



The University of Vermont

A GUIDE TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW for Accredited Programs

Office of the Vice Provost for Academic
Affairs and Student Success

AY 2023-24

Table of Contents

Preface.....	3
Purpose of Academic Program Review.....	3
The Self-Study.....	4
Timeline and Activities.....	5
Appendix A: Primary Roles.....	6
Appendix B: Guidelines for Preparation of a Self-Study Report.....	7
Appendix C: Standards and Criteria for Academic Program Review.....	10
Appendix D: Using OIRA Data for Academic Program Review.....	13
Frequently Asked Questions.....	19
Contacts and Additional Information.....	21

Preface

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 via reviewers external to the program or department, usually also external to the organization. It is a comprehensive analysis of program quality, utilizing a wide variety of data about the program. Under the current process, programs that are externally accredited are not evaluated by the Academic Program Review (APR) process. Instead, programs evaluated by an external accreditation body are asked to provide the materials prepared for the accreditation body along with an additional report that addresses any elements of the UVM APR self-study that are not included in the accreditation documents.

In general, reviews of accredited programs will be scheduled to synchronize with the accreditation reviews of the various professional programs; ideally, within one to two years following the program's scheduled accreditation. Academic Program Reviews are conducted through the Faculty Senate's Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) in partnership with the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success (VPAASS).

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

The result of the academic program review process is a clear picture of the program's strengths, challenges, and opportunities. These outcomes are used to inform strategic planning and resource allocation at program, department, college, and university levels.

Purpose of an Academic Program Review

The purposes of academic program review are to:

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

The Self-Study

The standard academic program review process is streamlined for programs that undergo reaccreditation review by their professional organizations. A comprehensive self-study report is not required. The Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee internal review subcommittee (IRS) works with the materials prepared by the program for the reaccreditation body. The program is only responsible for providing additional information if there are elements of a self-study report that are not addressed in the materials assembled for the accreditation process. To the extent possible, APR reviews will be synchronized with the accreditation reviews of the various professional programs to provide a measure of efficiency.

In addition to the accreditation materials, including the final report submitted by the external reviewers, the program is responsible for providing:

- An executive summary
- An index that identifies the location of the relevant data that directly applies to the seven standards¹ in the accreditation materials:
 - I. Contribution to Mission
 - II. Program Quality
 - III. Demand
 - IV. Societal Need
 - V. Quality Control Mechanisms
 - VI. Effectiveness
- Supplemental materials addressing anything that is not addressed in the accreditation self-study
- A summary of any planned, in-progress or completed actions that have been undertaken in response to the recommendation of the accrediting body.

When required, the Graduate Executive Committee provides a written assessment to the graduate program(s).

¹ The *Guidelines for Preparation of a Self-Study Report for Program Review* (Appendix B) have been included in its entirety. The Standards and Criteria section is located on pages 10 - 12.

SAMPLE
Timeline* and Activities

Approximate Time Frame	Responsibilities
<i>Fall Semester</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success (VPAASS) sends notification letter to program chair/director. — APR Coordinator creates Sharepoint site for program. — Program chair/director meets with the Executive Director of the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment to discuss data for the program APR report if needed. — The chair/director organizes and initiates the program APR report.
<i>Spring Semester 4-6 weeks prior to end of semester</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Program chair/director posts final APR report to program APR Sharepoint site. APR Coordinator notifies internal reviewers the program APR report is available for review. — When required, the Graduate Executive Committee provides a written assessment to the graduate program(s).
<i>Within 6 weeks of APR completion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Internal Review Subcommittee (IRS) meets with authors of the APR report. — IRS prepares report, and submits to full Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) for vote.
<i>Within 6 months after CAC vote</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — VPASS, relevant dean(s), program chair/director, CAC Chair, internal review subcommittee, and APR Coordinator meet to discuss internal reviewers reports and develop a summary memo.
<i>Within 1 month of summary meeting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — APR Coordinator drafts the APR Summary Memo for review and signature by VPAASS, and CAC chair. APR Coordinator distributes signed summary.
<p><i>*NOTE: Timeline will be based on the program’s external accreditation review; ideally, within one to two years following the program’s scheduled accreditation.</i></p>	

APPENDIX A: Primary Roles: Vice Provost's Office, Faculty Senate, and Program

Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success

- Notify program chair/director of upcoming program review
- Establish and maintain a long-term schedule of program reviews
- Manage the academic program review budget
- Establish and maintain a Sharepoint site for each program review
- Move reports through the final stages of the process
- Oversee summary meeting and report process

Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC)

- Assign committee members to serve on internal review subcommittee
 - Read and thoroughly understand the Program's accreditation self-study
 - Prepare written report and present to full CAC
- Receive the report from the internal review subcommittee
- Vote to accept or reject the report of the internal review subcommittee
- Participate in the summary
- Provide an annual report on APR activities

Program Chair/Director

- Prepare accreditation self-study and related materials according to the Guidelines.
(See Appendix B)

College/School Dean(s)

- Participate in summary meeting

APPENDIX B: Guidelines for Preparation of a Self-Study Report For Academic Program Review

Introduction:

The self-study report of an academic program describes the academic program using a common set of institutionally determined standards and criteria. The self-study report, together with external reviewer's input, identifies the program's strengths, challenges and opportunities, and provides a basis for informed decision making about future directions. The report is structured around the APR standards and criteria and agreed-upon unit-specific indicators, and should be built upon evidence that clearly indicates how the criteria are being met.

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 report should include relevant data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research (enrollments, FTE ratios, performance of graduates, etc.). The report is expected to provide a review of these data, along with other information collected through program-based assessment and other review processes. The program should utilize these data to explain its status with respect to the standards and criteria included in these guidelines. Evaluation data from existing reviews of the program such as accreditation reports, and any program changes made in response to accreditation reviews, should be incorporated into the self-study report wherever appropriate.

The main body of the report is divided into five sections, and should be approximately fifteen pages in total. Appropriate appendices comprise a sixth section and should be attached to the main body of the report:

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

The first two sections of the report provide general information and an executive summary. Sections Two and Three review data for each of the APR standards, and are followed by an analysis of the data in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 comprises an integrative Summary and Prospective that specifically identifies program strengths, challenges and opportunities, and poses future plans and directions for improvement. Each of these sections is described more fully below.

Section One: General Information

The General Information section 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. The process used to develop the report and the participation of different constituencies in its formulation should be described.

Section Two: Introduction/Overview

The Introduction/Overview section 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 program provides data for each standard and criterion. The standards are:

- I) Contribution to Mission
- II) Program Quality
- III) Demand
- IV) Societal Need
- V) Quality Control Mechanisms; and
- VI) Efficiency

In addressing Standard I, *Contribution to Mission*, the program should identify courses it offers that contribute to the University's General Education program.

The assessment of student learning outcomes is one of several items under Standard V, Criterion 5c and it requires special attention. To address this part of the standards, the program needs to:

- a) state its learning outcomes for students in the program and outline the methods and processes for assessing those outcomes. In addition to listing current learning outcomes and indicating the website where they are posted, all programs must provide an updated version of NECHE form E1A or, in the case of an externally accredited program, form E1B. Both forms are posted on the [Assessment website https://www.uvm.edu/assessment](https://www.uvm.edu/assessment).
- b) describe its long-term, cyclical plan and processes for assessing these learning outcomes.
 - i. Non-accredited programs should utilize the assessment plan template posted on the Assessment website to outline their cyclical assessment plan. If the department has a current assessment plan, this can be attached; if it does not, training and consultations are available to support the program as it develops the plan.
 - ii. Externally accredited programs do not need to fill out an assessment plan form. NECHE form E1B should be filled out with clear reference to the indicators of program success and areas of remediation identified by the external accreditors.

The completed forms should be included as an Appendix.

Note that additional consultation contacts, resources, and support services are posted on the Assessment website. All programs preparing for Academic Program Review are encouraged to consult with their school or college's Assessment Coordinator and the Provost's Office.

Where possible, direct assessment of student work should be included in the evaluation of student achievement of program outcomes along with indirect assessments. Direct assessments are those that

evaluate student work as evidence of achievement of learning outcomes. In most cases these evaluations will be conducted by program faculty and/or staff (where appropriate). However, some direct measures may be completed by people outside the program. These include students' performance on the licensure exams for which a program prepares them, or direct evaluation of student/graduate performance by employers or internship supervisors using criteria supplied by the program.

In addition to direct assessment of student work, indirect indicators of program outcomes should also be presented. These indicators may include student self-evaluations; interviews, surveys or focus groups of majors; interview, survey or focus group data on alumni satisfaction with the program; interview, survey or focus group data on employer satisfaction with program graduates' performance; post-doctoral placement of graduate students; academic or professional achievements of program graduates; job placement and career progression; and creative works, publications, and grant awards by program students and graduates. Program faculty can also include other data they deem indicative of student outcomes.

Section Four: Analysis

This section should present the main findings of the self-study including an analysis of the extent to which the program meets each standard. Data from direct and indirect assessment² of student achievement of program learning outcomes must be included in this analysis, as well as any planned or in-process responses to assessment data. Other regular internal review and evaluation processes, such as departmental reports and retreats, can also provide useful data and examples to demonstrate how well the program is meeting the standards. The meaning, implications, and any departmental response to the findings should be explained.

Section Five: Summary and Prospective

The Summary and Prospective should present a vision for the program grounded in the program's strategic goals. It should also present a balanced assessment of the program's strengths, challenges and opportunities as well as directions for the future as informed by the findings. The discussion should include 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 internal resources.

Section Six: Appendices

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

² See Standard 5c for an explanation of direct and indirect assessment.

Appendix C: Standards and Criteria for Academic Program Review

Approved by the University of Vermont Faculty Senate January 3, 2019

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) Reflects university priorities for diversity and inclusion in the faculty and student bodies.
- h) Fostering an enduring commitment to learning.
- i) Fostering the qualities of respect, integrity, innovation, openness, justice, and responsibility as expressed in *Our Common Ground*.
- j) 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 – The program assess student mastery of learning outcomes by means of direct and indirect assessments, performance in the field, professional achievements, and performance on professional licensure exams. Program graduates succeed in finding jobs and progress well in their chosen careers; alumni are satisfied with the program. Undergraduate and graduate students produce creative works, publications, and receive grant awards. Graduate students are awarded post-doctoral fellowships.
- f) Benchmarks – The program reflects “best practices” and compares well to relevant performance standards from comparable institutions and/or accrediting agencies and/or other authoritative sources. The program demonstrates leadership in its performances relative to appropriate external benchmarks.
- g) Advising – Program faculty provide excellent academic advising, per student evaluations and other appropriate indicators.
- h) Extramural Funding (for programs where such funding is critical) – Success in attracting extramural funding that contributes to the Program’s long-term stability.

Standard III: There is demand for the program.

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

- a) external demand based on local, regional, national, and global trends and forecasts for persons with particular types and levels 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 clearly stated student outcomes. This includes but is not limited to direct and indirect assessments of student learning at the course level. The program has a sustainable cyclical assessment plan in place to evaluate students' achievement of each program outcome, as well as a process for using assessment data to inform specific changes that are intended to improve student outcomes.
- d) to monitor the quality of student advising.
- e) to utilize data gathered in 5b-d to determine needed changes in tactics, policies, curriculum, and course contents.
- f) to plan and 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 assessment of student achievement of program learning outcomes, new knowledge in the discipline, societal need, and demand for the program.
- b) measures to maintain or improve high quality student advising, including career preparation advising.
- c) programmatic features that foster an appreciation of cultural and intellectual diversity.
- d) linkages with other programs, including articulation agreements, co-sponsored academic majors, minors, or concentrations, joint appointments of faculty members, cross-listed courses, student internships, practica, or field-based projects with organizations outside the University, resources shared with other academic units, dual degrees, and 3-2, 4-1, or other undergraduate + graduate degree arrangements.

APPENDIX D: Using OIRA Data for Academic Program Review

This FAQ is intended to familiarize you with the kinds of research and data made available to you for your program’s APR self-study by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). This list is by no means exhaustive, so please browse [Catamount Data](#) or [contact OIRA directly](#) for additional assistance.

1. What kinds of measures can we use to determine whether our program attracts high-quality students?

Interestingly, older measures of “high-quality students” will change and become harder to quantify as fewer high schools provide high school rank and UVM is now a test-optional institution. Contact OIRA directly to make requests for average high school grade-point- average for students in your program.

We recommend instead that many programs focus on yield (the percentage of students who are admitted to their program that actually enroll at UVM). A high yield rate is an indicator that the program is an attractive option for students. Undergraduate program admissions information can be found here:

<https://oir.w3.uvm.edu/catdat/restricted/uvm-oir-admissions-program.html>

See question 3 for other ways of determining whether a program retains high-quality students.

2. What kinds of measures can we use to determine whether our program retains and graduates students? What do we need to know about retention and graduation rates?

Retention and graduation rates are great metrics at the institutional level, however challenging to use at the program level because they are dependent on a student’s program choice in their first fall semester at UVM. We encourage you instead to use the adjusted retention and graduation rates, which looks at retention and graduation rates based on a student’s major in their third fall semester

(<https://www.uvm.edu/oir/retention/graduation-planning> - go to the section on Retention and Graduation Rates by Adjusted Cohorts).

College	Original Cohort Size	Left Major by 3rd Year	Joined Major by 3rd Year	Adjusted Cohort Size (3rd Year)	3rd to 4th Year Retention Rate	4-Yr Graduation Rate	6-Yr Graduation Rate
CALS	849	400	740	1189	92.0%	84.4%	95.0%
CAS	5171	3860	1993	3304	90.6%	77.8%	91.5%
CEMS	985	652	408	741	94.3%	69.9%	91.8%
CEM Dean's Ofc	136	132	4	8	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%
Civil & Env Engineering	255	173	81	163	95.1%	74.2%	96.3%
CE	101	54	63	110	96.4%	71.8%	96.4%
EENV	154	119	18	53	92.5%	79.2%	96.2%
Computer Science	78	36	65	107	91.6%	59.8%	82.2%
Elec & Biomed Engineering	57	31	34	60	98.3%	71.7%	91.7%
Interdisciplinary	173	161	10	22	90.9%	54.5%	90.9%
Mathematics & Statistics	42	16	66	92	85.9%	71.7%	89.1%
Total	9762	6104	4088	7746	92.4%	79.2%	93.2%

The *adjusted retention and graduation rate* allows you to see how well your students are doing when they are taking many of your program's courses, and is probably a more accurate reflection of how well your program is retaining and graduating students.

3. What do we need to know about student flow in and out of our program? How can we demonstrate that there is internal demand for our program?

The adjusted retention and graduation rates dashboard provides information regarding student flow in and out of a program in students' first two years at the University (<https://www.uvm.edu/oir/retention/graduation-planning> - go to the section on Retention and Graduation Rates by Adjusted Cohorts. This will give you a preliminary understanding of how many students who started in your program left but also provide insight as to how many students changed their major into your program. When the net inflow (joined major by 3rd year) is greater than the net outflow (left major by 3rd year), there is a strong internal demand for your program.

Using the Student Flow Dashboards

At <https://www.uvm.edu/oir/retention/graduation-planning>, go to the Student Flow Dashboard. This will allow you to examine what programs are receiving your students when they leave your program (you will see why the traditional retention/graduation rates are not very helpful at the program level).

The Student Flow, Semester-to-Semester and Student Flow, Fall Term-to-Fall Term examines student pipeline (what majors your students are coming from) and student pathway (where do your students go). Unlike the Student Flow Academic Career dashboard, which only looks at the academic career of a first-time first-year student, these student flow dashboards includes all students (i.e., external transfer students, readmits, and returning study abroad students). These dashboards can also be helpful in highlighting the internal demand for your program.

Finally, we encourage you to use all of these measures in concert to reflect on the ways in which your program and curricular structure and program-internal advising may influence student flow. In other words, are there targeted changes at key points that could aid in recruitment and retention?

4. What are some ways we can illustrate the successes of our program's students post-graduation and measure ongoing student outcomes?

The Career Center and OIRA produce annual reports on students' post-graduation outcomes six-months out (<https://www.uvm.edu/oir/career-outcomes>). Due to small numbers, the reports do not disaggregate by major. At the moment, please contact OIRA for specific program numbers and we will be happy to assist you.

The methodology in collecting this information aligns with the National Association of Colleges and Employers ([NACE](https://www.nacweb.org/job-market/graduate-outcomes/first-destination/)), which provides national benchmarks by programs (<https://www.nacweb.org/job-market/graduate-outcomes/first-destination/>).


Aside from the six-month post-graduation outcomes survey, there are no other university-wide initiatives to collect survey data on alumni. OIRA believes this information is better collected at the department level, both because learning outcomes varies from major to major and because this is the level of the institution that can be most responsive to the information gathered and can make relatively quick and meaningful changes.

For this reason, please see our [Alumni/Major survey design resource](#) offered through OIRA. Here you will find tools to assist with data collection (e.g., survey design/templates, survey cycle, survey administration, and focus group protocols). OIRA is also happy to assist with developing a survey or redesigning a previously deployed instrument.

5. What are ways of measuring the size of our program over time?

There are two ways you might consider measuring size: program enrollment (<https://www.uvm.edu/oir/program-level-minors-enrollment>) and degrees awarded (<https://www.uvm.edu/oir/degrees-minors-awarded>). The program-level dashboard includes not only those students whose primary major in the program, but also those who are double/triple majoring. The dashboard also includes those students who are studying abroad. Both dashboards allows you to examine the size of your program over ten years.

Program-Level Enrollment




Degree Completion



6. **What are some ways to evaluate the effectiveness of our program in terms of curricular design?**

Curricular Analytics, a free program, allows you to visualize the complexity of your curricula and degrees plans (<https://curricularanalytics.org/>). Please reach out to OIRA for support in creating the files for the visualizations.



The Student Curriculum Matrix (<https://www.uvm.edu/oir/retention/graduation-planning>) -> go to the section on Student Credit Hours & Matrix Dashboards) allows you to examine who (e.g., by major and class level) is taking your courses and what courses your students are taking. This can be helpful in identifying how effectively students' progress through your program and whether there are bottlenecks. It can also suggest patterns in the ways in which your program's students fulfill other requirements throughout the university.

Year 201920 Semester All Metric Type SCH
 Course Unit All Subject All Course Level All
 Student Unit All Student Major All Class Level All Apply

Overview Breakdown Data List

Student Curriculum Matrix, Overview

Unit of Student Major by Unit of Course Discipline
 Proprietary and Confidential

Totals by Academic Unit of the Course and of Students Enrolled in those Courses

	CALS Courses	CAS Courses	CEMS Courses	CESS Courses	CNHS Courses	GG Courses	GSB Courses	Interdisciplinary Courses	LCOM Courses	RSENR Courses	Total
Total	21,929.0	10,411.0	2,480.0	781.0	779.0	9.0	193.0	1,032.0	3,076.0	1,431.0	42,121.0
CALS Students	7,806.0	91,730.0	10,389.5	3,574.0	2,520.0	33.0	968.0	3,529.0	4,206.0	3,593.0	128,348.5
CAS Students	558.0	3,277.0	1,042.0	655.0	708.0	23.0	273.0	103.0	566.0	94.0	7,299.0
CEMS Students	890.0	8,184.5	31,294.5	305.0	548.0	18.0	613.0	626.0	751.0	219.0	43,449.0
CESS Students	685.0	6,211.5	1,259.0	11,749.0	266.0	7.0	36.0	214.0	257.0	190.0	20,874.5
CNHS Students	1,670.0	7,255.5	1,064.0	1,071.0	15,208.5	0.0	34.0	442.0	3,280.0	120.0	30,145.0
GSB Students	1,334.0	5,468.0	2,335.0	754.0	191.0	12.0	14,881.0	242.0	340.0	407.0	25,964.0
Graduate Students	1,588.0	2,808.0	3,355.0	5,826.0	6,413.5	0.0	1,776.0	3,612.8	2,711.0	956.0	29,046.2
Interdisciplinary Students	0.0	91.0	231.0	58.0	0.0	577.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	957.0
RSENR Students	2,629.0	5,420.0	1,478.0	174.0	260.0	0.0	69.0	422.0	101.0	12,255.0	22,808.0
Total	39,089.0	140,856.5	54,928.0	24,947.0	26,894.0	679.0	18,843.0	10,222.8	15,288.0	19,265.0	351,012.2

7. How can we best calculate and display student/faculty ratios and/or student credit hours (SCH) per faculty FTE?

There are a number of ways that institutions go about calculating a ratio like this. For example, is the student component of the metric the number of students in your major or student credit hour taught? With regards to the faculty component of the metric, who counts when calculating the faculty FTE? Before utilizing this metric, it is best to clearly understand what you are hoping to measure. The dashboard you see below is best used to address faculty workload, and compares SCH by department/program:

<https://oir.w3.uvm.edu/catdat/restricted/uvm-oir-all-faculty-workload.html>

This information can be further broken down by faculty category (TT/NTT) and can be viewed utilizing faculty headcount or FTE. Change over time in these numbers might also prove important in evaluating program size/demand and changes in faculty workload.

8. What are ways that we can measure the impact our program is having on efforts to attract and retain students from diverse groups at UVM?


The Undergraduate Program Admissions (<https://oir.w3.uvm.edu/catdat/restricted/uvm-oir-admissions-program-nore.html>) provides admissions information by program disaggregated by sex and by race/ethnicity. Please contact OIRA for admissions information disaggregated by race/ethnicity.

You can also disaggregate the information in the adjusted retention and graduation rates dashboard (<https://www.uvm.edu/oir/retention/graduation-planning> - go to the section on Retention and Graduation Rates by Adjusted Cohorts) by race/ethnicity and /or sex. This will allow you to assess your recruitment and student success efforts in creating an inclusive and equitable environment for your diverse students.

9. **What are ways of demonstrating faculty productivity and research output?**

Academic Analytics

(<https://portal2.academicanalytics.com/Account/Login?ReturnUrl=%2F>) provides information regarding faculty productivity and research output (i.e., awards, articles, books, conference proceedings, and grants). Chairs can use Academic Analytics to benchmark against similar departments at other institutions (see radar chart below as an example).



Please contact OIRA for access to or assistance with Academic Analytics.

This FAQ was prepared by Alex Yin (Alex.Yin@uvm.edu), Executive Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment Emily Manetta (Emily.Manetta@uvm.edu), Provost's Faculty Fellow for APR and Assessment and was last updated: 1/4/23.

Frequently Asked Questions:

What is an appropriate length for an accredited program self-study report?

It depends on the number of programs being included in the review, and the degree to which the APR standards are addressed in the accreditation materials. At the very least, a detailed cover letter or executive summary indicating where each of the standards are addressed in the accreditation report should be provided. Appendices may be attached to the report or submitted separately.

What is the process for gathering data?

Should the program require additional data specific to the Standards and Criteria, the Director of Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (see page 21) should be contacted for assistance. Refer to the Guidelines for Preparation of a Self-Study Report for suggested data to be included.

What do I do with the self-study report and accompanying documents when completed?

The report and accompanying documents are to be uploaded to the program's Sharepoint site by either the program or the APR Coordinator. In either case, the APR Coordinator (see page 21) should be notified when the self-study report is completed.

What happens after the self-study report is posted?

After receiving the program's input, the internal review subcommittee will draft a report and present their findings and recommendation to the full Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC). Following the vote of the CAC, the APR Coordinator schedules a summary meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to review and discuss the key findings of the program review. A summary is then drafted to document the main findings of the meeting.

What is the process for selecting internal reviewers?

The Internal Review Subcommittee consists of two CAC members appointed by the Chair of the CAC. For reviews that include a significant number of programs and/or require a member of the graduate faculty, a third member may be appointed.

What is the department/program responsible for?

The department/program is responsible for preparing the self-study report and participating in the summary meeting.

What happens with the APR Summary?

The APR Summary document is signed by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success and the Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee. Signed copies are distributed to the summary meeting participants, and uploaded to the program's Sharepoint site.

What happens after the APR Summary is completed?

Upon completion of the summary report, the APR will be considered closed with the next review to occur within one to two years following the program's next scheduled accreditation.

Contacts

For matters of policy and procedure:

Jennifer Dickinson
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success
304 Waterman Bldg.
Phone: 656-2232
Jennifer.Dickinson@uvm.edu

For questions about metrics and data:

Larry Granillo
Interim Director, Office of Institutional Research & Assessment
440 College Street
Phone: 656-1168
Larry.Granillo@uvm.edu

For logistical/coordination matters:

Catherine Symans
Academic Program Review Coordinator
304 Waterman Bldg.
Phone: 656-0903
Catherine.Symans@uvm.edu

For Faculty Senate curricular affairs matters:

Colby Kervick
Stephen Everse
Co-Chairs, Curricular Affairs Committee
Colby.Kervick@uvm.edu
Stephen.Everse@uvm.edu

Academic Program Review Web site:

<http://www.uvm.edu/~provost/?Page=academicprogramreview.html>