University of Colorado **Boulder**

Academic Review and Planning
2027 Program Reviews

2027 Review Units:

Aerospace Engineering Sciences (AES)

Alliance for Technology, Learning & Society Institute (ATLAS)

Biomedical Engineering Program (BMEN)

Chemical & Biological Engineering (CHBE)

Civil, Environmental & Architectural Engineering (CEAE)

Computer Science (CSCI)

Electrical, Computer & Energy Engineering (ECEE)

Engineering Management Program (EMP)

Environmental Engineering Program (EVEN)

Herbst Program for Engineering, Ethics and Society (HERBST)

Integrated Design Engineering Program (IBEN)

Mechanical Engineering (MECH)

Contents

Introduction and Process History – 1

Process Timeline – 3

Degree Program Evaluation Guidelines – 5

Goal Setting Exercise Guidelines and Topics – 7

Additional Resources and Supplemental Information – 10

Reauthorize Affiliated Centers – 11

External Review Guidelines – 13

ARPAC Procedures – 16

Contingent Review – 20

Glossary of Commonly Used Terms – 21

Introduction

As required by Board of Regents and University of Colorado (CU) System policy, the University of Colorado Boulder (CU Boulder) conducts degree program reviews on a seven-year cycle. CU Boulder undertakes degree program review in conjunction and coordination with academic program review to facilitate a holistic review of academic units, comprising departments, programs, research institutes, schools/colleges, and academic support offices in the Division of Academic Affairs, and in order to incorporate an assessment of degree program effectiveness within its assessment of those academic programs that offer undergraduate and/or graduate degrees. As defined in CU Boulder policy, the purpose of academic program review is to promote and maintain high-quality academic programs and academic support units that are administered equitably and efficiently, consistent with CU Boulder's mission. Responsibility for academic program review at CU Boulder lies with the provost, who determines the scope and structure of academic program review.

As also specified in CU Boulder policy, academic program review involves systematic procedures designed to identify program strengths and areas for improvement and results in recommendations for program development and modification. Academic program review is conducted by the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC), which is advisory to the provost and executive vice chancellor for academic affairs. CU Boulder faculty members serving on ARPAC assist the provost in carrying out academic review and planning obligations by making recommendations that identify and prioritize unit needs and opportunities and advance campus strategic goals.

The purpose of this document is to detail academic program review procedures and timeline in the context of the current academic year's review cycle and cohort.

Process History and Recent Notable Changes

Process Revision

Program review at CU Boulder has undergone two major revisions since it began in 1981. Following the work of a faculty task force in 2007, the campus undertook efforts to improve program review outcomes, including cohorting the units under review to facilitate discussions across units with similar academic interests.

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 found the amount of work required of units (in particular the self-study work) disproportional to the value of the outcomes of program review. In addition, CU System policy had changed to require a specific, detailed review of each degree program offered by the university. 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 informed by data; a clear and concise degree program evaluation; 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 (see p. 3-4).
- Unit Self-study: replaced by a shorter, more focused two-part submission:
    - Degree program evaluation, 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 fulfills CU System degree program review requirements.
    - Goal setting exercise, a unit-provided statement of vision and purpose, plus a set of short- and long-term goals and a roadmap toward meeting those goals. The goal setting exercise serves as the main driver of the review. Tools, guidelines, and resources are provided by ARPAC staff.
- External Reviewer Nomination Process: shorter and easier. While ARPAC staff continue to monitor and mitigate any bias and conflicts of interest, the double-blind selection process was 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: conducted in conjunction with 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 (as defined by the goal setting exercise) and the ERC report.
- ARPAC Reports: streamlined to focus on the unit's strengths, challenges, and goals, as well as recommendations to units and administrators. The final ARPAC report for each unit is due at the end of the fall semester.
- Accountability/follow-ups: streamlined and revised to 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 evaluation, goal setting exercise, 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 now have two required follow-ups in years two and four after the review. The dean has one required follow-up in year three, and the provost and other campus leaders 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 (see p.18-19).

Process Timeline

A review begins with the unit drafting its Degree Program Evaluation and planning for its Goal Setting Exercise. The degree program evaluation and the goal setting exercise allow the unit to look back on its accomplishments and look forward to its goals for the next five years. As a complement to these local perspectives, the provost invites experts from outside of the University of Colorado to serve as an external review committee (ERC) to bring the specific academic discipline's perspectives to bear in assessing the unit's strengths and weaknesses. ARPAC members also take on a "discovery process" to review the unit's goal setting exercise. These three key parts of the academic program review process – the unit reports (i.e., degree program evaluation 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 the next five years.

ARPAC reviews all of these materials before composing its report and recommendations to the unit, the dean(s), the provost, and other campus leaders. The provost may ask for revisions to the recommendations before they are finalized. In subsequent years, the unit, dean(s), provost, and other campus leaders provide follow-up responses on actions taken.

2027 Timeline	What to Expect
Late Summer/Early Fall 2026	• Review guidelines distributed to units and posted on public website • Units receive initial email regarding orientation scheduling for fall 2026
Fall 2026	• Unit orientation: ARPAC co-chairs and program director meet with unit leads/unit program review committees • Units receive degree program evaluation template from ARPAC staff • Units receive goal setting exercise report template from ARPAC staff • Units submit names of external reviewer nominators • ARPAC staff email external review committee (ERC) nominations; external review committees seated • Units work on their degree program evaluation and goal setting exercise report
November 2026	• Units submit degree program evaluation to ARPAC staff (Deadline: Nov 20) • ARPAC staff work with units to begin coordinating external review logistics
Jan-Feb 2027	• Units submit goal setting exercise report to ARPAC staff (Deadline: Feb 12) • ARPAC unit liaisons assigned discovery summary process work following receipt of goal setting exercise • ARPAC staff work with units to finalize external review logistics
Mar-May 2027	• External reviewer visits take place • ARPAC unit liaisons submit discovery summary report - report is sent to unit leads • Unit liaisons respond to external review report as needed • Units respond with clarifications to discovery summary report and revise goal setting exercise as needed
Fall 2027	• ARPAC full committee review and meetings take place • ARPAC liaisons complete work on final ARPAC report for each unit
December 2027	• Provost signs off on ARPAC reports with dean(s) in attendance • Units receive copy of signed ARPAC report
Jul 2028	• ARPAC submits cumulative campus degree program review report to CU System (Deadline: July 1)
Apr-Jun 2029	• Units submit first follow-up (Deadline: April 1)

Degree Program Evaluation

The degree program evaluation 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. Degree 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 evaluation consists of two parts: a data table summary and a summary of each degree program.

The data table summary includes data for seven (7) years leading up to the review period for the following: degree program headcount, full-time equivalent enrollment, and degrees awarded. A data table is created for each degree program offered by the unit under review. ARPAC staff 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 send the units a template for composing the summary of each degree program. For each degree program 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 evaluation is limited to 1,000 words; the data tables are not included in the word count.

The template for the degree program evaluation is provided by ARPAC staff following the orientation session held at the beginning of the program review cycle.

Degree Program Evaluation Deadline

For 2027 Program Review: Friday, November 20, 2026

Please submit the degree program evaluation via email to arpac@colorado.edu by 5:00pm on Friday, November 20, 2026.

Formatting and Submission Requirements

Word Count, File Type, and Naming Conventions

The prompts for the degree program evaluation should be answered in the order presented. Be succinct and thorough. Either bullet point or narrative format (or a combination) is acceptable.

Please limit each degree program evaluation to 1,000 words. The data tables and any required appendices are not included in the word count, but any non-required appendices submitted will be included in the word count. If your degree program evaluation 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)

or PDF file (.pdf). Please use the template provided to you by ARPAC staff for your responses.

File names should follow this convention: “[Unit abbreviation]_Degree_Program_Evaluation” For example: *AES_Degree_Program_Evaluation.docx* or *ECEE_Degree_Program_Evalutation.pdf*.

Appendices

Appendices in support of the degree program evaluation should be submitted as individual files. Non-required appendices that do not relate to a specific degree program evaluation 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]_DPE_Apx.docx.
For example: *ATLAS_Curriculum_Revision_DPE_Apx.docx*
The addition of “Apx” signals that it is an appendix belonging to the degree program evaluation (DPE).

Goal Setting Exercise

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

The goal setting exercise report includes (1) a unit-provided self-description; (2) a set of short-term and long-term goals, along with a roadmap for meeting those goals; and (3) required appendices.

For the unit self-description, describe your unit's purpose, role, and standing within the context of the University of Colorado Boulder's research, creative work, and teaching mission as a public comprehensive research university and in relation to the national (and, if applicable, international) discipline(s) represented within the unit. In broad terms, the self-description also presents the unit's vision of its current and future states. The unit self-description is limited to 2,500 words.

For the unit goals and road map, key areas of consideration include:

- Research, scholarly, and/or creative work excellence
- Hiring and mentoring (faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellows)
- Teaching and learning excellence and assessment
- 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 1-5 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 and measure success, and any barriers the unit anticipates. If an area does not apply to your unit, you may omit it. The unit goals and road map are limited to 3,500 words.

Required appendices

- A description of the goal setting process within the unit, including how the results from past years of the program's learning assessment informed the goal setting process (committee membership, voting process and results; the role of an executive committee, curriculum committee or other standing committee in the process of departmental review; and voting process and results, etc.)
- Unit bylaws; reappointment, tenure, and promotion criteria; annual merit, salary, and grievance processes, etc.
- Learning outcome assessment plans and reports
- The unit's faculty roster including rank, years of service, and joint appointments. Use the tables below as guidelines for formatting and providing this data.

Faculty Name	Current Rank	Years of Service	Rostered in (i.e., paid by) the Unit?	Joint Appointment?
Last Name, First Name	*Assistant Professor*	*[ ] years*	*Yes/No*	*Tenure home in CMDI, 25% appointment in ENGL*

Faculty Rank	Total	Full-time (100% in Unit)	Less than full-time (<100% in Unit)
Professor			
Associate Professor			
Assistant Professor			
Teaching Professor			
Associate Teaching Professor			
Assistant Teaching Professor			
Clinical Professor			
Clinical Associate Professor			
Clinical Assistant Professor			
Scholar or Artist in Residence			
Instructional Associate			
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 Exercise Report Deadline

For 2027 Program Review: Friday, February 12, 2027

Please submit your goal setting exercise report via email to arpac@colorado.edu by 5:00pm on Friday, February 12, 2027.

Formatting and Submission Requirements

Word Count, File Type, and Naming Conventions

The topics should be addressed in the order presented. Be succinct and thorough. Either bullet point or narrative format (or a combination) is acceptable.

Your goal setting exercise report is limited to a total of 6,000 words: a maximum of 2,500 words for your unit self-description and 3,500 words for your unit goals and roadmap. Required appendices are not included in the word count, but any non-required appendices submitted will be included in the word count. Please do not exceed the word limit. If your goal setting exercise 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: *CHBE_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: *CEAE_Bylaws_GSE_Apx.docx* or *EMP_OrgChart_GSE_Apx.docx*
The addition of "Apx" signals that it is an appendix belonging to the goal setting exercise (GSE).

Optional Attachments

If your unit has any goals focusing on physical space, you are highly encouraged to provide additional attachments such as photos or videos. While not required, such attachments are extremely useful for external reviewers as well as ARPAC committee members to get a better sense of the physical spaces (e.g., classrooms, laboratories, studios, storage spaces, etc.) your unit wishes to draw attention to. These additional attachments should be sent to arpac@colorado.edu at least one week before the external review visit.

Additional Resources and Supplemental Information

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

Most of the Data & Analytics data is now under a login protected page at https://data.colorado.edu/user/login?destination=/reports.

Once a user is logged in, there is a checkbox for 'ARPAC Academic Review and Planning.' The unit profiles are set up as separate pages for each unit (i.e., for Mechanical Engineering see https://data.colorado.edu/reports/mechanical-engineering-academic-review-planning). The 'go to report' link takes the user to a SharePoint folder that contains each unit report for that individual unit.

If there are issues with accessing these reports, email arpac@colorado.edu for assistance.

The ARPAC visualization can be found at https://data.colorado.edu/reports/academic-review-planning-visualizations.

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 goals, as well as the campus's Shared Equity Leadership practice and the priorities laid out in the Academic Futures report:
https://www.colorado.edu/about/strategic-priorities
https://www.colorado.edu/leadershipsupport/resources/shared-equity-leadership
https://www.colorado.edu/academicfutures/

Leadership Support at CU Boulder

In completing its goal setting exercise, a review unit may find it useful to take into consideration the campus's five common goals; and the unit-level results of the most recent Campus Culture Survey:
https://www.colorado.edu/leadershipsupport/
https://www.colorado.edu/leadershipsupport/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 12, 2027. RIO staff will invite the school/college associate dean for research and all center directors 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 2027

Parent Unit	Affiliated Centers
Aerospace Engineering Sciences	• Aerospace Mechanics Research Center (AMReC) • BioServe Space Technologies • Colorado Center for Astrodynamics Research (CCAR)
Alliance for Technology, Learning & Society Institute	• XXX
Chemical & Biological Engineering	• Center for Fundamentals and Application of Photopolymerization • Center for Pharmaceutical Biotechnology (CPB)
Civil, Environmental & Architectural Engineering	• Center for Advanced Decision Support for Water and Environmental Systems (CADSWES)
Computer Science	• XXX
Electrical, Computer & Energy Engineering	• Center for Infrastructure, Energy, and Space Testing (CIEST) • Colorado Power Electronics Center (CoPEC)
Engineering Management Program	• XXX
Herbst Program for Ethics and Society	• XXX
Mechanical Engineering	• Design Center Colorado (DCC) • Membrane Applied Science and Technology Center (MAST)
College of Engineering and Applied Science	• Center for Technology Workforce Innovation • Center for Unmanned Aircraft Systems (C-UAS) • Mortenson Center in Global Engineering and Resilience • Research and Engineering Center for Unmanned Vehicles (RECUV)

Aerospace Mechanics Research Center (AMReC)
BioServe Space Technologies
Center for Advanced Decision Support for Water and Environmental Systems (CADSWES)
Center for Fundamentals and Application of Photopolymerization
Center for Infrastructure, Energy, and Space Testing (CIEST)
Center for Pharmaceutical Biotechnology (CPB)
Center for Technology Workforce Innovation
Center for Unmanned Aircraft Systems (C-UAS)
Colorado Center for Astrodynamics Research (CCAR)
Colorado Power Electronics Center (CoPEC)
Design Center Colorado (DCC)
Membrane Applied Science and Technology Center (MAST)
Mortenson Center in Global Engineering and Resilience
Research and Engineering Center for Unmanned Vehicles (RECUV)

External Review Guidelines

The external review is an assessment of unit strengths and weaknesses by disciplinary 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 the candidate's expertise, experience, and 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 Office of the Provost 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 evaluation , goal setting exercise and appendices, and other relevant documents.
- The external review for the 2027 program review will be held remotely via web conferencing tools. Both external reviewers must be present synchronously for the remote

"visit." If an external reviewer cancels, a replacement reviewer will be selected, and the review may need to be rescheduled.

- 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 make the necessary arrangements.
- ARPAC staff are responsible for logistical support for remote visits, including creating and managing the zoom links to be used for the visit.
- The objectivity of the external reviewers must be protected. Although reviewers may have friends in the unit, 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, staff member, or student 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 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 ends with an exit meeting attended by the provost, ARPAC members and staff, and other campus officers, as needed.

External Review Report

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), comment on the unit's vision and plans, and point to any opportunities the unit may have missed. The report should address specific recommendations regarding how the college and/or campus can better sustain and improve the unit. It is helpful for the external review report to include some commentary on each of the key areas of consideration addressed in the unit goal setting exercise:

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

As this is a review of the whole unit, the report should not include comments on individuals or specific 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 is advisory to the campus committee and to the provost in determining whether a contingent review of the unit is advisable, including a more extensive external review.

Deadline, Formatting, and Submission Guidelines

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. There is no predetermined template for the external reviewers' report.

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 Procedures

Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC)

Role and Membership

The Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee, which is advisory to the provost, is responsible for turning strategic information generated by the units in their degree program evaluation and goal setting exercise and by the external review committees in their discipline-specific evaluations, into planning recommendations, as informed by their own committee discussions. 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 leaders. Recommendations might describe resource-neutral or resource-saving improvements as well as improvements requiring new investment.

ARPAC is composed of tenured faculty members representing the range of CU Boulder colleges and schools and the University Libraries. The size of the committee varies depending upon the number of units undergoing review in a given cohort. ARPAC members serve three-year terms. 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 leadership support and programming; the dean of the graduate school; the dean of undergraduate education; the vice chancellor for enrollment management; and the dean of the institutes also serve as standing, non-voting members. The co-chairs recruit ARPAC members subject to approval by the provost; ARPAC membership is then shared annually with the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Executive Committee.

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 ensure the accuracy and completeness of the goal setting exercise and determine if additional consideration is needed. The ARPAC unit liaison(s) are tasked with examining the unit's goal setting exercise closely 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 meet with the external reviewers, typically on 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 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

Report Preparation Guidelines

The discovery summary report focuses on identifying any gaps in or questions about the goal setting exercise and includes a list of follow-up questions or concerns for the unit to address or provide additional clarification. The discovery summary report does not describe the unit, as that has already been covered by the degree program evaluation and goal setting exercise, nor does it provide analysis of the unit, as that is part of the final ARPAC report. The discovery summary does not report on the degree program evaluation, 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. All responses and/or revised goal setting exercises are due to arpac@colorado.edu by the end of the spring semester.

Deadline, Formatting, and Submission Guidelines

The ARPAC unit liaison(s) email the discovery summary report formatted as a Word document (.docx file) to arpac@colorado.edu following receipt of the unit's goal setting exercise and degree program evaluation. All discovery summaries must be submitted no later than the end of the spring semester.

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 Reviews**: A brief 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 evaluation, goal setting exercise, external review report, and discovery summary report with specific attention to the review units' 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.
- **Recommendations**: Specific and numbered recommendations for program improvement and development. Recommendations must relate explicitly to a topic mentioned in the unit analysis section of the report. Recommendations may be made to the unit, to the dean(s), to the provost, or to other campus officers, as appropriate.

Submission

After the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee has approved the report and its recommendations, the ARPAC co-chairs submit the document to the provost. The provost may elect to make modifications. A copy of the report signed by the provost 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

Purpose of Follow-Up Reporting and ARPAC Assessment

Units, deans, the provost, and other administrators are required to respond to ARPAC recommendations in the four years subsequent to the report's final acceptance by the provost. ARPAC assesses follow-up reports submitted by the units, the deans, and the provost that describes the implementation of review recommendations. The committee's ongoing involvement with reviews provides 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 2029 through 2032, 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, 2029 April 1, 2031	May 1, 2030	June 1, 2032

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. A template for the responses will be sent to the appropriate group of responders.

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

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 Commonly Used Terms

Terms	Definition
Unit	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. 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.
Degree program	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. The following abbreviated terms are common in describing academic degrees: ● 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	Individuals who self-report as African American, Hispanic/Latinx, American Indian/Native American, or Pacific Islander. When expressed as a percentage of a total number in CU Boulder statistics, the percentage is a proportion of those with known race/ethnicity. International students/faculty are considered distinct from underrepresented groups.
Faculty	**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. **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). **Rostered faculty:** Faculty who appear on a primary unit's personnel roster with a position number and are compensated by the unit. Rostered tenured or tenure-track faculty of a specific unit may have their tenure home in other units. **Tenure home:** The unit that is the tenure locus (full or shared) of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are appointed and reviewed by the tenure home unit.

Full-time equivalent (FTE)	FTE is defined as the equivalent of one position, continuously filled, full-time for the entire fiscal year (or the academic year in the case of academic year appointments) and 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.
Fall-term (FT)	Refers to data compiled as of the fall census, which occurs in 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.

Other common abbreviations (in alphabetical order):

- ERC - External review committee
- FCQ - Faculty Course Questionnaire
- FRPA - Faculty Report of Professional Activity
- IR - Institutional Reporting
- D&A - Data & Analytics
- OIEC - Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance
- PUEC - Primary unit evaluation criteria
- SCH - Student credit hours
- TTT - Tenured and tenure-track faculty