**UAA Process**

The Program Review process was redesigned in 2009 by the deans and campus directors, working in collaboration with the Office of Academic affairs. The principles incorporated into the design include:

- **Close alignment with Regents’ Policy and University Regulation 10.06.010**: The 7 elements described in university regulation are central to the self-studies generated in the departments being reviewed.
- **Regular Assessment**: All academic programs were scheduled for review under this revised process in AY 2009-10 or 2010-11. All are being scheduled for their next review that will occur within 5 years of the last review.
- **Meaningful results**: Deans and Campus Directors worked with Institutional Research to ensure that the data considered were useful for evaluation of status and for planning of program improvements. All units were provided with a standard productivity data set to review, and were asked to incorporate an evaluation of student performance in learning outcomes as a component of their considerations.
- **Minimal Disruption**: The process was designed to provide meaningful analysis with minimal disruption of unit operations. Taking advantage of regulation changes that occurred in 2005, the self-study and subsequent reviews were less intrusive and cumbersome than previously required.
- **Information Sharing**: Deans and Campus Directors have the opportunity to share insights and opinions on disciplines and departments that are the responsibilities of their colleagues, but which contribute to their own programs.

The UAA process has three levels of review.

1. The initial review and self-study is performed by the department. Analysis is based on a uniform data set and other information that the department considers to be relevant. Deans and campus directors collectively determine which programs need no further review.
2. Extended reviews are recommended and undertaken for those programs facing serious issues or that are being considered for augmentation or reduction. These programs undergo a more thorough analysis that is tailored around the specific issues addressed.
3. Extended reviews are completed with a conference between the dean or campus director and the Provost where an action plan is agreed upon.

**Results**

In the past two academic years 139 reviews have been conducted at UAA. Some reviews cover more than a single academic program so there is not a 1:1 match with UAA academic programs. (e.g. BS and BA in Psychology = one review)

A few academic programs are excused from this cycle (those that are new [with no graduates yet], suspended, or have just completed an external accreditation). Approximately a dozen programs have initiated or completed extended reviews. Action plans for those that completed extended reviews included program augmentation, continued observation and increased frequency of review, or program elimination.

Extended reviews are scheduled to be completed by the end of the current academic year.

All programs are being scheduled for the next cycle of reviews.
Program Review at the University of Alaska Fairbanks

UAF has conducted program review on a 5-year cycle for about 10 years, and nearly all\(^1\) degree and certificate programs have been reviewed twice via that process. Until now, the process was modeled on the old Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities accreditation standards. Since those standards have changed, in 2010 UAF revamped its program review process to align with both the new NWCCU standards and Board of Regents Policy and University Regulation: Chapter 10.06, Academic Program Review - R10.06.010

Purposes:
- Meet Board of Regents’ requirement for Program Review
- Meet UAF Chancellor’s requirement for review: all Vice Chancellors must review their areas of responsibility in 2010-2011.
- Document current program and student learning outcomes assessment for regional accreditation

Information and data collected:
- Institutional Research data on students and faculty – SCH, service course SCH, headcount of majors, FTE faculty
- Financial information by department/unit – expenditures and revenue
- Publications by department/unit from Annual Unit Reports
- Grants awarded to department/unit from a standard UA report
- Other information provided by departments/units
  - Employment market for graduates
  - Service by faculty
  - Similar UA programs
  - Explanation of unusual data
  - Performances/Exhibits if applicable\(^2\)
  - Partnerships
  - Specialized Accreditation
  - Report on student learning outcomes assessment
  - Input from community or statewide Advisory Council (if applicable)

Review Process:
Each level of review prepares a standard report on each program. The report form is attached.
- Faculty committee including both Fairbanks and community campus faculty
- Dean’s Council augmented by community campus directors
- Chancellor’s Cabinet

Status:
- 209 programs are being reviewed in 2010-11.
- Data and other information have been compiled.
- Faculty review committee is working on reviews and about 50% are complete.
- Deans/directors are reviewing programs as they are completed by the faculty.
- Chancellor’s cabinet will begin review in May.
- The goal is to complete before the end of the FY.
- Deletions will follow the normal process through the Faculty Senate and Board of Regents.
- After this year, program review will return to the former 5-year cycle: 1/5 of programs will be reviewed each year.

\(^1\) Some programs were approved after 2000 and so have been reviewed only once or not at all, depending on approval date. Also, some programs slated for their second review in 2010-11 were instead reviewed under the new process.
\(^2\) Performances and exhibits in the fine arts.
Program Review 2011 Evaluation Form

Sections 1 - 7 are taken directly from the UA BOR University Regulation Part X, Academic Policy Chapter 10.06, Academic Program Review - R10.06.010

Your username will be recorded when you submit this form.

* Required

Program Information

Program Name *i.e. Anthropology  ____________________________________________

College /School Name *i.e. CLA ____________________________________________

Degree *Please choose one from the list. (Cert., AAS, BA, BS, MA, MS etc.)_________

PART I - To be completed by the Faculty Program Review Committee

1. Quality and Assessment of the Program

Quality of the program, as determined by the establishment and regular assessment of program outcomes. Outcomes should be comprehensive, and indications of achievement should involve multiple measures and satisfy the properties of good evidence.

Please check all that applies to the Quality and Assessment of the Program.

- Separate plan for each program level e.g. Cert., AA/AAS, BS, BA, BBA, MS, MA, PhD
- Multiple (at least two) measures of student outcomes
- Plan has direct evidence of student learning not just surveys
- Assessment information is collected and summarized regularly
- Assessment summary is based on aggregate student information
• Assessment process has resulted in curricular improvement
• All elements recorded in the assessment plan are addressed in the assessment summary.

What is the evidence that students are achieving intended learning outcomes?

Committee's assessment and guidance on Quality and Assessment of the Program:

2. Demand for Program Services

Demand for program services, as indicated by measures such as: credit hour production appropriate to the program's mission, services performed by the program in support of other programs, graduates produced, the prospective market for graduates, expressed need by clientele in the service area, documented needs of the state and/or nation for specific knowledge, data, or analysis, other documented needed.
3. Program Productivity and Efficiency

Program productivity and efficiency as indicated by courses, student credit hours, sponsored proposals and service achievements produced in comparison to the number of faculty and staff and the costs of program support (The latter may not be available or may be a combined cost for several programs).

Teaching:

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity:
Did the program review include significant public, university and professional service achievements?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Committee's assessment and guidance on Program Productivity and Efficiency:

4. Program Duplication

Unnecessary program duplication resulting from the existence of a similar program or programs elsewhere in the UA statewide system (BOR policy). Academic programs offered by UAA are available online at http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academics/degrees/ and those offered by UAS are available at http://www.uas.alaska.edu/academics/alpha.html

Committee's assessment and guidance on Program Duplication:
5. Centrality of the Program

Centrality of the program to the mission, needs and purposes of the university and the unit.

Committee's assessment and guidance on Centrality of the Program:

6. Timeliness

Timeliness of an action to augment, reduce or discontinue the program. [Address current internal or external factors that provide an opportunity for change, i.e. availability of new grant funding, increasing employment opportunities of graduates, or the departure of a significant portion of the faculty.]

Committee's assessment and guidance on Timeliness:
7. Cost of the Program

Cost of the program relative to the cost of comparable programs or to revenue produced (BOR policy). Because we are not currently able to provide program specific budget information or the cost of comparable programs, assessment will be based on proportionate cost.

Committee's assessment and guidance on the Cost of the Program:

8. Partnerships
Program described successful partnerships resulting in scholarships, equipment or in-kind services during the past three years.

Committee's assessment and guidance on Partnerships:

RECOMMENDATION by the Faculty Program Review Committee: Please check one

- [ ] Continue program
- [x] Discontinue program

Additional instructions for continuing program (if any): Please check applicable boxes

- [ ] Continue program but improve assessment process and reporting
- [ ] Continue program but improve other specific areas

Comments (majority/minority statements welcome):

Vote Count  Please record the vote majority/minority:
PART II - To be completed by the Administrative Program Review Committee

RECOMMENDATION by the Administrative Program Review Committee: Please check one

- [ ] Continue program
- [ ] Discontinue program

Additional instructions for continuing program: Please check applicable boxes.

- [ ] Continue program but improve assessment process and reporting
- [ ] Continue program but improve other specific areas

Comments: 

PART III- To be completed by the Provost

RECOMMENDATION by the Provost: Please check one
- [ ] Continue program
- [ ] Discontinue program

Additional instructions for continuing program: Please check applicable boxes

- [ ] Continue program but improve assessment process and reporting
- [ ] Continue program but improve other specific areas

Comments:
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SOUTHEAST

Learn, Engage, Change

Office of the Provost: Program Reviews
Processes and Outcomes

OVERVIEW

Board of Regents policy calls for UAS to conduct assessments of all instructional programs with respect to quality, efficiency, and contribution to mission and goals. Annual assessments of instructional programs are done by the faculty and the school dean. Comprehensive program reviews will be done at least every five years, and exceptional reviews may be conducted as needed in response to specific academic or budgetary concerns.

For details, see the UAS Provost website: http://www.uas.alaska.edu/provost/Programreview/index.html

Program reviews assist the faculty, dean, and the university administration in:

• evaluating the contribution of the program to the mission of the university;
• evaluating the contribution of the program to the community;
• evaluating the degree to which the program is achieving its educational goals;
• identifying the relative strengths and weaknesses of the program;
• developing plans and priorities for the future of the program;
• providing appropriate recognition to the program;
• determining need for change or program improvement; and
• evaluating the value of the program to the State of Alaska.

THE PROCESS

Comprehensive program reviews are completed at least every five years according to a cycle linked to the UAS accreditation process. The process includes the following steps: 1) faculty prepare a comprehensive program profile based upon institutional data, identified student learning outcomes, budgetary and enrollment data, and other relevant factors; 2) review of the document by a school committee made up of faculty, staff, and at least one student; and 3) review by an Institutional Review Committee, which includes members both internal and external to UAS. This Committee makes a recommendation to the Dean and Provost about whether the program should be: 1) continued as offered, 2) continued with modifications/improvements, or 3) identified for suspension or deletion. These materials and recommendations are forwarded to the Dean and Provost for review and action.

RECENT HISTORY WITH PROGRAM REVIEWS AT UAS

In the AY10-11 academic year, the following program reviews are completed or underway: Fisheries Technology (Cert. and AAS), Automotive Technology (Cert. and AAS), Diesel/Power Technology (Cert. and AAS), Business Administration (BBA, MBA, AAS, Cert.).

At UAS program reviews in the past five years have contributed to decisions affecting the following programs:

• Suspended (teach-out of remaining students): Associate of Applied Science in Paralegal Studies, Spring 2006.
• Suspended (teach-out of remaining students): Bachelor of Science in Information Systems, Spring 2007.