



UW-Madison Guidelines for Conducting Five-Year Reviews of Academic Programs

Document History: Adopted by UAPC April 18, 2013. Revised to reflect changes in UW System/Regent policy; as of August 2012 the participation of System Administration in the five year review was no longer required by Regent policy; modified from a document adopted by UAPC action March 18, 2010.

Scope

Degree/major programs: The first review of a new degree/major program is required approximately five years after implementation. The school/college dean's office and program faculty leader will be notified to initiate the review by the Office of the Provost. The office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research will oversee the review. These guidelines are intended primarily to describe the five-year review of degree/major programs; however they may provide useful guidance for reviews of named options and certificates.

Named Options: Five-year reviews are also required for named options of degree/major programs. Typically, these reviews are conducted under the auspices of the school/college dean, with a prompt from the Office of the Provost. If at the time of approval specific stipulations are made about the five-year review by governance groups, a reminder of those stipulations will be provided with the notice to the dean that it is time to initiate the review.

Certificate programs: In addition, five-year reviews are required for certificate programs. Like reviews of named options, the first reviews of certificate programs usually are conducted under the auspices of the school/college dean, with a prompt from the Office of the Provost. If at the time of approval, specific stipulations are made about the five-year review, a reminder of those stipulations will be provided with the prompt to the dean that it's time to initiate the review. Also consult the Guidelines for Certificates for information about the five-year review of certificates.

Purpose

The general purposes of the five-year review are to:

- a. Determine whether the goals and objectives as stated in the original program proposal were met and evaluate if the program is meeting standards of quality that are expected based on the original proposal.
- b. Confirm that the program is important to be delivered at UW-Madison and understand the program's relationship to other programs at UW-Madison. Are other programs positively or negatively impacted? Are connections with other programs as planned in the original proposal developing as envisioned?
- c. Determine if the resource implications of continuing the program are appropriate.
- d. Offer the program faculty, the dean(s), and/or provost any advice for program improvement and summarize any actions for follow-up or attention.

Process

1. At the time of initial program approval and implementation, a date is set for review approximately five years after implementation. Acknowledgement of and planning for the review is part of the program proposal process.
2. At the five year mark, the provost charges the dean with initiating the review and requests that the program faculty conduct a self-study. The self-study should focus on the purposes of the review stated above, reference the original proposal, and follow additional guidelines for UW-Madison self-studies. If the program faculty have recently conducted a program review for another purpose - a departmental review or accreditation – which included a preparation of a self-study that substantially addresses the program under review that document may be used as the self-study. The provost's memo sets a timeline for completion of the self-study completion, usually within six to twelve months.
3. Program faculty are responsible for completing the self-study. They are invited and welcome to seek advice or supporting information from the school/college dean's office, from the office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research, and from other appropriate units on campus.
4. When the self-study is completed, the program faculty formally endorse the document and forward it to the dean. (In rare circumstances, program faculty may decide that the program should not be continued either before preparing the self-study, or in the process of conducting it; in such cases they may instead a request to discontinue the program.)

5. When the dean receives the self-study, (s)he conducts a preliminary school/college review of the self-study. Typically, this review is comprised of a discussion of the self-study at the school/college academic planning council, or equivalent governance body. That discussion should confirm that the self-study accurately represents the program, that it serves the purposes of five-year review, and that the program has school/college support. Alternatively, if problematic issues are evident, the dean may choose to conduct an in-depth review at the school/college level, or may request a delay in the process to address an issue within the program, or the dean may choose to recommend that the program be discontinued.
6. When consideration at the school/college level is completed to the satisfaction of the dean, the dean forwards the self-study to the provost. The self-study is to be accompanied by a cover memo that documents the school/college level review. This memo should summarize program strengths and weaknesses and any future directions. If serious resource issues are a prominent feature in the self-study (beyond typical of what all programs are dealing with), the dean's comments should provide enough information and context for the review committee to evaluate those issues.
7. The self-study and the dean's cover memo are sent from the dean to the provost (with a copy to the director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research and for graduate programs to the dean of the Graduate School).
8. The provost, working with the director of APIR, convenes and formally charges a review committee. The committee is comprised of at least three faculty members and two consultants:
 - i. A chair, who is a member of the UAPC (faculty or academic staff appointee)
 - ii. For graduate programs, a member of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee
 - iii. One or two provost's appointees who are not active members of the program faculty. These appointees are usually a faculty member who is a recent UAPC member, or who was a member of the review committee that reviewed the corresponding new program proposal, or whose expertise is related to the academic program being reviewed.
 - iv. A member of the academic planning council of the program's school/college; this member is optional and is included at the discretion of the dean
 - v. A representative of the program faculty, who serves as a consultant and who answers questions and provides information about the program

- vi. The director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research, who serves as a consultant and who provides continuity across five-year reviews and who can provide additional information about the program
9. In addition to a charge memo, the committee is provided with the cover letter from the dean reporting on the school/college review, the self-study, and the original program proposal as approved by the Board of Regents. The committee is also invited to request additional information from the consultant members – the member of the program faculty and the director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research.
10. The work of the review committee is conducted under the leadership of the committee chair, who calls the meetings, sets the plan for the review, determines agendas for meetings, and works with the other committee members to draft a report. (Advice for committee chairs is provided in Appendix I.) Typically, the committee report addresses the program in relation to the purposes of program review listed above. The report describes the strengths and weakness of the program, offers advice to the program or the dean or the provost for improving the program, and specifies any necessary follow up action. In rare circumstances, the program committee may deem that discontinuation is an appropriate recommendation. The completed report is sent by the committee chair to the provost.
11. The report of the review committee is circulated on behalf of the provost by the director of APIR to the dean for review and comment before being submitted to governance committees.
12. For graduate programs, the review report is presented to the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee by the GFEC representative. GFEC discusses the materials. The formal GFEC action is to accept the report and endorse the review committee's recommendations. The GFEC may choose to provide additional advice to the program beyond that outlined in the program review committee report. The GFEC and/or Graduate School may choose to reject the report and substitute another course of action, although this is likely to be a rare occurrence.
13. For all programs, the review report is presented to the UAPC by the chair of the review committee (a UAPC member). A program representative and the dean are invited to attend the UAPC meeting. The formal UAPC action is to accept the review committee report and endorse their recommendations. The UAPC may choose to accept the report and endorse their recommendations. The UAPC may provide additional advice to the program beyond that outlined in the program review committee report. The UAPC may also choose to reject

the report and substitute another course of action, although this is likely to be a rare occurrence.

Expectations are that if controversial recommendations are made by the review committee, GFEC, or the UAPC, interested parties will work together in good faith towards a resolution that serves the needs of students and the program faculty and staff, as well as broader institutional considerations.

14. To conclude the program review, the provost will formally send the report and recommendations to the dean and program faculty and with thanks for their participation in the process. The program enters the regular 10-year cycle for review unless there are recommendations for an intermediate review in a shorter time frame.
15. In annual reports on program review, the provost notifies UW System Administration that the five-year review for the new program has been completed.

Appendix I. Suggestions and Advice for Five-Year Review Committee Chairs

(Jocelyn Milner, Director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research)

I. Review committee chair and the committee

Review committee chairs are active members of the University Academic Planning Council (UAPC), or very recent past members. If the person who chaired the original new program proposal committee is available, that person will be invited to participate as one of the other members.

The director of APIR is always available for questions or to provide additional information.

II. Materials

The five-year review committee is convened through a formal charge memo from the provost to all members of the five-year review committee. When the review committee chair receives the charge memo with the packet of materials, he/she should review the packet to make sure it contains all of the documents with all of the pages and all of the pieces.

Typically the packet will consist of the self-study, a cover letter from the dean, and the summary of the original program proposal. The charge letter will specify what's in the packet.

Contact the director of APIR if anything is missing.

III. Preliminary planning and communication with the review committee

The chair decides on a general plan for the review.

The chair may make a range of decisions about how to proceed. Typically the chair schedules two 2-hour meetings for the review committee.

For some reviews, the chair may choose to include meetings with program faculty and staff, meetings with students, a tour the program facilities, and/or meetings with other program constituencies. Such activities are not always included and they can be added at the discretion of the committee.

The chair should start making arrangements for review committee meetings as soon as (s)he receives the charge memo. It may be necessary for the meetings to be scheduled several weeks into the future to accommodate everyone's schedule. That gives lots of time for members to review the materials. Scheduling assistance may be available from the Office of the Provost; consult the director of APIR.

Once the meeting schedule is set the chair e-mails the committee members to confirm.

At least two weeks before the first meeting, the chair should remind committee members to review the documents and remind them to send requests for any additional information well in advance of the meeting. This action sets the expectation that committee members should be prepared to make the meeting time productive.

IV. Agenda for the review committee meeting

The agenda for the review committee meeting can take many formats. It is always useful to start with introductions. Often members of the review committees don't know each other. Because UW-Madison is such a large university, we can structure meaningful review committees without external reviewers.

An agenda format that seems to work well:

1. Introductions
2. Overall discussion of the self-study. The chair has already signaled in via email the expectation that everyone will have read the materials, so no lengthy description of the program is really necessary. Experience says discussion is better than inviting the program rep to give an overview of the program.
3. Go through the self-study page by page and invite comments, discussion, and questions. The program rep can probably answer many of the questions. Probably allow about 45 min for that. This discussion allows everyone to have their say and to get a good understanding of the program. This approach puts all of the issues, concerns, positives perspectives on the table without having to get to a resolution on each one. This format for discussion is a good basis for identifying program strengths, concerns, and some ideas for any (friendly and non-binding) advice the review committee wants to offer the program faculty for improvement of the program.
4. Address the specific questions described in the charge memo. Some of this will be a recap of the earlier discussion. Are the goals and objectives met? Is the program important to UW-Madison? Has the program achieved a reasonable level of quality, as appropriate to the field? Are there resource implications/issues that will keep the program from continuing at some level of effectiveness?
5. Recap the program strengths and opportunities for improvement. It is helpful to recap from the earlier discussion the main points.
6. Next steps. Outline next steps and time line. The committee may want to meet again. The committee may want to interview students or faculty, or tour facilities. Otherwise, next steps will depend on the decisions of the chair and the review committee.

V. Preparing the review committee report

The chair drafts the report based on notes taken at the review committee meeting.

The review committee report is typically 2-3 pages long.

An outline might be something like this:

- a summary of the activities of the review committee, meeting dates, and materials reviewed
- a summary/overview of the programs key features
- identification of strengths and challenges
- summary of any opportunities for improvement
- as requested in the charge, have the goals and objectives of the program, as originally stated in the program proposal, been met. If not, why?
- is the program an important contribution to the UW-Madison program offerings - does it serve students, faculty, the public good?
- has the program achieved a level of quality appropriate for a young UW-Madison program? Is it planning for the future? Is it on a positive trajectory?
- are there any resource implications that are problematic (outside those that are impacting all programs)
- summary of overall program review findings

On a timeline set by the chair and the committee, the chair should circulate a draft report for review by committee members and provide a deadline for responding. It may take a couple of iterations of review to satisfy all members of the review committee. If the report becomes more complicated to complete and consensus is difficult to achieve via email, then an additional review committee meeting may be required.

After all of the committee members are satisfied with the report, it should be submitted to the provost (copy to all the committee members), as requested in the charge to the committee.

Usually, the work of the committee is completed when the report is submitted.

If the committee placed conditions or restrictions on the program, then the committee may have an on-going evaluative role. Details will be determined on a case by case basis.

VI. Governance review

After the report is submitted to the provost, it will be sent from the provost's office to the school/college dean for comment. (Because a program representative is on the review committee, the program already knows about the content of the report.)

After the dean acknowledges the report, the review is scheduled for governance review. For graduate programs the report is sent to the Graduate School and presented at a Graduate Faculty Executive Committee meeting by the GFEC member on the committee. GFEC takes a formal action to endorse the recommendation of the review committee.

The final campus review step is consideration by the UAPC. The chair of the review committee, a UAPC member, presents the review at the UAPC meeting and is present for the discussion. At this point the work of the committee chair is complete. The UAPC will vote to adopt the report and endorse the recommendation of the review committee.

The provost sends formal notice to the dean and the program faculty leader.