



University of Colorado **Boulder**

Academic Review and Planning 2025 Program Reviews

2025 Review Units:

Art and Art History (AAH)

Asian Languages and Civilizations (ALC)

Center for Asian Studies (CAS)

Cinema Studies and Moving Image Arts (CINE)

Classics (CLAS)

English (ENGL)

French and Italian (FRIT)

German and Slavic Languages and Literatures (GSSL)

History (HIST)

Humanities (HUMN)

Jewish Studies (JWST)

Music (MUSIC)

Philosophy (PHIL)

Religious Studies (RLST)

Spanish and Portuguese (SPAN)

Theatre and Dance (THDN)

Writing and Rhetoric (PWR)

Contents

Introduction and Process History – 1

Process Timeline – 3

Degree Program Summary Guidelines – 4

Goal Setting Exercise Guidelines and Topics – 6

Additional Resources and Supplemental Information – 8

Reauthorize Affiliated Centers – 9

External Review Guidelines – 11

ARPAC Guidelines – 14

Contingent Review – 18

Glossary of Terms – 19

Introduction

As required by University of Colorado System policy, the University of Colorado Boulder (CU Boulder) conducts academic program reviews on a seven-year cycle that started in 1981. Reviews involve systematic procedures designed to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. The reviews result in recommendations made by the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC), the key faculty governance committee charged with advising on program development and modification. The ultimate goal is to promote and maintain high-quality programs that are administered equitably and efficiently, consistent with CU Boulder’s mission. The purpose of this document is to outline procedures employed by the Boulder campus for academic program reviews.

CU Boulder’s academic units, comprising departments, programs, research institutes, schools/colleges, and academic support offices, participate in the process. A review begins with the unit drafting its Degree Program Summary and planning for its Goal Setting Exercise. The degree program summary and the goal setting exercise allow the unit to look back on its accomplishments and look forward to its goals for the next five or so years. As a complement to these local perspectives, the provost invites “external reviewers” (“ERC”), experts from outside of the University of Colorado to participate in the process of assessing the unit’s strengths and weaknesses, applying a specific academic discipline’s perspective. After the ERC report is submitted, ARPAC members then take on a “discovery process” to review the unit’s degree program summary and goals and roadmap. These three key parts of the academic program review process – the unit reports (i.e., degree program summary and goal setting exercise), external review, and discovery process – help the unit focus on goal setting and actionable suggestions and provide support for the unit’s development of a roadmap for approximately the next five years.

Process History and Recent Notable Changes

Process Revision

Program review at CU Boulder has undergone two major revisions in recent decades. Following the work of a faculty task force in 2007, the campus undertook efforts to improve program review outcomes, including identifying ways to make review procedures more useful.

In 2023, the provost charged ARPAC staff to conduct research and solicit campus input regarding how to revise the program review process. Faculty had expressed concerns about the length of the review process and the amount of work required of units (in particular the self-study work), particularly because some did not find significant value in the outcomes of program review. The key goals of the provost’s charge included a reduction in the time and effort spent by units; a renewed focus on strategic goal setting of academic units with a reliance on data; a clear and concise degree program summary; and the inclusion of an overview of budget, shared governance, and administration.

In response to this charge, ARPAC made revisions to several aspects of the review process:

- Timeline: reduced to 12 months from unit report to ARPAC report, down from 18+ months; this revised timeline is reflected in the Process Timeline in these guidelines (p. 3).

- Unit Self-study: replaced by a two-part submission:
 - Degree Program Summary, comprising (1) an ARPAC-provided data table for each degree program within the unit and (2) a unit-provided summary of strengths, challenges, and goals. This report will fulfill [CU System degree program review requirements](#).
 - Goal Setting Exercise, a unit-provided set of short-term and long-term goals and a road map toward meeting those goals. The Goal Setting Exercise will serve as the main driver of the review. Tools, guidelines, and resources will be provided by ARPAC staff.
- External Reviewer Nomination Process: will be shorter and easier; ARPAC staff will continue to monitor and mitigate any bias and conflicts of interest, but the double blind selection process will be revised so that nominations are collected directly from the unit, with review, ranking, and invitations completed by the ARPAC co-chairs and staff.
- Discovery Summary Process: will be conducted following the spring semester external review committee (ERC) visits, rather than before the ERC visits. Any suggestions or clarifications stemming from the discovery summary will be in response to the unit's goals and roadmap and external review report. Units will have from approximately June 1 to Labor Day to revise their goals and roadmap.
- ARPAC Reports: the final ARPAC report for each unit will be shorter and more streamlined to focus on the unit's strengths, challenges, and goals, as well as recommendations to units and administrators; it will now be due at the end of the fall semester.
- Accountability: follow-ups will be streamlined, and include more communication between deans/campus leaders and the unit.

Report Templates

ARPAC staff have created templates for the key reports throughout the review process, to be distributed by staff leading up to each section of the review. These include templates for the degree program summary, goal setting exercise, external review report, discovery summary report, and the final ARPAC report.

Follow-Up Responses

Instead of requiring annual follow-up responses from the unit, dean, and provost/campus leadership in each of the three years following the review, the units will now have two required follow-ups in years two and four after the review. The dean will have one required follow-up in year three, and the provost and other campus leaders will have one required follow-up in year five. A table outlining the responses and due dates is included in the "ARPAC Report" section of these guidelines (p.18).

Glossary of Terms

A glossary of terms used frequently throughout the review process is provided in the 2025 review guidelines. The definitions for these terms were compiled from various sources across campus to build a common understanding of the review process.

Process Timeline

Timeline	What to Expect
Early-Mid Fall 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review guidelines distributed to units and posted on public website ● Units receive initial email regarding orientation scheduling for October 2024
Late Fall 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Unit orientation: ARPAC co-chairs meet with unit leads/unit program review committees ● Units receive degree program summary template from ARPAC staff ● Units receive goal setting exercise report template from ARPAC staff ● Units submit names of external reviewer nominators (Deadline: Oct 18) ● ARPAC staff email ERC nominations; external review committees (ERCs) seated
November 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Units submit degree program summary to ARPAC staff (Deadline: November 22) ● ARPAC staff work with units to begin coordinating external review logistics
Jan-Feb 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Units officially begin work on goal setting exercise report ● Units submit goal setting exercise report to ARPAC staff (Deadline: February 14) ● ARPAC staff work with units to finalize external review logistics
Mar-May 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● External reviewer visits take place ● Units work with ARPAC member unit liaisons to respond to external review report as needed
May 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ARPAC unit liaisons submit discovery summary report ● Units respond with clarifications to discovery summary report and revise goal setting exercise as needed (Deadline: September 2)
Fall 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ARPAC review and meetings take place ● ARPAC liaisons complete work on final ARPAC report for each unit (Deadline: November 21) ● Units submit revised goal setting exercise as needed based on discovery summary report feedback (Deadline: September 2)
December 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provost signs off on ARPAC reports with dean(s) in attendance (Deadline: December 19) ● Units receive copy of signed ARPAC report
Jul 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ARPAC submits cumulative campus degree program review report to CU System (Deadline: July 1)
Apr-Jun 2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Units submit first follow-up (Deadline: April 1)

Degree Program Summary

The degree program summary mirrors the requirements of the cumulative campus degree program review report that ARPAC staff are required to submit to the System Office every July following the review year. Academic program review is required under [Regent Policy 4.B.1: Academic Program Review](#), as well as Administrative Policy Statement [\(APS\) 1019: Degree Program Review](#). The degree program summary will consist of two parts: a data table summary and a summary of each degree program.

The data table summary will include data for five (5) years leading up to the review period for the following: 1) degree program headcount; student credit hours delivered by the degree program including percentage of credit hours taken by majors and taken by non-majors; and 2) degrees awarded. A separate data table will be created for each degree program offered by the unit under review. ARPAC staff will work with the Data & Analytics division of the Office of Information Technology to create and prepopulate all tables for units within each review cohort.

Upon distribution of the data table summaries, ARPAC staff will send the units a template for composing the summary of each degree program. With consideration of the various degree programs offered by the unit, the unit will be charged with writing a summary in bulleted or narrative form that addresses:

- up to five (5) program strengths;
- up to five (5) program challenges
- up to five (5) program opportunities;
- up to five (5) program goals for the next review period

Each degree program summary may not exceed 1,000 words (~2 pages); the data tables are not included in the word count.

The template for the degree program summary will be sent by ARPAC staff following the orientation session held at the beginning of the program review cycle.

Degree Program Summary Deadline

For 2025 Program Review: Friday, November 22, 2024

Please submit your degree program summary via email to arpac@colorado.edu by close of business on Friday, November 22, 2024.

Formatting and Submission Requirements

Word Count, File Type, and Naming Conventions

The prompts for the degree program summary should be answered in the order presented. Be succinct and thorough. Bullet point or narrative format is both appropriate and acceptable.

Please limit each degree program summary to a maximum of 1,000 words (~2 pages). The data tables and any required appendices are not included in the word count, but any additional material submitted that is not required will be included in the word count. If your degree program summary exceeds the limit, ARPAC staff will request a revised and shortened submission within the word

count limit.

Format your summaries of all of your degree programs as a single (1) Word document (.docx files). Please use the template provided to you by ARPAC staff for your responses.

File names should follow this convention: “[Unit abbreviation]_Degree_Program_Summary” For example: *AAH_Degree_Program_Summary.docx* or *THDN_Degree_Program_Summary.docx*.

Appendices

Appendices in support of the degree program summary should be submitted as individual files. Non-required appendices that do not relate to a specific degree program summary cannot be accepted.

Please be sure to make the appendix’s association clear in its file name. For example, if you have an appendix for the summary, use the file name convention: [Unit abbreviation]_[File]_DPR_Apx.docx.

For example: *JWST_Curriculum_Revision_DPR_Apx.docx* or *PWR_Certificate_Proposal_DPR_Apx.docx*

The addition of “Apx” signals that it is an appendix belonging to the degree program summary.

Goal Setting Exercise

While the degree program report is a key requirement, the substantive goal setting exercise will serve as the main driver of the review for the unit, for the external review, and for the ARPAC committee. Tools, guidelines, and resources will be provided by ARPAC staff.

The goal setting exercise involves a unit-provided set of short-term and long-term goals along with a road map toward meeting those goals. Key areas of consideration for the goal setting exercise include:

- Teaching and learning excellence and assessment
- Research, scholarly, and/or creative work excellence
- Hiring and mentoring (faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellows)
- Student success and mentoring (undergraduate and graduate students)
- Inclusivity and unit climate
- Unit planning and governance structures and processes

For each of these areas, please share 1-3 short-term goals (1-3 year horizon) and at least 1, but no more than 5, long-term goals (4-6 year time horizon) for your unit. Explain briefly why your unit selected these goals, how the unit plans to meet them or measure success in meeting them, and any barriers the unit might face. If an area does not apply to your unit, you may omit it.

Required appendices

- A description of the goal-setting process within the unit (committee membership, voting process and results, etc.)
- Unit bylaws, processes, salary and merit, etc.
- Learning outcome assessment plans and reports

Provide the unit's faculty roster that includes rank, employment tenure, joint appointments (if applicable), as well as gender, race/ethnicity, etc. Use the tables below as guidelines for formatting and providing this data.

Faculty Name	Current Rank	Tenure in Unit	Rostered in the Unit?	Joint-Appointment?
<i>Last Name, First Name</i>	<i>Assistant Professor</i>	<i>[] years</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>	<i>Tenure home at CMCI, 25% courtesy appointment at ENGL</i>

Faculty Rank	Total	Full-time	Part-time (<100% in Unit)	Women (Total)	Underrepresented Groups (URG) (Total)
Professor					
Associate Professor					
Assistant Professor					
Principal Instructor					
Senior Instructor					
Instructor					
Lecturer					
Visiting Professor					
Other					

The template will be sent by ARPAC staff following the orientation session held at the beginning of the program review cycle.

Goal Setting Deadline

For 2025 Program Review: Friday, February 14, 2025

Please submit your goal setting exercise report via email to arpac@colorado.edu by close of business on Friday, February 14, 2025.

Formatting and Submission Requirements

Word Count, File Type, and Naming Conventions

The topics should be addressed in the order presented. Be succinct and thorough. Bullet point or narrative format is appropriate and acceptable.

Please limit your goal setting exercise to a maximum of 3,500 words (~7 single-spaced pages). Please do not exceed the word limit. If your goal setting exercise report exceeds the limit, ARPAC staff will have to request a revised and shortened submission that is within the word count limit.

Format your goal setting exercise as one (1) Word document (.docx files). Please use the template provided to you by ARPAC staff for your responses.

File names should follow this convention: “[Unit abbreviation]_Goal_Setting_Exercise” For example: *CAS_Goal_Setting_Exercise.docx* or *GSSL_Goal_Setting_Exercise.docx*.

Appendices

Appendices in support of the goal setting exercise should be submitted as individual files. Non-required appendices that do not relate to a specific goal setting exercise prompt are not accepted.

Be sure to make the appendix’s association clear in its file name. For example, if you have an appendix for the goal setting exercise, use the file name convention: [Unit abbreviation]_[File]_GSE_Apx.docx.

For example: *MUSIC_Bylaws_GSE_Apx.docx* or *SPAN_OrgChart_GSE_Apx.docx*

The addition of “Apx” signals that it is an appendix belonging to the goal setting exercise.

Appendices are not required and are optional based upon the unit’s and ARPAC staff’s discretion.

Additional Resources and Supplemental Information

Unit Data Profiles and Other Resources from the Data & Analytics Division

The campus' standardized description and statistical information of all review units are made available on the Data & Analytics website and updated annually every fall semester: <https://www.colorado.edu/oda/department-institution-data/departmental-information>. Units may also find it useful to refer to Data & Analytics' Tableau visualization of these unit metrics over time: https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/university.of.colorado.boulder.ir/viz/all_years_gr_ug/UGStudents.

Data & Analytics' departmental data web site includes a wealth of information useful for goal setting: <https://www.colorado.edu/oda/department-institution-data/departmental-information>.

CU Boulder Strategic Plan and Academic Futures

In completing its goal setting exercise, a review unit may find it useful to take into consideration the campus vision, values, and strategic imperatives and the priorities laid out in the Academic Futures report: <https://www.colorado.edu/chancellor/strategic-plan>; : <https://www.colorado.edu/strategic-initiatives> <https://www.colorado.edu/academicfutures/>

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at CU Boulder

In completing its goal setting exercise, a review unit may find it useful to take into consideration the IDEA Plan that serves as the campus' blueprint for diversity, equity and inclusive excellence; the five specific goals emerging from the IDEA Plan that have been identified by the IDEA Council; and the unit-level results of the most recent Campus Culture Survey: <https://www.colorado.edu/odece/cu-boulder-diversity-plan> <https://www.colorado.edu/dei/five-goals> <https://www.colorado.edu/dei/survey-results/unit-level-dashboard>

Remember to Reauthorize Affiliated Centers

The university's Centers Establishment and Reauthorization Process and Procedures specifies that requests for center reauthorization should be made concurrently with the review of the parent unit by the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC). The center reauthorization process is managed by the Research and Innovation Office (RIO).

The unit to which the center reports (the “parent unit”) is responsible for ensuring that the center supplies RIO with the required reauthorization materials by February 14, 2025. RIO will reach out to the Associate Dean for Research and all Center Directors to invite them to an open information session prior to the start of each center reauthorization cycle.

If your unit is the parent unit for a center, please make sure the center follows RIO’s instructions for the reauthorization process to ensure affiliated centers are reauthorized appropriately. Instructions and templates for required materials, including the center’s program plan, bylaws, and budget, are available on the RIO website:

<https://www.colorado.edu/researchinnovation/research-administration/policies/centers-establishment-and-reauthorization-process>

If you have questions about this process, please email centers@colorado.edu.

List of Centers Undergoing Reauthorization Review in 2025

Parent Unit	Affiliated Centers
Cinema Studies & Moving Image Arts (CINE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Brakhage Center
The College of Music (COM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The American Music Research Center (AMRC) ● The Entrepreneurship Center for Music (ECM)
Philosophy (PHIL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Center for Values and Social Policy
Spanish & Portuguese (SPAN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Latin American and Latinx Studies Center
Division of Arts & Humanities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Anderson Language and Technology Center (ALTEC)
College of Arts & Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bruce D. Benson Center for the Study of Western Civilization (CSWC) ● Center for Asian Studies ● Center for British and Irish Studies (CBIS) ● Center for Medieval and Early Modern Studies (CMEMS) ● Center of the American West (CAW)

External Review Guidelines

The external review is an assessment of unit strengths and weaknesses by experts from outside of CU Boulder. External reviewers are asked to:

- address the unit's scope, orientation, and standing, including evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the unit's curricular offerings and research or scholarly/creative work programs;
- comment on the unit's planning goals and progress toward meeting the goals; and
- provide a broad and comparative perspective.

As area experts, external reviewers are qualified to apply a specific academic discipline's perspective to strategic questions and to appraise the unit's relative standing in the field as well as the currency of its research or scholarly/creative work trajectories.

External Review Committee (ERC)

Composition and Selection Criteria

- Each unit will be assigned two external reviewers. If the unit would like to have more than two external reviewers, the unit lead should inform the ARPAC co-chairs, with the understanding that the honorarium payment of an additional reviewer must be covered by the unit. The co-chairs will decide if the request can be granted.
- Following the orientation, the unit will be tasked with providing at least 10 names of unbiased experts working within the unit's disciplinary scope from outside of the University of Colorado who do not have a conflict of interest (e.g., graduates of the program, faculty members' friends, co-PIs, former advisor/advisees). These individuals should be widely knowledgeable about their field and may have held leadership positions within their field (e.g., department chair, research director, etc.) Submitted names should be rank-ordered and grouped into specializations, if applicable. Additional names may be required if 2 external reviewers cannot be secured from the initial list.
- The ARPAC co-chairs will make final selections, considering the unit's rank order but also considering a candidate's representativeness, including whether they come from an AAU institution. The ARPAC co-chairs extend invitations on behalf of the provost to the top-ranked nominee(s), working down the list until the requisite number of reviewers is found.
- Once external reviewers are identified, the unit lead is informed of their names and works with ARPAC staff and the external reviewers to select and coordinate dates for the review.
- An honorarium is provided to each external reviewer for their participation in the process. ARPAC staff and the Financial Service Center specialist work with the external reviewers to complete the necessary forms before the honorarium can be processed. This process is initiated once the external reviewers submit their report.

Visit Rules

- Prior to the visit, external reviewers will be made aware of these procedures. The reviewers will be given access to the unit's degree program summary, goal setting exercise, and other relevant documents.
- The external review for the 2025 program review will be held remotely via web

conferencing tools. Both external reviewers must be present synchronously for a visit. If an external reviewer cancels, this will require the selection of an individual to fill the vacancy and the review will be rescheduled if necessary.

- The external review typically takes place while classes are in session, usually before spring finals. At the outset of the review, reviewers will be provided with a meeting itinerary. If the external reviewers wish to hold additional interviews outside those scheduled by the unit, ARPAC staff will work to make the necessary arrangements.
- Office of Faculty Affairs ARPAC staff will be responsible for logistical support for remote visits.
- The objectivity of the external reviewers must be protected. Although reviewers may have friends in the unit, the review visit is not an occasion to renew those friendships. Outside of meetings included within the review schedule itself, unit members should have no contact with the external reviewers from the point that they are identified until after the receipt of their report. This prohibition includes all communications and meetings between unit members and external reviewers outside of those published in the review schedule, unless specifically approved by the ARPAC co-chairs.
- The first day of the review is typically spent meeting with the unit's students, faculty, and staff. Any faculty member may request a private meeting with an external reviewer, though if the schedule does not allow this, an option exists to talk by phone or via email after the review visit ends, depending on terms specified by the external reviewers, but not to exceed a period of 7 days after the conclusion of the external review. ARPAC staff will work with the faculty member and the external reviewers to coordinate such a meeting.
- On the second day of the visit, the conversations are typically focused on planning and larger organizational themes, including meetings with allied unit leads, such as institute directors or the chairs of cognate departments. The day will end with an exit meeting attended by the provost, the dean, ARPAC members, and other campus officers, as needed.

External Review Report

Deadline

The external reviewers are expected to email a report formatted as a Word document (.docx file) to arpac@colorado.edu within 14 days of the conclusion of the external review.

Report Preparation Guidelines

The external review report does not need to describe the unit, as that has already been accomplished by earlier reporting. Instead, the external review report should focus on analyzing unit strengths and weaknesses; the report should indicate how the unit has (or has not) created a strong identity for itself in its field(s) and point to any opportunities the unit has missed. The report should address specific recommendations to how the college and/or campus can better sustain and improve the unit. As this is a review of the whole unit, the report should not include comments on individuals or particular personnel issues.

Any finding of doubt about the educational and/or research qualifications of a unit should be detailed in the external review report. This information will be advisory to the campus committee and to the provost in determining whether a contingent review of the department is advisable, including a more extensive external review.

When the ARPAC co-chairs receive the external reviewers' report, it is forwarded to the unit lead. The unit has 14 days to make written comments to ARPAC for the correction of factual errors.

ARPAC Guidelines

The Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) is responsible for turning strategic information generated by the units in their degree program summary and goal setting exercise, and by the external review committees in their discipline-specific evaluations, into planning recommendations. ARPAC is composed of tenured faculty members representing the range of CU Boulder colleges and schools. ARPAC members serve three-year terms, and the size of the committee varies depending upon the number of units undergoing review. The senior vice provost for academic planning and assessment and the vice provost for faculty affairs co-chair ARPAC as non-voting members; the vice chancellor for academic resource management; the senior vice chancellor for diversity, equity, and inclusion; the dean of the Graduate School; the dean of undergraduate education; and the dean of the institutes also serve as standing, non-voting members. By tradition, the co-chairs recruit ARPAC members in collaboration with the provost; nominees are then shared with the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Executive Committee as a courtesy.

The committee's reports address accountability requirements in the context of campus planning goals. The committee is responsible for describing unit-specific and multi-unit strengths, challenges, and opportunities that have arisen during the review process and for recommending actions to the unit, dean, provost, and other relevant campus academic and operational administrators. Recommendations might describe resource-neutral or resource-saving improvements as well as improvements requiring new investment. Units, deans, the provost, and other administrators are required to respond to these recommendations in the four years subsequent to the report's final acceptance by the provost.

Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC)

Liaison Assignment

The ARPAC co-chairs assign a primary and secondary liaison or liaisons from among the committee's standing members to each review unit. The assigned ARPAC unit liaison(s) must come from outside the unit under review and may not serve as the assigned unit liaison if they have a conflict of interest with the unit. The ARPAC unit liaison is responsible for documenting a summary of their findings from the discovery process and drafting the ARPAC report for the unit. In some review years, liaisons may be tasked with drafting multiple reports.

Discovery Process

The ARPAC discovery process aims to serve as a check on the accuracy and completeness of the goal setting exercise and determine if additional consideration is needed following the external review committee report. The ARPAC unit liaison(s) are tasked with examining the unit's goal setting exercise closely, in conjunction with the analysis and recommendations from the external review committee report, and documenting a summary of their findings from the discovery process. Units will have the opportunity to respond to the discovery summary report and revise the goal setting exercise as needed.

External Review Committee Visit Protocol

It is customary for the ARPAC co-chairs to welcome and meet with external reviewers on the first day of their visit to brief them on the review procedures and to answer their questions. Additionally, the ARPAC unit liaisons will have a meeting scheduled for the morning of the second day of the visit; ARPAC unit liaisons should try to make themselves available to the external reviewers as a resource for information about the review process and the campus.

The ARPAC liaisons are also invited to meet with the external reviewers at an exit interview on the last day of their visit. The liaisons are advised of the date and time as soon as it is known.

Fall Meetings

The ARPAC staff will send a meeting schedule to committee members and provide the group with relevant materials and reports. Committee members are asked to inform the ARPAC co-chairs of absences as soon as possible, preferably before the beginning of the fall term.

ARPAC fall meetings take place for two hours twice weekly and begin with the start of the term in August. Meetings continue until all final reports are completed and approved by the committee.

Confidentiality

Committee members are expected to maintain confidentiality throughout the review process. Committee meetings and discussions are confidential. The committee's final reports are public, after the provost has accepted and approved them.

Discovery Summary Report

Deadline

The ARPAC unit liaison(s) are expected to email a report formatted as a Word document (.docx file) to arpac@colorado.edu following the external review visit for the unit; while this will vary by unit depending on when the external review visit occurs, all discovery summaries should be submitted before the end of the spring semester.

Report Preparation Guidelines

The discovery summary report need not describe the unit as that has already been accomplished by the degree program summary and goal setting exercise. Instead, the discovery summary report should focus on identifying any gaps in or questions about the goal setting exercise and include a list of follow-up questions or concerns for the unit to address or provide additional clarification. The discovery summary does not need to report on the degree program summary, although this will be made available to the assigned ARPAC liaison(s) for additional information on the unit.

When the ARPAC co-chairs receive the discovery summary report, it is forwarded to the unit lead. The unit is then charged to make written comments to ARPAC for the correction of factual errors and to revise the goal setting exercise, as needed. The response and/or revised goal setting exercise is due to arpac@colorado.edu by September 2, 2025.

ARPAC Report

Report Preparation Guidelines

The ARPAC report contains the following sections, in the order shown. Each section is headed with the title indicated.

- **Process Overview:** A description of the entire review process for the unit, including summary details of the discovery process and the external review visit.
- **Past Review:** A description of recommendations from the previous program review and the results of their implementation.
- **Unit Analysis:** A summary and analysis of key points raised in the degree program report, goal setting exercise report, external review report, and discovery summary report with specific attention to the review unit's strengths, challenges, and goals. The analysis must address each area of goal-setting described in the goal setting exercise but may also bring up additional considerations such as the unit's role in the context of the campus. These are the general observations and conclusions of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC).
- **Recommendations:** Specific and numbered recommendations for program improvement and development. Recommendations must relate in some explicit way to a finding or determination in the analysis section of the report. Recommendations may be made to the unit, to the dean(s), to the provost, and to other campus officers, as needed.

Submission

After the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee has approved the report and its recommendations, the ARPAC co-chairs shall submit the document to the provost. The provost may elect to make modifications. A copy of the report signed by the provost, with any modifications noted, shall then be distributed to the unit leads and the deans. The final, signed report is a public document. *When the Division of Academic Affairs undergoes review, the chancellor will fill in for the provost and be the final approver of the report.*

Follow-up Reporting

ARPAC assesses follow-up reports submitted by the units, the deans, and the provost that describe the implementation of review recommendations. The committee's ongoing involvement with reviews may provide it with opportunities to outline areas of emerging and ongoing concern for the campus as a whole, to point to new opportunities, and to relate ARPAC findings to other campus planning processes.

Follow-up Deadlines

From 2027 through 2030, the heads of the reviewed units, the deans, and the provost/other central campus leaders are expected to complete follow-up reports; reports are not required by each group each year (see table below for year assignments for each group). The reports describe the implementation of review recommendations.

The following table outlines the follow-up deadlines and the assigned parties:

The unit leads must complete their reports by these dates:	The dean reports are due after the units' follow-ups:	The provost and other central campus leaders reports follow:
April 1, 2027 April 1, 2029	May 1, 2028	June 1, 2030

Requirements

The follow-up narrative should address each of the recommendations found in the ARPAC report. The follow-up should duplicate the layout of the review report recommendations, listing the original recommendation by number and adding a brief narrative that outlines what the unit has done regarding its implementation. Unit leads should address all recommendations, including any directed to the deans and the provost.

The follow-up might also afford the unit lead with an opportunity to address other, more general post-review developments. Information about significant programmatic and personnel changes, space and infrastructure losses or gains, new degree proposals, major gifts, etc., is of interest to ARPAC.

The deans and the provost are likewise asked to address review recommendations in their replies but with special attention to broader campus circumstances. As with recommendations addressed to the units, campus leaders will find recommendations addressed to them in most unit reports.

ARPAC will take up the responses of the unit leads, the deans, and the provost at the outset of the fall term. It is ARPAC's responsibility to make sure that the responses offer sufficient explanation and context and to ask for clarifications or additional information if needed.

The unit leads are obliged to update ARPAC with clarifications or additional information when these are asked for. If asked for, these updates are expected before the end of the fall term. The updates are not a substitute for the follow-up narrative itself.

Contingent Review Guidelines

Occasionally a unit might require extra attention, such as when program or management difficulties impede its progress or when its reporting line within the university's organizational structure is in question.

Additionally, administrators might wish to understand the goals of a unit not otherwise reviewed (for example, an academic support unit), or to study specific questions consequential to a single unit or to multiple units.

Any unit reporting to the provost may be obligated to undergo a contingent review, even well-performing ones. A contingent review would follow one of these requests:

- the dean finds cause to request the review;
- ARPAC requests the review;
- the provost orders the review.

A contingent review might assume the form of a task force reporting to the dean or provost on actions necessary to promote unit quality, or to recommend program reconstitution or discontinuance.

Contingent review status, or pending status, does not excuse a unit from regular program review obligations.

Glossary of Terms

Terms	Definition
Unit	<p>As defined in Regent Law 4.A, academic units are schools, colleges, and departments that roster tenured and/or tenure track faculty and offer at least one degree program.</p> <p>For the purposes of program review, the definition of a unit is extended to include research institutes; research centers; the University Libraries; academic programs such as the Environmental Design Program and the Program for Writing and Rhetoric; and the administrative support units and associated offices of the CU Boulder Academic Affairs' division.</p>
Degree program	<p>As defined in Regent Law 4.B, a degree program is a course of study leading to a degree at the bachelor's, master's, or doctoral level and may only be offered by an academic unit or a program within an academic unit.</p> <p>The following abbreviated terms are common in describing academic degrees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BA/BS - Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science ● BAM - Bachelor's-Accelerated Master's ● MA/MS - Master of Arts/Master of Science ● PMP - Professional Master's Program
Underrepresented groups	<p>Individuals who self-report as African American, Hispanic/Latinx, American Indian/Native American, or Pacific Islander, as a proportion of total U.S. majors with known race/ethnicity.</p> <p>International students/faculty are considered distinct from underrepresented groups.</p>
Faculty	<p>Full-time faculty: Full-time faculty are those with a 100% appointment. The percent time of the appointment (% full-time) is based on the college- or school-specific definition of 100% full-time effort. In larger colleges, full-time expectations may be defined on a discipline-specific basis.</p> <p>Regular faculty: All faculty eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate of the University of Colorado, as defined by Regent Law 5.A.2(A)(2).</p> <p>Rostered faculty: Faculty who appear on a primary unit's personnel roster with a position number, and are compensated by the unit. Rostered faculty of a specific unit may have their tenure locus housed in other units (i.e., the tenure home unit), and are appointed and reviewed by the tenure home unit.</p> <p>Faculty affiliates: Faculty who are affiliated with the unit via tenure locus (full or shared). Faculty are appointed and reviewed by the tenure home unit.</p>

Full-time equivalent (FTE)	FTE is defined as the equivalent of one position, continuously filled, full-time for the entire fiscal year and which may comprise any combination of part-time and full-time positions. It provides an estimate of the total full-time employment by converting part-time employees to a full-time derived statistic. This general definition of FTE is adjusted, however, for academic year appointments.
Fall-term (FT)	Refers to data compiled as of the fall census, that is, the end of the third week of fall classes.
Fiscal year (FY)	Refers to the time period from July 1 through June 30.
Academic year (AY)	Refers to the time period from August through May.
<p>Other common abbreviations (in alphabetical order):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ERC - External review committee ● FCQs - Faculty Course Questionnaire ● FRPA - Faculty Report of Professional Activity ● IR - Institutional Research, a division of the Office of Data Analytics ● ODA - Office of Data Analytics ● OIEC - Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance ● PUEC - Primary unit evaluation criteria ● SCH - Student credit hours ● TTT - Tenured and tenure-track faculty 	