the Dean of the Graduate College to discuss and prioritize the report and recommendations.
- Within 60 days, sends a memo to the dean(s) with copies to the program chair and the CAC chair, summarizing the outcomes of review and directions and actions to be taken.

**IX. Procedures and Chronology in the Academic Program Review Process**

Assume that a given site visit will occur during **Fall semester, 2020**.

1. **Notice**  Departments and programs to be reviewed shall receive notice from the Office of the Provost in **September, 2019**. Notification shall include a full copy of the most currently approved version of “Policies and Procedures for the Periodic Review of Academic Programs,” which will include the guidelines for creating the self-study and a timeline for all milestones of the review process. By **September 30, 2019**, those notified will provide the name(s) of the program(s) contact person(s) who will serve as the chief manager(s) of the program review process on behalf of the program or program cluster.

2. **Sharepoint Construction**  A Sharepoint website for the Review will be established by the Office of the Provost in **October, 2019**. The Sharepoint site will be the depository for all documents related to the program review.

3. **Request for Information**  During **October, 2019**, the Office of the Provost will (1) notify the Director of the Office of Institutional Studies and any other data providers identified in this document of the impending review and request that all data be transmitted to the program(s) by **December 1, 2019**, and (2) request UVM program nominations for peer and aspirant programs from which external consultants should be recruited, according to the guidelines established in this document, with a response deadline of **November 15, 2019**.

4. **Recruitment and Selection of External Consultants**  The Office of the Provost will draw on peer and aspirant program nominations from the CAC to recruit a minimum of two external consultants to serve as program reviewers. This process will occur during the **Spring Semester, 2020**, and will proceed according to the following steps: (a) contact with program administrators of nominated programs asking for suggestions for specific individuals; (b) contact with individuals so specified to ascertain interest and availability and requesting curriculum vitae from those interested; (c) meeting with UVM program representatives to share vitae of interested nominees and request that the program faculty review the vitae and provide a recommendation for preferred reviewers from this pool. The program faculty may, with appropriate justification, disqualify any nominated reviewer, and will be asked to identify any nominees with whom UVM faculty members have had ongoing research collaborations or mentor/protégé relationships. No contact between UVM faculty members and reviewer nominees is appropriate. This process will continue until external consultants agreeable to the program faculty have been successfully recruited. Once the external team has been confirmed, the Provost’s Office will contact all other pending nominees, inform them that a team has been selected, and thank them for their willingness to participate.
5. Self Study and Self-Study Report  The self study shall be conducted by the program during the Spring Semester, 2020 (January-May). The work of the self-study should be organized and conducted so that all necessary input and participation of the faculty is concluded by May, 2020. The principal author(s) will compose a final draft over the Summer of 2020 so that the report can be reviewed by the faculty in September, 2020 and be available to the external reviewers and the internal review committee no later than the working day closest to September 15, 2020. The Provost’s Office will review all documents prepared for the site visit posted on the Sharepoint site, including the self-study, to ensure completeness and accuracy before providing access to the external consultants.

6. Travel Arrangements and Site Visit Itineraries  During the Summer, 2020, the Office of the Provost will make all travel arrangements with the external consultants and arrange the administrative portions of the site visit itinerary.

7. Internal Review Subcommittee  By the beginning of semester in which the site visit is to take place (September, 2020), The APR Coordinator will appoint two CAC members to serve as an Internal Review Subcommittee. These will be joined by a third member from outside the CAC, chosen to provide perspective on the program under review. This Internal Review Subcommittee will:
   a) Read the self-study and associated documents
   b) Participate in the site visit activities as much as possible, especially the discussion sessions with faculty members and students, and the exit interview with the external consultants
   c) Read the consultants’ report and the program response
   d) Present the draft report to the CAC and take a leadership role in developing the final report by:
      i. Summarizing the major findings of the consultants’ report.
      ii. Commenting on the appropriateness of the consultants’ recommendations within the context of a local reading of the self-study, participation in the site visit, and knowledge of UVM. They will determine, among other things, if there are recommendations that should have been included but weren’t, were included but shouldn’t have been, or that should be given more prominence in the report.
      iii. Reconciling any differences of opinion between the consultants’ report and the program’s response, especially with regard to specific recommendations, and correcting any factual errors in the consultants’ report. Any substantive changes require approval by the external reviewers.
   e) Rewrite as necessary portions of the report, or append a short report of the Internal Review Subcommittee to the consultants’ report and program response.

8. External Reviewer Site Visit  The site visit of the External Reviewers shall be conducted between September 30, 2020 and December 10, 2020. Key features of the site visits are as follows:
   a) The External Reviewers, the CAC Internal Review Subcommittee, the Department Chair(s) or Program Director(s), the Associate Dean(s) of the respective school(s)/college(s), and the Associate Provost will hold a dinner meeting the evening before the site visit. The purpose of this dinner meeting is to welcome and orient the site visitors and determine final details of the site visit.
   b) The External Reviewers will meet with members of the UVM Administration, including the Provost, the Associate Provost, the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate College, and the Dean and/or Associate Dean of the respective school/college with responsibility for the program budget.
c) The External Reviewers will meet with senior and junior faculty, current undergraduate and graduate students, and recent graduates. The program is responsible for notifying faculty and students of these meetings and providing a room in which they may be conducted in private. Information exchanged in these meetings is of a confidential nature. It is important that non-tenured faculty and students be able to speak freely about the program(s) being reviewed.

d) The Provost’s Office and the department/program will provide escorts for guiding the site visitors on campus, when necessary.

e) The department/program faculty should schedule lunches with the site visitors during their visit.

f) The Associate Provost and CAC Internal Review Subcommittee will meet with the site visitors in an exit interview to familiarize themselves with the reviewers' perspectives.


Reports will be organized according to the following model:

a. Conclusions: The consultants' report should provide general conclusions about the state of the program(s): number and quality of the faculty and their productivity, the number and quality of its students relative to its capacity, the appropriateness of the curriculum, the quality of program assessment practices, and so forth.

b. Recommendations: Consultants are asked to provide specific recommendations for action by the faculty, school or college, Graduate College, and UVM administration (8-12 recommendations are typical). A statement of rationale for each recommendation will be helpful to the CAC and the UVM faculty and administration.

c. Analysis: The remaining narrative of the report may be organized according to the APR standards. The analysis may be open-ended or organized as responses to a set of questions about each category below and/or as assessments of the extent to which stated standards have been reached in each category.

In preparing the report, consultants should make sure that adequate attention is given to each of the degree programs. To ensure this breadth, attention to the major strengths of the program(s) and issues which need to be addressed is preferable to a point-by-point response to the items of the self-study. Report lengths will vary depending on the number and complexity of distinct programs under review, but a report of 8-14 pages would be typical.

10. Transfer of Ownership to the UVM Faculty (Spring Semester, 2021). Although the Office of the Provost administers the APR process and external consultants draft review reports, the authority over academic matters vested in the UVM faculty requires the enactment of a deliberative process that results in the faculty’s approval of all academic program reviews and ends with the transmittal of approved reports to the Provost for action. This process will be executed in the following manner:

a. Once the external reviewers have submitted their report, the Provost’s Office will forward the report to the program(s), the relevant dean’s office, and the CAC Internal Review
Subcommittee members who will be asked to correct any factual errors. In addition, the academic program may submit written comments on the draft report, including proposals for revision of the conclusions, recommendations, or analysis contained in the report. Any proposed corrections or revisions will be submitted by January 23, 2021.

b. During spring semester, 2021, the CAC Internal Review Subcommittee members will present the report to the full CAC for discussion, revision, and action. Representatives from the program(s) and college administrations will be invited to attend and contribute to all such discussions. The Internal Review Subcommittee is responsible for recommending approval or disapproval of any proposed revisions.

c. Once approved, the report will be transmitted to the CAC and on to Provost for action with a summary of all CAC discussions.

11. Provost Response. Following receipt of the report from the CAC, the Provost and Associate Provost will meet with the Dean of the relevant college and, if appropriate, the Dean of the Graduate College to discuss and prioritize the recommendations from the report and Committee. Within 60 days, the Provost will transmit a summary of directions resulting from the discussion to the Dean with copies to the program chair or director and APR Coordinator. (spring-summer, 2021)

12. Follow-Up Review. The Provost’s Office will request follow-up reports from the program two years after CAC approval of the review. The follow-up report will use a standardized format consisting of program responses and supporting documentation to each of the recommendations listed in the approved review. The CAC will receive this report in Fall, 2023. CAC actions are described above in II.2.

X. Confidentiality

While the meetings of the Review Subcommittees and the Curricular Affairs Committee will be open, the documents involved in reviews will not be made public, except with the permission of the academic dean(s) for the program under review. The Curricular Affairs Committee shall report to the Faculty Senate the general status of reviews, but programs will not be identified, and specific recommendations will not be disclosed.

XI. Evaluation and Revision of the Program Review System

The system of Academic Program Review will be evaluated by the Faculty Senate at the end of each 8-year cycle. The purposes of evaluating the system are to ensure the infrastructure is working smoothly and the system is functioning as intended over time. Following each system evaluation a status report and recommendations will be presented to the Faculty Senate. The policies and procedures for assessment of the system of Academic Program Review are described in detail in Appendix C.
Appendix A

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Program

The operational definition of "program" will be flexible. "Program" may be used to designate an approved degree program or a cluster of one or more programs related by academic discipline or content. The process of determining the programs and program clusters to be reviewed will include consideration of 1) current degree program listings; 2) which academic unit is responsible for the administration of the degree program; 3) the recommendations of each of the academic deans regarding logical clustering of related programs within their respective schools and colleges, and priorities for the timing of reviews within the 5-year cycle (The deans' recommendations should be based on a perspective consistent with the University's strategic planning process. The deans will be asked to update their recommendations for program clusters and timing of reviews in the fall semester of even numbered years); and 4) the recommendations of the Provost regarding clustering and timing of program reviews, reflecting overall University needs, opportunities and priorities.

Contribution to Mission

Contribution to mission means the Program's purpose and performance contribute to the larger missions of its School or College and the University with respect to education, research and service. The narrative should identify distinctive qualities of the program that give UVM a unique identity. The following criteria should be addressed in the self-study report:

- The program has a strategic plan that is aligned with the vision, mission and strategic plan of the University.
- The program supports research and creative activities that generate new knowledge and understanding, and enrich the intellectual environment for students, staff and faculty.
- The program engages in the relevant application of knowledge to contemporary problems, through teaching, scholarship, creative activities, service and outreach.
- The program prepares students for productive, responsible and creative lives.
- The program encourages students to use their knowledge and skills for the benefit of society.
- The program promotes global perspective and the examination and understanding of diverse perspectives and experiences
- The program fosters an enduring commitment to learning
- The program fosters the qualities of integrity, accountability and leadership

Program Quality

Program quality is defined by the following criteria. In addressing the criteria the self study should compare the Program’s characteristics and performance to external benchmarks (defined below). In addition, programs may present their own indicators and metrics in order to adapt the criteria to the program's particular circumstances and characteristics.

- **Faculty:** The Program faculty are qualified to teach the curriculum, as indicated by earned academic degrees and professional certifications. The program invests in the professional and scholarly development of its faculty, including the mentoring and guidance of junior faculty through the RPT process.
• **Resources**: The program has adequate faculty, support staff, equipment, and facilities. Library resources are appropriate and available to support research and teaching.

• **Reputation criteria**: The program is well regarded, as evidenced by external rankings and other external judgments of students, faculty, resources and productivity. The program attracts and retains excellent students as evidenced by admissions qualifications, performance on standardized examinations, etc.

• **Faculty Performance**: Faculty demonstrate excellence in teaching and student advising, scholarship, and service, as evidenced by evaluations, awards, honors, grants, research contributions, publications, citations and service contributions.

• **Student Performance**: Students demonstrate mastery of knowledge by means of formative and summative assessments, performance in the field, professional achievements, and performance on professional licensure exams. Program graduates succeed in finding jobs and progress well in their chosen careers; alumni are satisfied with the program. Undergraduate and graduate students produce creative works, publications, and receive grant awards. Graduate students are awarded post doctoral fellowships.

• **Benchmarks**: The program reflects "best practices" and compares well to relevant performance standards from comparable institutions and/or accrediting agencies and/or other authoritative sources. The program demonstrates leadership in its performance relative to appropriate external benchmarks.

• **Advising**: The program faculty provides excellent academic advising to students, per student evaluations and other appropriate indicators.

• **Extramural Funding** (for programs where such funding is critical): The program is successful in attracting extramural funding that contributes to its long-term stability.

**Demand**

Demand for a program will be determined by the following criteria:

• Evidence for external demand based on local, regional, national and global trends and forecasts for persons with particular types and levels of education;

• Evidence for internal demand as reflected by both student enrollment in the Program, and the scope of service teaching for students from other Programs.

**Societal Need**

Societal need for a program will be determined by the following criteria:

• Evidence for private, public, and/or not-for-profit sector needs for persons with particular knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values required to make social institutions work

• Evidence of the need at national, state and local levels for persons who can be informed and responsible citizens

**Quality Control Mechanisms**

Quality Control Mechanisms means the program has processes for ongoing evaluation of how well it is achieving its strategic goals.
The criteria include:

- The program has mechanisms to determine how well it is achieving its strategic goals.
- The program has mechanisms for ongoing monitoring of the design of the curriculum/curricula as informed by student outcomes.
- The program has mechanisms for ongoing evaluation of student outcomes. This includes but is not limited to formative and summative assessments of student learning. As appropriate, other outcomes should include academic or professional achievements; job placement and career progression; alumni satisfaction with the program; employer satisfaction with program graduates' performance; graduates' performance on professional licensure exams; post-doctoral placement of graduate students, publications, grant awards and creative works of undergraduate and graduate students, etc.
- The program has mechanisms to monitor the quality of student advising
- The results of the evaluations are used to determine needed changes in tactics, policies, course contents, etc.
- The self-determined changes are implemented in a timely manner.

**Effectiveness**

Effectiveness means the program serves to enrich students' academic experience and is responsive to changing educational needs related to new knowledge in the discipline, student outcomes, and indicators of societal need and demand for the curriculum. While one of the criteria for Quality Control Mechanisms is having a system to monitor the design and delivery of the curriculum, effectiveness refers to the demonstrated use of the system. Where relevant, program effectiveness is also indicated by linkages and interactions with other programs. Effectiveness is determined by the following criteria:

- The program implements improvements in the design and delivery of the curriculum based on new knowledge in the discipline and assessments of student outcomes, societal need, and demand for the program.
- The program takes measures to maintain or improve high quality student advising
- The program cultivates an appreciation of cultural and intellectual diversity.
- The program has (where relevant) linkages with other programs, including articulation agreements; cosponsored academic majors, minors or concentrations; joint appointments of faculty members; cross-listed courses; student internships, practica, or field-based projects with organizations outside the University; resources shared with other academic units (e.g. computer systems, laboratories, services); dual degrees, and 3-2, 4-1 or other undergraduate + graduate degree arrangements.
Appendix B

Self-Study Components and Guidelines

Purpose of the Self-Study Report:

The Self-Study Report describes an academic program using a common set of institutionally determined standards and criteria. It is a systematic approach to data collection that provides a basis for identifying the strengths of the program, describing difficulties in the program, and making decisions about the direction for needed improvement and opportunities for growth. The report is based upon the stated criteria and agreed upon unit-specific indicators. Evidence that clearly indicates how these criteria are being met is the basis for the written report. The self-study report along with the report of the external reviewers provides the basis for the program review; the review is carried out by the Faculty Senate’s Curricular Affairs Committee.

Program review establishes a baseline understanding of opportunities and challenges in academic programs. All academic programs will engage in the UVM review process to ensure that programs are maintained at the highest level of quality possible; the review will contribute to an institutional perspective for planning and budgetary decision-making.

Guidelines for Writing the Self-Study Report:

The self-study report is prepared by the responsible faculty and department chairperson or director of the program under review. The self-study addresses the process used to develop the report and describes what constituencies participated in its formulation. The self-study report includes relevant data supplied by the Office of Institutional Studies (enrollments, FTE ratios, performance of graduates, etc.). The report addresses a review of such data and is used to explain the status of the program with respect to the standards and criteria included in these guidelines. Evaluation data from existing reviews of the program such as accreditation reports should be incorporated into this self-study report wherever appropriate. The body of the report is to be approximately twelve pages in length; appropriate appendices should be attached.

The self-study report concludes with a narrative, integrative summary and a prospective that address the meaning and implications of the evidence presented and describes the manner in which the program meets each criterion. The narrative should specifically identify the program’s strengths and challenges as well as directions for needed improvement, opportunities, and other plans.

There are six sections to the self-study report:

- Section One: General Information
- Section Two: Introduction/Overview
- Section Three: Standards and Criteria
- Section Four: Analysis
- Section Five: Prospective
- Section Six: Appendices

Section One: General Information

General information provides factual data about the program, including name of the program, program type, college or school in which the program is located, name of the chairperson/director of the program, name of the dean of the academic unit, names of faculty writing the report, and date of the report.
Section Two: Introduction/Overview

The Introduction/Overview establishes the background and context for the review. It should include a brief history of the Program, a brief description of its present status, the goals and mission of its graduate and undergraduate programs, unique and distinguishing characteristics, and links with other units such as joint faculty appointments, cross-listed courses, shared undergraduate and graduate service courses, and research collaborations.

Section Three: Standards and Criteria

In this section the self-study demonstrates the extent to which the program meets each standard and criterion. The standards are contribution to mission, program quality, demand, societal need, quality control mechanisms, and efficiency.

Section Four: Analysis

This section should present a brief summary of the teaching, research, and scholarly enterprise and review how the program meets each criterion. The meaning and implications of the evidence presented should be explained. The narrative should specifically identify the Program’s progress since its last review, its strengths, difficulties, directions for needed improvement, and opportunities.

Section Five: Prospective

The prospectus should present a vision for the Program grounded in the Program’s strategic goals and a balanced assessment of opportunities and resources needed. It should include a discussion of new scholarly directions, research plans, curricular or degree program changes, and plans for maintaining and enhancing excellence and diversity of faculty and students over the next eight years. Given the persistence of budgetary constraints, the discussion should include ways in which the unit can be strengthened without receiving additional resources.

Section Six: Appendices

Supporting data and materials may be appended to the main body of the report.

Standards and Criteria.

Standard I: The program has a clear and publicly stated purpose that contributes to the mission of the University.

Criterion 1: The program contributes to the mission of the University, the College/School and department by:

a) Having an active strategic plan that is aligned with the vision, mission, and strategic plan of the University.

b) Supporting research and creative activities that generate new knowledge and understanding; and enrich the intellectual environment for students, staff, and faculty
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c) Engaging in relevant application of new knowledge to contemporary problems through teaching, scholarship, creative activities, and service and outreach.

d) Preparing students for productive, responsible, and creative lives.

e) Encouraging students to use their knowledge and skills for the benefit of society.

f) Promoting global perspective and appreciation of cultural and intellectual diversity.

g) Fostering an enduring commitment to learning.

h) Fostering the qualities of integrity, accountability and leadership.

i) Additional unit-specific indicators.

**Standard II: The program is of high quality**

Criterion 2: The *program quality* is evidenced by:

a) Faculty - The Program faculty are qualified to teach the curriculum, as indicated by earned academic degrees and professional certifications. The program invests in the professional and scholarly development of its faculty, including the mentoring and guidance of junior faculty members through the RPT process.

b) Resources - The program has adequate faculty, support staff, library resources, equipment, and facilities to accomplish its purpose.

c) Reputation – The program is well regarded, as evidenced by external rankings and assessments by external reviewers of students, faculty, resources, and productivity. The program attracts and retains excellent students as evidenced by admission qualifications, performance on standardized examinations, etc.

d) Faculty performance – Faculty demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and student advising, scholarship, and service, as evidenced by evaluations, awards, honors, grants, research contributions, publications, citations, and service endeavors.

e) Student performance – Students demonstrate mastery of knowledge by means of formative and summative assessments, performance in the field, professional achievements, and performance on professional licensure exams. Program graduates succeed in finding jobs and progress well in their chosen careers; alumni are satisfied with the program. Undergraduate and graduate students produce creative works, publications, and receive grant awards. Graduate students are awarded post-doctoral fellowships.

f) Benchmarks – The program reflects “best practices” and compares well to relevant performance standards from comparable institutions and/or accrediting agencies and/or other authoritative sources. The program demonstrates leadership in its performances relative to appropriate external benchmarks.

g) Advising – Program faculty provide excellent academic advising per student evaluations and other appropriate indicators.
h) Extramural Funding (for programs where such funding is critical) – Success in attracting extramural funding that contributes to the Program’s long-term stability.

**Standard III: There is demand for the program.**

Criterion 3. There is *demand* for the program as evidenced by:

a) external demand based on local, regional, national, and global trends and forecasts for persons with particular types and level of education.

b) internal demand as reflected by both student enrollment in the program and the scope of service teaching for students from other programs.

**Standard IV: The program provides graduates who contribute to social institutions.**

Criterion 4: *Societal need* for the program is reflected by:

a) evidence for private, public and/or not-for-profit sector needs for persons with particular knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values required to make social institutions work.

b) evidence of the need at national, state, and local levels for persons who can be informed and responsible citizens.

**Standard V: The program uses an identified plan for systematic evaluation and assessment of goals and purposes.**

Criterion 5: The program has *quality control processes* that are used:

a) to evaluate how well the program is achieving its strategic goals.

b) to monitor on an ongoing basis the design and delivery of the curriculum/curricula as informed by student outcomes.

c) for ongoing evaluation of student outcomes. This includes but is not limited to formative and summative assessments of student learning. As appropriate, other outcomes should include academic or professional achievements; job placement and career progression; alumni satisfaction with the program; employer satisfaction with program graduates' performance; graduates' performance on professional licensure exams; post-doctoral placement of graduate students; publications, grant awards, and creative works of undergraduate and graduate students, etc.

d) to monitor the quality of student advising.

e) to determine needed changes in tactics, policies, curriculum, and course contents.

f) to implement the self-determined changes in a timely manner.

**Standard VI: The program accomplishes effectively its educational and related purposes**
Criterion 6: The **effectiveness** of the program is reflected by:

a) improvements in the design and delivery of the curriculum based on assessments of new knowledge in the discipline, student outcomes, societal need and demand for the program.

b) measures to maintain or improve high quality student advising.

c) programmatic features that foster an appreciation of cultural and intellectual diversity.

d) linkages with other programs, including articulation agreements, co-sponsored academic majors, minors, or concentrations, joint appointments of faculty members, cross-listed courses, student internships, practica, or field-based projects with organizations outside the University, resources shared with other academic units, dual degrees, and 3-2, 4-1 or other undergraduate + graduate degree arrangements.
Appendix C  POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSMENT OF THE SYSTEM OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The system for Academic Program Review (APR) will be evaluated at the end of each eight-year cycle. Review of the APR system will be conducted by the Faculty Senate under the authority of its president.

Purpose:

The purpose of APR assessment is to determine the degree to which the system of Academic Program Review is meeting its stated goals, per sections I and II of the document Academic Program Review at UVM, and to make recommendations for the improvement of the system.

Structure:

The APR Assessment Committee will have broad representation as follows, analogous to that for the Grievance Committee (see section 270.2, Officers' Handbook). The APR Assessment Committee shall consist of seven persons who shall be voting members.

a) Five members shall be members of the faculty, appointed by the Executive Council of the Senate. The members shall be chosen in such a manner as to represent a broad cross section of the faculty. The Executive Council shall establish and publicize qualifications for membership, and receive applications and nominations for membership on the APR Assessment Committee.

b) Two members shall be administrators with academic experience, appointed by the Provost.

Charge:

The APR Assessment Committee is charged to evaluate the system of academic program review and all its phases (selection of programs to be reviewed, selection of external reviewers, evaluation of reports, development and reporting of recommendations, development of MOUs and implementation of outcomes). The APR Assessment Committee is specifically charged to:

a) Determine the degree to which the system of APR possesses the essential qualities described in section I of Academic Program Review at UVM.

b) Determine the degree to which the system of APR has achieved its stated goals

c) Specify the strengths and weaknesses of the system of APR

d) Develop specific recommendations to improve the system of Academic Program Review.

To carry out its charge, the APR Assessment Committee is to review the written reports on academic programs that have undergone review, and to interview program faculty, program administrators and central administrators.

Reporting:

The APR Assessment Committee will be appointed and charged in the Spring semester of the final year of the eight-year cycle, and a deadline will be set for the submission of a written report to the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate. The report will be made available to all faculty members. The Executive Council will consider the report and, in consultation with the Provost’s Office, will determine appropriate actions to be taken. The Senate president will report the actions to the Faculty Senate, which in turn will report to the Provost.