The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at Meeting #[illegible] on April [illegible], 2017:

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the approved updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regents Policy (Regents Policy and UA Regulation [illegible]) which it passed at Meeting #[illegible] on December [illegible], 2016. This more recent [illegible] more recent amendment [illegible] 15, 2017 is indicated in bold italicized text (below):

Effective: Spring 2017

Rationale: The existing process was modified at the Faculty Senate meeting #[illegible] on [illegible] to accommodate a five year review cycle. The divisions approved Modifying #[illegible] intended to ensure recursive [illegible] input and [illegible] eliminations. The Program Review Procedure was updated to reflect Board of Regents Policy [illegible] also changed since the last Faculty Senate amendment in 2016, and their versions are included. The most recent amendment [illegible] at step 2:

[illegible]

[illegible]

President, UAF Faculty Senate

APPROVAL: _____ DATE: _____
Chancellor's Office

DISAPPROVED: _____ DATE: _____
Chancellor's Office

[illegible]

(See attached [illegible])

Additions: ***bold italics***
Deletions: ~~strikethrough~~

The program review process shall be completed as follows:

1. An initial review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a [illegible] provided brief narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective [illegible] existence of similar programs elsewhere in [illegible], and any special circumstances that explain [illegible] features of the centrally generated [illegible] review template for more details). The [illegible] and Regulation (10.06 – current PDF posted with [illegible]). A single Faculty Program Review Committee shall be comprised of one faculty representative [illegible] including CRCD) plus one representative from CRCD and one representative from [illegible] Faculty Program Review Committee shall be nominated by the Provost in consultation with the deans and directors, and, once formed, the list of committee members [illegible] Faculty Senate for comment and approved by the Provost. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall review the materials [illegible] and make one of the following recommendations:

- Continue program
- Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
- Continue program but improve other [illegible]
- Modify program through consolidation with another program or single stream and re-organization
- Suspend admissions to program or
- Discontinue program

The Faculty Program Review Committee shall invite two representatives from the [illegible] under review to attend the meeting and to answer questions. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall provide [illegible] areas needing improvement prior to the next review. A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the program under review and the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President, in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, then has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks. The program under review also has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee, comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and four administrative representatives from CRCD, shall review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee, may request additional information from the program, and shall state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation. ***A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the program under review and the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President, in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, then has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks. The program under review also has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.***

3. The Provost, in consultation with the Chancellor's Cabinet, reviews the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee, the Faculty Senate President, and the Administrative Program Review Committee and takes one of the following actions:

a) Program continuation without conditions;

b) Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Provost to meet improvements needed by the Faculty Senate. Specific action points will be related in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee;

c) Other actions, such as a major program restructuring. An action plan shall be required by the end of the next regular academic semester after a request for restructuring or similar action is made;

d) Recommend to discontinue program. When appropriate, administration may also suspended pending action.

4. Faculty Senate reviews the recommendations of the Chancellor's Cabinet and the proposed program. If their collective agreement or disagreement with the Chancellor's Cabinet recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it shall provide an alternate recommendation by the first day of the semester in which the Chancellor's Cabinet recommendation is made.

5. The Chancellor reviews all levels of recommendations and decides whether to forward program discontinuation to the Board of Regents.

Copies of the following are attached to hard copy printed version:

Link to current Academic Program Review Template

Link to BOR Policy section 4.9 Academic Program

DEPARTMENT:

DISCIPLINE:

of place given the size and capacity of your program?

a. Total SCH

What other programs are offered in the department and how are they connected with this program?

What percentage of faculty and staff time is devoted to this program as compared to other offerings?

by students?

[Please type your response here.]

NEED FOR PROGRAM

DEPARTMENT:

PROGRAM:

DEGREE:

[Type your response here]

graduates obtaining?

REGENTS' POLICY

PART X – ACADEMIC POLICY

Chapter 10.06 Academic Program Review

P10.06.010 Academic Program Review

A. In accordance with Board Policy [illegible] and cause [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] as service programs [illegible]

[illegible] level

[illegible] be conducted as needed, to respond to issues including but not [illegible] academic or budgetary concerns. [illegible]

C. Exceptional reviews may [illegible] limited to specific [illegible]

[illegible] improve the effectiveness [illegible] the curriculum or its [illegible]

[illegible] anyone [illegible] reports will be provided to the board. Assessment outcomes will be [illegible] in program [illegible]

PART A – ACADEMIC POLICY

Chapter [illegible] Academic Program Review

Section [illegible] Academic Program Review

A. Purpose

[illegible]

The purpose of academic program review is to assist the university's budget unit and the responsible division [illegible] in making decisions on changes in programs [illegible] consistent with and guided by these [illegible]

The necessary elements that a team should assess during the program review process include the following:

1. Centrality of the program to the mission, goals, and purposes of the university and the unit;

2. Quality of the program, as determined by the establishment and regular assessment of program outcomes. Outcomes should be comprehensive, and [illegible] indicators of achievement should include multiple measures and satisfy [illegible] properties of good evidence.

[illegible]

[illegible]

C. Process

1. Each chancellor shall be responsible for setting an academic program review process in his/her [illegible] unit. Results of the process shall be utilized for budgeting and planning purposes of the unit and shall be reported to the Board of Regents upon their request.

2. Expedited program reviews shall be conducted in accordance with an expedited process developed by the chancellor and approved by [illegible] to meet the needs of the campus.