The Board of Trustees of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College held a meeting on Saturday, May 21, 2011 at 8:30 a.m. in the Livak Ballroom, 417-419 Dudley H. Davis Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Robert Cioffi, Vice Chair Harry Chen, Secretary Donna Sweaney, Bill Botzow, Samuel Bain, Ian Boyce, Carolyn Branagan, Christopher Bray, Frank Cioffi, David Daigle, Jeff Davis, Kyle DeVivo, Daniel Fogel, John Hilton, Jr, Joan Lenes, Debbie McAneny, David Potter, Kesha Ram, Bill Ruprecht, Brian Sozanky, Jeanette White and Mark Young

MEMBERS ABSENT: Susan Hudson-Wilson, Dale Rocheleau and Peter Shumlin

ALSO PARTICIPATING: Senior Vice President and Provost Jane Knodell, Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel Francine Bazluke, Vice President for Executive Operations Gary Derr, Vice President for Finance and Administration Richard Cate, Vice President for Student and Campus Life Thomas Gustafson and Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations Richard Bundy

Chair Robert Cioffi called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

A motion was made, seconded and it was voted to approve the minutes from the March 28, 2011 and May 2, 2011 meetings as presented.

Public Comment

There were no requests for public comment.

Committee Reports

Prior to inviting Committee Chairs to offer reports, he publicly recognized the senior administration for their dedication and hard work, much of which goes on behind the scenes and unnoticed. In particular, he thanked Vice President for Executive Operations Gary Derr for the incredible job he does and expressed his appreciation for staffing the Presidential Search Committee.

Chair Cioffi reported that Committee Chairs had an opportunity at yesterday afternoon’s Committee of the Whole session to report, and entertain questions, on their Committees’ recommendations on key strategic action items including the FY 2012 budget and approval of Phase I of the General Education Program and revisions to the Academic Program Review Process. He invited the Chairs to offer additional highlights from their meetings.
Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee (EPIR)

Chair Donna Sweaney reported that, in addition to the Committee’s recommendation to approve Phase I of a General Education Program at UVM and revisions to the Academic Program Review Process, the Committee also endorsed the approval of Phase I of the Soccer/Lacrosse Turf Field project and adoption of the College of Medicine Faculty Handbook. Additionally, the following action items were recommended by the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee and endorsed by the Committee:

- Approval of Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
- Approval of Ph.D. and Master of Science in Bioengineering
- Approval to merge the Departments of Anatomy & Neurobiology and Neurology into the Department of Neurological Sciences
- Amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws

Resolutions for each of the action items are included on the consent agenda for the Board’s consideration.

The Committee also entertained a motion in support of exploring the options under which the University could successfully execute an increase in the enrollment of international students as one component of a larger internationalization effort.

Chair Sweaney reported that the Equal Opportunity in Education Programs and Activities and Non-Harassment Policy Statement and Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy Statement are due for annual review by the Board for compliance purposes and fall under the purview of this Committee. The latter policy has been amended to include the words ‘place of birth’ in the opening paragraph and the former policy remains unchanged since the last review. Included on the consent agenda is a resolution endorsed by the Committee recommending reaffirmation of both policy statements.

Budget, Finance and Investment Committee (BFI)

Chair Debbie McAneny reminded Trustees that Committee leadership has worked with the administration over the course of the last several months on the proposed budget and that every effort was made to identify a solution other than the recommended 5.8% increase. As reported yesterday afternoon, the Committee discussed the importance of identifying a longer term solution to moderate the growth in the tuition rate and amended the resolution approving the budget planning premises to request that the administration bring to the Board, at the October 2011 meeting, the first draft of a long-term budget plan to do so. The amended resolution appears on the consent agenda and was unanimously approved for Board consideration.

Sam Bain, Chair of the Investment Subcommittee (ISC), provided a brief overview of the endowment market values. As of 4/30/11, the endowment was valued at $335 million compared to $333 million as of calendar year end. The University’s long-term portfolio outperformed its peers during the first quarter of 2011 and preliminary results for April are positive as well. In July, the Subcommittee will conduct annual manager interviews in New York.
Trustee Bain reported that the Committee endorsed reaffirmation of the resolution regarding Divestment from Sudan and reaffirmed the resolution regarding Divestment from Companies Manufacturing or Distributing Cluster Munitions and/or Military Items Containing Depleted Uranium with the amendment that the period of review be extended from annually to once every five years. Both resolutions are recommended for Board consideration.

The Investment Subcommittee recommended, and the BFI Committee endorsed, resolutions approving a Quasi-Endowment Policy and the establishment of a quasi-endowed fund. Future quasi-endowment approvals, under the new policy, will be subject to approval of the ISC only. Both resolutions appear on the consent agenda for Board consideration.

Chair McAneny concluded by reporting that the Committee also reviewed the resolution endorsed by the Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee approving Phase I of the Soccor/Lacrosse Turf Field Project. The Committee amended the resolution to include that the project will not begin construction until the first $750,000 installment of the gift is received and that in the unlikely event that the second installment of the gift is not received, up to $750,000 from the treasury operations account may be used for this purpose. The Committee recommends the resolution as amended for Board approval.

**Audit Committee**

Chair Mark Young began his report by acknowledging how far the University has come since his last term of service, citing the hiring of a new Chief Internal Auditor and the addition of a Chief Compliance Officer and the collaboration and achievements by both offices. The Committee last met on April 25, 2011 and received reports from the Chief Internal Auditor and the Chief Compliance Officer on activities since the last meeting and a preview of their work plans for the coming year. The FY 2012 internal audit plan and preliminary report of the FY 2012 Office of Audit Services budget was presented. Chair Young referenced the time spent on unplanned audits and his desire to be able to fund the work of the Office of Audit Services properly.

Chair Young announced the selection of Dean Williams as the new Information Security Officer. Mr. Williams is currently the Director of Client Services at the University and will assume his new position June 1, 2011. The Audit Committee will receive quarterly reports from the new Information Security Officer.

He concluded his report by stating that the Committee will also continue to receive reports on the Enterprise Risk Management Program and encouraging Trustees to read the full summary report.

**Vermont Agricultural College Board**

Chair Jeanette White reported that Vice President of Student and Campus Life Thomas Gustafson and Assistant Director of University Communications Jeff Wakefield provided an overview of the results of surveys conducted to gauge public attitudes towards UVM. Highlights include that the University is good for Vermont’s economy and that UVM prepares good citizens. A copy of the presentation will be distributed to the full Board.
The Board elected officers for the year. Jeanette White was re-elected Chair; David Potter, Vice Chair; and Kesha Ram was elected Secretary.

University of Vermont Board

Vice Chair John Hilton reported that the Board reviewed the Wilbur Trust and elected officers for the year. David Daigle was elected Chair; Bill Ruprecht, Vice Chair; and Sam Bain was elected Secretary.

The Board met in executive session for the remainder of the meeting to discuss the evaluation and appointment of public officers.

Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Cioffi presented the consent agenda for approval:

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

1. **Resolution Endorsing Campaign for UVM**

WHEREAS, The University of Vermont and State Agricultural College is in its third century as a distinguished institution of higher learning; and

WHEREAS, the University’s vision, as articulated in the Strategic Action Plan adopted by the University’s Board of Trustees in September 2008, is to be among the nation’s premier small research universities, preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to liberal education, environment, health, and public service.; and

WHEREAS, key strategies to fulfilling the vision include an intensified effort towards becoming more focused, efficient, and assertive in seeking new investment partners in both the public and private sectors; and

WHEREAS, The University of Vermont is entering an exciting and promising new era of challenge and opportunity and is poised to continue making significant progress towards achieving its strategic vision;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees endorses the launch of the advance phase of its next comprehensive campaign, the goal of which will be set no later than 2015 based on the success of initial major gift commitments and likely commitments, such goal to be inclusive of all private support (including but not limited to annual giving) secured through the duration of the effort with the passing of this resolution, campaign accounting to begin effective July 1, 2011.
(2) **Resolution for President to Confer Honorary Degrees**

RESOLVED, that the President is hereby authorized to offer and confer honorary degrees at the 2012 Commencement to the individuals recommended by the Honorary Degree Work Group.

(3) **Resolution Authorizing Memorandum of Understanding with Foundation**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby authorizes the administration to continue negotiations with the UVM Foundation regarding a Memorandum of Understanding between the organizations, in a manner consistent with the status report of today; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board hereby authorizes the administration to conclude negotiations with the UVM Foundation regarding the Memorandum of Understanding subject to the prior approval of the proposed material terms by the Executive Committee.

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES**

(4) **Resolution Approving Creation of Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies**

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the creation of a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, approved and advanced by the Provost on April 18, 2011, and the President on April 20, 2011.

(5) **Resolution Approving Creation of Ph.D. and Masters of Science Degrees in Bioengineering**

WHEREAS, in June 2009, the Faculty Senate approved the Curricular Affairs Committee recommendation to create Ph.D. and Masters of Science degrees in Bioengineering; and

WHEREAS, at that time the administration deferred action to allow time to determine whether the degree programs in Bioengineering would be congruent with the strategic directions resulting from the Transdisciplinary Research Initiative; and

WHEREAS, it has now been determined that the Ph.D. and Masters of Science in Bioengineering programs will support the goals of two of the identified Spires of Excellence (“Complex Systems” and “Neuroscience, Behavior and Health”); and

WHEREAS, both the Curricular Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Council re-examined the proposal on May 4, 2011 and reaffirmed their support for moving the proposal forward;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the creation of Ph.D. and Masters of Science degrees in Bioengineering, as approved and advanced by the Provost on May 29, 2009, and the President June 3, 2009.
6) Resolution Approving Merger of Departments of Anatomy & Neurobiology and Neurology into the Department of Neurological Sciences

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the merger of the Department of Neurology and the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology in the College of Medicine into the Department of Neurological Sciences, as approved and advanced by the Provost on May 19, 2011, and the President on May 19, 2011.

7) Resolution Approving the Changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws as approved and advanced by the Provost on March 10, 2011, and April 18, 2011, and the President on March 11, 2011, and April 20, 2011, and attached hereto as Appendix A.

8) Soccer/Lacrosse Turf Field Resolution

WHEREAS, the Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee has carefully reviewed the program, scope, and preliminary estimate of $1,500,000 for the proposed installation of the Soccer/Lacrosse turf field and finds it an institutional priority, consistent with the Strategic Capital Plan, and worthy of further review;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee hereby endorses the project and remits it to the Budget, Finance, and Investment Committee for financial review and approval.

9) Resolution Reaffirming Equal Opportunity Statements

RESOLVED, that the Board reaffirms the Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy Statement as amended and attached hereto as Appendix B, and the Equal Opportunity in Educational Programs and Activities and Non-Harassment Policy Statement, attached hereto as Appendix C, both effective as of March 8, 2010, and unchanged since then, attached hereto as Appendices B and C.

10) Resolution Approving Phase I of a System of General Education at the University of Vermont

WHEREAS, on April 12, 2011, the Student Government Association unanimously endorsed the General Education proposal; and

WHEREAS, on April 14, 2011, the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee unanimously endorsed the General Education proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate submitted to the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate the General Education proposal that it endorsed on April 20, 2011; and
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2011, the Faculty Senate endorsed the General Education proposal;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the General Education proposal as presented in Appendix D, as approved and advanced by the Provost on May 19, 2011, and the President on May 19, 2011.

(11) **Resolution Approving Revisions to the Academic Program Review Process**

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee and the Provost’s Office have collaborated to revise and amend the existing Academic Program Review process in effect since academic year 2001; and

WHEREAS, the revisions reflect experienced gained through utilization of the existing Academic Program Review process over the last ten years and the inclusion of best practices; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees acknowledges the importance of routine and comprehensive assessment and evaluation of academic programs to ensure that the University of Vermont offers the highest quality academic programs;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the revision to the Academic Program Review Process as presented in Appendix E, as approved and advanced by the Provost on April 8, 2011, and the President on April 8, 2011.

(12) **Resolution Adopting College of Medicine Handbook**

RESOLVED, that the Committee hereby authorizes the adoption by the University, through its College of Medicine, of the College of Medicine Faculty Handbook, as summarized in the report made today by Dean of the College of Medicine Rick Morin.

**BUDGET, FINANCE & INVESTMENT**

(13) **Tuition Charges for Fiscal Year 2012**

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby approves increases in the following tuition rates effective with the 2011-2012 academic year:

a. In-state tuition from $12,180 to $12,888 per year, or $537 per credit hour.

b. Out-of-state tuition from $30,744 to $32,528 per year, or $1,355 per credit hour.

c. Medical student in-state tuition from $28,440 to $29,220 per year for first-year students; from $28,440 to $29,220 for second-year students; from $28,440 to $29,220 for third-year students; and from $27,890 to $28,660 for fourth-year students. Medical student out-of-state tuition from $49,780 to $51,150 per year for first-year students; from $49,780 to $51,150 for second-year students; from $49,780 to $51,150 for third-year students; and from $48,820 to $50,160 for fourth-year students.
On-line Tuition Rate

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the establishment of a flat tuition rate for programs that are offered exclusively online. On-line tuition will go into effect for the Fall 2011 semester at a minimum rate of $537 and a maximum rate of $1,355 per credit hour for the 2011-12 academic year. The rate will be determined by the Provost, based on demand for the program and assessment of the national market place for similar online programs.

Room and Meal Plan Rates, Fiscal Year 2012

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby approves room and meal plan rates for Fiscal Year 2012 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room and Meal Plan</th>
<th>Rate per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Single with Bath</td>
<td>$8,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Double with Bath</td>
<td>$7,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Single with Shared Bath</td>
<td>$7,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Double with Shared Bath</td>
<td>$6,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Single</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Double</td>
<td>$6,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Triple</td>
<td>$5,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Dining – Lite Points</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Dining – High Points</td>
<td>$3,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited Access (+100 Points)</td>
<td>$3,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited Access (+250 Points)</td>
<td>$3,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Fees for Fiscal Year 2012

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves increases to student fees from $1,886 to $1,896 effective with the 2011-2012 academic year.

Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Planning Assumptions: General Fund

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the budget planning assumptions for Fiscal Year 2012, which lead to a General Fund operating expense budget for the University of $292,503,000 and hereby authorizes the President to proceed with detailed budget preparation in accordance with these assumptions; and the administration will bring to the Board, at the October 2011 meeting, the first draft of a long-term budget plan that will moderate the growth in the tuition rate.
(As recommended by the ISC April 27, 2011)

(18) Reaffirm Divestiture from Sudan

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees reaffirms its Resolution for Divestment from Sudan, as adopted by the Board on May 18, 2006, and amended by the Executive Committee on June 12, 2006 (stated below);

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Budget, Finance and Investment Committee, as successor to the Committee on Socially Responsible Investing, will review this resolution on an annual basis.

Resolution for Divestment from Sudan

WHEREAS, the University’s Policy Statement on Moral, Social and Ethical Considerations in Investment and Shareholder Resolutions holds that the primary objective of investment by the University is to provide a satisfactory return on investment for the support of University operations based upon the Prudent Investor Rule; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Statement also holds, however, that the policy of fiscal prudence shall not preclude the University from considering moral, ethical, and social criteria in determining companies in which to invest; and

WHEREAS, a balanced group of the University community has been convened as the Committee on Socially Responsible Investing and has studied the issue of genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan and has made recommendations to the Investment Committee of the Board of Trustees;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the University adopt and implement a policy of targeted divestment from companies doing business with or otherwise aiding the governing regime of Sudan based on the model developed by the Sudan Divestment Task Force;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the University implement its divestment policy to the fullest extent consistent with its fiduciary responsibilities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Socially Responsible Investment Work Group will review and reaffirm this resolution on an annual basis.

(19) Reaffirm Divestiture from Companies Manufacturing or Distributing Cluster Munitions and/or Military Items Containing Depleted Uranium

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees reaffirms its Resolution for Divestment from Companies Manufacturing or Distributing Cluster Munitions and/or Military Items Containing Depleted Uranium as adopted by the Board on May 15, 2009 (stated below);

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Budget, Finance and Investment Committee will review this resolution on an annual basis every five years.
Resolution Regarding Divestment from Companies Manufacturing or Distributing Cluster Munitions and/or Military Items Containing Depleted Uranium

WHEREAS, the board reaffirms its commitment to “Our Common Ground” and its stated values of “justice” and “responsibility”; and

WHEREAS, the University’s policy of fiscal prudence shall not preclude the consideration of moral, ethical and social criteria in determining companies in which to invest, and that the University will take an active role on request in pursuing shareholder resolutions through proxy resolutions and other means in order to further its goal of investing in firms that produce safe and useful products in accord with moral, ethical and social criteria; and

WHEREAS, reaffirming the Declaration of the Oslo Conference on Cluster Munitions, by which, inter alia, States recognized the grave consequences caused by the use of cluster munitions and committed themselves to conclude by 2008 a legally binding instrument that would prohibit the use, production, transfer, and stockpiling of cluster munitions that cause unacceptable harm to civilians, and would establish a framework for cooperation and assistance that ensures adequate provision of care and rehabilitation for victims, clearance of contaminated areas, risk reduction education, and destruction of stockpiles; and

WHEREAS, weapons containing depleted uranium have potentially harmful effects on human health and the environment and do so indiscriminately;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Budget, Finance & Investment Committee recommends University divestment from companies that are materially engaged in the manufacture of:

a) Cluster munitions as defined by the Oslo Treaty of December 2008.

b) Military equipment and/or weapons containing depleted uranium.

(20) Resolution Approving Quasi-Endowment Policy

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board hereby approves the adoption of the Quasi-Endowment Funds Policy, as recommended by the Budget, Finance and Investment Committee and presented as Appendix F,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, until the Board rules otherwise, responsibility for the review and approval of proposals for the establishment, alteration, or termination of specific quasi-endowment funds is delegated to the Investment Subcommittee.

(21) Resolution to Establish the Bartlett H. and Mable L. Stone Scholarship Fund

WHEREAS, the University has received just over $790,000 from the estate of Mable Stone, designated to support in-state medical students as recipients of the “Bartlett H. and Mable L. Stone Scholarship”; and
WHEREAS, $30,000 has already been disbursed as scholarship aid to medical students; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the College of Medicine has requested that the remaining balance of over $760,000 be placed in a quasi-endowment that will produce approximately $30,000 per year to fund the Bartlett H. and Mable L. Stone Scholarships;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Investment Subcommittee approves the creation of the Bartlett H. and Mable L. Stone Scholarship Fund as a quasi-endowment within the University’s consolidated endowment pool.

(22) Soccer/Lacrosse Turf Field Resolution

WHEREAS, the Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee (EPIR) has today carefully reviewed the program, scope, and preliminary estimate of $1,500,000 for the installation of the Soccer/Lacrosse Turf Field (the “Project”) and has found it an institutional priority, consistent with the Strategic Capital Plan and worthy of further consideration; and,

WHEREAS, EPIR has remitted the Project to the Budget, Finance, and Investment Committee for financial review and approval; and,

WHEREAS, the Division of Development and Alumni Relations has secured a commitment for a gift of $1,500,000 of non-debt funding for the Project, of which $750,000 is scheduled for receipt on or about June 15, 2011 and the remaining $750,000 is scheduled to be received on or about August 15, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the project will not begin construction until the first $750,000 installment of the gift is received;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Vice President for Finance and Administration and University Treasurer, or his successor or designee, is hereby authorized to utilize the non-debt funding to finance the $1,500,000 installation of the Soccer/Lacrosse Turf Field; and, in the unlikely event that the second installment of the gift is not received, up to $750,000 from the treasury operations account may be used for this purpose; and,

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Secretary or Assistant Secretary will provide certificates of incumbency, as required, showing the names and signatures of those people appointed to any of the positions heretofore mentioned, and further, that any officer of this corporation is hereby authorized to certify this resolution to whom it may concern.

A motion was made, seconded and it was unanimously voted to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Executive Session

At 9:15 a.m. Chair Cioffi entertained a motion to enter into executive session to consider contracts, collective bargaining and personnel actions. The Chair noted that action was anticipated following the executive session. The motion was made, seconded and approved. All in attendance were excused.
from the meeting with the exception of Senior Vice President and Provost Jane Knodell, and Vice Presidents Fran Bazlake, Richard Cate, Thomas Gustafson, and Gary Derr. Vice President Bundy was invited to remain for the first item. Trustee Jeff Davis recused himself for a portion of the session addressing a contract. President Fogel and Richard Cate were excused for a segment of the last item. Senior Vice President and Provost Jane Knodell and all remaining Vice Presidents were excused for the last segment of the last item.

At 11:15 a.m. the meeting was re-opened to the public.

Chair Cioffi presented the following resolution for approval:

**Resolution regarding Presidential Evaluation and FY12 Compensation**

WHEREAS, on this date the annual review subcommittee ("the subcommittee") has reported on the status of its work to this Board;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby authorizes the Board Chair to finalize the President’s annual performance evaluation and compensation for FY12 following such additional consultation with the subcommittee or Executive Committee as he deems necessary or desirable; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board Chair shall report his final actions to the Board in due course.

A motion was made, seconded and it was unanimously voted to approve the resolution as presented.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:17 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Sweaney, Secretary
Appendix A

The Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws is amended to add Section 3.53 as follows:

3.53. Removal. Officers of the Senate can be removed from office for neglect of duties prescribed in the Constitution and Bylaws. Removal from office shall require two steps. First, written Charges of Neglect of Duties shall be made in the form of a Motion to Remove from Office as a warned agenda item at a meeting of the Faculty Senate. If approved by a 2/3 vote of the Faculty Senate present at the meeting, these charges shall be forwarded to the Parliamentarian who shall put the Charges of Neglect of Duties to a vote by referendum of the full faculty within 7 days. The Officer shall be removed from office if a majority of the referendum responses favor it, provided at least 25 percent of the eligible faculty members cast valid ballots in the referendum.

Section 7.151 Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws is amended as follows:

This committee shall have responsibility for matters related to undergraduate and graduate educational policy and long-range academic planning, including items referred to in Section 1.1b, 1.13, 1.1f, 1.1g, 1.2a, 1.2c, and 1.2k. It shall review proposals to initiate, alter, or terminate programs from the Schools and Colleges. Actions taken by this committee and approved by the Faculty Senate will be sent to the Provost for action. It shall make recommendations for faculty members to serve on the joint Senate/Trustees Honorary Degree Committee. The Curricular Affairs Committee shall have double the numbers of members stipulated in 7.121a.

Section 7.152 Professional Standards Committee of the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws is amended as follows:

This committee shall have responsibility for matters related to faculty professional standards and welfare, including items referred to in Sections 1.1a, 1.1h, 1.1i, 1.2b, and 1.2d. The Professional Standards Committee is advisory to the Provost on confidential personnel matters related to faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure, as well as on the awarding of sabbatical leaves. Any eligible faculty member with no conflicting administrative responsibilities who holds the rank of Professor or Associate Professor, including Clinical, Extension, Library, or Research Professors or Associate Professors, may stand for election by his/her college or school to serve as its representative to the Professional Standards Committee. No member of the Professional Standards Committee shall be serving concurrently on the standards committee of his/her college or other unit specified in Section 7.121a.
The Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws is amended to add Section 7.3.1 as follows:

7.3.1 Ad Hoc Grievance Committee for non-represented faculty. The Grievance Committee shall consist of seven persons, all of whom shall be voting members. The Faculty Ombudsperson shall not be a member of the Committee, but may attend all meetings and hearings of the Committee unless excluded by Committee majority vote. Five members of the Committee shall be members of the faculty, appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Council (“Executive Council”). Two Committee members shall be administrators with academic experience, appointed by the Provost. The Grievance Committee shall elect a chair from among members appointed by the Executive Council.

Section 9.1 Membership [of the Board of Trustees] of the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws will be amended as follows:

9.1 Membership.

a. Audit Committee: representative recommended by the Executive Council and appointed by the Senate President for a two-year term.

b. Budget, Finance and Investment Committee: the chair of the Financial & Physical Planning Committee and one additional representative recommended by the Financial and Physical Planning Committee and appointed by the Senate President for a two-year term.

c. Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee: the Senate Vice President, the Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee, and the Chair of the Research, Scholarship & Graduate Education Committee.

d. Executive Committee: Senate President.

e. Socially Responsible Investing Workgroup: two representatives recommended by the Executive Council and appointed by the Senate President for two-year terms.

f. Honorary Degree Working Group: the Senate Vice President and one additional representative recommended by the Executive Council and appointed by the Senate President for two-year terms.
Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy Statement

Policy Statement

The University of Vermont and State Agricultural College is committed to a policy of equal employment opportunity and to a program of affirmative action in order to fulfill that policy. The University will accordingly recruit and hire into all positions the most qualified persons in light of job-related requirements, and applicants and employees shall be treated in employment matters without regard to unlawful criteria including race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, place of birth, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, positive HIV-related blood test results, status as a disabled or Vietnam Era Veteran, genetic information, or gender identity or expression, as these terms are defined under applicable law, or any other factor or characteristic protected by law.

In addition, the University of Vermont recognizes that discriminatory harassment and sexual harassment are forms of unlawful discrimination, and it is, therefore, the policy of the University that discriminatory harassment and sexual harassment will not be tolerated. The University also prohibits unlawful harassment on the basis of other characteristics protected by law.

Further, employees and applicants will not be subjected to harassment or retaliation because they have engaged in or may engage in the following: filing a complaint or assisting or participating in an investigation regarding alleged discrimination or harassment as prohibited in the policy statement above; filing a complaint or assisting or participating in an investigation, compliance evaluation, or any other activity related to the administration of the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 ("VEVRAA"), Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 ("Rehabilitation Act"), or the Affirmative Action provisions of federal, state or local law; opposing any act or practice made unlawful by VEVRAA, requiring equal employment opportunities for
individuals with disabilities, disabled veterans, or veterans of the Vietnam Era; or exercising any rights under VEVRAA or the Rehabilitation Act.


Note: This Statement of Policy is the official University of Vermont Equal Educational Opportunity Policy Statement and supersedes all prior policy statements regarding its subject matter. It may be modified only by written statement issued by the President as Chief Executive Officer of the University or by formal action by the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College Board of Trustees. This Policy Statement is designed to express the University’s intent and commitment to comply with the requirements of federal, state and local non discrimination laws. It shall be applied co extensively with such laws, and shall not be interpreted as creating any rights, contractual or otherwise, that are greater than exist under such non discrimination laws. Persons seeking to participate in educational opportunities offered by the University must consult position and program descriptions to determine criteria for eligibility. All such criteria shall be established in a manner consistent with the legal requirements herein referenced.

Contacts

Questions regarding this policy statement or compliance with its provisions may be directed to:

Chief Diversity Officer and Special Assistant to the President for Multicultural Initiatives University of Vermont 346 Waterman Building Burlington, VT 05405 (802) 656-8426

Questions may also be directed to government agencies having oversight and enforcement authority with respect to the referenced laws. A complete listing of such agencies may be obtained from the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity.

The President is the University official responsible for the interpretation and administration of this policy.

Related Documents/Policies

Effective Date

Approved by:

____________________         President
Daniel M. Fogel

_____________________    Chair Board of Trustees
Robert Cioffi

_________________________         Date
Date
Equal Opportunity in Educational Programs and Activities and Non-Harassment

Policy Statement

The University of Vermont and State Agricultural College is committed to a policy of equal educational opportunity. The University therefore prohibits discrimination on the basis of unlawful criteria such as race, color, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, or gender identity or expression, as those terms are defined under applicable law, in admitting students to its programs and facilities and in administering its admissions policies, educational policies, scholarship and loan programs, athletic programs, and other institutionally administered programs or activities made available to students at the University. The University also prohibits harassment, as defined in the Vermont Statutes at Title 16, section 11(a)(26). Unlawful harassment is a form of discrimination and is therefore prohibited. Sources: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; the Vermont Public Accommodations Act; and such other federal, state, and local non-discrimination laws as may apply.

Note: This Statement of Policy is the official University of Vermont Equal Educational Opportunity Policy Statement and supersedes all prior statements regarding its subject matter. It may be modified only by written statement issued by the President as Chief Executive Officer of the University or by formal action by the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College Board of Trustees. This Policy Statement is designed to express the University's intent and commitment to comply with the requirements of federal, state and local non-discrimination laws. It shall be applied co-extensively with such laws, and shall not be interpreted as creating any rights, contractual or otherwise, that are greater than exist under such non-discrimination laws. Persons seeking to participate in educational opportunities offered by the University
must consult position and program descriptions to determine criteria for eligibility. All such criteria shall be established in a manner consistent with the legal requirements herein referenced.

**Contacts**

Questions regarding this policy statement or compliance with its provisions may be directed to:

Dean of Students  
University of Vermont  
41-43 South Prospect Street  
Burlington, VT 05405  
(802) 656-3380

or to:

Chief Diversity Officer and  
Special Assistant to the President for Multicultural Initiatives  
University of Vermont  
346 Waterman Building  
Burlington, VT 05405  
(802) 656-8426

Questions may also be directed to government agencies having oversight and enforcement authority with respect to the referenced laws. A complete listing of those agencies may be obtained from the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity.

The President is the University official responsible for the interpretation and administration of this policy.

**Related Documents/Policies**

Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy Statement  

Harassment – Students  

Procedures for Investigating and Resolving Discrimination Complaints  

Sexual Harassment Policy – Students  
Effective Date

Approved by:

____________________         President         __________________
Daniel M. Fogel                     Date

_____________________________     Chair Board of Trustees     __________________
Robert Cioffi                        Date
PREMISES AND MOTION TO ENDORSE GENERAL EDUCATION

Premises

1) Developing a University-wide vision for undergraduate education is the right thing to do for our students and can be transformative.
2) In this vision, General Education is expressed as desired student outcomes.
3) The proposed outcomes reflect themes that emerged through extensive outreach and consultation across the campus, and a continual review and revision process.
4) The outcomes should be infused throughout the undergraduate experience.
5) The outcomes can be achieved in a variety of ways, not limited to academic courses.
6) General Education assessment will focus on improving the student educational experience.
7) Ongoing faculty-led work conducted in an inclusive, transparent manner will be necessary to refine the outcomes and develop specific implementation and assessment plans for General Education.

Motion

A) That the Curricular Affairs Committee and full Faculty Senate endorse, in principle, the proposed general education outcomes and continuation of an open, inclusive process to determine detailed implementation and assessment plans, conditional on appropriate resources being made available; and

B) That the Faculty Senate establish an ad hoc Committee to work in consultation with the Provost’s Office to continue the work of the Joint Committee on General Education and to
   1. Refine the outcomes as needed
   2. Inventory current offerings and determine where and to what extent the proposed outcomes are already being achieved
   3. Draft phased implementation and assessment plans
   4. Determine resources needed to implement the plans
   5. Plan faculty development opportunities and incentives for course and curriculum design and outcomes assessment
   6. Make a detailed recommendation to the Faculty Senate for implementation and assessment

Proposed Outcomes

1. Communication and Information Literacy
2. Quantitative Reasoning
3. Cultures, Diversity and Global Perspectives
4. Sciences, Systems and Sustainability
5. Art, Aesthetics, and Design
6. Integration and Application of Knowledge
Joint Committee on General Education
of the Faculty Senate and the Central Administration

Proposed Outcomes for General Education at UVM
April 6, 2011

1. Communication and Information Literacy

Students must develop broad and flexible communication skills in order to develop written texts and presentations designed for varied audiences. Communication skills are closely connected to information literacy skills, and both need to be emphasized over time and across disciplinary boundaries so that students develop increasingly sophisticated abilities.

In order to communicate effectively, students need to develop the ability to identify what sorts of information needs are appropriate for a given task, and they need to critically evaluate information and research data so that they can shape ideas and conclusions. Students must be able to integrate information and research data into texts and presentations in line with audience expectations; students must also be able to cite sources, and write and present information in light of professional and academic ethical standards.

Students can use writing, speaking, and research to discover, express, and share ideas. A strong foundation for written communication should be created in a first-year writing experience (either a composition course or a first-year seminar designed specifically to be writing-intensive) that aims to help students develop writing, reading, and critical analysis strategies essential for their success in university courses and work contexts after college.

Such a course would:

- teach flexible, recurring processes of invention, revision, and editing that can be developed in more specialized ways with advanced study
- promote multiple modes of inquiry
- help students understand how to analyze audience expectations and make sense of the array of academic expectations they will encounter
- introduce research strategies that will develop in more specialized ways with advanced study
- spend significant time on writing instruction

At the upper levels, courses, sequences, or other experiences will teach more specialized communication and information literacy skills, in ways that:

- build on first-year composition to provide specialized training
• introduce students to discipline-specific ways of thinking, writing, and researching
• connect to professional expectations

As they move through degree programs, students will develop flexible strategies for communicating with a range of audiences and for a range of purposes. Courses or other experiences will promote students’ ability to work alone and with others to produce complex and polished documents that integrate credible and appropriate information, formatted and cited in ways that are consistent with the discipline’s expectations. In addition to learning the formats for written work and presentations, students will be introduced to the habits of mind that characterize their major discipline’s focus. Writing experiences in the upper division will allow practice of writing processes that permit sustained, researched work in the disciplines. As appropriate, students will use composing and presentation technologies that mix words, graphics, and other visuals. Students will have the chance to learn and explore the varied technologies and processes that advanced students as well as disciplinary professionals use to identify, analyze, organize, evaluate, and circulate information.

2. **Quantitative Reasoning**
Quantitative reasoning skills help students identify and propose solutions for problems; they also help students evaluate empirical claims and how to gather numeric or empirical information. Quantitative reasoning teaches the ability to both create and critique arguments, which will prepare students to address problems in a variety of contexts—at home, at work, and in the community, students will need to create and support arguments using quantitative evidence, and they will need to communicate their thinking using words, tables, graphs, or equations that fit the situation, drawing on appropriate use of mathematical and statistical techniques.

Students who possess quantitative reasoning skills have the ability to:

• Interpret data and mathematical models in the form of graphs, tables and charts, and draw inferences from them
• Translate problems using algebraic and logical operations into a mathematical model using appropriately defined variables
• Implement procedures for finding a solution using a set of criteria, constraints or assumptions
• Apply arithmetic, algebraic and statistical techniques in conjunction with logical reasoning to solve a problem
• Analyze proposed solutions, understand the range of possible answers, consider alternative solutions, check solutions against given data and assumptions, and observe when a proposed solution is not plausible

3. **Cultures, Diversity and Global Perspectives**
Coursework and experiences in this area are meant to widen social, historical, and cultural perspectives and strengthen students' ability to take multiple perspectives by exposing them to a wide variety of cultural constructions with regard to religion and belief, institutions and society, political, economic and legal systems, and societal inequalities and marginalization
within and among nations. In an increasingly connected world, local social concerns simultaneously affect diverse societies globally. Coursework from varied disciplines can prepare students to address the social, political, economic and environmental issues affecting the planet and its population that require global, collaborative solutions.

It is clear from the fall data that many members of the campus community consider competence in foreign languages an important aspect of being a global citizen. The role of language study in relation to global and cultural understandings remains to be clarified.

In order to prepare students for living and working in a multicultural world, students must explore issues of identity formation, particularly within cultural, national, and global contexts. The Joint Committee affirms the Diversity Requirement; in our view, the outcomes proposed here complement and extend the diversity competencies that have already been affirmed by the UVM faculty. Through the existing Diversity Requirement, which will not change as a result of any implementation of these outcomes, students take at least one course (D1) that addresses:

- Race and racism in the United States
- The meaning of power and privilege
- The importance and impact of diversity and multiculturalism in the United States society

and includes content that fosters self-reflection regarding one's own prejudices in a manner that is observable by the instructor.

In addition, students may take at least one course (D2) that promotes an understanding of and an appreciation for at least one of the many facets of human and/or societal diversity including but not limited to:

- Non-United States cultures, past or present
- The workplace, organization, and/or the community
- Global or international issues, including the flow of people, cultures, labor, capital, diseases, or resources past or present, across or within all international/multinational geographical borders
- Backgrounds and/or orientations related to race ethnicity, religion, class/socio-economic status, language, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, age, disability, or other socially constructed categories
- Interventions and/or techniques to serve the needs of diverse groups in society

4. **Sciences, Systems and Sustainability**

Nothing is more complex than human societies and nothing is more pressing than to bring our species into a sustainable relationship with the natural world. The ways of knowing in the natural and social sciences together provide a foundation to address these issues. In the natural sciences, knowledge comes through careful observation of the natural world. Scientific principles, including objective observation, forming and testing hypotheses, and critical analysis of scientific ideas are paramount. In the social sciences, the ways that people
interact with each other, the social institutions and associations that emerge from those interactions, and the group identities and individual personalities that are shaped by these social forces, are examined.

To achieve this outcome, literacy in the natural sciences is essential. Through engagement in the process of doing science, students will understand and apply the scientific method. They will become familiar with scientific reasoning, making appropriate assumptions, and using scientific methods and tools to solve basic problems. By communicating the results of a set of scientific experiments or observations to the broader community, students will demonstrate scientific literacy. They should be familiar with issues relating to the credibility of, use, and misuse of scientific information, and they should understand the roles of diverse individuals and approaches in advancing scientific knowledge.

In the social sciences, analyses of the patterns of social interaction are critical, including studies of social dynamics and the distribution of power, wealth, and knowledge. Group identities and experiences, social institutions, and an understanding of diverse sources of cultural capital are all components of understanding social forces.

Sustainability is an interdisciplinary field of study that brings together the scholarship surrounding the social, ecological, economic and cognitive challenges that affect the way those in the present are responsible to future generations. It lies at the critical intersection of science and society, and has at its core the ability to understand the ways in which Earth and social systems are interrelated.

Students who are prepared to address the challenges of creating a sustainable world will be conversant with scientific, ecological, economic and cognitive ways of thinking. They will understand individuals and institutions as parts of systems; they will be able to see patterns in human and natural behavior, and they can identify some of the relationships between the different parts of scientific, social, and natural systems as well as the relationships of systems to each other.

Both the biophysical world and human societies are complex systems; which is evident at all levels, from atoms to ecosystems, and individuals to social and economic systems. Through a systems approach to problem solving, students will focus on the relationships among the components rather than on the individual components themselves. In this way, the emergent properties impossible to predict through isolated intensive analysis can become apparent.

5. **Art, Aesthetics, and Design**

Courses or experiences in this area should develop students’ aesthetic sensibilities, visual competency, appreciation of craft, and imagination, and should also engage them critically in a dialogue with human creativity through writing, reading, research, historic and cultural contextualization, relevant problem solving, listening, and oral peaking/performing. Through these various approaches to creativity, students will come to understand an array of arts or design practices, but also develop innovative ideas about how they might initiate and sustain their own communicative and expressive work and become informed members of a broad audience for such work. To fulfill this element of the general education requirement students
must produce or at least come to understand how works of art and design, broadly defined, are created and evaluated.

6. **Integration and Application of Knowledge**

   Courses and experiences in this area ask students to connect conceptual learning to challenges and opportunities in the world outside of the university classroom through experiential education. In addition to participating in an applied activity, students critically analyze their experience in order to make meaning of it. Students may complete the experiential education requirement in a variety of ways, providing them the opportunity to choose an experience that is connected to their own goals and interests. Particular work will be needed in this area to determine what infrastructures would be necessary to implement this outcome (both in terms of arranging credit-bearing experiences as well as evaluating alternatives for non-credit bearing arrangements).

   Learning from experience does not happen by itself; this requirement creates opportunities for students to receive explicit instruction in strategies that are useful in individual and community life. While a variety of experiences can fulfill the requirement, common features will include:

   - Identification of learning goals
   - Meaningful and purposeful experience/action
   - Support and consistent feedback from a faculty member, advisor, or mentor
   - Reflection on learning

   Some examples of ways in which the experiential education requirement may be filled include:

   - Faculty-mentored and/or community-based research or creative activity
   - Field placements
   - Internships
   - Project-based courses
   - Residential learning communities
   - Service-learning courses
   - Study abroad
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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 principles\(^1\) 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 bench-marking.
- 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 V 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.

VI. 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.

VII. 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.
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 shall 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.

9. **Report of the External Reviewers.** The External Reviewers shall jointly prepare and submit a report within six weeks of the site visit, but no later than **January 12, 2021**.

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.
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 to 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 five 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, responsiveness and effectiveness, efficiency, and quality control mechanisms.

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.

---

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) 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, 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, 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, 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.

1. 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.
2. 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:

1. Determine the degree to which the system of APR possesses the essential qualities described in section I of Academic Program Review at UVM.
2. Determine the degree to which the system of APR has achieved its stated goals.
3. Specify the strengths and weaknesses of the system of APR
4. 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.
Quasi-Endowment Funds

Policy Statement

The University, through its Board of Trustees, may establish, alter, or terminate quasi-endowment funds. A quasi-endowment fund functions in substantially the same manner as a true or permanent endowment fund, except that (1) the terms of a quasi-endowment fund are established by the University, not by an external donor, and (2) the University may spend down the principal of a quasi-endowment fund under the authority of the Board. If the original source of a quasi-endowment fund is a restricted gift or other restricted assets, the fund must retain the restricted purpose as originally specified, and the fund’s principal and earnings may be expended only for that purpose.

Reason for the Policy

From time to time the University may decide to designate assets as quasi-endowment funds. These funds gain the benefit of the earning power of the University’s consolidated endowment pool while retaining the flexibility to be expended in whole or in part. Because the creation, management, and termination of quasi-endowment funds involve the University’s consolidated endowment pool, they may proceed only with the approval of the Board of Trustees. These funds create a mechanism for the University to save and invest sums of money to be spent over time to achieve long-range academic objectives.

Strategic Direction

This Policy supports the following strategic objective:

- Ensure that the resources, facilities, and support programs are available and policies and procedures are in place to attract, recruit, and retain the very best scholars to UVM.
Applicability of the Policy

This policy applies to all University of Vermont faculty, staff, and students and to all academic and non-academic units.

Policy Elaboration

A minimum asset value of $50,000 is necessary to establish a quasi-endowment fund. A department may use its own internal funds for this purpose.

Once established, a quasi-endowment fund’s principal must remain within the consolidated investment pool for at least three years. New cash or assets may be added to a quasi-endowment fund only if that cash or those assets are unrestricted or bear restrictions that are compatible with the established quasi-endowment fund.

Following the establishment of a quasi-endowment fund and the expiration of the three-year lock-up period, its principal may be partially or totally expended only with the approval of the Board.

Definitions

A quasi-endowment fund is an expendable fund designated by the Board of Trustees for medium- to long-term investment. A quasi-endowment fund is established by the Board to function like an endowment fund but may be totally expended at the discretion of the Board. The fund’s assets are invested in the same manner as those of a true endowment and have the same payout provisions.

Procedures

Requests or proposals to establish quasi-endowments must be directed in the first instance to the University Controller. That official may then advance the request or proposal to the Vice President for Finance and Administration (VPFA). If the VPFA determines that a quasi-endowment should be established, said establishment will be subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees Investment Subcommittee.

Forms

(none)
Contacts

Questions related to the daily operational interpretation of this policy should be directed to:

Claire Burlingham, Controller
656-2903

The Vice President for Finance and Administration is the official responsible for the interpretation and administration of this policy.

Effective Date

Approved by:

__________________              President              ______________
Daniel M. Fogel                     __________________

_____________________         Chair Board of Trustees
Robert Cioffi                        __________________