

This motion was amended on the Faculty Senate floor on October 11, 2010 to include "for this year only"; and a friendly amendment on page 2 was proposed by the Provost's Office and approved by the Administrative Committee on May 6, 2011.


The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its October 11, 2010 Meeting #169:

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regent policy and regulations (10.06).

*Approved frequency: for this year only, as amended on*  
EFFECTIVE: Immediately *the Senate floor.*

**RATIONALE:** The existing program review process (Meeting #102, May 2001) does not fully meet Board of Regents policy and regulations on program review (10.06). The proposed process aligns with the new accreditation cycle, is a more efficient process, i.e., it is less burdensome on programs, and is intended to yield more consistent quality of review.

 11 October 2010  
President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

APPROVAL:   
Chancellor's Office

DATE: 10-12-10

DISAPPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chancellor's Office

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

The new program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial brief review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit supplied two-page narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the requirements set by Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one tenured-faculty member from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus five CRCD representatives will review the materials and make one of the following recommendations:
  - Continue program
  - Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
  - Continue program but improve other specific areas or

Program Review Process  
Approved by Faculty Senate 10/11/10

- Discontinue program.

The committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCDC will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information from about the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.

*in consultation  
with  
chancellor's  
cabinet*

3. ~~The Provost~~ will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:

- a. Program continuation is confirmed until next review cycle
- b. Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.
- c. Recommend to discontinue program. Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, when appropriate admissions may be suspended pending action.

## Program Review Template

The program will provide the following information (submit electronically to LaNora Tolman <latolman@alaska.edu> by December 1 – your Dean may ask for this information earlier to review it):

1. A current outcomes assessment plan and summary for each academic program (see attached appendix for more detail)
  2. Concise narratives responding to the following (no more than 2 pages):
    - a. The prospective market for program graduates expressed need by clientele in the service area and documented needs of the state (note if program is included in state high demand job area list) and/or nation. The following sites provide state and national employment related information:
      - i. UA System list of high demand job programs  
<http://www.alaska.edu/swbir/performance/metrics/MetricDetail/HDJTable1.pdf>
      - ii. State of Alaska Department of Labor  
<http://www.labor.state.ak.us/research/iodata/occpj.htm>
      - iii. U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics <http://www.bls.gov/oco/>
- Programs may use other appropriate data, e.g., placement information they collect or information from professional societies but should avoid anecdotal information. Continuing education such as baccalaureate enrollment for AA or AAS programs or graduate or professional school placement for baccalaureate programs can be included if appropriate. It is recognized that market data may not be available or appropriate for all programs.
- b. A description of unique and significant service achievements by unit faculty during the past three academic years. These service achievements should be ones where local or regional expertise was needed or were exceptional because of the achievement made. Please do not include common service functions such as

refereeing journals, service on UAF committees or science fair judging. The following examples illustrate what is wanted:

- i. Civil Engineering faculty worked with the local school district to implement a pre-engineering curriculum track.
  - ii. A Fisheries faculty member served on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
  - iii. An Anthropology faculty member serves as editor of a major journal in the field
  - iv. Music faculty participate in the Fairbanks Symphony, a collaboration between UAF and the local community
- c. A narrative addressing whether similar programs exist elsewhere in the UA system and briefly describe differences and/or justify program duplication. If the program is special or unique in the national context, the program should describe why.
  - d. A narrative explaining any unusual features observed in the demand and productivity summaries listed below.
  - e. Programs with faculty in the fine and performing arts units should supply a list of performances and exhibits by faculty from annual activities reports for 3 years. The Provost's Office will provide a list of publications by unit faculty in the previous three calendar years compiled from annual unit plans.
  - f. A brief narrative describing successful partnerships resulting in scholarships, equipment or in-kind services during the past three years.
  - g. Indicate whether the program has specialized accreditation (identify the professional association or accrediting body) or not.

**The Provost's Office will provide the following by November 1:**

- A list of publications by unit faculty in the previous three calendar years compiled from annual unit plans. Fine and performing arts units should supply a list of performances and exhibits by faculty from annual activities reports for 3 years.
- The UA Statewide annual list of unit principal investigators supported on external funding and the amount of funding over the past three years

**PAIR and/or Financial Services will provide the following demand and productivity summaries by November 1:**

- A graph illustrating 5- year trends in the following:
  - SCH lower division (developmental coursework listed as well for select units)
  - SCH upper division (500 level SCH not included unless specifically requested)
  - SCH graduate
- A graph illustrating 5-year trends in the following:
  - SCH by students outside the major
  - SCH by students outside the college/school
- A graph or table illustrating 5-year trends in distance SCH partitioned by those offered through the Center for Distance Education (CDE) and those not offered through CDE.
- A graph illustrating 5-year trends in the number of majors by degree/certificate type
- A table or graph illustrating the gender and ethnicity distribution of majors over 5 years
- A graph illustrating 5-year trends in the number of degrees/certificates awarded by type

- Average number of declared majors in program over 4 years /average number of degrees (certificates) over 4 years (no intention to compare across different degrees)
- A numerical summary of the following information for the previous fiscal year:
  - \*Total department annual budget
  - \*\*Tuition revenue generated by all designators associated with department
  - FTE faculty positions and a list of faculty funded by the program with an indicator as to whether the faculty member was an active PI
  - FTE staff positions

\*= Where department budgets are problematic to obtain, measures of the cost of the program will be developed by the college or school, described and used or college/school budget used.

\*\*= approximate tuition revenue will be determined by ignoring in-state/out-of-state and whether tuition waivers were applied or not.

## **Appendix A. Evaluating a Programmatic Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program will submit the following outcomes assessment information:**

- **An assessment plan for each program; programs are encouraged, but not required, to include employment placement and/or graduate school enrollment information as part of their assessment process.**
- **Assessment information collected and summarized during the previous three years**
- **A summary of programmatic revisions (improvements) resulting from the assessment information**

**The Program Review Committee will assess the quality of the programmatic assessment process. Quality shall be assessed based on at least the following characteristics:**

- 1) Assessment Plan**
  - a. Each program has its own outcomes assessment appropriate to the certificate or degree (the same plan for cannot be used programs of different levels, e.g., associate and baccalaureate because the outcomes should differ)**
  - b. Multiple measures of student outcomes are utilized**
  - c. Assessment includes direct evidence of student learning (student survey results are considered indirect evidence)**
- 2) Assessment information is collected and summarized on a regular basis.**
- 3) The assessment summary is based on aggregate student information not a statement about individual student outcomes. The intent of the process is to assess the effectiveness of the curriculum not individual performance. In addition, it is important to be able to share assessment information with external evaluators without violating FERPA.**
- 4) Where the assessment process results in the identification of weaknesses in student outcomes, documented curricular changes have occurred intended to improve student outcomes.**