



# The University of Georgia

Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

## PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE 2016 – 2017

### **Agricultural and Environmental Sciences**

Dr. Dennis Duncan  
Dr. Douglas Bailey  
Dr. Craig Landry  
Dr. Kent Wolfe

### **Arts & Sciences**

Dr. Michael Hahn  
Dr. Joe Hermanowicz  
Dr. Hilda Kurtz  
Dr. Ari Levine  
Dr. Wolfgang Lukowitz  
Dr. Brigitte Rossbacher  
Dr. Tina Salguero  
Dr. Paul Schroeder  
Dr. T.N. Sriram  
Dr. Hyangsoon Yi

### **Business**

Dr. Dave Chatterjee (Chair)  
Dr. Piyush Kumar

### **Education**

Dr. Kyunghwa Lee  
Dr. Stacey Neuharth-Pritchett  
Dr. Holly Kaplan

### **Engineering**

Dr. William Tollner

### **Family & Consumer Sciences**

Dr. Kandauda Wickrama

### **Forestry and Natural Resources**

Dr. Michael Chamberlain

### **Law**

Dr. Christian Turner

### **Public and International Affairs**

Dr. Christina Boyd

### **Public Health**

Dr. Andreas Handel

### **Public Service and Outreach**

Dr. Wes Clarke (Co-Chair)  
Dr. Richard McCline

### **Veterinary Medicine**

Dr. Branson Ritchie  
Dr. John Wagner

### **Research Centers /Institutes**

Dr. Tina Harris

Dear Colleagues:

The attached proposal is a recommendation to amend Academic Affairs Policy 4.12 – 2: University of Georgia Academic Program Review Policy. A two-page summary of the major changes, the proposed policy revisions, and the previous policy are included in this packet. Please consider this proposal as an agenda item for the November 16, 2016 University Council Meeting.

Sincerely,

Dave Chatterjee

UGA Program Review Policy changes—Overview  
October 19, 2016

Background for this revision to the UGA Program Review Policy:

As required by the existing policy, a subcommittee of the Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) undertook during spring and summer of 2016 an evaluation of the UGA Program Review Policy and attendant procedures. In considering the current policy and process and developing recommendations for the full committee, the subcommittee considered:

- Findings from recently conducted reviews;
- New requirements from the University System of Georgia Board of Regents (BOR)
- New and existing requirements from Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC);
- New UGA policies and governance for student learning outcomes assessment; and
- Findings and recommendations of an ad hoc committee charged in 2015 by the Provost to study program review practices at other institutions.

This revision seeks to streamline the review process to make the most efficient use of faculty, staff, and administrative time, while maintaining the rigor of the review, the focus on continuous improvement of UGA programs, and compliance with external requirements.

This revision also takes into account the recent addition of PRAC to the University Council as a standing committee.

Substantive changes include:

1. Focusing and structuring the *required* scope of the review on the new reporting guidelines specified by the BOR and SACSCOC. The new reporting guidelines emphasize the evaluation of academic programs and assessment of procedures for student learning outcomes assessment. The review will also include other elements deemed necessary to evaluate how excellence can be achieved, how programs can move to the forefront of their fields, and how available resources can be used for maximum impact. (Policy document item #4 and #3)
2. Improving the efficiency of producing the review's self-study report by providing report templates and directing units to draw from existing documentation and data, such as specialized accreditation reports, UGA Elements reports, and Institutional Research data. (Policy document item #9)
3. Including a new requirement that final reports will be distributed to the academic program faculty, staff, and administrators with oversight of the academic program. As deemed necessary, personnel recommendations or other sensitive items will be

redacted from this report. Such redactions will be made explicit in the report. (Policy document item #11)

4. Adding a second PRAC member to each review team. This member will focus on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment as a member of the team rather than as a member of a separate subcommittee. (Policy document item #8)
5. Updating the review team nomination section that includes a new expectation that the Dean or Director's nominee on the review team will act as Chair. (Policy document item #8)
6. Establishing a new expectation that the self-study will be shared with the appropriate dean or director at the same time it is submitted for the review. (Policy document item #9)
7. Including a new expectation that PRAC will review follow-up reports to ensure adequate progress is being made by the unit and appropriate administrative hierarchy, and make referrals as necessary. (Policy document item #11)

Changes that do not affect the substantive content of the review include:

1. Reformatting and reorganization of the policy content to better match current UGA policy practice.
2. Including a new reference section of related internal and external policies and integrating references into the content of the policy where applicable.
3. Changing the administrative office charged with program review from the Office of Academic Planning to the Office of Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness.
4. Removing the defined distribution of the committee membership, as this is now in the Bylaws of the University Council.
5. Removing examples of potential conflicts of interest, as these are operational and dynamic and can be included in procedure documents as needed. The policy regarding conflicts of interest is unchanged.
6. Abbreviating the background section.

## Academic Affairs Policy 4.12-2: University of Georgia Academic Program Review Policy

### 1. Background

Formal academic program review procedures approved by University Council have been in place at the University of Georgia since 1990. In 2002, the Council approved the *University of Georgia Program Review Policy* to ensure the University of Georgia complied with new requirements for academic program review passed by the University System of Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) in 2001. In addition, the 2002 revision sought to build on the solid foundation of experience from the first cycle of review and to codify in policy practices that had evolved during the first ten years of academic program review.

The 2016 revision of the *UGA Academic Program Review Policy* is based on a thorough evaluation of the review process by the Program Review and Assessment Committee as required by the existing policy. The revised policy seeks to streamline the review process, align it with new policies and expectations from UGA, the BOR, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC); and ensure it continues to provide for the continuous improvement of UGA academic programs.

### 2. References

- a) Board of Regents Policy Manual, University System of Georgia, Policy 2.9, titled “Institutional Effectiveness: Planning and Assessment”
- b) Board of Regents Policy Manual, University System of Georgia, Policy 3.6.3, titled “Comprehensive Academic Program Review”
- c) Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), Principles of Accreditation, Core requirement 2.5 and Comprehensive Standards 3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.4, and 3.3.1.5
- d) UGA Academic Affairs Policy 2.04-4, titled “Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes”
- e) UGA University Council Bylaws, Part I, Section XIV, “Program Review and Assessment Committee”

### 3. Guiding Principles and Purpose of this Policy

Academic Program Review is one among a number of interrelated processes in place at the University of Georgia to ensure institutional effectiveness in accordance with requirements of the BOR and SACSCOC. The purpose of Academic Program Review is to provide a systematic means of ensuring the continuous improvement of the University’s academic, research, and service programs. Reviews should focus on how excellence can be achieved, how programs can move to the forefront of their fields, and how available resources can be used for maximum impact. The outcomes of Academic Program Reviews serve to guide development of individual programs, inform administrators making decisions about the allocation of resources. The essential elements of all Academic Program Reviews include:

- Evaluating the quality, viability, and productivity of each academic program according to a set of criteria that meet the requirements of the BOR;
- Evaluating the program’s contribution to the University’s mission;
- Recommending a set of priorities for the academic program’s improvement

As defined in section 7, the intent of the review process is that academic program faculty should, as part of the larger university review, engage in a careful self-review of each academic program in light of its own purpose and strategic goals for achieving excellence in the field. This should improve the quality of the

university review; make it more salient to the faculty and academic programs; and increase the likelihood that the process will result in continuous improvement.

#### 4. Scope of Academic Program Review

All academic degree programs; the majors within each degree program at the undergraduate, graduate, professional levels; and all certificate programs are subject to review. Consistent with BOR and SACSCOC requirements and Academic Affairs Policy 2.04-4, Academic Program Review must, at a minimum, evaluate each academic program and assess its procedures for student learning outcome assessment. In addition, research programs, public service and outreach programs, and the programs of official Centers and Institutes may also be included as appropriate within the scope of Academic Program Reviews. The full scope of each Academic Program Review Team's work will be determined in consultation with academic program faculty or its representative(s) at the outset of the review.

In general, all appropriate programs within an administratively distinct unit will be reviewed at the same time by one Academic Program Review Team as defined in section 8 of this policy.

#### 5. Responsibility for Academic Program Reviews

Academic Program Reviews is a partnership between the Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC), as constituted in the bylaws of the University Council, and the Office of Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE). In general, PRAC has primary oversight of all matters directly related to the substantive elements of Academic Program Reviews, including establishment of review criteria and guidelines that meet BOR and SACSCOC requirements; evaluation of student learning outcomes assessment processes; oversight of review teams; and considering, approving, and forwarding the review team reports and recommendations. In general, OAIE has primary oversight of procedural matters related to Academic Program Reviews and responsibility for annual reporting required by the BOR and reporting to SACSCOC as necessary. This includes maintaining the official review cycle, ensuring compliance with PRAC guidelines, BOR requirements and SACSCOC requirements, facilitating the review process, and maintaining the record of academic program review results.

#### 6. Faculty Involvement in the Review Process

Academic program faculty must be involved in the review process in accordance with the rules of faculty governance under which that academic program operates. Because the usefulness of the review process and the validity of its results are greatly enhanced by the broadest possible involvement of the academic program faculty, they should be encouraged to participate in all aspects of the review. This should include defining the scope of the review, planning and preparing the self-study, identifying potential reviewers, providing information to the review team through interviews and surveys, and responding to recommendations in the Final Report.

Academic Program Reviews will be conducted by a review team of UGA faculty assembled by OAIE and approved by the PRAC according to guidelines in section 8 of this policy. Review teams may include external reviewers.

The final self-study, any final review report and recommendations of Academic Program Reviews will be made available to all academic program faculty. As deemed necessary, personnel recommendations or other sensitive items will be redacted from this report. Such redactions will be made explicit in the report.

## 7. Review Cycle

In accordance with BOR requirements, there will be a seven-year review cycle for all academic programs. The review cycle will be developed and maintained by the OAIE in consultation with PRAC, Deans, and Directors. For academic programs subject to external accreditation review, and consistent with Academic Affairs Policy 2.04-4, every effort will be made to coordinate the internal review with the external review, minimize duplication of effort, and make efficient use of documentation for both reviews.

## 8. Academic Program Review Team

Each Academic Program Review Team will consist of at least four University of Georgia faculty appointed as follows:

- Two team members will be assigned from the membership of PRAC, one of whom will focus on evaluating student learning outcomes assessment processes.
- The Director, Dean or Vice President with oversight of the program(s) will nominate one member from a related field who will usually serve as chair of the Academic Program Review Team and who meets conflict-of-interest standards as defined in section 13. If the program(s) under review include a graduate program, this member must be a member of the graduate faculty at UGA or have similar standing at their home institution.
- The academic program faculty, either through the Head/Director or in accordance with its faculty governance procedures, will either a) nominate one member who has agreed to serve and who meets conflict-of-interest standards as defined below, or b) submit to the OAIE the names of at least three faculty from related fields who the faculty deems appropriate to serve on the review team and who meet conflict-of-interest standards as defined below. If the academic program (s) under review include a graduate program, nominees/submissions must be members of the graduate faculty at UGA or have similar standing at their home institution.

External Reviewers: The inclusion of a noted expert from the same field as the academic program(s) can add significant value to the results of an academic program review. If an academic program or Dean wishes to include an external reviewer on the review team, the Dean or program Head/Director must:

- a) Notify the OAIE in writing of its intention to include an external reviewer;
- b) Submit the name(s) of the potential reviewer(s) to the OAIE for approval;
- c) Secure stipend and travel expenses for the reviewer; and
- d) Secure the agreement of the reviewer to serve as a member of the Academic Program Review Team

The external reviewer, if added, will be a fifth member of the Academic Program Review Team.

All review team nominees are subject to the approval of PRAC.

## 9. Self-Study

The basis of an Academic Program Review will be a self-study prepared by the academic program faculty according to PRAC guidelines provided at the beginning of the review process. The purpose of the self-study is to provide a mechanism for the faculty to undertake a thorough self-evaluation of each programs' goals and successes, including its students' attainment of learning outcomes as defined in and required by Academic Affairs Policy 2.04-4. The self-study should incorporate applicable BOR and SACSCOC requirements, and to the extent possible, incorporate existing documentation from other sources, such as

specialized accreditation reports and data from central UGA resources, such as the Office of Institutional Research. The self-study should identify the key strengths and weaknesses of the academic program and should include strategies for continued development of its strengths and correction of its weaknesses. In the process of preparing the self-study, the faculty should consider each academic program in relation to currency in the discipline, the University's strategic goals, and the needs of the State, as appropriate. The self-study will be shared with the appropriate dean or director at the same time it is submitted for the review.

#### 10. The Final Report of the Academic Program Review Team

The final report will be prepared according to PRAC guidelines provided at the beginning of the review process. The final report will address each academic program offered by the unit and make explicit recommendations as to whether each academic program should be maintained at current levels, enhanced, reduced in scope, consolidated, or eliminated consistent with the requirements of Board of Regents Policy Manual, University System of Georgia, Policy 3.6.3, titled "Comprehensive Academic Program Review"

#### 11. Administrative Follow-up of Academic Program Review Reports

Final reports will be distributed to the academic program faculty, staff, and administrators with oversight of the academic program. As deemed necessary, personnel recommendations or other sensitive items will be redacted from this report. Such redactions will be made explicit in the report. A meeting will be held soon after completion of the review with the academic program faculty or its representative(s) and the above administrators to discuss the final report and determine action items.

One year following completion of the review, the academic program faculty will submit a report on the unit's progress in responding to the action items determined in the follow-up meeting. PRAC will review follow-up reports to ensure adequate progress is being made by the unit and appropriate administrative hierarchy and make referrals as necessary.

#### 12. Evaluating these Policies and Procedures

At least once every five years, PRAC should undertake a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of this policy and any procedures enacting it with the purpose of recommending improvements, as appropriate, to the University Council.

#### 13. Conflict of Interest Policy in Academic Program Reviews

The PRAC acknowledges that persons who are actively engaged and familiar with an academic unit may best be able to assess strengths and challenges of its programs. However, it is vital to the effectiveness of program reviews that individuals involved in the review process are free of conflicts that might compromise or be perceived to compromise critical objectivity. For this reason, faculty with rank, joint, or adjunct appointment in the unit with programs under review shall not participate as reviewers or as PRAC members discussing the review in committee. PRAC will consider other potential conflicts as necessary, with particular attention to those occurring within seven years leading up to the review.

Any potential conflict within the review team must be disclosed in writing to the full academic program faculty and to PRAC. Disclosure should include personal confirmation that the potential conflict does not compromise the critical objectivity of the reviewer. Academic program faculty may object to individual reviewers through departmental governance procedures or directly to PRAC or to the OAIE. PRAC will consider disclosed potential conflicts, written confirmation of critical objectivity, and any objection from the unit in determining whether to confirm members of the review team. PRAC will have final determination regarding review team membership. PRAC members who have any of the potential conflicts listed above or

other potential conflicts relating to a unit under review must disclose those relationships to the committee, which will determine whether or not the member should participate in discussions relating to that unit.

Approved by the University Council, January 31, 2002

Revised and approved, September 22, 2005

Revised and approved, February 8, 2007

Revised and approved, February 7, 2013

Revised and approved, November X, 2016

## UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY

Approved by the University Council, January 31, 2002  
Revised and approved, September 22, 2005  
Revised and approved, February 8, 2007  
Revised and approved, February 7, 2013

### Introduction

Program Review is one among a number of interrelated processes in place at the University of Georgia to ensure institutional effectiveness in accordance with guidelines of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (BOR) and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The purpose of Program Review is to provide a systematic means of assuring the continuous improvement of the University's academic, research, and service programs. The outcomes of Program Reviews serve to guide development of individual programs and to inform administrators making decisions about the allocation of resources. The essential elements of all Program Reviews include:

- Evaluating the viability, quality, and productivity of the program according to a set of criteria that meet the requirements of the BOR;
- Evaluating the success of the program in fulfilling its mission as defined by its internal strategic planning process;
- Evaluating the program's contribution to the University's mission;
- Recommending a set of priorities for the program's improvement

All programs of instruction, research, and/or service are subject to review. This includes the programs of academic units, public service units, and official centers and institutes. In general, all appropriate programs within an administratively distinct unit will be reviewed at the same time. The intent of the review process is that the unit being reviewed should, as part of the larger university review, engage in a careful "self review" in light of its own mission and strategic plans. This should improve the quality of the university review; make it more salient to the unit; and increase the likelihood that the process will result in continuous improvement.

### Background

Formal Program Review procedures were approved at the University of Georgia in June 1990, when the University Council adopted as a resolution the *Guidelines and Procedures for Program Evaluation* and established a ten year review cycle. During the initial cycle, August 1992 through May 2002, 58 university faculty members served on the Program Review Committee, overseeing 128 reviews conducted by more than 330 university faculty members participating on review teams.

This revision, the *University of Georgia Program Review Policy*, is undertaken to ensure that the University of Georgia complies with new requirements for Program Review passed by the BOR in 2001. In addition, this revision seeks to build on the solid foundation of experience from the first cycle, to maintain the high quality of reviews, and to codify in policy practices that have evolved over the last ten years.

### Administration of Program Reviews

Administration of Program Reviews is a partnership between the Faculty Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) and the Office of Academic Planning (OAP) in coordination with the Associate Provost for Academic Planning. In general, PRAC has primary oversight of all matters directly related to the substantive elements of Program Reviews, including establishment of review criteria and guidelines, oversight of review teams, and considering, approving, and forwarding the review team reports and recommendations. In general, OAP has primary oversight of procedural matters related to Program Review and responsibility for annual reporting required by the Board of Regents. This includes maintaining the official review cycle, assuring compliance with faculty and Board of Regents-approved guidelines, facilitating the review process, maintaining the record of program review results, and coordinating with the Associate Provost for Academic Planning.

#### Faculty Involvement in the Review Process

Program Reviews will be conducted by a review team of UGA Faculty (in some cases in conjunction with external reviewers) assembled by the PRAC according to guidelines following in this document.

Faculty of the unit must be involved in the review process in accordance with the rules of faculty governance under which that unit operates. Because the usefulness of the review process and the validity of its results are greatly enhanced by the broadest possible involvement of the unit's faculty, they should be encouraged to participate in all aspects of the review. This would include planning and preparing the self-study, identifying potential reviewers, and providing information to the review team through interviews and questionnaires.

### **Program Review & Assessment Committee (PRAC)**

The Program Review and Assessment Committee will consist of 30 UGA senior faculty selected by the University Council Executive Committee to serve two-year terms running from August 1 through July 31. The composition of the committee should be proportional to the number of degree programs, review units, and senior faculty in each school or college. The following distribution of faculty on the PRAC takes these values into account:

<b># Faculty on</b>	<b>School, College, Administrative Division</b>
4	College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
10	The Franklin College of Arts and Sciences
3	College of Education
2	Terry College of Business
2	College of Veterinary Medicine
1	College of Family and Consumer Sciences
2 <sup>1</sup>	College of Public Health
	School of Public and International Affairs
	Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
1 <sup>2</sup>	School of Social Work
	College of Engineering
1 <sup>2</sup>	College of Pharmacy
	School of Law
1 <sup>2</sup>	Warnell School of Forest Resources
	College of Environment and Design
2	Public Service Faculty
1	Odum School of Ecology
	Affiliate of a Center or Institute (may be from any College or School or fully funded through a Center or Institute)

<sup>1</sup>To be selected in such a way that each PRAC member from the group is from a different School or College and that no School or College will be unrepresented on the PRAC for more than one two-year term.

<sup>2</sup>To be selected in rotation so that neither School nor College will be unrepresented on the PRAC for more than one two-year term.

All members of the PRAC should be senior faculty (i.e. at the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Public Service Associate, Senior Public Service Associate, Associate Research Scientist, Senior Research Scientist, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Academic Professional). At least 15 PRAC members should be on the Graduate Faculty. The members should be appointed in such a way that 15 rotate off each year. No member should be appointed for more than 2 consecutive terms without first rotating off the committee for a 2-year term. The first order of business for each new committee will be to elect a Chair and a Co-chair to serve one-year terms.

The Chair should be a returning member of the PRAC; the Co-chair, in general, should be a new member of the PRAC.

In accordance with BOR requirements, there will be a 7-year Review Cycle for all programs subject to review. The Review Cycle will be developed by the OAP and approved by the PRAC. For programs subject to external accreditation review, every effort will be made to conduct the internal review simultaneously with the external review. Programs triggered for off-cycle review by the BOR will be reviewed according to BOR guidelines.

### Self Study

The basis of a program review will be a Self-Study prepared by the unit according to PRAC guidelines provided at the beginning of the review process. The purpose of the self-study is to provide a mechanism for the unit to undertake a thorough self-evaluation of its program goals and successes. The self-study should identify the key strengths and weaknesses of the unit's programs. It should include strategies for continued development of its strengths and correction of its weaknesses. In the process of preparing the self-study, the unit should revisit and renew its Strategic Plan in accordance with the University's Strategic Plan, discipline developments, and the needs of the State as appropriate. The self-study should also provide existing data from sources such as Strategic Planning Reports, Annual Reports, Learning Outcomes Assessment Processes, and Institutional Research and Planning that will assist the review team in understanding the program.

### Program Review Team

Each Program Review Team will consist of at least **three** University of Georgia faculty appointed as follows:

- One team member will be assigned from the membership of the Program Review and Assessment Committee.
- The Dean or Vice President with oversight of the unit will nominate one member from a related field who has agreed to serve and who meets conflict-of-interest standards as defined below. If the unit has a graduate program, this member must be a member of the graduate faculty. If a school or college has a "Committee on Committees" or other mechanism for faculty appointments to University committees, that mechanism should be used to make appointments to the review team. This nomination is subject to the approval of the PRAC.
- The faculty of the unit, either through its Head/Director or in accordance with its faculty governance procedures, will either a) nominate one member who has agreed to serve and who meets conflict-of-interest standards as defined below, or b) submit to the OAP the names of at least three faculty from related fields who the unit deems appropriate to serve on the review team and who meet conflict-of-interest standards as defined below. If the unit has a graduate program, nominees/submissions must be members of the graduate faculty. If the program under review chooses to nominate (a) a member for the review team, this nomination is subject to the approval of the PRAC.

External Reviewers: The inclusion of a noted expert from the same field as the unit can add significant value to the results of a program review. If a unit wishes to include an external reviewer on the review team, the unit must:

1. Notify the OAP in writing of its intention to include an external reviewer;
2. Submit the name(s) of the potential reviewer(s) to the OAP for approval;
3. Secure stipend and travel expenses for the reviewer; and
4. Secure the agreement of the reviewer to participate as a member of the UGA Program Review Team

Review Team Chair: The review team chair will be one of the UGA faculty members of the review team, will be selected by the team members, and will not be the PRAC representative.

### Conflict of Interest Policy in Program Reviews

The PRAC acknowledges that persons who are actively engaged and familiar with an academic unit may best be able to assess strengths and challenges of its programs. However, it is vital to the effectiveness of program reviews that individuals involved in the review process are free of conflicts that might compromise or be perceived to compromise critical objectivity. For this reason, faculty with rank, joint, or adjunct appointment in the unit under review shall not participate as reviewers or as PRAC members discussing the review in committee.

PRAC will consider other potential conflicts as necessary, with particular attention to those occurring within seven years leading up to the review. Potential conflicts include but are not limited to those on the following list, which exist for faculty participating in the review of:

- < a unit in which the faculty member has formerly held a position;
- < a unit in which a spouse, relative, domestic partner, or other intimate acquaintance of the faculty member holds a position;
- < a unit in which the faculty member is actively engaged in collaborative research with any of the unit faculty, staff, or graduate students;
- < a unit in which the faculty member has a business or consulting relationship with any of the unit faculty, staff, or graduate students;
- < a unit in which the faculty member has been the major professor of any of the unit faculty or staff;
- < a unit in which a unit faculty member has been the major professor of the reviewer or PRAC member;
- < a unit in which the faculty member advises or participates on graduate committees for students in the unit; and
- < a unit in which the faculty member has or has had other formal interactions.

Any relationship listed above or other potential conflict within the review team must be disclosed in writing to the full faculty of the unit under review and to PRAC. Disclosure should include personal confirmation that the potential conflict does not compromise the critical objectivity of the reviewer. Faculty of the unit may object to individual reviewers through departmental governance procedures or directly to PRAC or to the OAP. PRAC will consider disclosed potential conflicts, written confirmation of critical objectivity, and any objection from the unit in determining whether to confirm members of the review team. PRAC will have final determination regarding review team membership. PRAC members who have any of the potential conflicts listed above or other potential conflicts relating to a unit under

review must disclose those relationships to the committee, which will determine whether or not the member should participate in discussions relating to that unit.

#### The Final Report of Program Review Team

The final report will be prepared according to PRAC guidelines provided at the beginning of the review process. The final report will address each program offered by the unit and make explicit recommendations as to whether each program should be maintained at current levels, enhanced, reduced in scope, consolidated, or eliminated.

#### Administrative Follow-up of Program Review Reports

The final reports of program reviews will be distributed to the Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Planning, and to all administrators with oversight of the unit and its programs. A meeting will be held soon after completion of the review with the Head/Director of the unit and the above administrators to discuss the final report.

One year following completion of the review, the Head/Director of the unit will submit a report on the unit's progress in responding to the recommendations of the final report. Meetings will be held to address concerns from the follow-up report as necessary at the request of the unit or of any of the administrators with oversight of the unit.

#### Evaluating these Policies and Procedures

After no more than five years of conducting reviews under these Policies and Procedures for Program Review, PRAC should undertake a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of these policies and procedures with the purpose of recommending improvements, as appropriate, to the University Council.

# PRAC Process Review Roadmap

