

## **Program Review Committee report 9-10-21**

Dear Senators:

On June 4, the Program Review guidelines were remanded back for follow ups. Four items were the focus of our discussions at that meeting:

- 1) Include follow up
- 2) Specific links between APSA 3 process and program review.
- 3) Review of AAUP documents
- 4) Departmental procedures for notification

We address each of these items below.

### **1) On follow up**

We agree that follow up has been a challenge and getting the Provost's office to turn the responses around quickly has been an issue. However, it should be noted that in the attached schedule, there is a set time period for the Provost's office to reply. Separate from this, of course, are the tenor of the remarks. Programs retain their right to reply to the Provost's office comments under these guidelines, and this has been used by units in the past.

### **2) Links between APSA 3 process and program review**

Programs are still going to be reviewed on a seven year cycle (or sooner if required by accreditors). That schedule is posted on the Provost's [web page](#).

A group has been working on a more automated annual review system for the past year. Faculty have been involved in this since inception (J. Farina, T. Sciglitano, M. Deyrup, M. Edwards). The entire package of that review will be presented by Farina and Lillquist later in the Fall.

Those annual reviews of programs are going to be based on meeting specified metrics on six criteria: Mission, Scholarship, Financial, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation. Programs falling short on these criteria will work with their Dean on corrective action, and Program Review will be kept informed of progress. Programs requiring further review past this stage will need to complete an out of cycle self study for the Program Review Committee.

### **3) AAUP information on program review**

The AAUP has documents on the role of faculty in program closures in the wake of a finding of financial exigency. These are not germane to the processes described here. Any decision by the Program Review Committee would come before the full body for discussion.

### **4) Departmental procedures for notification**

We have already sent out our first set of requests for programs to begin their self-study. As these invitations were based on a Provost's office master list of programs, we will refine this as we move forward. The key here is that the program is the unit of analysis and not the department. We have already grouped some units together for the sake of efficiency (Diplomacy, for example, is submitting one review in 2026 rather than 5 separate ones across multiple years). The committee is aware this is a work in progress, and changes might need to be made along the way going forward.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Marta Deyrup and Martin Edwards, Co-chairs.