

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
MANAGEMENT TEAM**

**Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
626-4099**

Gail D. Burd, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
gburd@email.arizona.edu

Barbara J. Martinez
Special Assistant to the Vice Provost
626-4099
bmarti@email.arizona.edu

Office of Academic Affairs

Patti J. King
Senior Associate for Academic Affairs
621-4107
pattik@email.arizona.edu

Celeste F. Pardee
Curriculum Associate
621-5375
cpardee@email.arizona.edu

Information Warehouse

Rachel Serrano
Manager of Data Warehousing & Business Intelligence Services
621-9273
rstclair@email.arizona.edu

Academic Year 2009-10 Academic Program Reviews

Applied Mathematics, College of Public Health, School of Dance, Ecology &
Evolutionary Biology, Immunobiology, Molecular & Cellular Biology,
School of Nursing, Physiological Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Academic Program Review Management Team

Introduction 1

The Process

Initial Planning 2

Self-Study 3

Joint Internal/External Review 5

Discussion of the Findings: Conclusions & Recommendations 8

Report to the Arizona Board of Regents 8

Appendices

Appendix A Academic Program Review Task Guideline

Appendix B Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline

Appendix C Sample Itinerary

Appendix D Low Productivity Process

Introduction

What is Academic Program Review?

Academic program review (APR) is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of all academic programs offered on the campuses of the three Arizona state universities. Arizona Board of Regents' (ABOR) policy 2-208 (Academic Program Review) states that academic departments are the basic unit of review. Both departmentally based programs and programs administered by committees are reviewed at least once every seven years. According to Board policy, the standard review consists of a self-study, followed by a review that includes experts from outside the University. An academic program review is not a review of the unit head.

Purpose

According to ABOR policy, academic program review fulfills several purposes. The process is designed to assess program quality and facilitate program improvement where appropriate and to assist in achieving the best use of institutional resources. The information gathered in the course of the review will assist in University and State planning efforts and guide University and ABOR evaluation of new program proposals, budget requests, and capital project requests.

The primary purpose of academic program review is to examine, assess, and strengthen programs. The areas in which program quality is evaluated include, but are not limited to: (a) the quality of educational programs, including an assessment of student outcomes; (b) the quality of research, creative activity, or scholarly work; (c) the quality of outreach activities and service to the University, the profession, and the community; (d) the contribution or importance of the program to other campus programs; and (e) the potential and future expectations for the program. The review is intended (1) to enhance the quality of a program and to assist in determining a program's ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities, (2) to evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and thus, determine future priorities, and (3) to aid in shaping the strategic plan for the program.

APR Administration at the UA

Given their central role in guiding academic decision making, academic program reviews are overseen by the Executive Vice President and Provost. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs administers the process. Members of the Office of Academic Affairs serve as consultants to academic units, particularly as questions arise in the preparation of self-studies, and provide assistance to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in the culminating phases of the review process.

Seven-Year APR Schedule

The seven-year APR schedule is developed in consultation with the deans of the various colleges and conforms to ABOR calendar requirements. When possible, the schedule is coordinated with other review and accreditation obligations of the programs. It is important to note that accreditation reviews are conducted for other purposes and do not take the place of the academic program review. However, elements of and preparation for these reviews may overlap. Many accreditation or other reviews have a self-study that requires many if not most of the items suggested for the APR self-study in Appendix B, and the APR self-study or the

accreditation/other review self-study can be tailored to meet the needs of the other. In some instances the review teams have been the same for both reviews.

Under exceptional circumstances, the seven-year schedule may be revised by the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in consultation with the appropriate dean. A department head, with the approval of the dean, may request an academic program review at any time. On rare occasion, when circumstances warrant, a review may be extended or postponed.

The Process

The academic program review process includes the five major steps outlined below. These steps are: (1) initial planning, (2) self-study, (3) joint internal/external review, (4) discussion of findings, and (5) the report to the Arizona Board of Regents. The explanation of each step includes guidelines for the review process. While the guidelines are not binding and may be adapted to the needs of the individual program under study, they should be followed as closely as possible.

The timetable required for the review of an academic program should be one academic year. A model timetable for the entire review process is found in Appendix A. Actual time for each step will vary according to the department and the unique needs of each review. Some reviews may be completed in substantially less time. The one-year schedule, however, allows for occasional and often unavoidable interruptions in the process. It is critical that the review process be accomplished within the proposed time frame so as to not overlap with the next cycle.

Initial Planning

The academic program review process will be initiated each academic year by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Late in the spring semester preceding the academic program review year, letters will be sent to the appropriate deans notifying them of the programs under their purview scheduled for review. Early in the fall semester, deans, unit heads, and appropriate staff will be invited to participate in an informational meeting to launch the academic program review process. This meeting will serve as an introduction to the APR process and its purposes, and it will provide guidelines for successful completion. If there are unique needs left unaddressed at the meeting, the dean and/or the head of the academic unit may contact the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for further discussion.

As with any review process, there is a need for support, ranging from secretarial assistance to payment of expenses for external reviewers. It is expected that such support for the APR will be provided by the program being reviewed, its college, or a combination of the two. Costs should be part of the department head-dean discussion at an early date. Hotel and travel arrangements for out-of-town APR committee members should be made as early as possible to avoid increased costs and limited availability due to conflicts with other events, i.e., Rodeo Days, the Gem and Mineral Show, etc.

Self-Study

A. Guidelines

A thorough and thoughtful self-study will candidly assess a program's past and present efforts and will outline a realistic course for the program's future. The self-study provides the basis for the entire review process. Therefore, it is critical that the study cover all aspects of the academic program. It is of particular importance that the self-study pays special attention to issues and measures of quality. If a self-study has been undertaken within the previous year for accreditation or other purposes, it is possible, with appropriate modifications and updating, to adapt parts of that study for academic program review purposes.

The areas and issues to be covered by the self-study are reflected in the *Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline* (Appendix B). The outline provides an overview of the features of the program that should be examined. Such features include the goals and history of the program, an overview of program quality and ranking; faculty (including an assessment of the post-tenure review process in the unit, as required by ABOR); undergraduate and graduate students and curricula (including alumni feedback), student outcomes assessment; academic outreach; resources; administration; and diversity/affirmative action. It is also important to ensure that student privacy is respected, as required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 (See <http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/>). In addition, the Office of the Provost and the College may identify particular areas to be examined in the self-study. It must be noted that the academic program review is not a department head review.

Because of the variety of academic programs, it is assumed that the self-study may go beyond the issues and questions raised in the outline or may disregard questions not pertinent to the program. The outline is intended to provide the general framework of the review and should be augmented by whatever supplemental information is deemed necessary to create an effective self-assessment. This additional information may be presented as an extension of the information suggested in the outline. In writing the report, please be succinct, yet thorough.

B. Composition and Appointment of the Self-Study Committee

Membership of the self-study committee generally is recommended by the program head; final decisions and appointments are made by the dean. The self-study committee usually consists of three or more faculty from the department or program being reviewed. It is recommended that committee members be selected from among those faculty with a good understanding of the department, as well as of the discipline/profession. When possible, this group should include both junior and senior faculty. The committee should also include staff and student representatives.

Alternatively, it may be beneficial to have all faculty participate in the self-study process through the use of subcommittees. This approach is particularly appropriate in larger units.

C. Procedures

The self-study should be started immediately following the informational workshop so that it can be completed by the beginning of the spring semester (see Appendix A). The self-study is the

most time-consuming part of the APR process. The model timetable allows sufficient time for the completion of a comprehensive report on the important aspects of the review. No specific procedures have been established for how the self-study is to be conducted. By following the outline provided in Appendix B and expanding upon those areas of special relevance to a particular review, the report will be responsive to the requirements and intent of the academic program review process. It is important that every effort be made to ensure that the process and the resulting report are comprehensive and thorough. It is also essential that the process and results be open and available to all members (faculty, students, and staff) of the department or program.

It is recommended that the self-study committee make a special effort to gather all relevant data and present the findings clearly in ways that serve as a basis of information for the review; to interview all faculty and selected representative students and alumni; and to gain information from other campus and non-campus resources, as appropriate. Relevant data include faculty vitae, annual reports, prior review reports, information pertaining to grants and research, and data accessible through the Integrated Information Warehouse (<https://admin.iw.arizona.edu>.)

The Office of Academic Affairs will provide a set of APR data reports to units being reviewed through a password-protected web site (<http://apr.web.arizona.edu/Home>). Each unit head will be provided with a password that will be used to access the APR data reports relevant to his/her unit. The password should be shared with internal and external reviewers as deemed necessary and appropriate by the unit head. All data provided must be included in its entirety in the appendices of the self-study report. Select portions of the data provided may be used in the body of the self-study report as desired and additional data provided by the department may also be added as deemed necessary and desirable. Please include only information available since the last APR report. Keep in mind that the self-study report will be the review team’s first comprehensive introduction to the program. **Note that FERPA, prohibits releasing any personal data on a student, i.e., grade point averages, standardized test scores, etc., without written permission from the student** (<http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/>).

In spring 2003, ABOR eliminated its policy requiring system-wide review every five years of “low-degree-producing programs.” Instead, the academic program review policy was revised to include the following new requirement: “For low productive degree programs with graduations below established thresholds, an evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the Board-approved guidelines as set forth in a document entitled “A Methodology for Identifying Low Productive and Duplicative Programs” (Appendix D) and reported to the Board.

Threshold for Defining Productive Programs
Arizona University System

Type of Degree	Type of Campus	3-Year Degree Total
Baccalaureate	Main	24 or more degrees
Baccalaureate	Non-main	15 or more degrees
Masters	Main	9 or more degrees
Masters	Non-main	6 or more degrees
Doctorate	Main (only)	6 or more degrees

Except when a university recommends elimination of a program, it must provide the additional information specified in the approved “methodology.” Units with programs that have failed to attain the required thresholds over the most recent three-year period will be notified by the Office of Academic Affairs and provided with the required methodology so that they may include the necessary information in their self-studies.

D. Review of Self-Study Report

A working draft of the self-study report should be sent electronically to Celeste Pardee (cpardee@u.arizona.edu) in the Office of Academic Affairs who will perform an initial review and provide feedback. This step gives the self-study committee an opportunity to polish the report before it is submitted to the college dean. Once completed and approved by the dean, a copy of the self-study report should be forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for review no later than January 15.

Joint Internal/External Review

A. Guidelines

The self-study committee should suggest possible members for the joint internal/external review committee to the program head and dean early in the process, and no later than November 1 (see “Composition and Appointment of the Review Committee” below). The College/Department should clear visit dates with Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (who will check dates on calendar of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Executive Vice President and Provost), the dean, and the entire review committee before submitting the committee list to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for approval. These recommendations are due to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs by November 15.

The joint internal/external review committee will be appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost. The review committee should make every effort to review the department or program within the context of the University’s Strategic Plan (http://president.arizona.edu/university_5year.cfm). Among the features of the unit that should be examined are the undergraduate and graduate programs; student outcomes assessment; research, teaching, and academic outreach efforts; faculty post-tenure review process and outcomes; fiscal and physical resources; recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented ethnic or minority groups; and academic and administrative organization. In addition, opportunities for inter- or cross-disciplinary development and cooperation should be explored. The committee may consult the *Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline* (Appendix B) for the range of subjects that are within its purview.

These suggestions are not exhaustive. The joint internal/external review committee is encouraged to be responsive to other issues that come to the fore in the course of the review. It is expected that the review committee will make specific recommendations for improvement of the quality of the program, as well as identify those aspects of the program(s) that are exemplary.

B. Composition and Appointment of the Review Committee

Prior to completion of the self-study, after consultation with the program head, and no later than November 15, the dean should submit the names of potential joint internal/external review committee members to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

A review committee will usually consist of seven members.

Review Committee:

3 external committee members (selected from the unit's current and aspirational peers)

2 internal committee members

 one from within the college of the department under review

 one from a college other than the department's college

1 community member

1 recent alumnus

It is anticipated that the selected reviewers will reflect the various academic areas covered by the program, be of national stature, be familiar with the various research specializations of the faculty, and be free of conflicts of interest that would prevent them from conducting an objective review. Every effort should be made to include members of under-represented groups and women on the committee. Community committee members could be members of college, unit, or University advisory groups or professionals in a related field working in the community; they should not have an appointment in the department under review. Alumni could be community members working in the area, but should not be a member of the department under review.

The list of recommended reviewers submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs should include at least two names for each committee member "slot." The list should include a brief biosketch and contact information (mailing address, email address, and phone number). Prior to submission of the list, the unit head or dean should contact potential internal/external review committee members to ensure their willingness to serve on the review team and general availability in the likely timeframe for the site visit. The dean may list those recommended in priority order, indicating any preference for a committee chair. The committee chair will usually be selected from among the external reviewers.

The dean will then be notified of the prospective members approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost and asked to finalize the committee's composition and site visit dates. It is important to consult the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Barbara Martinez (626-4099 or bmarti@email.arizona.edu) to ensure that the Executive Vice President and Provost is available at the end of the visit and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs available at the start and end of the visit to meet the review team on the afternoon of last day of the team visit. When the review team membership and site visit dates are confirmed, the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs should be notified, so that letters formally appointing the chair and committee members can be sent. This mailing will include a copy of the *Procedures Manual for Academic Program Reviews* and a list of committee members invited to serve.

The dean may also correspond with members of the review team stating clearly the nature and purpose of the review and the reviewers' role. The unit head should also mail the self-study,

faculty CVs, and other appropriate material to the reviewers following their acceptance of the appointment, but at least three weeks prior to the visit. Some reviewers may also want this information in an electronic format (sent as attachments to an email or on a CD); please check with reviewers about this issue. The reviewers need this information in advance to be sure they have adequate time to review materials before the site visit.

No specific guidelines have been established for the remuneration of external reviewers. This matter is the responsibility of and at the discretion of unit heads and deans.

C. Procedures

It is the unit's responsibility to schedule the team's meetings with the Executive Vice President and Provost and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. It is advisable to do the scheduling well in advance of the site visit as the calendars fill up quickly. The Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs can assist with scheduling these meetings. Generally, it is advisable to block tentative visit dates on the calendars when the original suggested list of reviewers is sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Note that the joint internal/external review team site visit should be completed no later than mid-April in the spring semester following the completion of the self-study.

A draft APR review team itinerary should be prepared and sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Gail Burd (Admin. 501 gburd@email.arizona.edu) and Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Barbara Martinez (Admin 501, bmarti@email.arizona.edu) for review. A sample itinerary is provided in Appendix C. After the draft itinerary has been reviewed, the final review team itinerary should be prepared and sent to the reviewers no later than a week before the visit. The schedule should be sufficiently flexible to allow the inclusion of additional appointments at the committee's request.

The visit should span two full days to allow sufficient time for reviewers to meet with administrators, faculty, students, and others; to visit facilities; and to prepare a draft of their review report. Committee members should be provided time at the beginning of the visit to discuss among themselves how to proceed. The Vice Provost, on behalf of the Executive Vice President and Provost, will join the committee at its initial meeting to discuss procedures, scope, and issues unique to the particular review.

The committee may receive an additional charge from the dean related to college-based considerations. An opportunity will be provided at the end of the schedule for the committee to brief the Executive Vice President and Provost about issues and outcomes of the review.

Generally, the committee will review the self-study in depth, and interview faculty members, staff, students, and other individuals as appropriate (college and university administrators, faculty and/or department heads of related departments, and public or private groups with whom the department interacts). The review team may request additional information or data that may be deemed necessary and appropriate to do a complete review.

The external reviewers, as experts in the discipline, will be encouraged to evaluate the program in its national context. Attention should be given to the depth and breadth of faculty scholarship,

the quality of undergraduate and graduate education, the status of the department as a learning community, and the commitment of individuals to support the department, college, and university vision. The reviewers should feel free to respond to the findings of the self-study and comment upon any other issues that bear upon the quality of the academic program.

It is anticipated that the joint internal/external review committee will complete its work within a period of no longer than three to four weeks. The committee should provide its final report to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs within four weeks of the conclusion of the site visit. The report will be distributed to the Executive Vice President and Provost, unit head, and dean. The final report should include: a) Introduction, b) Strengths, c) Weaknesses, and d) Recommendations.

The report of the joint internal/external review committee should make specific suggestions for improvement of the program. When the report is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost, it will be considered a public document that will be shared with faculty, students, and others upon request.

Discussion of the Findings: Conclusions and Recommendations

Following the Executive Vice President and Provost's receipt and subsequent distribution of the joint internal/external review committee's report, a concluding conference among the Executive Vice President and Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the dean, and the program head will be scheduled. The unit self-study and the review committee report, including a summary of its recommendations, will provide a basis for discussion at this meeting. The Executive Vice President and Provost invites the dean and unit head to provide their perspectives regarding the conclusions and recommendations. A short memo of comments in response to the report of the joint internal/external review committee may be prepared by the unit head and distributed to the dean, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and the Executive Vice President and Provost prior to this final meeting. This meeting will be scheduled by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

The purpose of the meeting is to consider the findings and recommendations of the review. It may be preceded by a meeting of the dean and unit head. The decisions reached at the concluding conference are documented in a memorandum from the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Report to the Arizona Board of Regents

The final step in the Academic Program Review process is preparation of a summary report on the year's academic program reviews for the Arizona Board of Regents.

Upon ABOR request, a three-page narrative summary report will also be prepared for the Board and will include: (a) a description of the program; (b) an outline of the most recent previous review and responses; (c) procedures used in the review process; (d) major findings and conclusions of the review; (e) future plans for the program; and (f) a follow-up monitoring and reporting plan. A data summary will be appended to the narrative. A copy of the report will be sent to all those involved in the process.

APPENDIX A ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TASK GUIDELINE

Who/What

When (Deadline)

Unit Head

Attends APR kickoff	September
Submits recommendations for self-study committee members to Dean	September
Ensures progress on self-study report (SSR)	September - November
Blocks two sets of site visit dates on Vice Provost & Provost's calendar	September - October
Identifies and contacts & blocks dates with 14 review committee nominees	September - October
Forwards list of 14 willing review committee nominees to Dean	Early November
Forwards draft copy of SSR to the Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs	Early January
Confirms dates for visit with Vice Provost & Provost's Office	Late December-Early January
Sends 3 copies of final version of Self Study Report & materials to Vice Provost	January
Self-study sent to each review committee member	One month before visit
Sends draft site visit itinerary to Vice Provost for review	One month before the visit
Sends final itinerary for site visit to Vice Provost and review committee	Three weeks before the visit
SITE VISIT	No later than April 30
Attends final meeting with Dean, Vice Provost, and Provost	Shortly after receipt of review cmte report

Dean

Appoints self-study committee	September
Approves 14 review team nominees and forwards list to Vice Provost	November
Ensures progress on self-study report (SSR)	September - November
Attends final meeting with unit head, Vice Provost & Provost	Shortly after receipt of review cmte report

Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Meets with unit for initial planning when requested by unit	September
Reviews list of review committee nominees	November
Notifies department of Provost's selection for review committee	Mid-December
Sends invitation letter to the review committee	Late December-Early January
Forwards feedback on draft itinerary to the unit	Shortly after receipt of itinerary
Distributes review committee report to unit head, Dean, and Provost	Shortly after receipt of review cmte report
Attends final meeting with unit head, Dean, and Provost	Shortly after receipt of review cmte report
Completes final report for ABOR	

Executive Vice President and Provost

Selects the 7 members of the review committee	Early December
Meets with review committee on last day of site visit	Preferably, no later than the end of April
Holds final meeting with unit head, Dean and Vice Provost	Shortly after receipt of review cmte report
Concludes academic program review process after receiving commentary from the unit head and/or Dean	

Office of Academic Affairs

Provides consulting to units in the preparation of self-study	Fall term
Provides some institutional data for self-study	Fall term
Reviews and forwards feedback on draft SSR to the unit	Shortly after receiving report
Prepares summary for final meeting with Provost	One week prior to the final meeting
Prepares summary for ABOR following site visit	September of following year

APPENDIX B
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY OUTLINE

A. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND GOALS

1. Briefly describe the unit under review; this should include a statement of the unit's mission, role, and scope.
2. Briefly describe each of the academic degree programs under review, including the name of the degree and major and the purpose and scope of the program.
3. What are the major goals of this academic unit? If these have changed over the past 5 to 7 years, provide a summary of the changes. How are these goals expected to change in the future? (Append the program's or unit's strategic plan.)
4. How do these goals relate to the University's strategic plan and mission as expressed in the University of Arizona's Five-Year Strategic Plan? (http://www.president.arizona.edu/university_5year.cfm)

B. PROGRAM HISTORY

1. Describe the program's history since the last program review or within the past 5 years, emphasizing major changes that have occurred. Include information on academic programs that have been renamed, merged, or disestablished.
2. Provide a summary of the recommendations of the previous academic program review and the unit's responses to those recommendations.

C. OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM'S ACADEMIC QUALITY

1. In the view of the faculty, what is the overall quality of this program?

The quality of an academic unit can be assessed in many ways. In addressing this question, the faculty should consider all three of the illustrative criteria below. In each case, the status of this academic unit should be considered, and the information used to make these judgments should be described.

- a. Resource criteria, e.g., student selectivity or demand; faculty prestige, training, and teaching loads; grants and contracts; library; equipment; and support staff
- b. Reputational criteria, e.g., national or international ranking, or other judgments of the program's students, faculty, resources, and productivity

- c. Outcome criteria, e.g., faculty scholarly productivity, awards and honors, research contributions, teaching performance, service to state and nation; student gains in knowledge, students' professional achievements, placement, personal/or career development; and program alumni opinion.
2. In what areas has the program improved or deteriorated within the last 5 to 7 years? Describe the evidence used to support these conclusions.
3. Describe new directions in curriculum, resources, research, reorganization, staffing, or student clientele planned for the next few years and aimed at strengthening the program.
4. Identify the top five programs in this field. How does this program compare with others nationally? What evidence suggests this conclusion?

D. FACULTY

1. List the faculty in the department along with their titles. Summarize the faculty's overall strengths and weaknesses. What information has been used in identifying these strengths and weaknesses, and what conclusions have been drawn from this information? What plans have been implemented to capitalize on individual faculty strengths and to overcome weaknesses?
2. Describe the overall nature and breadth of the faculty's research and other scholarly contributions made through active participation in the generation of knowledge and exemplary practice or creative performance. If there is a means for doing so, provide an appraisal of the significance of these contributions in this field.
3. Describe the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty including teaching assistants in the teaching programs of the unit. How are these instructors assigned their teaching loads and particular courses? Do part-time faculty members participate in the academic program's meetings and discussions, in curriculum planning and/or in course design? How are part-time faculty identified, and how are their credentials evaluated? What role do teaching assistants play in instruction, and how are they prepared for their responsibilities?
4. Describe this faculty's participation, leadership, and influence in the academic profession through such avenues as professional associations, review panels, and advisory groups. Include the faculty's contributions to the University of Arizona through such activities as committee work. Provide short biographical sketches of the faculty in the self study and supply in the appendix, complete, up-to-date curriculum vitae (P&T approved format preferred).

5. Considering the academic unit's faculty as a whole, describe the faculty's potential for response to change -- to urgent discoveries, changing directions, and/or new external demands. What is the level of morale, commitment, and sense of continuing self-improvement? What is the balance of scholarly depth and breadth in the faculty, and what is the balance of traditional views with work taking place at the field's frontiers?
6. What is the faculty's collective view of the program's future, its desired directions, and its means for reaching these objectives? How do planning and incentives direct the program to these ends?
7. The unit head/chair should supply a brief overview of the post-tenure review results for the unit. This description should indicate how many tenured faculty were reviewed, how many reviews were satisfactory, how many reviews were not satisfactory and the nature of the improvement plan(s), and an aggregate description of how the tenured faculty contribute to the unit's mission.

E. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM (If none, please so indicate)

Please follow FERPA guidelines, <http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/> when reporting student data.

1. Describe, in general terms, the undergraduate programs offered by this academic unit. Use the data provided by the Office of Academic Affairs to show enrollment trends by program.

The CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is a six-digit code developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify the primary discipline of an academic program. CIP codes are widely used in both national surveys and studies, and are the accepted government taxonomy standard for higher education program classification. It is recommended that units cross reference their unit with the CIP code on the NCES web site (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/ciplist.asp>) to confirm alignment of unit's mission with current CIP code.

- a. In the most recent three years, has any single undergraduate degree program in the unit awarded fewer than 24 degrees? If so, an evaluation may be required in accordance with ABOR-approved guidelines set forth in a document entitled "A Methodology for Identifying Low Productive and Duplicative Programs" (APPENDIX D). The Office of Academic Affairs will contact units that must complete this evaluation.
2. Describe your department's role in the college and University in offering proficiency/foundations/general education courses.

- a. What has been the planning process for these courses? How are such offerings coordinated with other courses taken by these students and with courses offered for students majoring in this field?
 - b. Who teaches these courses, and what is the evidence of instructional quality for these courses? How (with particular emphasis on “outcomes”) is the quality of these courses assessed? What plans are underway to strengthen these offerings? Describe the process for planning and updating these courses.
3. The undergraduate major(s) and minor(s) curriculum and courses:
- a. How does the undergraduate curriculum(s) reflect the basic goals of the academic program? Does an accrediting body prescribe the curriculum(s)? If so, how is this done?
 - b. What evidence is available to compare this curriculum with similar programs nationally and assess its quality? Using this evidence, document the quality of the undergraduate major(s) in the unit’s program(s). In general, what plans are underway to change or strengthen the undergraduate majors(s) in the light of these or other sources of information?
 - c. How are courses in the undergraduate curriculum(s) coordinated? What evidence is there of sufficient offerings and balance among the various specialties to meet student needs and interests -- is there sufficient breadth of course offerings as well as sufficient depth for specialization?
 - d. What specific efforts are made to incorporate new knowledge and perspectives into the curriculum, and to consolidate or eliminate outdated views?
 - e. What efforts are made to involve students actively in their learning through such opportunities as internships, practica, work-study, or seminars?
4. Undergraduate Students:
- a. How does the quality of students selecting this unit for a major compare with the quality of students in other fields at the University of Arizona? In what manner, and how well, do students demonstrate their overall command of the field? How does the quality of students graduating in this unit compare with student quality in similar units nationwide?
 - b. What efforts are underway to attract and retain well qualified undergraduate students?

- c. Discuss time to degree data and compare with time to degree data for undergraduate students in your college and the University.
- d. How are undergraduate students majoring in the unit's program(s) advised? How has the advising process been evaluated? If the advising process has been evaluated, what were the results of this evaluation?
- e. How do alumni of the program view their educational experience? What methods are used to solicit their views? If statistics on graduation outcomes (% attending graduate school, types of jobs obtained following graduation, etc) are available, please discuss these outcomes.

F. GRADUATE PROGRAM

Please follow FERPA guidelines, <http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/> when reporting student data.

1. Overview:

- a. Describe, in general terms, the graduate degree program(s) offered by this unit. Include, as appropriate, dual degrees, joint degrees, accelerated masters programs and post-baccalaureate and/or graduate certificate programs. How does (do) the graduate program(s) reflect the basic goals (Section A) of the academic program? What changes have occurred in recent years, and what changes are contemplated for the future?

The CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is a six-digit code developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify the primary discipline of an academic program. CIP codes are widely used in both national surveys and studies, and are the accepted government taxonomy standard for higher education program classification. It is recommended that units cross reference their unit with the CIP code under the NCES web site (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/ciplist.asp>) to confirm alignment of unit's mission with current CIP code.

- b. What evidence (resources, reputation, outcomes, NRC rankings, or other criteria) is available concerning the quality of this unit's graduate program(s)? How is this information used to strengthen the graduate program(s)?
- c. Discuss time to degree data and compare with time to degree data for graduate students in your college and the University.
- d. In the most recent three years, has any single master's degree program in the unit awarded fewer than 9 degrees or has a Ph.D. program awarded fewer than six doctoral degrees? If so, an evaluation may be required in accordance with ABOR-approved guidelines set forth in a document entitled "A Methodology

for Identifying Low Productive and Duplicative Programs” (APPENDIX D). The Office of Academic Affairs will contact units that must complete this evaluation.

2. Curriculum and courses:

- a. What evidence is there of sufficient offerings and balance among the various specialties -- is there sufficient breadth of course offerings and sufficient depth for specialization? How are the courses in the graduate program coordinated? What plans are underway to modify the graduate program(s) in the light of available information?
- b. What evidence is there that the courses meet student needs? Are a sufficient number of courses offered at the 500 level and above? In what ways besides individual thesis or dissertation research are students involved actively in their learning -- for example through internships, practica, teaching internships, and/or assistantships?
- c. Do students have adequate resources to carry out their studies, e.g., office and lab space, supplies, travel, photocopying, etc.? What additional resources would be required to improve the quality of the graduate program substantially?

3. Graduate Students:

- a. What mechanisms are used to recruit students? Is the program competing well for top students? What help is needed in recruiting? How does (do) the quality of students in this (these) graduate program(s) compare with student quality in other similar programs? Has the quality of students improved over the last 5 years (based on GREs, GPAs, or other admissions criteria)?
- b. What is the current gender and race/ethnicity composition of the unit's graduate students? How do these figures compare with similar figures for undergraduates and for similar graduate programs at other schools?
- c. Are stipend levels and availability adequate? In addressing this, indicate the percentage of graduate students in the program(s) that have a teaching or research assistantship; the impact of increasing stipends (number or amount) on the graduate program; the salary range of stipends for half-time research assistantships and teaching assistantships; what financial support is provided for students presenting scholarly papers; what steps have been taken to improve student support; what additional program, college, or university-level support is needed to strengthen students' programs?
- d. What is the nature and quality of the advising for graduate students, and how has advising been assessed? What is the average ratio of student/faculty thesis

and dissertation supervision? What is the minimum and maximum ratio of student/faculty thesis and dissertation supervision?

- e. What are the completion rates and time to degree in this graduate program? How do these rates compare with the rates of 5 years ago? How do they compare to other programs in this discipline? Provide a list of all graduates from the last 3 to 5 years and indicate where they have been placed. How do graduates of your program view their graduate experience, and how are their views solicited? What program modifications do these views suggest?
4. Does this unit offer courses taken by significant numbers of students from other units? If so, the self-study should address the following questions:
 - a. Describe the planning process used for these courses. How are such offerings coordinated with other courses taken by these students and with courses offered for students concentrating in this graduate program? What coordination problems, if any, have you encountered?
 - b. Who teaches these courses? What has been the coordination of this instruction with the home departments of students taking these courses?
 - c. What is the instructional quality of these offerings for non-majors, and how is the quality assessed? What plans are underway to use these data or other information in strengthening these offerings?
 5. Do a significant number of students from your unit utilize graduate courses from other fields? What coordination problems, if any, have been encountered?
 6. How many PhD students in your program complete minors in other disciplines? How many PhD students from other programs complete minors in your discipline?

G. STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Refer to the Draft of The University of Arizona Assessment Plan web site, http://assessment.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/Assessment_Plan_2009_draft_04-07-09.pdf, and examine the information for your academic unit on the UA assessment website (<http://assessment.arizona.edu>). Updating and adding to the assessment information reported for your unit on this website should be done at this time. Some aspects of assessment may already be covered within the preceding sections on the undergraduate and graduate programs.

1. List the intended student outcomes: describe what students should know, understand, and be able to do at the conclusion of a course, a series of courses, or the full academic program.

2. List and characterize the different methods used to assess intended student outcomes. Describe how the data are collected. Are the data collected from a representative sample?
3. Specify how student outcomes are related to the mission and goals of the program, college, and University (<http://plan.web.arizona.edu/>).
4. Describe how faculty and students are involved in the development, implementation, and use of student outcomes assessment.
5. Describe results of the outcomes assessment from your program and indicate how these will be used to improve learning and instruction. Place the outcomes assessment of your unit's academic programs on the UA Assessment Website (<http://assessment.arizona.edu/>).
6. Explain how the results of student outcomes assessment are incorporated in strategic planning and curricular review processes in your unit.

H. THRESHOLD FOR DEFINING PRODUCTIVE PROGRAMS

In spring 2003, ABOR eliminated its policy requiring system-wide review every five years of “low-degree-producing programs.” In its stead, the academic program review policy was revised to include the following new requirement: “For low productive degree programs with graduations below established thresholds, an evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the Board-approved guidelines as set forth in a document entitled “A Methodology for Identifying Low Productive and Duplicative Programs” and reported to the Board. Except when a university recommends elimination of a program, it must provide the additional information specified in the approved methodology.” Units with programs that have failed to attain the required thresholds over the most recent three-year period will be notified by the Office of Academic Affairs and provided with the required methodology so that they may include the necessary information in their self-studies.

Threshold for Defining Productive Programs Arizona University System

Type of Degree	Type of Campus	3-Year Degree Total
Baccalaureate	Main	24 or more degrees
Baccalaureate	Non-main	15 or more degrees
Masters	Main	9 or more degrees
Masters	Non-main	6 or more degrees
Doctorate	Main (only)	6 or more degrees

I. ACADEMIC OUTREACH

This term refers to educational efforts, leadership, and sharing of knowledge off-campus, for example in the local community and throughout the State. Service to the campus and national academic profession is addressed in Section D-4.

1. Describe the nature of academic outreach activities in this academic unit.
2. How do these activities reflect the goal(s) described in Section A, and the particular needs of Arizona?
3. What evidence is available to document the quality and effects of these activities?

J. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER UNITS

1. What are the other departments, schools and/or colleges to which your unit contributes and/or with which it collaborates most frequently? Include joint degrees, dual degrees and Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs, as appropriate. Describe the nature of those efforts and an assessment of successes and disappointments.
2. What changes are contemplated in these collaborative efforts? How will these changes be implemented?

K. RESOURCES

1. Provide data showing faculty compensation comparisons with peer institutions, including as many as appropriate of the institutions named in Section C-4 (Provide a range compensation for each level of faculty).
2. Describe and appraise support services for the unit's: (a) teaching program, (b) research, creative production, or other scholarly activities, (c) outreach, including professional and community service, and (d) administration.
3. What are the program's specific resource needs, e.g., library, laboratory, classrooms, classroom support, office personnel, research assistants, others? Describe the units' efforts to find external donors who could help support the mission of the unit.
4. What changes in program quality might be projected if additional resources were available, and what would be the expected effects of those changes?

L. ADMINISTRATION

1. How is this unit organized? Describe the unit's governance structure and give an overview of the more important policies and procedures. (Note: the APR is not a review of the department head; this is accomplished at another time).
2. Summarize the program-related aspects of the last unit review(s) and efforts undertaken as a result of the review(s).
3. Describe the classified staff and professional staff in this academic unit. What has been the turnover rate in these positions during each of the previous five years? If high, what steps have been taken to identify and address the problem(s)? What changes are underway or contemplated to strengthen the staff support for the academic program's activities?

M. DIVERSITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Refer to The University of Arizona Diversity Action Plan that appears at <http://diversity.arizona.edu/>.

1. What is the gender and race/ethnicity composition of the faculty? Describe the major features of the program's plan for the recruitment, retention, and equity of a diverse faculty.
2. Describe the program's efforts toward the recruitment, retention, and equity of a diverse staff.
3. Describe the unit's plan for recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented ethnic groups and the degree to which this plan has been realized.
4. Describe steps taken to create a welcoming and supporting climate inclusive of diversity in the unit.

N. DEPARTMENT DATA PROFILES

1. Interpretations of data provided by the Office of Academic Affairs (which should be included in the self-study appendices) not discussed in preceding sections should be summarized here. APR data reports are available at <http://apr.web.arizona.edu/Home>.

Note: It may be helpful to contact a unit that has recently completed an academic program review to discuss the process. The following units completed academic program reviews in A.Y. 2008-09:

Agriculture & Biosystems Engineering	Music
Astronomy/Steward Observatory	Neurology
Emergency Medicine	Pathology
Entomology	Radiation Oncology
Linguistics	School of Natural Resources
Mathematics	Soil, Water & Environmental Science
Mining & Geological Engineering	

**APPENDIX C
SAMPLE ITINERARY**

Day 1

8:00 – 8:30 a.m.	Orientation with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
8:30 - 9:30 a.m.	Meeting with Dean
9:30 - 10:30 a.m.	Meeting with Self-Study Committee
10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 - 11:45 a.m.	Meet with individual faculty members
11:45 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch with Department Head
1:00 – 2:00 p.m.	Open meeting with graduate students
2:00 - 3:00 p.m.	This will provide you time to take a tour of facilities and/or for additional meetings with faculty or with other administrators (VP for Research, other Dept. Heads, etc)
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Meeting with full faculty
4:00 - End of Day	Review committee begins draft report

**Include meeting with Graduate College Dean etc., as appropriate*

Day 2

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Meeting with staff
9:00 -10:00 a.m.	Meeting with undergraduate students
10:00 - 10:15 a.m.	Break
10:15 - 12:00 p.m.	Meet with individual faculty members
12:00 – 1:30 p.m.	Working lunch
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.	Meeting with Dean
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Executive Vice President and Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
4:00 – End of Day	Write report

**Include meeting with community members and alumni, as appropriate*

APPENDIX D

Methodology for Identifying Low Productive and Duplicative Programs

Stage 1: Identify Low Productive Programs

Step 1 Identify Programs with Degree Production below Thresholds

Undergraduate

Institutions will review degree information for each academic program for the most recent three years for which degrees-awarded data are available. Academic programs at main campuses awarding twenty-four or more degrees over the three-year period and programs at non-main campuses awarding fifteen or more degrees are excluded from further consideration. Degrees with differing titles (e.g., B.A., B.S., etc.) for a given major will be combined for purposes of the threshold analysis if there exists a substantial overlap of course work among the different degrees. Degrees granted to students with dual majors are counted with each major. The review of undergraduate programs excludes interdisciplinary programs.

Graduate

For programs granting degrees at the masters or doctoral level, institutions will review the number of degrees granted in the most recent three years for which degrees-awarded data are available. Academic programs at main campuses granting nine or more masters degrees over the three-year period and programs at non-main campuses awarding six or more degrees are excluded from further consideration, as are programs granting six or more doctoral degrees. In those cases where a program offers both masters and doctoral degrees, if the number of doctoral degrees awarded is above the threshold, the masters program need not meet or exceed the threshold for masters degree programs. The review of graduate programs excludes interdisciplinary programs.

Step 2 Identify Valid Reasons for Low Degree Production

Institutions will review academic degree programs identified in Step 1 and remove those, which satisfy one or more of the following conditions:

1. The program no longer accepts students and is in the process of being phased out.
2. The program was recently approved by the Board of Regents and recently implemented by the institution. Approved academic programs at the baccalaureate and doctoral levels that were implemented more recently than six years prior to the first year for which data are examined will be excluded; those implemented three years prior will be excluded at the masters level. If, however, a campus only offers upper-division courses, a program at the baccalaureate level will be excluded only if it was implemented more recently than four years prior to the first year for which data are examined.*

* Central office staff will provide each university with the year of ABOR approval.

3. In general, the Board effective approval date, as determined from Board records, will be used as the implementation date. If, however, the Board effective approval date differs from the date on which, according to university records, the program was actually offered, then the date the program was first offered in the campus catalog will be used as the date of implementation.
4. In the case of programs offered outside of the main campuses, the following determines what implementation date will be used:
 - ◆ Programs that were approved for a main campus and subsequently moved (in their entirety) to a non-main campus site carry their implementation date with them.
 - ◆ Programs that were never requested and approved for the main campus but that were requested and approved for the non-main-campus site will use the date of implementation for the non-main campus program as the official date of date of implementation for that program.
 - ◆ Programs that were approved for the main campus but that also are offered on non-main campuses will be reviewed separately for the main and non-main campuses. The implementation date for the non-main campus program will be the date that program was first offered at that site according to a catalog. Programs for which 50% or more of the courses are offered through information technology are not defined as non-main campus programs, and graduates from these programs will be considered to be graduates from the main campus program. In the case of a collaborative program offered using information technology, unless a single university is responsible for 50% or more of the courses offered through information technology, the program would be classified and reviewed separately as a “joint” program.

Step 3 Identify Programs Considered "Basic Academic Subjects"

For each program failing to satisfy the conditions in Steps 1 and 2, institutions will identify and remove those academic programs considered basic academic subjects. A program is considered a basic academic subject if a majority (twelve or more) of peer institutions grant degrees in the subject. The source of degree data is the most recent IPEDS Degree Completion report. Program matches are on the basis of CIP code and degree level in conjunction with peer program catalog review. Information about these programs will be reported to the board, as described in Stage 3, Step 2, below.

Stage 2: Provide Expanded Information

Universities with degree programs not meeting the minimum thresholds identified in Stage 1 will be asked to provide additional information about each program that is not recommended for elimination or consolidation. Information will include the number of degrees awarded during the period under review and assessments of each of the following:

1. Program quality:

Quality may be demonstrated by student, faculty, or overall program quality. Examples of measures include evidence of instructional effectiveness (e.g., student satisfaction), student performance (e.g., scores on national examinations), employer satisfaction, student placement, research/scholarship/creative/artistic excellence, external funding, external recognition (e.g., national rankings, awards), and accreditation.

2. Contribution to university mission:

Universities have complex missions with multiple goals. A program's contribution to the university mission is evidenced by identifying the university goal that the program fulfills (e.g., the university goal of providing educational services to an underserved population might be met by a degree that is targeted to a community).

3. Contribution to other programs in the university:

Universities have responsibilities to provide students access to courses and programs of study that support both broad educational goals (such as general education) and specific student needs (such as certificate programs). Evidence of a program's contribution to other programs in the university includes the number of student credit hours (or full-time equivalent students -- FTE) taught, courses taught that meet general education requirements, students completing minors, students completing certificates, courses required by other majors (e.g., mathematics courses required by engineering), and non-majors in courses required of majors.

4. Program uniqueness:

A program may be important to Arizona by virtue of its unique educational contribution. Uniqueness is evidenced by a distinctive program focus (such as community partnerships, internships, interdisciplinary, or subject area), differentiation between the program and other programs in the state, and being unique to the university's service area.

5. Program size:

The program size is indicated by the number of majors enrolled in the three previous years.

6. Program costs:

In units that devote all (or nearly all) of their effort to the program, the fixed cost of the program will be the faculty salaries and the variable costs will be operations and travel.

Units that have program cost accounting systems already in place and that offer multiple programs and/or contribute to other programs in the university should report fixed and variable costs assignable to the program. Units with multiple programs or contributing to other programs in the university without program cost accounting systems should identify the incremental costs associated with the degree program. To estimate the incremental cost, units should identify the additional services provided to students in the program and additional costs associated with those services (e.g., the costs of offering a course open only to majors).

7. Accessibility

A program is more accessible when it is opened to students who, for geographic or other reasons, would not be able to participate in other programs. The measure of access will be the number of students enrolled in the program from rural or otherwise under represented populations.

8. Other

Additional Criteria for Duplicative Programs

Programs failing to satisfy the conditions in Steps 1, 2, and 3 are reviewed for duplication** both within each university and between universities. If a low productivity program is duplicative, departments should also provide information related to which of the following criteria are met or, where the criteria are not met, a workplan for meeting the criteria should be provided:

- **Alternative delivery systems**

Alternative delivery systems have been fully considered and it is determined that this program cannot be delivered off-campus by the universities currently offering the program because of limited resources, because of the need for specialized equipment or library resources, or because for some other reason, the courses that make up the program cannot be delivered at a level of quality comparable to that of the on-campus program.

- **Efforts to collaborate**

Efforts have been made to collaborate between the universities to offer this program (e.g., joint degrees, shared courses, and team teaching of courses), and to minimize the duplication of programs and courses.

- **Other**

Stage 3: Recommendations

Step 1: Recommendations for programs not meeting Stage 1, Steps 1 & 2 conditions

Based on the information provided in Stage 2, institutions will provide a recommendation for each program failing to satisfy the conditions in Steps 1 and 2 of Stage 1 about whether it should be retained, eliminated, or in some way modified.

Step 2: Basic Academic Programs

Programs that fail to meet the conditions in Steps 1 & 2 of Stage 1 but that are, following Step 3, classified as basic academic programs, shall be listed, along with the number of degrees awarded, the number of peers offering the program, and the student credit hours generated by the courses required for the program in each of the past three years (which can be compared to the total university student credit hours).

** The Board staff will provide each institution a list of duplicate programs offered by the three Arizona universities.

Threshold for Defining Productive Programs

Arizona University System

Type of Degree	Type of Campus	3-Year Degree Total
Baccalaureate	Main	24 or more degrees
Baccalaureate	Non-main	15 or more degrees
Masters	Main	9 or more degrees
Masters	Non-main	6 or more degrees
Doctorate	Main (only)	6 or more degrees