



---

**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

---

I. PURPOSE: Describe policy and procedures for academic program review.

II. REFERENCE

R 401 – 5.5.2 – Template for Three-year and Two-Year Follow-up Reports  
R 411 – Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews

III. POLICY:

- A. Background. The Utah State Board of Regents has delegated responsibility for three-year and two-year follow-up reports and cyclical academic program review to the Southern Utah University Board of Trustees. Program reviews will be conducted under the direction of the Provost's Office and submitted to the President and to the Board of Trustees, and the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education. A systematic program report and cyclical review process is a significant dimension of the University's assessment program.
- B. Purpose of Academic Program Reviews. The purpose of program review is to monitor and improve the quality of academic programs. In the context of this policy, programs are defined as the academic units that comprise a college or school (See R401-3.1.5 for definition details). The review process provides information, analysis, and evaluation that will help the academic program and the University identify strengths, the fulfillment of program goals, objectives, and learning outcomes, suggested areas for improvement, and to make recommendations and offer commendations.
- C. Academic Program Review Committee (APRC):
1. The APRC will oversee the process of academic program reviews and Three-Year or Two-Year Follow-Up Reports and members will include the faculty senate president, the associate provost, and senior faculty members (one from each academic school or college and one representative of at-large faculty) appointed by the Provost.
  2. The APRC will meet each academic year to update and revise the schedule for Three-Year and Two-Year Follow-Up Reports and Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews. The timetable for reviews shall be maintained by the Associate Provost and will be reviewed by the APRC and the Deans' Council annually. (See Appendix B, C)



---

**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

---

3. The focus of the APRC will be to monitor and improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate degree programs. In addition, reviews should include an evaluation of the need for and cost-effectiveness of the program and its alignment to institutional academic plans and the SUU strategic plans.
4. The APRC shall make recommendations to the Provost regarding the college/school and its academic programs, including human, physical, and financial resources.

D. Three-Year, Two-Year Follow-Up Reports

Three-Year and Two-Year Follow-Up Reports are mandated by the Board of Regents as per Policy R401. The department chair/program director prepares the report following the template in the R401 policy and uses enrollment and other relevant data from the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment. The report also includes an institutional analysis of the program to date and data regarding program graduates' employment or placement in graduate school. The report is forwarded to the APRC for review and comment and returned to the department/program if changes are deemed necessary. The final report is forwarded to the Provosts for submission to the SUU Board of Trustees for approval. The approved report is forwarded to the Board of Regents for further action as per R401.

E. Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews of Colleges or Schools

1. Per Policy R411, Seven-Year Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews:
  - a. are faculty-driven with self-study involving faculty from the program being reviewed and with review being provided by peers from other programs;
  - b. incorporate external review;
  - c. occur on a regular cycle;
  - d. are evaluative, not just descriptive;
  - e. are forward looking and focus on continuous improvement;
  - f. are concise, balanced and honest; and,
  - g. result in an action plan that will be implemented by the faculty in the academic unit(s).
2. Initial steps and notification:



---

**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

---

- a. Each school or college of the University will be responsible for the completion of a self-study pursuant to the criteria in Appendix A
  - b. In the month of May preceding the review which starts in September, the APRC notifies the dean of the selected program in writing to begin the formal process of program review using available data and information, catalogs and syllabi, and other materials in the college/school;
  - c. The Institutional Research & Assessment Office (IR&A) prepares activity reports and other data; and,
  - d. Under the leadership of the dean, a faculty self-study committee will be established to:
    - review the criteria in Appendix A,
    - gather the evidence required for each criteria beyond that prepared by the Office of IR&A,
    - analyze available data and information sources,
    - prepare a draft of the self-study document, and
    - prepare a response to the external review.
  - e. A self-study prepared for a specialized accreditation may satisfy the requirements in III. E.2.d. and Appendix A. If using a self-study from an accreditation process, it must be cross-referenced to the criteria set forth in *Policy 6.41, Appendix A*. Any SUU criteria not addressed in the accreditation self-study will need to be provided in the program review. Accreditation self-studies or interim report older than 5 years cannot be used for cross-referencing with criteria set forth in Appendix A.
3. External review:
- a. Every self-study will receive an external review for additional perspective. Programs whose degree programs are accredited or seeking specialized accreditation may substitute the evaluation of the accrediting team for the external review. If an external review is older than 5 years, new external reviewers will be required as per 3.b. below;
  - b. At least two faculty members, one representing a USHE institution and a second representing a national perspective, will conduct the external review. Depending on the structure of the college/school, additional external reviewers may be requested by the dean in consultation with the Provost. The Provost, in consultation with the dean, will select the external reviewers. Each reviewer will receive



---

**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

---

a copy of the program's self-study and supporting documents and will be expected to spend at least two days on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and to prepare a report of findings and recommendations; and,

- c. copies of the reviewer's report will be sent to the program and to the APRC.

F. Program Dean Responsibility

1. The school/college dean will be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the internal and the external review process for all programs and centers in his/her school.
2. The dean will establish a faculty self-study committee as per E.2.d.
3. After analyzing all documents in the program review process, the dean will provide comments on all recommendations and may add recommendations as needed. These comments will be sent to the APRC and incorporated in the final review document, which will then be sent to the Provost.

G. Provost's Office Responsibility

1. Direct and monitor the process, and receive from the APRC the review materials and recommendations.
2. Using the information gathered for the Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews and the Three-year and Two-year Follow-Up Reports, the Provost's Office creates summary reports as required for the State Board of Regents policies R401 and R411 (See Appendix B and C). The reports are forwarded, along with the Provost's recommendation, to the President and Board of Trustees, and the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education (OCHE).
3. The Provost's Office will maintain the schedule of program reviews on its website.

The following appendices provide an overview of the process and the documents required for the academic program review.



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

**POLICY 6.41 - APPENDIX A**

**Overview of Framework:** The framework clarifies the content, criteria, supporting evidence, and **Key Performance Indicators** (KPIs) applicable to the program review. The criteria have been adopted/adapted from the NWCCU Accreditation Standards (<http://www.nwccu.org/Standards%20and%20Policies/Accreditation%20Standards/Accreditation%20Standards.htm>) and from the book 'Using Quality Benchmarks for Assessing and Developing Undergraduate Programs' (Dunn, D. S., McCarthy, M. A., Baker, S. C., & Halonen, J. S. (2011). *Using quality benchmarks for assessing and developing undergraduate programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.)

**General Guidelines for Program Review:** As applicable, supporting evidence should not only be provided for the program but also for the college, the institution, and, as available, in comparison to national norms/standards for the discipline to allow for benchmarking. Moreover, as applicable supporting evidence should be for the most recent 7 years.

Content	Related Criteria	Supporting Evidence	Related Key Performance Indicators
Introduction			
Section 1: Purpose and R411 Data			
1. A. Mission Statement (Including program goals and objectives)	1. A.1. The program has a published mission statement and goals that appropriately reflect its purpose, characteristics, and expectations, give direction for its efforts, and derive from, and are generally understood by, its community.  1. A.2. The program defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations. Guided by that definition, it articulates program accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.	1. A.1.a. Provide evidence of published mission statement  1. A.1.b. List of goals related to mission fulfillment  1. A.2.a. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for measuring mission fulfillment	



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

<b>Content</b>	<b>Related Criteria</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Related KPIs</b>
1.B. R411 Data Form	1. B.1. Faculty, number of graduates, enrollment, cost, and funding.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headcount of majors (Total and broken down by class standing)</li> <li>• Program FTE based on courses</li> <li>• Total SCH generated by program</li> <li>• % of program SCH generated by majors in program</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2: Operations</b>			
2.A. Faculty Characteristics	2. A.1. Consistent with its mission, intended outcomes, services, and characteristics, the program employs a sufficient number of qualified faculty to achieve its educational objectives and to assure the integrity and continuity of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered.	2.A.1.a Faculty qualifications and bios  2. A.1.b. Data on teaching loads and assignments  2. A.1.c. Data on faculty retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCH and Contact Hours per credit hour</li> <li>• Average class size</li> <li>• Student-faculty ratio (ICH/SCH ratio) (total and broken down by course level)</li> <li>• Number of majors per FTE faculty (split by full-time faculty and other faculty)</li> <li>• %of SCH taught by program faculty vs. % of SCH taught by faculty from other programs</li> <li>• % of release time for faculty</li> <li>• % of SCH taught by faculty rank</li> </ul>



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

<b>Content</b>	<b>Related Criteria</b>	<b>Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Related KPIs</b>
2.A. Faculty Characteristics (continued)	2. A. 2. Faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner based on clearly established criteria that reflect duties, responsibilities, and authority of their position.	2. A.2.a. Department LRT criteria and documentation guidelines  2. A.2.b. Aggregated data on teaching evaluations for program faculty	
	2. A.3. The program provides faculty with appropriate opportunities and support for professional growth and development to enhance their effectiveness in fulfilling their roles, duties, and responsibilities.	2. A.3.a. Evidence of Faculty Development  2. A.3.b. Library resources report based on national standards	
2.B. Administrative Support	2.B.1 Consistent with its mission, intended outcomes, services, and characteristics, the program employs a sufficient number of qualified administrative leadership and other personnel to achieve its educational objectives, assure the integrity and continuity of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered, and maintain its support and operations functions.	2.B.1, a. Leadership and staff qualifications  2.B.1.b. Clerical, professional, and technical support with duties and responsibilities	
	2. B.2. Administrative leadership and other personnel are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner based on clearly established criteria that reflect duties, responsibilities, and authority of the position.	2.B.2.a. Annual reviews as per policy 6.2 Academic Officers are administered	



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

Content	Related Criteria	Supporting Evidence	Related KPIs
2.B. Administrative Support (continued)	2. B.3. The program provides administrative leadership and other personnel with appropriate opportunities and support for professional growth and development to enhance their effectiveness in fulfilling their roles, duties, and responsibilities.	2. B.3.a. Evidence of regular leadership and staff development activities	
2.C. Program Resources	<p><i>Financial Resources:</i></p> <p>2. C.1. The program demonstrates financial stability</p> <p>2. C.2. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and responsible projections of grants, donations, and other non-tuition revenue sources.</p>	<p>2.C.1.a Budget report</p> <p>2.C.2.a List of grants (funded and unfunded) by purpose, title, source, and amount</p> <p>2. C.2.b. Other external funding revenue</p> <p>2. C.2.c. Amount of student support (e.g., scholarship, tuition waivers)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost per FTE (total and broken down by class standing)</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Physical and Technological Infrastructure:</i></p> <p>2. C.3. Consistent with its mission, intended outcomes, and characteristics, the program’s physical facilities and equipment are accessible, safe, secure, and sufficient in quantity and quality to ensure healthful learning and working environments.</p> <p>2. C.4. Consistent with its mission and characteristics, the program has appropriate and adequate technology systems and infrastructure to support its management and operational functions, and it’s academic and support services, wherever offered and however delivered.</p>	<p>2. C. 3.a Evaluate the extent to which program meets criteria set forth for facilities, equipment, and technology.</p> <p>2. C.4.a. As applicable, perform evaluation reflecting specialized accreditation standards.</p>	





---

**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

---

Content	Related Criteria	Supporting Evidence	Related KPIs
2.D. Student Development	2. D.1. Students receive effective and sufficient support and opportunities beyond the classroom in an effort to facilitate their academic success and to enhance their overall development.	2.D.1.a List of program level activities and events  2.D.1.b. List of student organization and number of students involved  2.D.1.c. Evidence of student involvement in program decision-making  2.D.1.d. Department Student Handbook	
2.E. Program Climate	2. E.1. The program has a positive and stimulating work environment in which mutual respect, shared responsibility, and equitable problem solving are demonstrated and differences are utilized as strengths for advancing the program.  2. E.2. The program shares responsibility at the university level, is engaged with the community outside the institution, and is reputed to be functional, contributing, and talented.	2. E.2.a. List of institutional committee service  2. E.2.b. Evidence of community engagement	



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

Content	Related Criteria	Supporting Evidence	Related KPIs
Section 3: Instructional Programs (address each academic unit)			
3.A. Curriculum	3. A.1, Admission and graduation requirements are clearly defined and widely published.	3. A.1.a. Course Catalog information (could be linked)  3. A.1.b. Course Syllabi (most recent academic year)  3. A.1.c. Evidence of course selection directions for majors (e.g., advisement, clarification of required vs. selected courses for major, evidence of clear description of required course sequences for program completion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of enrolled students per course/section</li> </ul>
	3. A.2. The program provides a curriculum with appropriate content and rigor and consistent with its learning outcomes.	3. A.2/3. a. As applicable, evidence of how the curriculum complies with national standards (curricular tables)	
	3. A.3. The curriculum demonstrates a coherent design with appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, and synthesis of learning.	3. A.2/3.b. Evidence of how the curriculum supports the student learning outcomes  3.A. 2/3.c. Evidence of use of High Impact Practices ( <a href="http://www.aacu.org/leap/hip.cfm">http://www.aacu.org/leap/hip.cfm</a> )	
3.B. Student Learning Outcomes	3. B.1. Academic programs identify and publish expected course and program student learning outcomes that are clearly stated.	3. B.1.a. Program Learning Outcomes	



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

Content	Related Criteria	Supporting Evidence	Related KPIs
3.B. Student Learning Outcomes (continued)	3. B.2. The course and program learning outcomes are aligned with the institutional student learning outcomes.	3. B. 2.a. Evidence of alignment of program learning outcomes with SUU learning outcomes	
3.C. Assessment	3. C.1. The program documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment, achievement of its intended outcomes and the students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course and program learning outcomes.	3. C.1.a. Evidence of systematic and ongoing assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of graduates</li> <li>• Ratio of seniors in a given year in relation to the number of graduates in the following year</li> <li>• % of students who begin and complete the program versus % of students who begin and do not complete the program</li> <li>• Ratio of completed versus attempted credits in a given semester</li> <li>• Average number of credits at completion</li> </ul>
	3. C.2. The program regularly monitors its internal and external environments to determine how and to what degree changing circumstances may impact its mission and its ability to fulfill that mission.	3. C.2.a. List of majors' post-graduate 'success' (employment and graduate school activity)	



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

Content	Related Criteria	Supporting Evidence	Related KPIs
3.C. Assessment (continued)	3. C.3. The program regularly reviews its assessment processes to ensure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.	3.C.3.a, Evidence of student achievement of course and program learning outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade distribution for courses</li> <li>• Average GPA of students for a) courses taken outside their college, b) courses taken within their college, and c) GE classes taken</li> </ul>
	3. C.4. The program disseminates assessment results and conclusions concerning mission fulfillment to appropriate constituencies.	3. C.4.a. Evidence of dissemination of assessment results	
	3. C.5. The program uses the results of its assessment to inform its planning and practices that lead to enhancement of the achievement of intended outcomes including student learning achievements.	3. C.5.a. Evidence of utilization of assessment results for improvement purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Data from TracDat</b></li> </ul>
3.D. Special Considerations or Issues			
Section 4: Areas for Commendations, Recommendations, Concern, Questions and Future Directions (Reviewer's Charge)			



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

**Appendix B (R401-5.6.1)**

**Report – Third-Year Report Template**  
**Higher Education Institution**  
**Degree Type and Title**  
**MM/DD/YEAR**

**Program Description**

*One paragraph description of the program. Include Regents' approval date and date when program first started admitting students. (Remove these descriptive italics after completing this section of the template.)*

**Enrollment and Revenue Data**

*Use department or unit numbers as reported in the approved R401 proposal for "Prior to Program Implementation" and "Estimated" columns.*

Departmental/Unit Enrollment and Staffing Data	Prior to Program Implementation	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
		Est.	Actual	Est.	Actual	Est.	Actual
Total Department Student FTE <i>(Based on Fall Third Week Data)</i>							
Total Department Faculty FTE <i>(A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition)</i>							
Student FTE per Faculty FTE <i>(from Faculty FTE and Student FTE above)</i>							
<b>Program Level Data</b>							
Total Number of Declared Majors in Program	X						
Total Number of Program Graduates	X						
<b>Departmental Revenue</b>							
Total Revenue to Department <i>(Total of Funding Categories from R401 Budget Projection Table)</i>							
<b>Departmental Instructional Cost per Student Credit Hour</b> <i>(per Institutional Cost Study Definition)</i>		X		X		X	

**Institutional Analysis of Program to Date**

*Provide a statement that summarizes the institution's current analysis of the program's strengths and weaknesses relative to enrollments, staffing, and funding. Describe any actions the institution has taken or will take to respond to any issues with the program.*

**Employment Information**

*Provide employment information on graduates of the program. (Remove these descriptive italics after completing this section of the template.)*



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

**APPENDIX C**

**R411 – Program Review Policy**  
Seven-Year Program Review  
Higher Education Institution  
Program  
MM/DD/YEAR

**Reviewers:** *(Add bullets as needed. Remove italics when using template)*

- *External Reviewer's(s) Name(s), Affiliation*
- *Internal Reviewer's Name, Affiliation*

**Program Description:** *One- to three-paragraph description of the program. (Remove italics when using template).*

**Data Form:** *Current counts of faculty and staff and Financial Analysis*

*The following table in R 411 is designed to gather data about the institutional unit being reviewed. The table has been designed to present consistent data to Trustees and Regents who will receive the report. Institutions decide on the configuration of the unit to be reviewed, and in most cases, the review is at the department level. However, in some instances, the unit being reviewed provides services that are different from those provided by traditional academic departments. When providing data on such units, please offer an explanation that clarifies the purpose of the unit, preparation of faculty or staff who provide the service, attendance data on participants, cost of providing services, and any credential that may be offered to completers if this applies. With sufficient explanation, the data table can be adjusted for that purpose. Use this template and make appropriate changes to present a full picture of the unit that was reviewed.*

R411 Data Table					
Department or Unit--	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX
<b>Faculty</b>					
Headcount					
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
With Master's Degrees					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					



**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

Part-time					
With Bachelor's Degrees					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
Other					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
Total Headcount Faculty					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
FTE (A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition)					
Full-time (Salaried)					
Teaching Assistants					
Part-time (May include TA's)					
Total Faculty FTE					
Number of Graduates					
Certificates					
Associate Degrees					
Bachelor's Degrees					
Master's Degrees					
Doctoral Degrees					
Number of Students—(Data Based on Fall Third Week)					
Semester of Data: _____, 20__					
Total # of Declared Majors					
Total Department FTE*					
Total Department SCH*					
*Per Department Designator Prefix					
Student FTE per Total Faculty FTE					
Cost (Cost Study Definitions)					
Direct Instructional Expenditures					
Cost Per Student FTE					



---

**SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS**

---

Funding					
Appropriated Fund					
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants of Contracts					
Special Fees/Differential Tuition					
Total					

**Program Assessment:** *Strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations from the reviewers. (Remove italics when using template.)*

**Institution's Response:** *Responses to review committee findings and recommendations. (Remove italics when using template.)*