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A. Purpose of Academic Program Review

UW-Madison has a long history of conducting regular reviews of academic programs. The purpose of program review is to examine strengths and challenges, to celebrate accomplishments, and to reflect on, and plan for, the future.

Program review is a platform for exploring ways to maintain and enhance the academic quality of a range of academic activities. Program review provides the opportunity to set priorities, to articulate a strong case for those priorities, and to develop strategies for a program to stay at or move to the forefront of its field in any budgetary environment. Occasionally, program review may provide a venue in which to consider discontinuing or recombing academic activities in favor of strengthening priority areas.

Program reviews are intended to be focused and meaningful endeavors that improve the quality of programs and the university. They require significant investment of faculty and staff time.

See Appendix I for a flowchart that shows the steps of program review as outlined below.
B. Governance

The responsibility for program review rests primarily with the deans, as the school/college chief executive and chief academic officer (FPP Ch 3.01).

Program review is coordinated by the Office of the Provost, and is overseen by UW System Administration and the Board of Regents. The Graduate School also coordinates reviews that include graduate programs, and the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee has an oversight governance role (FPP Ch 3.07.B). The University Academic Planning Council (UAPC) is the governance committee that is charged with setting policy related to program review (FPP Ch 6.52).

C. Ten-year Cycle

Periodic review of all UW-Madison programs – degrees, majors, named options, and certificates - is required by the UW-System Board of Regents. UAPC policy at UW-Madison requires that each program must be reviewed at least once every ten years. All new academic programs must be reviewed five years after implementation. The Office of the Provost will prompt the dean to initiate these reviews.

D. Annual Reports on Program Review

Deans are required to submit annual reports on program review to the provost. These annual reports are to include:

-- A list of program reviews that were completed in the prior year.
-- A summary of the findings of the review in the form of the dean’s letter that the dean sends back to the program that summarizes the findings of the review and directions for the future. In addition, the dean’s office may provide the report from the review committee.
-- A status report on the review of any programs that were identified as low-enrollment in the prior year (see section E).
-- A list of program reviews scheduled in upcoming years; this list should include scheduling information for any programs that have not been reviewed in the past ten years.
-- Any additional information required for the report to serve as a basis for the report to UW System Administration and the Board of Regents (see below), or to meet any other external reporting needs.

These reports are the basis for a mandated report to UW System Administration and the Board of Regents, prepared by Academic Planning and Institutional Research on behalf of the provost. These reports allow the Provost’s Office to monitor the intentional activity directed to maintaining program quality across campus.

This information is compiled into a report that is presented to the UAPC at least annually for discussion and consideration of any changes to the process or policy guidelines that might enhance the effectiveness of the process or compliance with the policy.
E. Low-Enrollment Programs

If fewer than five (5) degrees in a five-year period are awarded in a program, the provost will ask the dean to review the status of the program and provide a report by the end of the subsequent academic year. If low-enrollment programs are to be continued, once that justification is made the justification is revisited on the same 10-year cycle as program review.

In some cases, low-enrollment programs may be considered for discontinuation, or they may need to be restructured or merged with other programs. Maintaining low-enrollment programs requires the program faculty to be committed to offering the curriculum and conducting all the activities associated with more robust programs.

Consult the Policy on Low-Enrollment Programs (Appendix II).

F. Many Contexts for Program Review

Program review may be conducted in a variety of contexts. Each school/college dean’s office may use their own program review/self-study guidelines as long as they generally conform to the UW-Madison guidelines. See Appendix VI for UW-Madison Guidelines for Structuring the Self-Study.

In some units, programs will be reviewed in the context of departmental review; this is acceptable as long as there is a student-learning focus on the academic programs in addition to what is usually a faculty-centered focus of departmental review.

For graduate programs, the Graduate School must be included in the process.

Accreditation reviews meet the needs of program review except for graduate programs, which still require additional review to meet the needs of the Graduate School. See http://grad.wisc.edu/education/academicprograms/accreditreviews.html.

All new academic programs must be reviewed five years after implementation. The Office of the Provost will prompt the dean to initiate these reviews.

In all contexts, the review should be student-focused and address issues related to student learning. The framework for considering student learning is the Wisconsin Experience, the idea that students (especially undergraduates) have a learning experience characterized by high levels of engagement and that they learn the value of living the Wisconsin Idea. A set of learning goals, referred to as the Essential Learning Outcomes, have been adopted for undergraduate programs. These learning goals may also be used for graduate and professional programs. The Wisconsin Experience and the learning goals are described in Appendix III.

Program review is an opportunity to demonstrate alignment with and contributions to the strategic priorities of the University and of the school/college with which the program is associated. The 2009-14 Strategic Framework is described in Appendix IV.
G. The Dean Initiates the Program Review

The program review is usually initiated by a charge memo from the dean to the lead member of the program faculty, usually a department chair or the chair of a program’s executive committee. Annually, the Provost’s Office will remind deans about the status of program reviews in their school/college and ask that they initiate reviews that are approaching the 10-year mark.

Occasionally a program review will be initiated by the dean of the Graduate School or by the provost.

The dean’s charge memo typically includes the following elements: a request that a self-study be written; information about whether to use school/college guidelines or these institutional guidelines; a description of any issues that need to be addressed; and a due date for completion and submission of the self-study. The memo may also provide directions for how to obtain assistance with data resources. Ideally, the dean’s summary memo from the previous program review is attached as a reference for a starting point.

H. The Program Faculty Prepare the Self-study

The first major stage of a program review is the development of the self-study. The dean will provide the program with a charge memo that directs it to develop a self-study either according to the self-study guidelines provided in Appendix VI, or to self-study guidelines specific to the school/college.

The program review will be of most lasting value if the preparation of the self-study is undertaken with reflective discussion on the state of the program and future directions among the program faculty and staff. Self-studies are most useful if they provide evidence of successes and key issues, and identify steps to advance the program. The self-study is a reference against which progress can be measured at the next program review. While grounded in the past and present, the self-study should be forward-looking.

Staff in Academic Planning and Institutional Research (Provost’s Office) and Academic Assessment and Funding (Graduate School) are available to work with program faculty to assemble relevant data.

When complete, the program faculty submit the self-study to the dean or to the university official who requested that it be prepared.

I. The Review Committee

The review committee is appointed and convened by the dean or the university official who requested the review. The review committee is typically comprised of three to five faculty members or experts. The review committee may include members external to the university or may make use of the breadth of faculty expertise on campus. The program faculty may or may not have a representative on the review committee, depending on the context. For graduate programs, a member of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee must be included on the committee. The
GFEC member will not serve as chair. The appropriate associate dean in the Graduate School makes the GFEC appointment.

The dean will provide the review committee with a written charge that outlines the expectations of their work. This charge will specify a number of items, including naming the chair of the committee and will provide any guidelines for the work of the committee and a due date for the report.

The chair of the committee is responsible for scheduling and convening the meetings, setting the meeting agendas, making any specific assignments to review committee members, overseeing the process, drafting the report, getting feedback from the committee, and submitting the final report to the dean or the university official who requested the review.

The review will be based on the self-study documents. In addition, the review committee with the guidance/support of the dean’s office or equivalent agent may wish to coordinate a “site visit” to meet with program faculty and staff, students, other program constituencies, and to tour the program site.

The review committee report is framed to respond to the charge to the review committee. Typically, a report provides a summary of program strengths, challenges, advice, and recommendations for improvement or focused attention.

The review committee may choose to give the program faculty an opportunity to review the report for errors of fact prior to submission to the requesting dean.

When the work of the review committee is complete, they submit their report to the dean.

**J. Final Steps – Completing the Program Review**

After the review committee report is submitted to the dean, the dean or dean’s designee will review the documents.

Typically, the program faculty will be invited by the dean to provide a response to the program review committee report. If a program faculty member was a member of the review committee, this step may not be needed.

The academic planning council of the school/college reviews the program review documents - the self-study, the program review committee report, and any program response (FPP Ch 3.08)

The dean prepares a final summary of the review. This summary identifies program strengths and summarizes the recommendations for improvement or any requirements for follow-up reports that the dean may choose to make to the program. **This letter becomes a public summary of the review and is a very useful document for reference over the time period between reviews and at the point of initiating the next program review in the ten-year cycle.** It is this document that is sent to the provost and dean of the Graduate School for graduate program reviews.
Once the dean has finalized the review for graduate programs, the Graduate School and the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee will also conduct a discussion of the program review and may provide additional comment.

Summary information about program reviews is reported annually to the University Academic Planning Council for discussion and consideration of broad program review issues that may require action or further (see section D above). The dean’s summary letters are included in this report. A summary report is also provided to UW System Administration as mandated by the Board of Regents.
Appendix I. Flowchart of the Annual Program Review Cycle
Appendix II. Policy on Low Enrollment Academic Programs (Majors and Certificates)

http://www.apa.wisc.edu/acad_plng_ProgramReview.html
Adopted by the University Academic Planning Council, June 21, 2010
Revised from May 1995 Program Review Guidelines

Particular attention should be given to low-enrollment majors, defined as those in which enrollment is very low and very few degrees have been granted in recent years. For some programs, they may award few degrees because they serve a specialized audience. For other programs, when few degrees are awarded it may be a signal that the commitment of program faculty has waned or that the program does not serve student or societal needs.

Definition of low-enrollment¹:
- In general, the standard for triggering low-enrollment status is a program in which fewer than five (5) degrees have been awarded in five (5) years. This standard applies to all of UW-Madison’s graduate and professional programs. It also applies to all UW-Madison undergraduate programs that have counterparts at fewer than half of other UW institutions.
- For undergraduate programs that have counterpart offerings at more than half of all UW institutions, then the standard for triggering low-enrollment status is when fewer than 25 degrees are awarded in a five (5) year period. UW-Madison programs that have counterparts at more than half of other UWs typically have strong enrollments and would rarely drop below this higher threshold.

A low-enrollment program will be scheduled for review in the academic year following the program’s identification as low-enrollment. The provost will request such a focused review from the dean, and specify a schedule for a status report. The schedule may be adjusted by mutual agreement.

In general, the expectation is that either a compelling case will be made for continuation, or the low-enrollment programs will be discontinued or reorganized.

The following possibilities for handling low-enrollment programs should be considered:
- Discontinue the program.
- Merge smaller programs into an appropriate larger program with a more inclusive scope.
- Merge several low-enrollment programs into one more inclusive title.
- Make the program available to the occasional student through the Individual Major at the Bachelor’s level or the Special Committee Degree at the graduate level.

There may be excellent reasons to continue a low-enrollment program. If such a program is important to the program faculty, they should develop a written rationale based on the following criteria and other criteria that may emerge:

- What evidence demonstrates a genuine student need and/or community demand -- even at a low level – for graduates with this specific credential?

¹ Definition aligns with UW System Policy ACIS 1, “Monitoring Low-Degree-Producing Programs”, June 10, 2010 Board of Regents Agenda Item I.1.h.(2). System Administration will conduct an audit of low-degree-producing programs every five years.
• Does the program fill a specific academic niche unique to UW-Madison or in some way necessary for the University’s identity, or for the fulfillment of the mission of the program, school/college, or university?
• What is the cost of the program? No program is without cost so a clear recognition of all costs is important. All programs incur costs in terms of record keeping and a range of monitoring activities for the school/college, the Registrar's Office, the Graduate School, the Office of the Provost, and others.
• Is faculty time and effort best invested in such a program? Time must be devoted to review of the program, recruitment of students, curriculum development, and similar activities. Programs with few or no students that are formally offered still need to have a full curriculum available to a student who seeks to enroll in the program.
• What are the compelling reasons why none of the options outlined above (merging this major into a larger major, or offering it as an individual major) are viable alternatives?
• Is the program in question a Master's degree that is associated with a corresponding Ph.D.? If so, and if the doctoral program is robust, there is little reason to discontinue the corresponding Master's degree and such programs will not routinely be identified as low-enrollment.

The director of APIR, the provost, and the UAPC will review reports on the status of low-enrollment programs. If a low-enrollment program is continued, it will be placed in the 10-year cycle of program review.
Appendix III. The Wisconsin Experience and Student Learning Outcomes

THE WISCONSIN EXPERIENCE

Grounded in the 100-year old Wisconsin Idea and our progressive history, our historical mission has evolved to create an expectation for all of us—faculty, staff, and students—to apply in- and out-of-classroom learning in ways that have significant and positive impacts on the world. [...] It is this unique Wisconsin Experience that produces graduates who think beyond the conventional wisdom, who are creative problem-solvers who know how to integrate passion with empirical analysis, who know how to seek out, evaluate, and create new knowledge and technologies, who can adapt to new situations, and who are engaged citizens of the world.

The Wisconsin Experience is comprised of inquiry-based, high impact practices:

- Substantial research experiences that generate knowledge and analytical skills
- Global and cultural competencies
- Leadership and activism opportunities
- Application of knowledge in the “real world”

The nature of these opportunities and how we offer them makes UW–Madison unique in higher education. The resulting Wisconsin Experience is characterized by close integration of in-class and out-of-class learning experiences, by active, creative and entrepreneurial engagement in real world problems, and by offering students leadership in their learning.

(Excerpted from the full statement - see http://www.learning.wisc.edu/)

By its nature, an essential component of program review is a focus on student learning. In Spring 2008, the UAPC endorsed the Wisconsin Experience framework, and requested that these ideas be integrated into the guidelines for program review. Considering academic programs in this framework will advance the University’s priority of fully realizing the Wisconsin Experience for students.

The Wisconsin Experience is comprised of high-impact practices that engage students in learning. Examples include residential learning communities, first-year interest groups, study abroad, research and scholarship with faculty, internships, practica, and capstone experiences. While it is intended to apply to the undergraduate experience, these ideas are also applicable to graduate and professional programs.

One important source of information about student learning to be used in the self-study will come from regular assessment activities. Academic programs are required to have plans for assessing student learning and to conduct at least one evaluative activity each year. See the University Assessment Plan for details (http://www.provost.wisc.edu/assessment/). The essential learning outcomes provide a campus-wide framework for these evaluative activities.

UW-Madison’s essential learning outcomes for undergraduates were adapted from those developed through an extensive national study by the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AACU).
AACU conducted surveys and interviews with employers, faculty, staff, and alumni, asking the basic question, “What qualities and skills do you want in [bachelor’s level] college graduates?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UW-Madison University-wide Expectations for Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(see <a href="http://www.learning.wisc.edu">www.learning.wisc.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural worlds
   - through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts
   focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring.

2. Intellectual and practical skills, including
   - inquiry and analysis,
   - critical and creative thinking,
   - written and oral communication,
   - quantitative literacy,
   - information literacy,
   - teamwork and problem solving
   practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standard for performance.

3. Personal and social responsibility, including
   - civic knowledge and engagement (local and global),
   - intercultural knowledge and competence,
   - ethical reasoning and action,
   - foundations and skills for lifelong learning
   anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges.

4. Integrative learning, including
   - synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized skills
   demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems.

The Wisconsin Experience and the learning goals were intended to frame the undergraduate experience. To the extent that it is useful, this framework may also be applied to graduate and professional programs.
Appendix IV. The 2009-14 Strategic Framework

In 2009, UW-Madison adopted a set of strategic priorities intended to serve for 2009-2014. Many schools and colleges articulated strategic priorities that align with the campus-level priorities.

Refer to the strategic planning website for more details, for information about how the strategic priorities were developed, and for links to school/college strategic plans: http://www.chancellor.wisc.edu/strategicplan/

For Wisconsin and the World: Focusing a Great University on its Core Mission, Public Purpose, and Global Reach

Our strategic priorities
- Provide an exemplary undergraduate education
- Reinvigorate the Wisconsin Idea and renew our commitment to our public mission
- Invest in scholarly domains in which we have existing or potential strength and impact
- Recruit and retain the best faculty and staff, and reward merit
- Enhance diversity in order to ensure excellence in education and research
- Be responsible stewards of our resources
APPENDIX V. Selected Resources That Support Program Review

The director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research (Provost’s Office) and the assistant dean Academic Assessment and Funding (Graduate School) are available to work with dean’s offices in support of program review and to assist program faculty with the assembly of data in support of self-study preparation. Deans and program faculty are invited to contact these offices for assistance.

Data resources in the form of standard reports are available at the APIR website (apir.wisc.edu), through the Graduate School web site, on the Registrar’s Office web site, and through the Madison Budget Office web site.

Some examples of web resources include:

Department Planning Profiles (http://www.apir.wisc.edu/deptplanningprof.htm)
- Provides quantitative indicators to support planning in academic departments and program review.
- Includes 95 indicators in several topic areas: permanent faculty and staff commitments, instructional FTE, non-instructional FTE, credits generated, enrollments in majors, degrees, extra-mural awards.

Graduate Program Profiles http://www.grad.wisc.edu/education/academicprograms/index.html

Instructional Activity Information, including Credits-follow-Instructor Reports and links to the Registrar’s Credit Reports (http://www.apir.wisc.edu/instruction.htm)

Data Digest (http://www.apir.wisc.edu/datadigest.htm)

Trends in degrees awarded by program, Time to Degree, Alumni Information http://www.apir.wisc.edu/students-degrees.htm

Registrar’s Enrollment Reports http://registrar.wisc.edu/students/acadrecords/enrollment_reports/

Budget Information and Expenditure Reports http://www.mbo.wisc.edu/

Extramural Support Reports http://www.mbo.wisc.edu/ESR/

Query Library http://www.doit.wisc.edu/querylibrary/
Appendix VI. Guidelines for Structuring the Self-Study

These self-study guidelines are provided for use by all programs and schools/colleges. Users of these guidelines should also refer the full program review guidelines.

Program review may be focused on a single academic program or one review process may address a collection of closely related programs.

Specialized accreditation may serve some of the purposes of program review. However, accreditation reviews may need to be expanded to cover aspects of the program or related programs not covered by the accreditation review (certificate programs, PhD programs). The Graduate School has guidelines regarding graduate programs and specialized accreditation. See http://grad.wisc.edu/education/academicprograms/accreditreviews.html.

The questions listed here should be considered prompts for describing academic programs – degrees, majors, and named options. Not all of the questions will be relevant to every program and there is no expectation that a self-study document will attempt to systematically respond to all questions. However, the school/college academic planning councils or the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee may raise any of these issues in the process of review.

In some cases a review will need to address specific issues that are not prompted by these questions. In such cases, the initiating memo from the dean should specify these issues.

If a full department or a department-like unit is under review a wider range of issues may need to be explored than described by these guidelines.

Self-study guidelines for certificate programs are not included here. Instead see the Guidelines for Certificates: http://www.apir.wisc.edu/certificates.htm

Components of the Self-Study

A. Executive Summary: Provide a 1-2 page summary of key findings from the self-study, including primary program strengths and challenges, and priorities the program has identified for improvement.

B. Response to previous program review recommendations: Summarize recommendations from the previous program review and how they were acted upon. If appropriate, elaborate elsewhere in the self-study.

C. Overview of the Program
   • Define the mission of the program and its fit with the home department, the school/college, and the mission of the university.
   • Is the program mission and its context well understood and articulated?
• Is collaboration with other programs at UW-Madison or at other universities important to this program? Elaborate. If important, explain what works and what could be done to improve collaborations in teaching, research, and service with other programs?
• Describe the degree and quality of scholarly interaction among faculty, staff, and students. Are their opportunities for improvement?
• Are there formal and informal opportunities for faculty/staff/student interaction (including collaborations with other programs)?
• If relevant to the program, explain how leaders within industry, business, government, or non-profit organizations are involved in offering advice and perspectives on the program and the curriculum.
• What is the unit’s sense of its reputation among other institutions and peer departments? What evidence is the basis for this judgment? Are there opportunities for the program to strengthen its presence and scholarly reputation within the university and externally?
• What are the emerging changes in the discipline? What is being done and can be done to move forward and seize emerging/future opportunities? Do these changes in the discipline suggest a need to refocus or adjust priorities?

D. Educational Program and Students
1. Program structure and characteristics
   • Characterize the structure of the program. Is it a single program or does it have informal tracks/concentrations or formal named options?
   • Is the program the only program within the home unit or are there other programs? If there are several programs in the same academic home, how are they related to one another? Is there equity of access to resources, and in real or perceived program quality?
   • Is the program under review one that has substantial and structured collaborations with other programs, such as dual or double or joint degrees arrangements? If so, explain. Also include information about these arrangements and their impacts throughout the self-study.
   • For graduate programs, do both the master’s and the doctoral programs directly admit students? Explain how the faculty view training at the master’s and doctoral level and the appropriate progression for each. Describe the “typical” graduate student’s program in terms of numbers of credits, the nature of the courses taken (i.e., proportion that are theoretical, proportion that are methodological, etc.), and the extent of a common core curriculum versus specialization? Describe the milestone requirements (such as thesis/dissertation, qualifying exam, preliminary exam, defense, field experience, etc.) and how and when they are woven into the program’s structure.
   • For graduate programs, how does the typical graduate’s program ensure exposure to breadth training? Do you require a doctoral minor for doctoral students? To what degree is breadth promoted within the context of course requirements/electives, scholarly/research project collaborations, certificates/minors, service learning, and thesis/dissertation topics or committee members?

2. Assessment information, program learning goals, and evidence of student learning
   • In this section, the program should reference the program’s assessment plan addressing the points below. A summary of the annual activities should be provided.
• What are the learning goals for students in the program? What skills, knowledge, and values are expected of all students in the program at the completion of a bachelor’s, master’s or doctoral degree? Are these learning goals (or outcomes) clearly defined and measurable? Do faculty and students know them?
• What methods are used to evaluate the extent to which students are meeting the learning goals?
• For interdisciplinary programs, how are students learning to integrate more than one discipline to address complex research questions? Are students using instruments, techniques or theories from more than one discipline? How do you ensure students have the tools to pursue interdisciplinary research? For graduate programs, are interdisciplinary endeavors reflected in master’s theses (or equivalent) and doctoral dissertations and how are they evaluated?
• What do students do after graduation? Is it consistent with program goals?
• How have the results of the program’s assessment activities been used for program improvement? Overall, is the program engaged in a coherent process of continuous curricular and program improvement? How does the program monitor the effects of changes?

3. Teaching and learning as they relate to the Wisconsin Experience and high-impact practices
• Does the program feature certain high-impact practices, for example: first-year interest groups, internships, research experiences or scholarly collaboration with faculty members, small seminar courses, practicum experiences, clinical experiences, field courses, capstone experiences, formalized leadership experiences, student organizations (See Appendix III).
• How are high-impact practices integrated into instructional and co-curricular elements of the program?
• What strategies do you have to increase these opportunities for students?

4. Courses and curricular delivery
• What curricular and program changes have been implemented since last review and for what reasons? Have the changes been effective in achieving their intended purpose? Are programmatic or curricular changes planned?
• Is assessment evidence about student learning gains used as a basis for curricular change?
• Are curricular changes aligned with emerging trends in the discipline? Are there changes the program might make to be a leader or innovator among peers?
• What progress has been made to effectively integrate appropriate technology to enhance student learning, faculty performance, and the quality of programs and services? What are the unit’s goals and plans to enhance the benefits of integrated technology use?
• How are faculty, instructional academic staff, and TAs used to carry out the curriculum? Is the balance about right? Are there changes that are needed or planned?
• How do faculty, instructional staff and TAs take advantage of opportunities for mentoring and professional development related to teaching improvement? What additional opportunities are planned or should be offered?
• For graduate programs, to what degree does the program offer teaching experience and teaching-related professional development to graduate students? Does the program encourage participation in organized TA training, workshops, programs, and other opportunities that are intended to enhance skills in teaching?

5. Recruiting, admissions, and enrollment trends
• What are the trends in enrollment? Are enrollment levels consistent with enrollment plans for the program? Do you have a basis for evaluating the size you want your program to be? What is the ideal size of your program in terms of numbers of students relative to career opportunities and/or advanced studies? How does that ideal compare with typical numbers of students in your program?
• Does the program have special requirements for admission beyond those required for admission to UW-Madison? If yes, are those requirements designed to identify and recruit students who are most likely to be successful in the program? Do the entrance requirements present unintended barriers to students?
• For undergraduate programs, are admission decisions offered sufficiently early in the course of a student’s study that they can gain admission and complete the program in a timely way? Are the academic needs of transfer students recognized and planned for and appropriately accommodated?
• For graduate programs, what do trends in application volume, admits, and enrolled students signal about program strength? What is the quality of the graduate applicants, as indicated by GPA, GRE, competitive awards, and other measures appropriate to the field? What are the admissions criteria and procedures?
• For graduate programs, is recruiting effective? What makes recruiting effective? How might recruitment be strengthened?
• What effort has the department/program made to enhance student diversity (traditionally underrepresented groups in field) and have those (diversity) efforts been successful? How do you know? For instance, what are the characteristics of the applicant pool, and how diverse is the student population?

6. Funding patterns and trends for graduate programs
• What are the most common types of student funding utilized (such as fellowships, TA’s, PA’s RA’s, traineeships, scholarships, etc.)? What percentage of students is funded upon entry (distinguish between fully and partially funded students within percentage)? To what degree is funding sustained for students throughout their graduate career?
• How are these funding decisions made? What are the sources of student funding? To what degree do students secure their own funding through external competitive grants and fellowships?
• To what extent is there planning around the funding of students with regard to program size (including efforts with student diversity)? To what extent does program funding for graduate students match that offered by the program’s peers?

7. Degree completion patterns and trends, progress/time to degree
• What is the average time to degree for completion? Is this optimal? What efforts have been made to help students make timely progress to degree? (Both Regent and UAPC policy encourage undergraduate programs to be structured to ensure timely degree completion.)
• For graduate programs, are completion rates appropriate to the structure of the program? Are their ways to improve the percent of students who complete the program, and do so in a timely way?
• Are there bottlenecks or constriction points in the curriculum? How might those bottlenecks be eased or eliminated?
• Comment on trends in the number of graduates?
• Do students from educationally underrepresented groups (racial/ethnic minority, low-income, first generation in college) succeed in the program at rates comparable to other students?
• For undergraduate programs, are their systematic grade gaps associated with any of the program courses for educationally disadvantaged students compared with all students? (Consult APIR for details.) If yes, have efforts been made to close the grade gaps.
• For graduate programs, how often and in what manner is satisfactory progress monitored? Does the way in which satisfactory progress is monitored coincide with published criteria (including the Graduate Catalog)? How do program progress criteria compare to those in similar programs?

8. Student services and academic support
   • Describe how advising works in the program.
   • How do department/program advising resources align with school/college resources?
   • How many advisees does each advisor (for undergraduate programs) or faculty member (for graduate programs) have?
   • Reflect on the frequency and quality of the adviser/student meetings. How are advisers assigned and matched to students? At what stage? What process do students employ to change advisers?
   • How does the program prepare students for the transition to further academic study, work, or other post-graduation pursuits? What career advising resources are available to students?
   • How does the program communicate academic standards and learning goals? Does the program have a student handbook? A website? Does the program website publish satisfactory progress criteria, guidelines for study, admission criteria, faculty interests, curriculum, and program learning goals? Is the information on the program's website consistent with that published in the Undergraduate or Graduate Catalog?
   • How are students made aware of grievance and resolution procedures?
   • Is there a student organization in/for the department/program? If so, how active is it? Does the student organization have a faculty or staff mentor? Does the program/department provide financial support? Is there a space for meeting?
   • For graduate programs, do students receive written annual feedback on their academic progress? What guidance/assistance is offered to students who need extra support or instruction with statistics, writing, or other basic skills needed in the field? To what degree does the program refer students to language screening/support resources?
   • For graduate programs, how do students choose their degree committees? Are there written guidelines for the reading of theses and dissertations and the scheduling of defenses?
   • For graduate programs, is an orientation offered to new students? If so, what topics/activities are included?
   • For graduate programs, are students offered student workspace?

9. Professional development opportunities for graduate programs
   • Does the program encourage students to participate in professional development opportunities that will enhance their skills and support their career goals? Are there resources and guidance for exploring academic and non-academic careers?
• Are there opportunities and funding available for graduate students to attend and present at professional meetings?
• Does the program offer training in preparing proposals for fellowships or grants?
• Does the program provide/require education in the responsible conduct of research/scholarship (e.g., conflict of interest, data management, mentor/trainee relationships, publication practices, peer review, collaborative science issues, human subjects, research involving animals, research misconduct)?
• To what extent does the program offer awards to students for teaching or research?

E. Outreach and the Wisconsin Idea
• Does the program contribute to the vigor of the Wisconsin Idea and the University’s commitment to our public mission? How might those connections be strengthened? Are there joint activities with other programs and communities beyond the university?
• What is the current pattern (number, type, constituency served, indicators of impact such as numbers served, social change, economic effects) and trend in outreach/engagement/service activity?
• What role do alumni have in the unit and its efforts to enhance its role in society?
• To what extent does the unit consult with external advisory groups? Are there areas for improvement or any untapped opportunities?

F. Leadership and Governance
• Describe the program’s governance model. Is the program based in a single department under the governance of the department structure, or is there some other governance mechanism? For programs that are not associated with a single academic department, how is the program administered? What are the responsibilities of each department, unit, school or college? Is there active engagement of enough faculty to build/maintain the governance and administration of the program?
• Does the program have an effective executive committee with strategic decision-making related to the student learning experience, curricular and programmatic issues? If not this model, how are these strategic decisions made, who is involved, and is this structure effective?
• What leadership changes have occurred in recent years? What has been the impact of these changes? Are there mechanisms for continuity in program operation across leadership transitions?
• How accessible is the program director to students, staff and faculty?
• Provide a list of program faculty and key instructional or research staff. Annotate this list to indicate what roles faculty play – Instructors of specific courses? Governance or leadership roles? Major professor for PhD programs? (See “Committees” in the Graduate School Academic Policies and Procedures for further details on committee member eligibility rules: http://go.wisc.edu/4ss330.)

G. Faculty, staff, infrastructure, and budget
• Does the program have a staffing plan? Who are the program instructors?
• Does the program have sufficient faculty, instructional academic staff, and TAs to deliver the curriculum?
• Does the program balance the resources that go to curriculum delivery with needs for student services, assessment and review?
• Are there sufficient advisers for students? Are there other academic and student support staff to maintain the program?
• What space and facility issues does the program face?
• What are the program’s current and future technology needs?
• What is the level of school/college administrative resources available to the program?
• How does program budget support the program mission and activities? If budget issues have been integrated into the preceding discussion, provide a summary overview of major budget issues and plans for reallocation and new revenue sources.

H. Faculty and Research/Scholarly Work
• For graduate programs, and with reference to the faculty list above, what is the process used to identify the program faculty who may serve as a major professor? How is that list maintained, reviewed and kept updated?
• What has been the impact of new faculty hires or departures over last 3-5 years on program quality and diversity? Is there a trend?
• How does the unit assess the effectiveness of initiatives/programs to recruit and retain faculty members (new, changes, decision-making process to identify staffing priorities)?
• How is hiring linked with program planning and curricular developments, evidence of student learning, research priorities, and future directions?
• Are there efforts to enhance representation of traditionally underrepresented groups in the field? Are those efforts effective? Are there persistent barriers? Are their efforts to examine the climate and create a truly diverse intellectual community?
• How does the unit rate its ability to attract and retain a diverse faculty? What should be done to continue and/or enhance progress? Are you making use of university-wide diversity recruiting programs?
• What initiatives have been developed or are in place to provide mentoring and support for new faculty members, those working toward successful transition from associate to full professor, and throughout the career cycle, if any? How effective have these efforts been?
• How has the unit enhanced and addressed work-life issues for faculty and staff?
• Do faculty members in the program have strong records of research, practice, leadership, service, and scholarship? What is the needed range of expertise of faculty in the program?
• How are program students involved in the research and scholarly activity of faculty? Is this a program strength? Are there opportunities for improvement?
• Does the curriculum reflect and integrate emerging areas of scholarship? Are mechanisms in place for the curriculum to evolve with the discipline?

I. Overall Analysis of the Self-Study and the State of the Program: outline key findings from the self-study, including primary program strengths and challenges, and priorities program has identified for improvement.