



The University of Vermont

# A GUIDE TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW for Accredited Programs

Office of the Provost  
Revised March 2019

# 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
Frequently Asked Questions.....	13
Contacts and Additional Information.....	15

## 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.

Program review operates on a nominal eight-year cycle, meaning that each program is reviewed every eight years. 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 Provost.

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, 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 standards<sup>1</sup> 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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**  
**Cycle 12 Timeline and Activities**

Approximate Time Frame	Responsibilities
<i>Fall 2017</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Provost’s Office sends notification letter to program chair/director.</li> <li>— APR Coordinator creates Sharepoint site for program.</li> </ul>
<i>Spring 2018</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Program chair/director meets with OIR Director to discuss data for the accredited program self-study report <i>if needed</i>.</li> <li>— The chair/director organizes and initiates the accredited program self-study report.</li> </ul>
<i>Fall 2018 – 4-6 weeks prior to end of semester</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Program chair/director posts final self-study report to program APR Sharepoint site. APR Coordinator notifies internal reviewers the self-study report is available for review.</li> <li>— When required, the Graduate Executive Committee provides a written assessment to the graduate program(s).</li> </ul>
<i>Within 6 weeks of self-study completion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Internal Review Subcommittee (IRS) meets with authors of the self-study report.</li> <li>— IRS prepares report, and submits to full Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) for vote.</li> </ul>
<i>Within 6 months after CAC vote</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Provost, Associate Provost, 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.</li> </ul>
<i>Within 1 month of summary meeting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— APR Coordinator drafts the APR Summary Memo for review and signature by Provost, Associate Provost, and CAC chair. APR Coordinator distributes signed report.</li> </ul>
<i>Two years following summary meeting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Provost, Associate Provost, relevant dean(s), program chair/director, CAC Chair, and APR Coordinator meet to review findings and recommendations in the APR Summary Memo.</li> </ul>
<i>Within 1 month of two-year follow-up meeting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— APR Coordinator drafts two-year follow-up report for review and signature by Provost, Associate Provost, and CAC Chair. APR Coordinator distributes signed memo to meeting participants.</li> </ul>

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

### **Provost's Office**

- 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
- Oversee two-year follow-up review

### **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 and two-year follow-up meetings
- 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 and two-year follow-up meetings

# **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 assessment<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

## 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 (see page 15) 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 15) 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, and to set expectations for follow-up in two years.

### ***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 and two-year follow-up meetings.

### ***What happens with the APR Summary?***

The APR Summary document is signed by the Provost, the Associate Provost for Teaching and Learning, 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 is the purpose of the two-year follow-up meeting?***

A follow-up meeting will be scheduled two years from the summary meeting. The purpose of the two-year follow-up meeting is to review the findings and recommendations in the APR Summary and to discuss the current status of the program and progress on identified goals and objectives. A second report will be drafted, signed and distributed. Upon completion and distribution of the second report, the APR will be considered closed with the next review to occur within one to two years following the program's next scheduled reaccreditation.

## Contacts

For matters of policy and procedure:

Brian Reed  
Associate Provost for Teaching and Learning  
352 Waterman Bldg.  
Phone: 656-2232  
[Brian.reed@uvm.edu](mailto:Brian.reed@uvm.edu)

For questions about metrics and data:

Alex Yin  
Director, Office of Institutional Research  
440 College Street  
Phone: 656-4418  
[Alexander.yin@uvm.edu](mailto:Alexander.yin@uvm.edu)

For logistical/coordination matters:

Catherine Symans  
Academic Program Review Coordinator  
348 Waterman Bldg.  
Phone: 656-0903  
[Catherine.symans@uvm.edu](mailto:Catherine.symans@uvm.edu)

For Faculty Senate curricular affairs matters:

Laura Almstead  
Chair, Curricular Affairs Committee  
Department of Plant Biology  
307 Jeffords Hall  
Phone: 656-2919  
[Laura Almstead](mailto:Laura.Almstead@uvm.edu)

**Academic Program Review Web site:**

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