

**University of Nebraska
at Kearney**

Academic Program Review Guidelines
and Procedures

Table of Contents

PURPOSE	3
PROCEDURES.....	3
Overview of APR Process	4
APR Costs	5
Frequency / Deferral Request Process	5
Coordination of APR and External Accreditation	5
Criteria for Selecting Programs for Review	8
THE SELF-STUDY.....	8
Purpose	8
Responsibilities	9
Self-Study Content	10
Formatting Self-Study	13
Number of Copies	13
THE REVIEW TEAM.....	13
Purpose	13
Composition	13
Selection Process	14
Responsibilities	15
Format and Content of the Review Team Report	15
RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM REVIEW	16
Department's / Program's Response	16
College Dean's Report	17
SVCASA's Report	18
Departmental / Program Update	18
APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COSTS	19
APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR SITE VISIT.....	20
APPENDIX C: SUGGESTED REVIEW TEAM SCHEDULE.....	21
APPENDIX D: PROGRAM REVIEW TIMELINES	23
APPENDIX E: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN AN APR	24

Faculty and Staff of the Reviewed Program	24
APR Coordinator (normally Department Chair or Program Director)	24
Review Team Chair	25
Review Team Members	26
College Dean	26
SVCASA	26
SVCASA's Office (Faculty Assistant)	27
APPENDIX F: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS USED IN DEVELOPING GUIDELINES .	28
APPENDIX G: APR PROCESS FOR MONITORING GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS.....	29
APPENDIX H: APR SCHEDULE.....	31

PURPOSE

The University of Nebraska is committed to providing the highest quality post-secondary education for the citizens of Nebraska. As per the Board of Regents Policy Statement on the Relationship of Teaching, Research and Service (1995: RP-2.1.6), “the first priority of the University of Nebraska and each of its campuses is teaching, with special emphasis on teaching the undergraduate or first-professional level student.” Further, the Board of Regents recognizes that periodic review coupled with coordinated, long range strategic planning is essential to ensure the quality of academic programming, both instructional and non-instructional.

As per the Board of Regents Policy Statement on the Relationship of Teaching, Research and Service (1995: RP-2.1.6), “UNK is primarily an undergraduate institution committed to quality undergraduate programs in a residential setting with a select mix of master’s level graduate programs.” To maintain UNK’s commitment to academic excellence, periodic review of each academic program (both instructional and non-instructional) is needed, as well as being required by the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska and by Legislative Bill 663.

The purpose of the Academic Program Review (APR) is to provide a common base for internal review and evaluation of all University of Nebraska at Kearney (UNK) academic (both instructional and non-instructional) programs. The primary goal of the APR process is to improve the program’s effectiveness and quality. The APR process is intended to be a periodic self-examination with the objectives of providing a clear assessment of the program’s strengths and weaknesses, developing a guide for the program’s future direction and contributing to a strategic plan for the future. Thus, an effective APR (i.e., one that is most beneficial to the program in planning for the future) is one that fully engages the faculty (or staff) and administration during the entire review process, from the development of the Self-Study to the program response to the final report to the implementation of accepted recommendations.

To meet these goals and objectives, the APR process has several components: 1) an internal self-study, 2) an external review of the program; 3) a final report that provides a clear plan for applying the results of the review; and 4) specific responses to the program review developed by the Department Chairs and/or Program Directors, College Deans and Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs (SVCASA); all of which are described in the following sections.

PROCEDURES

The APR process at UNK is overseen by the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (SVCASA). The Faculty Assistant to the SVCASA has the responsibility for monitoring the process of each APR.

The overall goal of the APR process is continuous program improvement. To achieve this goal, a standard procedure has been established to ensure internal consistency and to provide the necessary data for short- and long-term institutional planning. Additionally, this APR procedure meets the requirement for periodic program review required by the Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education described in LB663 and specified in Title 281, Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 4.

Overview of APR Process

The APR process provides programs an opportunity to improve program quality through a combination of internal self-study and an external review of the program. The APR process, from start to finish, can take up to an entire academic year and successful completion requires careful planning and preparation. Generally speaking, the review process can be broken down into three phases: before, during, and after the visit. A general overview of the activities in each phase is presented below:

	Before Visit	During Visit	After Visit
Department / Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develops Self-Study ▪ Participates in selection of Review Team ▪ Coordinates visit schedule with SVCASA's office ▪ Provides two copies of completed Self-Study to SVCASA's office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Actively participates in Review Team's visit, including providing logistical support ▪ Provides workspace for Review Team ▪ Chair / Director hears exit report of Review Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Responds to all evaluation and review comments prior to final review by SVCASA and Chancellor ▪ Submits copy of Department's / Program's Response to College Dean and SVCASA's office
College Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meets with Department / Program faculty explaining review process, campus/college issues Self-Study should address ▪ Advises in the selection of the Review Team ▪ Secures services of approved external reviewer and Review Team ▪ Reviews and evaluates the Self-Study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Actively participates in the Review Team's visit ▪ Hears exit report of Review Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluates Review Team Report and Department's / Program's Response, discusses the results with the Department / Program faculty ▪ Submits copy of College Dean's Report to Department / Program and SVCASA's office
SVCASA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approves external reviewer and Review Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hears exit report of Review Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluates all reports, discusses the results with the Department / Program representatives and the Dean(s), and with the assistance of the Dean(s), includes elements of the report in the Strategic Planning process, and provides written notification to Faculty Assistant that APR process is complete ▪ Submits copy of all APR documents to Library Archives

As indicated above, the Deans and the SVCASA actively participate in the APR process and incorporate APR findings in their recommendations for short- and long-range institutional planning. In addition, external reporting required by the Board of Regents and the Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education may include or be generated from program review documents.

APR Costs

The Department or Program under review will be responsible for the direct costs of producing the Self-Study report (e.g., preparing and duplicating). Departments / Programs should plan on providing a copy of the Self-Study for each member of the Review Team, Department Chair / Program Director, College Dean, Graduate Dean (if applicable), College of Education Dean (if applicable), **two** (2) copies for the SVCASA's office, and sufficient copies for Department / Program faculty member's access.

The office of the SVCASA will pay the following direct costs for the Review Team members: 1) transportation, housing, meals and honorarium for the off-campus Review Team chairperson and 2) two (2) working meals for the Review Team (normally the team orientation breakfast or dinner and a working lunch).

Frequency / Deferral Request Process

The intent is to schedule an APR for each Department or Program in a five-year cycle; although for programs with external accrediting agencies, the APR schedule is adjusted, as much as possible, to coincide with the accreditation cycle. Because of the number of programs in the review process during any given academic year and because the funding for APR site visits have been budgeted based upon the [master APR schedule](#), changes to the schedule will **only** be considered in special circumstances and must be approved by the SVCASA. The process to request a deferral of the APR is as follows:

- Department Chair / Program Director contacts College Dean with a **written** request for deferral, providing the rationale (e.g., program planning significant changes, program experiencing significant enrollment and/or staffing changes, changes in physical environment such as building renovations, etc.).
- College Dean, if in support of deferral, submits a **written** request (with rationale) to SVCASA for consideration.
- SVCASA makes decision in favor or against, notifies the College Dean in **writing**, at which time the APR schedule is updated to reflect the decision.

Coordination of APR and External Accreditation

Every attempt should be made to coordinate the Academic Program Review process with any departmental or program external accreditation. This would include both department- / program-specific accreditations and broader accreditation processes such as NCATE and AACSB. If an external accreditation occurs every eight (8) years or less, it is recommended that this become the APR cycle for that particular Department or Program (the College Dean or SVCASA may, at any time, call for an APR during the cycle). For external accreditations of nine (9) years or more, it is recommended that the traditional APR process be utilized during the middle year of the accreditation cycle.

Programs with external accreditation have two options for fulfilling UNK APR requirements: 1) expedited review process or 2) abbreviated review process.

Expedited Review Process

Under this approach, the Department / Program under review utilizes the materials prepared for the external accrediting agency for the APR process.

In order to pursue the expedited review process, the Department Chair / Program Director must obtain the approval of both the College Dean and SVCASA.

By using the expedited review process, the Department / Program and the College Dean submits all of the information that would have been developed through the usual APR process, but the Department / Program does not need to form a Review Team (with an external reviewer) and campus visit. Thus, the materials submitted for the expedited review process should include the following:

- The Self-Study Document for the Program: The Accreditation Self-Study should serve as the foundation for the expedited APR; however, additional editing and/or materials may be needed to ensure that the submitted document adequately addresses the nine major topics (as outlined in these Guidelines beginning on page 10) required for UNK's APR process.
- The Accreditation Team's Report: The Recommendations from the accrediting agency's visit identifying the program's strengths and areas of needed improvement (in essence, this is the Review Team's Report).
- The Department's / Program's Response: The Department / Program should develop a response, in the form of an action plan, to the recommendations outlined in the Accreditation Team's Report (this is the Department's / Program's Response to the Review Team's Report). The Department's / Program's Response provides a blue-print for the Department's / Program's implementation and monitoring of the recommended changes suggested in the Accreditation Team's Report and serves as a benchmark for evaluating the Department's / Program's progress toward achieving its goals during the next review cycle. As such, the Department's / Program's Response should include all six items (as outlined in these Guidelines beginning on page 16) required for UNK's APR process.
- The College Dean's Response to the Accreditation Team's Report and the Department's / Program's Response (this is the College Dean's Report): After receiving and reviewing both the Accreditation Team's Report and the Department's / Program's Response, the College Dean prepares and submits to the SVCASA an evaluative report of the potential impacts from implementing the recommendations and identifies the college resources that will be devoted to implementing those recommendations. The College Dean's Report should include all eight items (as outlined in these Guidelines on page 17) required for UNK's APR process.

All of the above materials are utilized by the SVCASA in developing the SVCASA's response to the program's review and for use in the strategic planning for UNK. As such, Departments / Programs electing to undergo an Expedited Review Process should submit two (2) copies of all review materials to the Office of the SVCASA, one of which will be filed in the C.T. Ryan Library Archives.

Departments / Programs electing to use the expedited review process should plan on submitting all of the above materials during the academic year in which their APR is scheduled (generally the year immediately following the accreditation visit). The exact due date for the materials will be negotiated between the SVCASA and the College Dean.

While using the materials prepared for the accrediting agency for the APR process is acceptable, it remains the responsibility of the program undergoing the review to ensure that the questions posed in the APR Guidelines are adequately addressed. In other words, there is no reason to expect that the information provided to the accreditation agency will be exactly the same information needed for decision making at UNK. Given that the information generated through UNK's APR process, as outlined in these guidelines, is utilized in the strategic planning process and resource allocation decisions on campus, it is imperative that that Departments / Programs ensure that all topics required by this manual are addressed in the materials submitted to the SVCASA's office.

Abbreviated Review Process

The following procedures apply when a Department / Program is utilizing an external accreditation as the basis for undergoing an Abbreviated Review Process for its UNK Academic Program Review:

- The APR should be scheduled during the academic year following the external accreditation visit.
- The Accreditation Self-Study and Report should serve as foundation materials for the APR; however, the Department / Program, in consultation with the College Dean, may choose to add materials to the Accreditation Self-Study in order to develop a more complete program review document. It is particularly important that Departments / Programs ensure that all topics required by this manual be addressed in the Accreditation Self-Study or in the supplemental materials provided.
- The Department / Program, in consultation with the College Dean and SVCASA's office, will choose to utilize either:
 - 1) a traditional Review Team comprised of an external evaluator (who serves as chair) and internal (on-campus) team members

Or

- 2) a Review Team, including the evaluator (who serves as chair), comprised solely of internal (on-campus) members. Should an on-campus Review Team be utilized, the chair of the team should be a faculty member from a different department in the same college. This team chair will receive an honorarium of \$400 for serving in this capacity.
- Depending upon the nature of the accreditation visit, and in consultation with the College Dean, the meeting schedule with various campus entities may be abbreviated. For example, if students and faculty were interviewed during the accreditation visit, it may not be necessary for this component of the APR process to be repeated.

- **All other aspects** of the APR process should proceed as outlined in this document; this includes submission of the Review Team Report and responses from the Department / Program being reviewed and the College Dean.

Departments / Programs electing to undergo an Abbreviated Review Process should submit two (2) copies of all review materials (e.g., Self-study, Review Team Report, etc.) to the Office of the SVCASA, one of which will be filed in the C.T. Ryan Library Archives.

Criteria for Selecting Programs for Review

Selection of the programs to be reviewed in a given year will be made by the SVCASA in consultation with the appropriate Dean or Director. The Faculty Assistant to the SVCASA may be advisory in this process. Centers and programs contained within a program (as defined in Executive Memorandum No. 24 (Appendix F) shall be reviewed along with the program. The following factors, not in priority order, should be considered in the selection:

- 1) Relationship of the program to other programs under review.
- 2) Marked change in student demand.
- 3) Recent or planned program changes.
- 4) Timing of the NCCPE program reviews.
- 5) Accreditation cycles ([accredited programs at UNK](#)).
- 6) Elapsed time since last major review of budget, staffing or program for any purpose.

THE SELF-STUDY

Purpose

The overall goal of the APR process is continuous program improvement, and the Self-Study is an important component in achieving this goal. The Self-Study presents a comprehensive picture of the department and its programs, describing the goals, rationale, program offerings, staffing resources, students, assessment of student outcomes, and the Department's / Program's strategies for improvement. The Self-Study should also describe the Department / Program in the context of the University of Nebraska at Kearney. In particular, the Self-Study should address the role(s) the Department / Program plays in supporting University-wide programs, such as General Studies, Honors Program, Women's and Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies, International Studies and others not assigned to an individual department. In essence, the Self-Study document should provide the necessary information for the Review Team to assess how successful the program is in fulfilling its mission and that of the University, how well it functions as an organization, the appropriateness of the program's strategic vision of its future directions and how it intends to move to a higher level of achievement.

An effective APR is one that is most beneficial to the program in planning for the future. Thus, prior to beginning the self-study process, Departments / Programs are encouraged to engage in a planning process that assists the program in moving from identifying its past accomplishments

and present needs to quantifying its future mission, goals, and strategies for achieving those goals. Further, it is expected that all faculty members in the Department / Program be familiar with the final Self-Study document prior to the campus visit of the Review Team.

Although an evaluation of past performance is an important component of the Self-Study, the focus of the review process is solidly on the future. Thus, while the Self-Study allows the Department / Program to describe “who we are and what we do,” the analysis of the program’s strengths and weaknesses and areas of improvement informs the Review Team, College Dean, and SVCASA regarding those matters that the Department / Program considers of the greatest importance and how it intends to address those matters.

Responsibilities

Development of the Self-Study is the responsibility of the Department / Program under review. Although one person, normally the Department Chair or Program Director, serves as coordinator of the Self-Study, the entire faculty and staff of the Department / Program are urged to be active participants in all phases of the review process, including preparation of the Self-Study. In addition, it is expected that each Review Team member and program faculty member will have access to a complete copy of the Self-Study **thirty (30) days prior** to the Review Team’s visit.

The Department Chair or Program Director normally serves as the coordinator of the Self-Study. Specifically, the coordinator (full details on responsibilities provided in Appendix E):

- 1) Recommends members for the Review Team in accordance with the APR guidelines.
- 2) Ensures the College Dean has opportunity to review and provide feedback on Self-Study report prior to finalizing the document.
- 3) Produces a Self-Study report which conforms to the APR guidelines.
- 4) Provides a tentative schedule for the Review Team's campus visit and coordinates visit schedule with SVCASA’s office.
- 5) Ensures each member of the Review Team receives a copy of the Self-Study and UNK APR Guidelines thirty (30) days prior to the campus visit.
- 6) Ensures Review Team has access to all review materials and facilitates the campus visit.
- 7) Ensures the Review Team's written report is reviewed by the Department / Program.
- 8) Responds to the Review Team Report (prepares Department’s / Program’s Response) and ensures copies of the report are submitted to College Dean and SVCASA’s office.
- 9) Meets with the SVCASA and the academic Dean(s) during their evaluation of the program.
- 10) Keeps the SVCASA and the Dean(s)* informed during the entire review.
- 11) Attends Review Team’s oral exit report to SVCASA and Dean(s).

*College Dean, Graduate Dean (if applicable) and/or College of Education Dean (if secondary education, MAEd or MEd program is being reviewed)

Members of a Department / Program are active participants in all phases of the APR process. Specifically, they should (full details on responsibilities provided in Appendix E):

- 1) Assist in preparation of the Self-Study.
- 2) Actively participate in the Review Team's visit including providing logistical support for the Review Team while on campus (e.g., providing transportation to and from campus, escorting Review Team members around campus, etc.).
- 3) Provide the Self-Study coordinator with responses to documents resulting from the APR process.

Self-Study Content

In general, the Self-Study should be factual and explicit, as well as efficiently describe and evaluate the department, the programs, and the student activities and works. It should also describe what issues have been addressed since the previous review and how. While determination of departmental needs is one purpose of the Academic Program Review, the Self-Study should specifically address the Department's / Program's goals and strategies for moving towards those goals in terms that are consistent with the mission and strategic plan of the unit and of the University.

Data required to complete the Self-Study are readily available through the UNK Factbook. If other specialized data is needed, Departments / Programs can contact the Office of Institutional Research for assistance.

There are nine major topics that **must** be included in the Self-Study document. Departments / Programs may wish to add additional topics to emphasize distinct or unique features of their program.

- 1) **General Program Characteristics:** Give a brief overview of the program's history, mission, goals, and primary stakeholders. Describe the Department's / Program's strategic plan. Discuss the unit's program in terms of academic, creative, and research endeavors, public service, efforts to provide access and success for a diverse student population, and any other major initiatives. Discuss how these are linked to the Department's / Program's strategic plan and to the University's mission and strategic plan. Relate current and planned program initiatives to the results from the previous APR (and most recent accreditation review, if appropriate) and to changes that have occurred since then. Discuss the leadership, governance and organizational structure of the Department / Program. Discussion of past efforts, both successful and not successful, may be useful in illustrating the current direction of the unit.
- 2) **Degree Programs and Curricula:** Discuss the educational objectives of each degree and/or certificate program offered by the Department / Program. Describe how the Department / Program assesses the effectiveness of each program's curriculum and teaching in meeting its educational objectives, and discuss changes that have occurred and that are planned based on those assessments. When internships, experiential

learning and/or community outreach experiences are central to degree programs, they should also be described. Analyze the information regarding courses taught, enrollment patterns, degree/certificates awarded, credit hour generation relative to the educational objectives of each program, and other relevant program data related to educational objectives. Discuss collaborations with other academic units that lead to degree/certificate completion (i.e., interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and extracurricular activities (such as colloquia, conferences, speaker series, performances, etc.) in relation to the Department's / Program's educational objectives. Where appropriate, data on program information may be combined.

- 3) **Student Performance Measures:** Explain what the Department / Program expects graduates to know and be able to do upon completion of each program. Show how each program tracks students' achievement of these outcomes and utilizes the findings to improve teaching and learning effectiveness. Summarize and discuss multiple forms of both direct and indirect evidence of student's academic performance over the last five years. Examples of direct evidence include: quality of capstone projects, papers, theses, presentations, performances, portfolios or research; performance on culminating exams, including licensure and certification; internship or practicum evaluations; publications in campus, local, regional, national and/or international venues; and student's awards. Examples of indirect evidence include: job and graduate school placement of graduates; time to degree; exit interviews and surveys of faculty, employers, recruiters, and alumni; graduate and alumni honors and awards; comparison or benchmarking with peer institutions. For accredited programs, the unit should utilize outcomes measures that are responsive to accreditation expectations.
- 4) **Institutional Contributions:** Discuss the Department's / Program's contribution to other academic units, such as General Studies and/or Honors Program courses, cross-listed courses (e.g., Women's and Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies, International Studies); courses that fulfill pre-requisites for other programs, common courses for selected graduate programs, and so on.
- 5) **Student Profile and Support Data:** Analyze student information for the past five (or more if the data is available) years, including admissions, persistence and graduation/completion rates (if available), time to degree (if available), and any other relevant measures. Discuss the Department's / Program's recruitment efforts and admissions criteria (if applicable), and relate these to the current and desired student demographics. Discuss retention efforts and advising procedures, and relate these efforts to program and/or certificate completion data. Discuss the financial support awarded to students by the Department / Program (if applicable). Analyze significant enrollment trends and the Department's / Program's response to these trends. Describe the effectiveness of support services for students that are provided within the Department / Program (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, labs, etc.).
- 6) **Faculty Matters:** Provide an **abbreviated** 2-page vita for each faculty member in the Department / Program. The vitae should focus on accomplishments within the past five years. Provide data summaries for the following: number of faculty by rank/title (including research faculty), FT/PT status, gender, ethnicity/race, courtesy/adjunct faculty by institution; faculty areas of expertise; teaching assignment patterns; both peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications, presentations, exhibits, etc.; student advising and mentoring; leadership and governance roles, and awards, recognition and honors received for the past five years. Briefly discuss the Department's / Program's practices

and policies regarding strategic planning for faculty hires, transition for retiring faculty and/or roles for emeriti faculty, support for faculty involvement in interdisciplinary or cross-unit academic programs, workload analyses, support for faculty development, use of adjunct faculty and faculty retention efforts.

- 7) **Resource Bases:** Evaluate the following resources over the past five years as they relate to the implementation of academic programs: support staff; program facilities; other related campus and regional facilities; library collections* and other educational resources; computing and technology resources. If applicable, evaluate all the sources of revenue generated and received by the Department / Program in relation to all current and projected costs. Discuss the relation between the budget and the Department's / Program's mission and strategic goals. How would the Department / Program deal with increases or decreases in resources during the next five years? In addition to the University resource base assigned to the Department / Program, provide summary data on extramural support (e.g., endowments, fundraising, grants, contracts) acquired by the unit. Indicate who is primarily responsible for each externally supported project or income generating program.

* Library Assessment – The Department Chair / Program Director notifies the Dean of the Library and requests that the Library develop an appraisal of the level of library support afforded their Department / Program over the preceding five years, or since the last APR. This report, developed by the Department's / Program's liaison librarian and in consultation with the Department / Program being reviewed, will be included as part of the final Self-Study document.

- 8) **Program Comparisons:** Discuss the unit's programs in comparison with any of the following: a) parallel programs in any of UNK's 10 Peer Comparison Group institutions as defined by the University of Nebraska Board of Regents, or an alternative defined set of peer institutions developed by the Department / Program; b) regional comparisons of academic programs; and/or c) comparisons made available through national ranking programs (e.g., U.S. News & World Report, National Research Council, professional associations, disciplinary organizations, etc.). In cases where peer comparisons are unavailable or inappropriate for a program, the Department / Program should instead focus on the distinctive contributions of their program and other indicators of their program's value.
- 9) **Future Direction: This is the most critical section of the Self-Study.** Building on the data discussed in the previous eight sections of this report, the Department / Program should give an overall assessment of its current effectiveness in the delivery of the academic programs and its plans for the future. What are the primary strengths of the Department / Program and what are the plans to build on those strengths? What are the areas of concern for the Department / Program and how do future plans address those concerns? Are changes anticipated in the Department's / Program's strategic direction, and if so, how does the Department / Program plan to reposition itself? Is the Department / Program responsive to the changing needs of the students, the community, and the state? Is the current organizational structure ideal for the Department's / Program's goals? If the Department's / Program's plans require additional and/or redistributed resources, how will the resources be obtained and how will reallocation decisions be made? If changes in the faculty and staff are projected, how will program effectiveness be maintained or enhanced? How will the Department / Program address future enrollment trends? **To respond to these and similar**

questions, the Department / Program should conclude with an executive summary of its immediate and long-range plans to achieve its academic mission.

Formatting Self-Study

All Self-Study documents must utilize a cover page that identifies the program, date, and authors of the Self-Study. In addition, all Self-Study documents must be less than 10" in width (for archival purposes). While there are no page limitations on the Self-Study document, Departments / Programs are strongly encouraged to consider efficiency in presentation.

Number of Copies

Copies of the Self-Study should be provided to each member of the Review Team, Department Chair / Program Director, College Dean, Graduate Dean (if applicable), College of Education Dean (if applicable), and **two** (2) copies for the SVCASA's office (one for Library Archives). Sufficient copies of the Self-Study report should be provided to ensure program faculty and staff adequate access.

THE REVIEW TEAM

Purpose

The purpose of the Review Team is to consider the role of the Department / Program at UNK and assess the quality of the program in relation to that role. To provide a comprehensive view, the Review Team integrates external peers with UNK faculty, students, and alumni.

The Review Team will submit a final written report as quickly as possible, preferably within four to six weeks (30 – 45 days), of the site visit. This report should be factual and explicit. While the Review Team is encouraged to comment on any aspect of the program deemed important for improved program quality and future development, the Review Team is asked to keep in mind that many of the recommendations that would improve a given program might not be feasible because of fiscal limitations and the requirements of other programs within the University. The team is, therefore, encouraged to: 1) focus their recommendation on what can and should be done within existing resources; and 2) make one or two suggestions for new investment that would have the greatest impact on program quality.

Composition

A Review Team may be uniquely composed to best examine the particular program's circumstances. At a minimum, however, the Review Team should be composed of the following members (see Coordination of APR and External Accreditation on page 5, if applicable):

- One individual, in the same discipline, from another institution that has a program similar to the one under review, to serve as team chair.
- One UNK faculty member from the appropriate academic affairs / educational policy committee of the Department's / Program's college. This member must come from a different department than the one under review.
- When possible, one UNK faculty member who served on the previous review.

- One undergraduate student from the program and/or one alumnus/ae.
- If the program under review has a secondary education or K-12 component, or has a MAEd or MEd program, one of the above team members, or an additional team member, will represent the Department of Teacher Education. Such representation will be determined jointly by the Chair of Teacher Education and the Chair (or program director) of the Department / Program under review.
- If a graduate program is being simultaneously reviewed, add, at a minimum, the following:
 - One graduate student from the program.
 - One UNK graduate faculty from outside the Department / Program, chosen by the Graduate Dean in consultation with the Department Chair or Program Director. This team member is normally a member of the UNK Graduate Council and will write a summary of the Review Team's report covering the graduate component. This summary is reviewed by the Graduate Council.

Specific graduate program review directions are attached in Appendix G.

Selection Process

The Review Team is selected by the SVCASA from a list of nominations submitted through the office of the College Dean, provided by the Department's / Program's APR coordinator. The selection process is described below:

- Department / Program being reviewed submits the names and qualifications of at least two (2) individuals for each position on the Review Team (e.g., external reviewer, UNK faculty member) to the College Dean.
- The College Dean will submit the names and qualifications of at least two (2) individuals for each position on the Review Team to the SVCASA for approval. The College Dean reviews the nominations submitted by the Department / Program. If in agreement with the Department's / Program's nominations, the College Dean forwards the names to the SVCASA for approval; if the College Dean does not agree with the submitted list of nominees, the College Dean provides the Department / Program feedback regarding the area of disagreement and requests new nominations be sent forward.
- The SVCASA reviews the nominees for each position of the Review Team, makes final selection and notifies the College Dean.
- The College Dean contacts the approved nominees and secures their agreement to serve on the Review Team. The College Dean then provides the Department / Program with the members of the Review Team.

Review Team nominations should be developed in consultation with the appropriate Dean(s), Department Chair / Program Director and faculty. It is expected that members of a program will not be totally unfamiliar with potential Review Team members and may even have had personal contacts in professional associations and meetings with the persons being recommended.

However, programs are strongly encouraged to submit names of people who will be both objective and beneficial to the program. In developing Review Team nominations, Departments / Programs should consider the following:

- **External Member:** The external representative will be selected by the SVCASA from a list of names submitted through the office of the College Dean, provided by the Department / Program. Outside national organizations appropriate to the program under review provide a resource in identifying potential external reviewers. Nominees considered should be prominent faculty and/or practitioners whose talents are relevant to the particular distinctions and aspirations of the Department / Program being reviewed, as well as having a broad interest in general issues within higher education.
- **UNK Faculty:** The Department / Program submits a list of recommended UNK faculty, with rationale, through the office of the College Dean to assist the SVCASA in the selection process. The College Dean and the Chair / Director should reach agreement on the list of potential team members, excepting the Graduate Council representative, who will be nominated by the Graduate Dean in consultation with the Chair / Director. The Department Chair / Program Director should contact potential team members to determine availability prior to submitting their names to College Dean and the SVCASA.
- **Other Members:** Programs may submit additional names for Review Team participation as desired and appropriate, for example, alumni/ae or members of industry.

Responsibilities

Members of the Review Team examine the Self-Study report, conduct a site visit, and prepare a written report of the Department / Program and its activities in its UNK role. The Review Team Chair, normally the team member from outside the institution, coordinates the Review Team during the visit and is responsible for finalizing and submitting the report to the Department Chair / Program Director.

Prior to completion of the departmental review, the Review Team holds two exit interviews. One of the interviews is with the departmental faculty. This is designed to allow an assessment of goals, plans, staffing, and resources as well as existing and potential areas of strength and areas which need improvement. The second exit interview provides the administration with a preliminary review and evaluation of the program.

Format and Content of the Review Team Report

The Review Team's written report to the Department Chair / Program Director should follow the team's visit as quickly as possible, preferably within four to six weeks (30 – 45 days). While the Review Team is encouraged to comment on any aspect of the program deemed important for program quality and future development, there are specific items the report should address. The report should follow the organization below, addressing the content for each area.

1) Abstract

The abstract should address the overall quality and integrity of the Department / Program, recommended broad directions for the future, and aspects of the Department / Program which should receive special attention.

2) Evaluation of the Self-Study Document

This evaluation should address the thoroughness of the Self-Study document and the overall representativeness of the views presented. Include commendations and recommendations.

3) Evaluation of the Mission of the Department / Program

This evaluation should address the mission and goals of the Department / Program in consideration of resources, its role within UNK and University of Nebraska system, and state and national trends in the area. Include commendations and recommendations.

4) Evaluation of Department / Program Resources

This evaluation should address structure and policies, the qualifications of faculty, the quality of the students, facilities and equipment, library and information technology resources, and Department / Program budgets. Include commendations and recommendations.

5) Evaluation of Department / Program Effectiveness

This evaluation should address student academic achievement; effective teaching; effective use of information technology; curriculum quality; faculty research, service, and development; and, if applicable, issues of accreditation. In addition, provide a brief discussion of the Department's / Program's assessment plan and a brief report of actions taken as a result of the implementation of the assessment plan. Include commendations and recommendations for all the above.

6) Recommendations for the Future

A list of specific recommendations, with appropriate rationale, that the Department / Program should address for the continued enhancement of the program (based on Evaluations 2 – 5 above). In making these recommendations, the Review Team is asked to keep in mind that many of the recommendations that would improve a given program might not be feasible because of the expense involved and the requirements of other programs within the University. The team is therefore strongly encouraged to: 1) focus their recommendations on what can and should be done within existing resources; and 2) make one or two suggestions for new investment that would have the greatest impact on program quality.

RESPONSES TO THE PROGRAM REVIEW

Department's / Program's Response

Within thirty (30) days following receipt of an acceptable Review Team Report, the Department / Program provides a written response to the Dean(s) (including Graduate Dean and College of Education Dean, if applicable) regarding the recommendations in the Review Team Report. These responses, which form the basis of an action plan, should include:

- 1) Responses to all specific APR recommendations as they relate to program, college and UNK strategic plans;
- 2) Timelines for accomplishing agreed upon changes;
- 3) Identification of those responsible for implementing those changes;
- 4) Resources required and program contribution to those resources;
- 5) Indication of how success in accomplishing these changes will be measured; and
- 6) A statement of how these changes relate to the program, college, and UNK strategic plans.

The Dean(s) may recommend revision of the written response to the members of the Department / Program. A copy of the finalized report must be submitted to both the College Dean's and the SVCASA's office.

In addition to the action plan generated as a direct response to the review process, a mid-term assessment of progress in achieving those actions will be conducted and reported in the Departmental / Program Update (full details on following page).

College Dean's Report

Following receipt of the Review Team's written report, the College Dean should meet with faculty in the program to discuss the review process, Review Team recommendations, and strategies for implementing the recommendations. Within 30 days following acceptance of the Department's / Program's written response to the Review Team Report, the College Dean then reports in writing to the SVCASA (copies distributed to all faculty and staff in the program and to Graduate Dean and College of Education Dean, as appropriate). The College Dean's Report should include the following information:

- 1) General evaluation of the Department / Program;
- 2) General comments on the Review Team Report;
- 3) General comments on the Department's / Program's Response to the Review Team Report;
- 4) Comments on all recommendations in the APR report and how the Department / Program responded;
- 5) Recommendations involving changes in faculty and staff responsibilities in the Department / Program;
- 6) Anticipated Department / Program changes that result from review recommendations;
- 7) An evaluation of the recommendations from the Review Team in terms of how they relate to Department / Program, college, and University strategic plans; and

- 8) An indication of what college resources will be devoted to accomplishing recommendations that are supported by the College Dean.

SVCASA's Report

The SVCASA will review the Department's / Program's Self-Study, the Review Team Report, the Department's / Program's Response and the College Dean's Report. Within thirty (30) days following receipt of the College Dean's Report, the SVCASA will report to the College Dean on the overall review process, adding recommendations he or she may have. Elements of the report will be included in the Strategic Planning process. Provides written notification to Faculty Assistant that APR process is complete. Copies of all APR documents are first kept by the Office of the SVCASA and then sent to the Library Archives.

Departmental / Program Update

The outcome of the APR process is an action plan, based on specific recommendations from the Review Team Report, for the Department / Program to achieve its stated goals and objectives. To maintain momentum gained during the APR process, as well as provide a means of assessing progress and encourage responsiveness in the planning process, Departments / Programs will prepare an Interim Report midway through the review cycle assessing progress made in achieving those actions.

The Interim Report will focus on the action plan items outlined in the Department's / Program's Response by addressing the following for each action item:

- Identify if initial timeline has been met; if not, explain why the timeline has not been met.
- Identify the resources committed and where those resources were obtained; if resources have not been obtained, explain why.
- Analyze the success, using the measures identified in the action plan, of meeting the stated goal or objective; if success has not been achieved, explain why.

Copies of the Interim Report will be distributed to the faculty / staff within the Department / Program, the College Dean, and the SVCASA's Office.

Departments / Programs will be notified in the spring semester prior to the academic year in which their Interim Reports are due. Interim Reports should be completed and submitted by the close (May) of that academic year.

APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COSTS

The office of the SVCASA will pay the following direct costs for the Review Team members:

- Transportation, housing, meals and honorarium for the off-campus Review Team chairperson. The honorarium is \$800 and will be paid after receipt of an acceptable Review Team Report. ***These arrangements must be made by the Office of the SVCASA.***
- Two working meals for the Review Team, normally the team orientation breakfast or dinner and a working lunch. Where possible, meals should be arranged with the campus food service and scheduling should be coordinated with the SVCASA's office. Reimbursement for meals will be made in accordance with University Accounts Payable Policies: Food/Meal Expenses (http://www.unk.edu/admin/vcbf/policy/7.0/index.php?id=9091#employee_meals). ***The orientation and working lunch must be arranged by the Office of the SVCASA.***

The Department or Program under review will be responsible for the direct costs (e.g., preparing and duplicating) of producing the Self-Study report. Programs should plan on providing a copy of the Self-Study for each member of the Review Team, Department Chair / Program Director, College Dean, Graduate Dean (if applicable), College of Education Dean (if applicable), **two** (2) copies for the SVCASA's office, and sufficient copies for program faculty member's access.

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR SITE VISIT

Generally the Review Team will be scheduled for a one and one-half day campus visit which incorporates the following elements:

- 1) Departments / Programs will develop the site visit schedule in coordination with the SVCASA's office. A draft schedule for the visit should be provided to members of the Review Team for input and comment before being finalized.
- 2) Departments / Programs will schedule appropriate meetings for the Review Team (e.g., with tenure track faculty, tenured faculty, faculty research and teaching groups, program faculty committees, non-tenure track faculty and/or staff, and students).
- 3) Faculty members of the reviewed program shall have an opportunity to meet privately with Review Team members who are external to UNK.
- 4) At the start of the review, the SVCASA will schedule an orientation meeting with the Review Team, College Dean, and Department Chair / Program Director.
- 5) All programs should schedule the Review Team for separate meetings with the:
 - a) College Dean of the program being reviewed,
 - b) Department Chair or Program Director,
 - c) Dean of Graduate Studies and Research or designee,
 - d) Director of Assessment,
 - e) Undergraduate student liaison and undergraduate students, and
 - f) Graduate student liaison and graduate students

Students must have an active voice in the review either as full members of the Review Team, or as a group to be interviewed by team members. The College Dean will consult with the Department / Program being reviewed before making a recommendation to the SVCASA as to the nature of student involvement. If students are to represent student perspective of the program by meeting with other students and the Review Team, the unit will choose, as appropriate, one undergraduate and one graduate student to serve as liaisons to the Review Team. If students serve as full members of the Review Team, the Department Chair / Program Director will submit a list of potential student members to the College Dean who will forward the nominations to the SVCASA.

The program being reviewed is responsible for informing its constituents (faculty, staff, students) about these meetings, with at least one week lead time. All meetings must be conducted in a way that affords reasonable confidentiality for participants. For example, unit faculty and staff should not be present at meetings held to elicit student comments. However, the purpose of the meetings must be made clear to all participants at the outset - meeting participants are there to provide input about overall quality and direction of the unit - there are other avenues and procedures for dealing with grievances.

- 6) On the final day of the site visit, the Review Team will provide separate oral exit reports at a meeting with program faculty, staff and Chair or Director, and at a meeting with College and University administration.

APPENDIX C: SUGGESTED REVIEW TEAM SCHEDULE

The following schedule is only suggested and should be modified to fit the needs of the individual Department / Program and external reviewer.

The orientation for the Review Team will be organized by SVCASA's office, in coordination with the APR Coordinator (Department Chair / Program Director), and scheduled for either the evening prior to or the morning of the review. The following individuals should be invited:

- 1) SVCASA or his/her designee (normally the Faculty Assistant to the SVCASA)
- 2) the Faculty Assistant to the SVCASA
- 3) College Dean
- 4) Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (if graduate program is reviewed)
- 5) Department Chair / Program Director
- 6) Review Team Members

After the initial briefing by the SVCASA and/or the Faculty Assistant to the SVCASA, the Review Team should conduct a brief organizational meeting to discuss the review process and schedule revisions.

DAY 0

before 6:00 p.m.

External Reviewer arrives

6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Orientation dinner with Review Team members, Department Chair / Program Director, College Dean, Graduate Dean (if applicable), and the Faculty Assistant

DAY 1

8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.

Meet with College Dean

9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Meeting(s) with Director of Assessment and/or Graduate Dean (if applicable) and College of Education Dean (if applicable)

11:00 a.m. to 12 noon

Meet with Department Chair / Program Director

12 noon to 1:00 p.m.

Lunch

1:15 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.

Meet with students

2:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Meet with faculty

7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Work Session as necessary

DAY 2

8:00 a.m.

Follow-up meeting with student or faculty representatives

9:00 a.m.	Open time for Review Team to schedule work or further interviews with faculty, etc.
10:30 a.m.	Preparations of recommendations for the exit interview
The above should be scheduled as necessary.	
12 noon	Working Lunch (Review Team members)
1:15 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.	Oral reports to Department faculty and Chair
2:30 p.m.	Oral exit report to the SVCASA, the College Dean, the Department Chair / Program Director, the Graduate Dean (if applicable), and the College of Education Dean (if applicable)
3:30 p.m.	Adjourn

If all the necessary elements of this schedule are accommodated earlier, the exit report can be scheduled earlier in the day.

APPENDIX D: PROGRAM REVIEW TIMELINES

Target Date for:		Responsible Person	Task(s)
Fall Campus Visit	Spring Campus Visit		
April 1	November 1	Department Chair / Program Director	Submits nominees for Review Team to College Dean and SVCASA
May 1	December 1	College Dean	Names Review Team with SVCASA approval; Contacts Review Team
May 15	December 15	Department Chair / Program Director	Sets date of team visit with SVCASA and College Dean approval; Coordinates with Review Team
September 1	February 1	Department Chair / Program Director	Completes Self-Study report and submits it to the College Dean for review and possible feedback
September 15	February 15	Department Chair / Program Director	Forwards individual copies of the Self-Study to Faculty Assistant, SVCASA, College Dean, all Review Team members (and Graduate Dean and College of Education Dean, if applicable) for evaluation prior to the visit
October 1 through November 15	March 1 through April 15	Review Team	Conducts visit
January 1	June 1	Review Team	Sends written report to Department Chair / Program Director (who ensures copy submitted to SVCASA).
February 1	July 1	Department Chair / Program Director	Responds to Review Team Report; Submits copy to College Dean and SVCASA.
March 1	August 1	College Dean	Responds to Review Team Report and Department's / Program's Response; Submits copy to Department / Program and SVCASA.
April 15	August 15	Department Chair / Program Director	Ensures Faculty Assistant receives one copy of all APR documents (the Self-Study, Review Team Report, Department's / Program's Response, and College Dean's Report) for Library Archives

APPENDIX E: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN AN APR

Faculty and Staff of the Reviewed Program

- 1) Assist in preparation of the Self-Study.
- 2) Participate in selection of Review Team.
- 3) Assist in coordinating site visit schedule with SVCASA's office.
- 4) Actively participate in the Review Team's visit including providing logistical support for the Review Team while on campus (e.g., providing transportation to and from campus, escorting Review Team members around campus, ensuring work space available, attending meetings, etc.).
- 5) Provide the APR coordinator with responses to documents resulting from the APR process.

APR Coordinator (normally Department Chair or Program Director)

- 1) Produces a Self-Study report which conforms to the APR Guidelines and ensures that the College Dean has opportunity to review and provide feedback on Self-Study before document is finalized.
- 2) Recommends and secures nominees for Review Team members and submits them to the College Dean and SVCASA for approval.
- 3) Sets up tentative Review Team visitation schedule, coordinating with the Dean(s) and the SVCASA's office.
- 4) After approval of Review Team schedule by the College Dean and the SVCASA, communicates Review Team schedule to each Review Team member, to the College Dean, the Graduate Dean and/or College of Education Dean (if applicable), and the SVCASA.
- 5) Provides copies of the Self-Study (at least 30 days prior to campus visit) to each member of the Review Team, the College Dean, the Graduate Dean (if necessary), the College of Education Dean (if appropriate) and **two** (2) copies for the SVCASA's office (one copy will be filed with the Library Archives).
- 6) Acts as facilitator during Review Team visit, i.e., scheduling facilities, arranging for students and faculty to be available, providing workspace, resources and references, etc.
- 7) It is recommended that the College Dean, the Graduate Dean and College of Education Dean (if applicable), and the SVCASA be reminded of interviews in which they are to be present.
- 8) Contacts the Office of the SVCASA so that the travel and accommodation arrangements for the external Review Team member, which are paid by the Office of

the SVCASA, can be made. ***These arrangements must be made by the Office of the SVCASA.***

- 9) Contacts the Office of the SVCASA to make meal and room arrangements for the orientation dinner or breakfast and working lunch. The orientation will include Review Team members, the College Dean, the Graduate Dean (if applicable), College of Education Dean (if applicable), the Department Chair / Program Director, and the Faculty Assistant to the SVCASA. The working lunch will include the External Reviewer and the Review Team only. ***The orientation and working lunch must be arranged by the Office of the SVCASA.***
- 10) Communicates names of Review Team members and their affiliations to all Review Team members.
- 11) Ensures that the Review Team chair receives a copy of the UNK APR Guidelines, which outline the External Reviewer's responsibilities, with the Self-Study document thirty (30) days prior to the campus visit.
- 12) Attends the Review Team's oral exit report to administration.
- 13) Sees that each Review Team member, the College Dean, the Graduate Dean and/or the College of Education Dean (if necessary), and the office of the SVCASA get copies of the Review Team Report.
- 14) Arranges for the External Reviewer to complete and sign a non-employee reimbursement form for the honorarium and expenses the reviewer may have incurred. The form will be processed by the Office of the SVCASA. The honorarium will not be paid until the report is completed by the External Reviewer. If the reviewer would like to be reimbursed for all other expenses prior to the completion of the report, he/she will need to fill out two non-employee reimbursement forms.
- 15) Ensures that the Faculty Assistant receives one copy of all APR documents (the Self-Study, Review Team Report, Department's / Program's Response, and College Dean's Report) for Library Archives.

Review Team Chair

- 1) Coordinates Review Team during visit, i.e., designates responsibilities of various members, consults with Department Chair / Program Director, etc.
- 2) Serves as moderator for exit report with departmental faculty.
- 3) Serves as moderator for exit report with administration.
- 4) Finalizes Review Team Report, with assistance of Review Team, and submits report to the Department Chair / Program Director. (A copy must be received by SVCASA's office before honorarium can be processed.)
- 5) Submits travel, meal, and lodging expenses to the SVCASA's Office for reimbursement.

Review Team Members

- 1) Examine the Self-Study report and actively participate, to fullest extent possible, in the site visit.
- 2) Assists in preparation of the Review Team's written report.
- 3) Attend, when possible, the exit reports with departmental faculty and administration.

College Dean

- 1) During the APR planning phase, meets with Department / Program faculty to explain the review process and identify any campus/college issues the Self-Study should address.
- 2) Reviews and evaluates the program's Self-Study before it is finalized; provides feedback regarding necessary revisions.
- 3) Advises in the selection of the Review Team.
- 4) Secures services of approved External Reviewer and Review Team.
- 5) Prepares specific questions about the program for the Review Team to consider during the site visit.
- 6) Actively participates in the Review Team's visit.
- 7) Hears exit report of Review Team.
- 8) Evaluates Review Team Report and Department's / Program's Response, discusses the results with the Department / Program faculty. May recommend revision of the Department's / Program's written response to Review Team Report.
- 9) Prepares and submits a written report to the SVCASA regarding the outcome of the review process; shares written report with Department / Program faculty.

SVCASA

- 1) Approves External Reviewer and Review Team.
- 2) Hears exit report of Review Team.
- 3) Evaluates all reports, discusses the results with the department representatives and the Dean(s), and with the assistance of the Dean(s), includes elements of the report in the Strategic Planning process.
- 4) Provides written notification to Faculty Assistant that APR process is complete.

SVCASA's Office (Faculty Assistant)

- 1) Coordinates Review Team schedules to eliminate conflicts.
- 2) Attends Review Team orientation, offers specific questions or focus when appropriate.
- 3) Gives prior approval for meal reimbursements.
- 4) Reserves room for exit reports.
- 5) Archives all materials in the Library.

APPENDIX F: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS USED IN DEVELOPING GUIDELINES

Academic Program Review Guidelines, UNL (2006).

Available online at: http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/apr_guidelines.pdf.

Executive Memorandum No. 24. UNL, Office of the President (August 19, 2002).

Available online at:

<http://nebraska.edu/docs/president/24%20Definition%20of%20University%20of%20Nebraska%20Program.pdf>

Commission for Development of Criteria for Evaluation and Prioritization of Academic Programs (2000).

Available online at: <http://nebraska.edu/docs/reports/prioritizationplan.pdf>.

University of Nebraska Board of Regents Policies, RP-2.1.6.

Available online at: <http://nebraska.edu/board/bylaws-policies-and-rules.html>

Title 281, Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 4; Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education, Rules and Regulations Concerning Review of Programs of Public Colleges and Universities.

Available online at:

<http://www.ccpe.state.ne.us/publicdoc/ccpe/LegalRegs/Chapters/RulesRegsChpt4.asp>

APPENDIX G: APR PROCESS FOR MONITORING GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

1. The interest of the Executive Graduate Council (EGC) is in monitoring or overseeing graduate program reviews conducted at the campus level, not in evaluating the programs. An EGC Committee will analyze the summary statements from each campus review to evaluate carefully the weaknesses of the program and the recommendations offered for correcting those weaknesses. Should the Committee judge that a follow-up of the recommendations is important before the next routine review cycle (i.e., approximately five years), the Committee Chairperson will direct those specific concerns to the appropriate Graduate Dean. The concerns will address the specific recommendations which require monitoring by the Committee and an appropriate timetable for a progress report, for example, a progress report at two or three years. It is recommended that the Office of the Dean of the Graduate College record these recommendations and bring them back to the appropriate Committee of the EGC on an annual basis for the Committee's review and appropriate action (see 2. Below).
2. With respect to the timing of the EGC review of the summary statements relative to the date of the campus review, it is recommended that the summary statements be forwarded automatically to the office of the Dean of the Graduate College by November 1 for those reviews conducted in the previous academic year. The reviews would be assigned by the Executive Committee to appropriate Committees of the EGC at the November meeting. Also at this meeting, the update material mentioned in 1. above should also go to the respective Committees.
3. It is recommended that the campus Graduate Deans work closely with the appropriate campus administrative officers and chairpeople of programs scheduled for review in a given academic year. The first contact with the chairpeople should be at the beginning of the academic year, in an effort to encourage the program chairpeople to ensure that the graduate program will be adequately represented in the overall review process, if the review is to encompass other components of the academic program as well.
4. Equity Issues in Program Reviews. Data on gender equity should be collected on an annual basis by the committees charged with administering graduate programs and reports (e.g., tabular data and brief narrative). This information should be presented to their respective campus deans by April 1 of each year. If more than one campus dean reviews a graduate program, the equity report should be submitted to the home campus dean who is primarily responsible for administration of the program.
5. It is recommended that the format for the program review summary be standardized for all three campuses. The use of a standardized form for presentation of the program review summaries will facilitate the review of the programs and minimize the need for requesting additional information from departments. The following items should be included:
 - 1) The degree program should be stated.
 - 2) The number of graduate faculty fellows and members should be given.
 - 3) Number of students enrolled per year since last review.

- 4) Number of degrees awarded per year since last review.
- 5) Summary statement (this section should include the following items):
 - a) Introduction: purpose of the program, history of the program, etc.
 - b) Quality of the graduate faculty: publications, research activities, numbers of students supervised, etc.
 - c) Quality of the curriculum
 - d) Student considerations: financial support, activities of advisory committees, etc.
 - e) Equity issues: recruitment of faculty and graduate students: graduate student support (advising, stipends, etc.); faculty support (graduate faculty status, scholarly support, etc.); graduate program information about equity issues.
 - f) Summary of strengths and weaknesses
 - g) List of recommendations
 - h) Response from the department or program (this will be solicited by the campus Graduate Dean after completion of the review).

The UNK Graduate Council requires departments/programs to have a Core Document on file that describes in general terms the responsibilities of graduate assistants. The Core Document should be included in the Self-Study and reviewed in the APR process. Alterations must be submitted to the Graduate Council for consideration and approval.

[Extracted from Report of ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Program Reviews which was approved by the EGC on October 15, 1987.]

The Executive Graduate Council approved insertions regarding equity issues in program review 04-21-94.

APPENDIX H: APR SCHEDULE

The APR Schedule can be accessed two ways:

- 1) Through the Academic & Student Affairs web-site, listed under "Institutional Documents": <http://www.unk.edu/academicaffairs/>
- 2) Or, directly at: <http://www.unk.edu/uploadedFiles/academicaffairs/APR%20schedule.pdf>