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Introduction

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) for program development and modification. The ultimate goal is to promote and maintain high-quality programs that are administered efficiently, consistent with the institution’s role and mission. The purpose of this document is to outline procedures employed by the university for academic program reviews conducted in 2022.

CU Boulder’s academic units, encompassing departments, research institutes, large centers, and academic support offices, participate in the process. A review begins with a self-study report, which addresses the unit’s interests and compliance with campus expectations for inclusiveness, faculty mentoring, student outcomes, etc. ARPAC members then take on a discovery process to evaluate the self-study report and provide a peer perspective on the function of the unit and its relation to broader campus circumstances. As a complement to this local take, the provost invites experts from outside of the University of Colorado to participate in the process of evaluating the unit, applying a specific academic discipline’s perspective. Together, the self-study, discovery process, and external review help to define a review unit’s standing and establish an analysis and evaluation framework.

Process History

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. Each review year affords opportunities to reflect on the success of previous reviews and to propose new review methods.

Recent Notable Changes

Self-Study Question Revisions

There were 19 self-study questions posed to units in the 2020 review. These questions have been reformulated for 2022 into 11 major components that provide the units an opportunity to highlight strengths and identify opportunities for improvement as they construct a blueprint for the future. These questions also aim to unify the unit’s efforts with the campus’ strategic initiatives, and address mandatory reporting requirements of all degree programs to the Board of Regents.

ARPAC Discovery Process

In lieu of the former internal review process, ARPAC is instituting a new discovery process. The discovery process aims to serve as a check on the accuracy and completeness of the self-study report. ARPAC members are assigned as liaisons for specific units, and are tasked with examining the unit’s self-study closely and conducting interviews and surveys with the unit’s constituents, deans, and other campus officers, as needed. Like the former internal reviewers, the assigned ARPAC unit liaison(s) must come from outside the unit under review and must indicate if they have
a conflict of interest with the unit. Those with a conflict of interest may not serve as the assigned unit liaison. The ARPAC unit liaison(s) will document a summary of their findings from the discovery process, and units will have the opportunity to respond to the discovery summary report and revise the self-study as needed.

ARPAC Report Format
The sections of the ARPAC report have been reformatted to improve general readability.

Glossary of Terms
A glossary of terms used frequently throughout the review process is provided in the 2022 review guidelines. The definitions for these terms were compiled from varied sources across campus to build a common understanding of the review process.

Guidelines Last Updated: March 2021
The provost welcomes suggestions for further process improvements.
## Process Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>What to Expect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Apr 2021      | • Review guidelines and self-study questions distributed to units and posted on public website  
• Units receive deadlines for deliverables via email:  
  o Unit orientation scheduling  
  o Names of external reviewer nominators (Deadline: Sept 1)  
  o Self-study submission (Deadline: Dec 15) |
| Summer 2021   | • Unit orientation: ARPAC co-chairs meet with unit leads/unit self-study committees                                                    |
| Aug 2021      | • Unit data profiles released by Office of Data Analytics/Institutional Research                                                            |
| Sept 2021     | • Units submit names of external reviewer nominators (Deadline: Sept 1)  
• ARPAC co-chairs ask nominators for external reviewer nominee lists by Nov 1                                   |
| Nov 2021      | • External review nominators submit nominee lists (Deadline: Nov 1)  
• External reviewer nominee lists received from nominators are shared with unit for feedback                           |
| Dec 2021      | • Units submit feedback on external reviewer nominee lists (Deadline: Dec 1)  
• External review committees (ERCs) seated; ARPAC staff work with units to begin coordinating external review logistics  
• Units submit self-study to ARPAC (Deadline: Dec 15)  
• ARPAC members receive liaison assignment and unit materials                                        |
| Jan-Feb 2022  | • ARPAC discovery process takes place  
• Units respond with clarifications to discovery summary report and revise self-study as needed                                      |
| Mar-May 2022  | • External reviewer visits take place  
• Units respond to external review report                                                                                                 |
| Fall 2022     | • ARPAC review                                                                                                                                 |
| Jan-Feb 2023  | • Provost signs off on ARPAC reports with dean(s) in attendance                                                                           |
| Mar-Apr 2023  | • Provost signs off on aggregation report                                                                                                 |
| Jun 2023      | • ARPAC submits degree program review report to CU System (Deadline: Jul 1)                                                                |
| Apr-Jun 2024  | • Units submit first follow-up (Deadline: Apr 1)  
• Responses from college/campus administrators                                                                                       |
Self-Study Guidelines

The self-study report provides the foundation for the entire program review process and addresses a series of questions generated by unit leads and faculty; the provost, deans, and other campus officers; and members of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC). These questions are designed to solicit strategic information and to document the unit’s organizational qualifications. It is also an opportunity for the review unit to describe its circumstances, including successes and challenges, and to detail what it hopes to accomplish moving forward.

To launch the review process, each unit will form a self-study committee. While a unit is free to develop the exact group, it must include representatives from across all faculty ranks, at least one staff member, one graduate student, and one undergraduate student. Smaller or non-departmental units, including those without students, should seek approval from the ARPAC co-chair(s) for an alternate self-study committee arrangement. The self-study committee should work to insure broad involvement in the process by students, staff, and faculty members. To the extent that aspects of the self-study involve personnel matters, it may be inappropriate for students or staff to participate at certain stages of the study.

The self-study committee will conduct open meetings with faculty, staff, and students to discuss and develop the report, engage in strategic planning as appropriate, and revise unit documents such as bylaws and primary unit criteria for faculty reviews. The ideas generated by the discussions will be incorporated by the committee into a final draft of the self-study. The committee should endorse the self-study through a formal vote or informal consent. Endorsement could mean that the committee approves the self-study answers as written or that the self-study adequately expresses various views on an issue that cannot be resolved by the group. The self-study should be shared with the entire unit before submission, and an appropriate mechanism for response, which might include a formal faculty vote, should be in place. The submitted self-study should document the committee’s endorsement process and the unit’s vote or other response process.

Upon completion and receipt, the self-study is made available to university community members.

Self-Study Deadline
For 2022 Program Review: Wednesday, December 15, 2021
Please submit your self-study answers and any supplied appendices via email to arpac@colorado.edu by close of business on Wednesday, December 15, 2021.

Formatting and Submission Requirements
Word Count, File Type, and Naming Conventions
As much as it is possible, the prompts within each question section should be answered in the order presented. Be succinct, but thorough. Points for consideration are provided to aid the development of your self-study narrative.
Please limit your self-study (inclusive of all questions answered) to 25,000 words or less (approximately 50 pages, single-spaced). Required appendices are not included in the word/page count. Any additional material submitted that is not required will be included in the word/page count.

Format your self-study answers and supplied appendices as Word documents (.docx files). Responses to each self-study question should be submitted as individual Word documents; as there are 11 self-study questions, units may submit up to 11 separate files, depending on the number of answered questions.

File names should follow this convention: “[Unit abbreviation]_Q.[Question number]”
For example: CMCI_Q.1.docx or SOE_Q.3.docx

The question numbers are not based on the number of questions you are answering but according to the number officially assigned to each question. For example, if LAW answers...

Question 2: Organizational Structure and Governance
...then the title of the resulting document for the Colorado Law School would be LAW_Q.2.docx.

Appendices
If submitting appendices as individual files, indicate to which self-study answer they attach. Appendices that do not relate to a specific self-study answer 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 answer to question 2C: Unit Policies and Procedures, use the file name convention: [Unit abbreviation]_[File]_Q.2C_Apx.docx.
For example: INSTAAR_Bylaws_Q.2C_Apx.docx or MUSEUM_OrgChart_Q.2C_Apx.docx
The addition of “Apx” signals that it is an appendix belonging to Q.2C.

Additional Resources and Supplemental Information
Unit Data Profiles by the Office of Data Analytics (ODA)
The campus’ standardized description and statistical information of review units are made available on the ODA website and updated annually every fall semester:
https://www.colorado.edu/oda/department-institution-data/information-department/academic-review-and-planning-arp

CU Boulder Strategic Plan
In completing its self-study report, a review unit may find it useful to take into consideration the campus vision, values, and strategic imperatives outlined here:
https://www.colorado.edu/chancellor/strategic-plan

CU Boulder Inclusion, Diversity and Excellence in Academics (IDEA) Plan
In completing its self-study report, 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. It
outlines three key areas of impact: climate, infrastructure and leadership in addition to identifying five actions to achieve results (CLIMB):
https://www.colorado.edu/odece/cu-boulder-diversity-plan

Academic Futures and Financial Futures Strategic Initiatives
The review unit might also take into account priorities set out by the Academic Futures and Financial Futures strategic initiatives outlined here:
https://www.colorado.edu/strategic-initiatives
Self-Study Questions

Please note that the submitted self-study should document the self-study committee’s endorsement process and the unit’s vote or other response process. Provide a description of the process.

Question 1: Unit Overview

1A: Background, Mission, Vision, and Purpose

Provide an overview of the unit including its background, mission, vision, and purpose.

Describe where the unit fits within the university landscape, and within its school/college. Research institutes should also describe the unit’s relation to other institutes, if applicable.

1B: Academic Profile

Outline the current academic/intellectual/scholarly/creative profile of the unit and describe how this profile compares to that of other programs in the field. Consider: What are emerging trends in the discipline? Do these changes in the discipline suggest a need to refocus or adjust priorities?

Highlight and provide evidence for the unit’s ratings, rankings, and other indices, where available.

Describe notable collaborations with institutions, research groups, etc. outside CU Boulder. Where applicable, note the impact of the collaboration on the unit’s resources, reputation, etc.

1C: Accreditation

Provide information regarding any specialized/external program accreditation(s) associated with the unit, including a summary of findings from the last accreditation review, if applicable. If not applicable, indicate that the unit does not have any specialized/external program accreditation(s).

1D: Previous Program Review Outcomes

Outline a brief description of the previous Academic Program Review findings, recommendations, and outcomes for the unit. The description should:

- note when the last review was conducted;
- provide a summary of the findings from the ARPAC report;
- provide a summary of actions taken in response to the previous ARPAC review.
Question 2: Leadership and Administrative Structure and Governance

2A: Leadership and Administrative Structure
Provide a brief description of the recent history and evolution of leadership and administration within the unit, and outline the terms, roles, and responsibilities of the unit’s officers and standing committees, as applicable. Consider: Are there impending changes to the leadership and the administrative structure that the unit will need to prepare for? Is the unit’s leadership and administrative structure inclusive and equitable? Describe the degree of participation of instructor-rank faculty, graduate students, staff, and other constituents in departmental governance.

2B: Governance Updates
Describe any recent changes and updates made to your unit’s policies and procedures for governance, personnel review (annual merit review and reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews), and student and faculty grievances. Consider: Is the unit aware of any gaps or areas requiring future bylaws revisions or new/revised policies and procedures? If so, how and when does the unit plan to implement and enact these revisions?

2C: Unit Policies and Procedures
Please note that unit bylaws, review criteria/guidelines, policies, and narrative must be updated for each program review. Submit the most recent version of:

- the unit’s organizational structure;
- the unit’s bylaws;
- documents governing annual merit review processes (if not addressed in the unit’s bylaws);
- primary unit evaluation criteria for reappointment, comprehensive, promotion, and tenure reviews (for both tenure-track and instructor-track faculty);
- the unit’s student and faculty grievance policies; and
- the unit’s inclusive excellence narrative.

As a reminder, use the file name convention for appendices: [Unit abbreviation]_[File]_Q.2C_Apx.docx
For example:

- LEEDS_OrgStructure_Q.2C_Apx.docx
- LEEDS_Bylaws_Q.2C_Apx.docx
- LEEDS_AnnualMerit_Q.2C_Apx.docx
- LEEDS_PUEC_Q.2C_Apx.docx
- LEEDS_Grievance_Q.2C_Apx.docx
- LEEDS_IENarrative_Q.2C_Apx.docx
Question 3: Inclusive Excellence and Unit Culture

3A: Unit Demographics
Provide demographics (e.g. racial/ethnic identities, gender identities, in-state/out-of-state/international student/faculty populations) for the unit’s faculty, staff, and student constituents, and briefly describe the emergent demographic trends of the unit, relative to its history, broader trends on campus, and nationally within the field/discipline. Consider: What efforts have been undertaken by the unit to enhance faculty/staff/student representation of groups historically underrepresented in the field?

3B: Inclusive Excellence and CU Boulder’s IDEA Plan
Provide the unit’s definition of inclusive excellence, and describe how inclusive excellence manifests in the unit’s teaching, scholarly/creative work and/or administrative activities. Consider: What efforts might further the unit’s inclusive excellence? What opportunities exist to collaborate with other units to further inclusive excellence goals? What barriers does the unit confront? How do these efforts tie into the CU Boulder IDEA Plan?

3C: Unit Culture
Briefly describe the culture of the unit. Describe the unit’s assessment of climate/culture issues facing its faculty, staff members, and students. Consider: Has the unit defined its shared social norms and are unit constituents aware of these norms? How are unit members held accountable for upholding these norms? Are all unit members treated with respect? Is there a positive social climate for all groups? How does the unit manage and address interpersonal challenges (e.g., are these concerns addressed by the unit lead or a climate committee), and are these measures effective? Do unit members know what recourse they have in the case of colleagues’ unprofessional conduct?

3D: Findings from the Campus and Workplace Culture Survey
Provide an analysis of results from the Campus and Workplace Culture (CWC) survey administered by the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance (OIEC) and the Office of Data Analytics (ODA). The analysis should include/indicate:

- if the unit has met with a member of the OIEC assessment team to unpack the survey results and address questions/concerns;
- identified strengths that the unit wants to maintain or build upon;
- 2-4 identified goals that the unit has set for improvement, along with a brief description of how it will measure improvement; and
- how and when the unit plans on meeting these goals.
**Question 4: Faculty Excellence**

**4A: Teaching**

Identify significant faculty achievements in teaching and student mentoring since the last review.

Describe the process that determines and assigns faculty course load (i.e., how many courses do faculty teach per semester, how does the unit determine faculty assignment to lower-division versus upper-division courses, etc.).

Describe the faculty-to-student and faculty-to-course ratio, and any impacts this has on unit success. How many student credit hours are taught by TTT faculty versus instructor-track faculty versus temporary/lecturer-track faculty? How many student credit hours are taught to majors, minors, and non-majors (service teaching)?

If applicable, describe the clinical education offered by the unit and the contributions made by clinical faculty towards clinical teaching activities. Consider: What kinds of clinical teaching activities are the unit’s faculty engaged with? How do these clinical teaching activities prepare students for post-graduation? Do these courses complete specific licensure requirements? What changes to the unit’s clinical education have occurred in recent years, and what changes are being contemplated for the future?

Describe the unit’s teaching and student mentoring outreach and engagement efforts, programs, and services, and the outcomes and impact on public needs across Colorado and beyond. Consider: What kinds of teaching and student mentoring work are the unit’s faculty engaged with? What are the impacts of the work on campus, within the state of Colorado, and nationally? How do faculty members’ teaching and student mentoring affect the public good?

Describe the unit’s online/remote initiatives: what efforts have been pursued to develop and establish online/remote courses and services? How have these efforts improved educational access and quality?

**4B: Research and Scholarly/Creative Work**

Identify significant faculty achievements in scholarship, creative work, and research since the last review.

Describe the intellectual life of the faculty and outline the overall nature and breadth of the faculty’s research, scholarly/creative contributions. Consider: Given the emphasis on interdisciplinarity in the Academic Futures initiative, what are the unit’s current interdisciplinary interests and where do opportunities exist for expanding collaborations or initiating new ones? What efforts have been undertaken to foster intellectual community or collaborations within the unit, and with other units on campus or the broader academic community? What are the unit’s strengths in research and scholarship (e.g., publications, patents, or inventions) and/or in creative practice (e.g., publications, performances, or exhibitions)? How does the unit compare with national peers on these measures?
Describe funding patterns and trends, and consider how these might impact work quality and productivity in the unit.

Describe the unit’s public scholarship and scholarly/creative outreach and engagement efforts, programs, and services, and the outcomes and impact on public needs across Colorado and beyond. Consider: What kinds of research and scholarly/creative work are the unit’s faculty engaged with? What are the impacts of the work on campus, within the state of Colorado, and nationally? How do faculty members’ research and scholarly/creative work affect the public good?

4C: Faculty Service
Identify any significant faculty achievements in service and leadership since the last review.

Describe the process that determines and assigns faculty service load.

Describe the service and leadership activities and contributions made by faculty, as well as the impact of this work on campus, within the state of Colorado, and nationally. Consider: What kinds of service and leadership work are the unit’s faculty engaged with? What are the impacts of the work on campus, within the state of Colorado, and nationally? How do faculty members’ service and leadership work affect the public good?

4D: Faculty Composition
Provide the unit’s faculty roster that includes rank, employment tenure, joint appointments (if applicable), gender, race/ethnicity, etc. You may include other identity categories and data points, but your response must account for the required elements in the table outlined below.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time (&lt;100% in Unit)</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Underrepresented Groups (URG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4E: Faculty Recruitment and Retention
Describe the unit’s efforts in faculty recruitment and retention. Consider: Have there been significant hires or losses since the last review? Does faculty research/scholarly/creative expertise meet the vision and goals of the unit, and does it reflect the current state of the field? Has the unit participated in campus faculty recruitment initiatives such as the Chancellor’s Postdoctoral Fellowship for Diversity Program or the Faculty Diversity Action Plan? Has the unit been successful in recruiting and retaining top faculty members? Are there impending retirements/personnel changes that the unit has anticipated/prepared for? What are the prospects for the future in terms of attracting the best scholars to the unit? How do salaries compare against benchmarks set by the Association of American Universities (AAU) peer institutions for each faculty rank?

4F: Faculty Mentoring
Describe the unit’s faculty mentoring structures. If the unit has a formal mentoring process in place, provide the document describing it. If no formal mentoring process exists, describe the unit’s plans for creating one. Consider: What mentoring structures and processes are/should be in place for instructors, pre-tenured faculty, mid-career, and senior faculty? CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1022 notes that the primary unit has certain obligations to mentor tenure-track faculty and to help them navigate review processes for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.

4G: Additional Documentation
Submit CVs of the unit’s faculty member affiliates.
Question 5: Undergraduate Education

5A: Required Degree Program Data for Submission to CU System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount in major (Fall Term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE in major (Fiscal Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH for courses in the major taken by students in the major (FY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degrees awarded (FY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the data points above, provide a list of each undergraduate degree program offered, including major tracks, minors, and undergraduate certificates.

If any changes to program or course fees have been implemented since the last review period or changes to program or course fees will be proposed, provide an explanation.

5B: Curriculum Description

Provide a description of the major/degree requirements. Consider: What is the number of credits required for the major? Does the major require or provide an opportunity for research and scholarly/creative work, or an experiential learning experience? How has the curriculum been updated since the last review?

5C: Degree Program Overview/Narrative

Provide an overview of the undergraduate degree program. Does the degree program have any unique characteristics? (I.e., is it the only such degree program in the CU System; in Colorado; in the Rocky Mountain region?)

Describe the accomplishments and evolution of the degree program since the last review. Provide context to understand statistical data generated by Institutional Research (IR) that describe changes over time in the number of majors, number of minors, number of student credit hours, time-to-degree, and number of degrees awarded.

Describe the challenges and opportunities currently facing the program. What changes have been implemented to improve student success and the quality of the educational experience? Consider:

- Student recruitment and retention
- Instructional delivery and faculty-to-student ratio
- Curriculum (i.e., are the numbers of courses, sections of courses, varieties of courses, and sequencing of courses offered sufficient?)
- Honors program and research opportunities
- Student advising (e.g., adequacy, availability, and quality)
- Other support and student services: financial support, extracurricular activities
- Time-to-degree and graduation rates

What are the unit’s goals for the undergraduate program for the next review period?
5D: Assessment
Describe the unit’s learning outcomes assessment procedures for the undergraduate program:

- Program Learning Outcomes: List and define the undergraduate program learning outcomes. Indicate how these outcomes align with campus baccalaureate learning goals.
- Assessment Planning: Describe how the unit measures the achievement of program learning outcomes. Describe targets the unit has set for determining achievement of learning outcomes. Provide the timeline for collecting data and reporting results for each outcome.
- Assessment Reporting: Present assessment results that measured student learning. Specify what actions the unit has taken or plans to take as a result of assessments. Describe any changes or planned changes to teaching and learning that resulted from assessment work.

If the unit does not have program learning outcomes or assessment processes in place, describe the unit’s plans to articulate these outcomes and/or processes in the near future, and specify what campus-level or college-level assistance would be helpful.

5E: Student Placement and Other Outcomes
How well are the unit’s students finding employment, or being accepted into graduate programs in or related to their field of study? Provide data to support this narrative. How does the program contribute to local/regional/national workforce needs? If possible, describe undergraduates’ achievements in relation to other desirable outcomes such as civic engagement, democratic participation, public service, health, or life satisfaction, etc.
Question 6: Graduate Education

6A: Required Degree Program Data for Submission to CU System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount in major (Fall Term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE in major (Fiscal Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH for courses in the major taken by students in the major (FY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degrees awarded (FY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the data points above, provide a list of each graduate degree program offered, including traditional master’s degrees (MA/MS), bachelor’s-accelerated master’s (BAM), professional master’s programs (PMP), doctoral degrees, and graduate certificates.

If any changes to program or course fees have been implemented since the last review period or changes to program or course fees will be proposed, provide an explanation.

6B: Curriculum Description

Provide a description of the major/degree requirements. Consider: What are the significant milestones of the graduate degree? What is required for the milestone completion? How has the curriculum been updated since the last review?

6C: Degree Program Overview/Narrative

Provide an overview of the graduate degree program. Does the degree program have any unique characteristics? (I.e., is it the only such degree program in the CU System; in Colorado; in the Rocky Mountain region?)

Describe accomplishments and evolution of the degree program since the last review. Provide context to understand statistical data generated by Institutional Research (IR) that describe changes over time in the number of majors, number of student credit hours, time-to-degree, and number of degrees awarded.
Describe the challenges and opportunities currently facing the program. What changes have been implemented to improve student success and the quality of the educational experience? Consider:

- Student recruitment and retention
- Student support and funding packages
- Graduate instructor teaching responsibilities
- Research assistantship opportunities
- Instructional delivery and faculty-to-student ratio
- Curriculum and major milestones within the program
- Student advising and mentoring (e.g., adequacy, availability, and quality)
- Time-to-degree and graduation rates

What are the unit’s goals for the graduate program for the next review period?

6D: Assessment
Describe the unit’s learning outcomes assessment procedures for the graduate program:

- Program Learning Outcomes: List and define the graduate program learning outcomes.
- Assessment Planning: Describe how the unit measures the achievement of program learning outcomes. Describe targets the unit has set for determining achievement of learning outcomes. Provide the timeline for collecting data and reporting results for each outcome.
- Assessment Reporting: Present assessment results that measured student learning. Specify what actions the unit has taken or plans to take as a result of assessments. Describe any changes or planned changes to teaching and learning that resulted from assessment work.

If the unit does not have program learning outcomes or assessment processes in place, describe the unit’s plans to articulate these outcomes and/or processes in the near future, and specify what campus-level or college-level assistance would be helpful.

6E: Student Placement and Other Outcomes
How well are the unit’s students finding employment, or for master’s students, being accepted into doctoral programs in or related to their field of study? Provide data to support this narrative. How does the program contribute to local/regional/national workforce needs? If possible, describe graduates’ achievements in relation to other desirable outcomes such as civic engagement, democratic participation, public service, health, or life satisfaction, etc.

6F: Postdoctoral Training
Outline the number of postdoctoral fellows affiliated with the unit, and provide a summary of their experiences in the unit. Consider: Who mentors them, and how? What career preparation does the unit offer them?
Question 7: Staff Personnel

7A: Current Staff
Describe the department’s current staffing arrangements and organizational structure (including a count of FTE and assigned duties), and highlight staff personnel’s successes, accomplishments, and needs. Consider: What mentoring structures, processes, and resources might be available to staff for career and professional development? Is the current organizational structure optimal for staff members’ workload and distribution of responsibilities?

7B: Staff Hiring
If the unit needs additional staff, briefly describe a plan for increasing such support, including how additional or different staff support would enhance the unit’s scholarly/creative work, instructional, or service obligations and goals.
Question 8: Resource Planning - Space and Infrastructure, Support Needs, and Budget

8A: Space and Infrastructure
Describe the unit’s current space and infrastructure arrangements. If applicable, identify specific needs for space and infrastructure. If more space is needed, provide an analysis of current space utilization and indicate how leveraging additional space might further the unit and university mission, including student success or revenue growth.

Consider: Does the Office of Research and Innovation (RIO) or your school/college provide your unit with required resources and support needs for research and scholarly/creative work, including, e.g., support for compliance, grant writing and administration, and shared instrumentation?

Consider: Is the Office of Information Technology providing your unit with required resources and support needs, including help with identifying useful technologies and with installing and maintaining these?

Consider: Is the library providing sufficient support to the unit’s faculty in established and emerging areas, such as the acquisition of materials/resources, federal funding requirements for open access and research data management, changing fair use and copyright issues, etc.? Is the library providing sufficient instructional support to the unit’s students in attaining information literacy, information technology literacy, and assistance with literature reviews, etc.?

8B: Budget
Provide an overview of the funding sources for your unit and describe areas for which these funding sources are adequate and/or inadequate. List the sources and approximate totals of major categories of the unit’s income and expenses in the most recent fiscal year. Income categories might include allocations from the school, college, or campus (salary, general operating budget, etc.), monies from indirect cost recovery, endowments, endowment income, or other sources. Expense categories might include salaries, general operating, scholarships, startup funds, equipment and infrastructure, etc. Define the categories in a way that makes sense for the unit’s operations.

Describe the unit’s budgeting process: how does the unit make decisions about resources and fundraising? Discuss its strengths and weaknesses.

Outline recent fundraising efforts taken by your unit or school/college development staff on behalf of your unit. Consider: Does your unit plan to increase or decrease fundraising efforts and why? Does the school/college development staff or the campus’ Office of Advancement assist your unit with resources and support needs for fundraising activities?
Question 9: Strategic Planning and Looking Ahead
Please use this opportunity to think about the ways in which the unit wishes to shape itself in the future. How should the unit look and what should it be doing in seven years? What will it need to get there?

Identify the unit’s most significant accomplishments or milestones in recent years, and how the unit plans to build on those accomplishments or milestones.

Describe how the unit is currently responsive to and/or aspires to achieve goals outlined in the university’s strategic plan(s).

Describe how the unit has responded to and/or continues to respond to the impact(s) of the COVID-19 crisis.

Question 10: Additional Information
Please use this opportunity to provide other pertinent information not covered in the previous questions, if any.
Question 11: Centers
Task: Reauthorize affiliated centers.

The Centers Establishment and Reauthorization Process and Procedures at the University of Colorado Boulder states that requests for center reauthorization should occur concurrently with the parent unit’s review by the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC). Please follow the instructions outlined below to ensure affiliated centers are reauthorized appropriately.

A list of centers identified by the Research and Innovation Office (RIO) as reporting to units undergoing ARPAC review in 2022 is included below. If the reporting unit has questions related to center reauthorizations or if a center is missing from the list, inactive, or incorrectly identified, the unit is responsible for notifying Alicia Adelman at centers@colorado.edu.

Instructions:
Step 1: Complete Required Reauthorization Materials
It is the responsibility of the parent unit to ensure each center completes the required reauthorization materials identified below. The required templates for the program plan, bylaws, and budget are available on the RIO website: https://www.colorado.edu/researchinnovation/resources/policies/centers-establishment-and-reauthorization-process

- Updated program plan: Please submit in track changes mode to allow for easy identification of updates.
- Updated bylaws: Please submit in track changes mode to allow for easy identification of updates.
- Five-year revenue and expenditure budget.
- 1-2 page statement which describes (a) the center’s success in accomplishing its goals, supporting the missions of the parent unit and the University, and maintaining fiscal solvency; and (b) the benefit of the center’s work to the research, education, and/or service programs of CU Boulder.
- Industrial or other membership agreements or memoranda, existing or new, for review by the Office of the University Counsel.

Step 2: Submit to RIO
All required reauthorization materials described above should be submitted to Alicia Adelman at centers@colorado.edu and included in your electronic self-study submission no later than December 15, 2021. Centers which do not supply this information risk being discontinued, and will no longer be recognized as or be permitted to operate as campus centers.

If you are aware of centers operating within the units below but are not listed here, please inform RIO by sending an email to centers@colorado.edu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Unit</th>
<th>Affiliated Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| College of Media, Communication and Information (CMCI) | • BoulderTalks  
• Center for Documentary and Ethnographic Media  
• Center for Environmental Journalism  
• Center for Media, Religion and Culture          |
| Colorado Law School (LAW)                       | • Byron R. White Center for the Study of American Constitutional Law  
• Getches-Wilkinson Center for Natural Resources, Energy, and Environment (formerly Natural Resources Law Center)  
• Silicon Flatirons Center for Technology, Law and Entrepreneurship |
| CU Museum of Natural History (MUSEUM)           | • N/A                                                                               |
| Leeds School of Business (LEEDS)                | • Business Research Division  
• Center for Business Integration  
• Center for Ethics and Social Responsibility  
• CU Real Estate Center  
• Burridge Center for Finance  
• Center for Research on Consumer Financial Decision Making  
• Robert and Beverly A. Deming Center for Entrepreneurship |
| School of Education (SOE)                       | • BUENO Center for Multicultural Education  
• Center for Assessment, Design, Research, and Evaluation (CADRE)  
• National Education Policy Center  
• CU Engage                                          |
| University Libraries (LIBR)                     | • Center for Research Data and Digital Scholarship                                  |
| Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research (INSTAAR) | • Center for Geochemical Analysis of the Global Environment (GAGE)  
• Center for Water, Earth Science, and Technology (CWEST) |
External Review Guidelines

The external review is an evaluation of unit performance 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 uniquely 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 and visit expenses of the third reviewer must be covered by the unit. The co-chairs will decide if the request can be granted.
- To facilitate the selection of unbiased external reviewers, a double-blind selection process is employed. By this arrangement, the unit lead is asked to supply names of experts working within the unit’s disciplinary scope from outside of the University of Colorado who are familiar enough with the unit that they might suggest suitable individuals as possible external reviewers. A 3:1 ratio of nominator to each external reviewer “slot” is optimal (i.e., calling on at least six nominators is typical in cases where a two-person ERC is required).
- The ARPAC co-chairs will contact the nominators and ask each to name 5-10 candidates. Nominators will be asked to name individuals who are widely knowledgeable about their field and issues in higher education and who may have held leadership positions within their field (e.g., department chair, research director, etc.).
- The ARPAC co-chairs will email the received names to the unit lead as an alphabetized list. Nominators will not be identified. Units will be given time to review the list and strike names for any reason. The remaining nominees should be rank-ordered and grouped into specializations, if applicable. Any associations between a nominee and a unit affiliate that might be perceived as a conflict of interest (e.g., former advisor/advisee, Co-PI, etc.) must be noted by the unit if they pass through its edit.
- The ARPAC co-chairs will make final selections, considering the unit’s rankings 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 identified, the unit lead is informed of the names of the external reviewers and works with ARPAC staff and the external reviewers to select and coordinate visit dates.
• ARPAC staff work with the external reviewers to arrange transportation, accommodation, and meals. The university covers these expenses.

• 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 self-study, discovery summary report, and other relevant documents.

• The external review may be held in-person or 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 visit will be rescheduled if necessary.

• The external review typically takes place while classes are in session, usually after spring break and before spring finals. At the outset of the visit, 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.

• Unit personnel are responsible for providing the external reviewers with logistical support for in-person visits, including transportation to and from the accommodation venue. ARPAC staff will provide the unit lead with detailed instructions once the visit dates and meeting modalities are confirmed.

• 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. 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 visit 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. A lunch meeting may be arranged with unit members.

• On the second day of the visit, the focus of conversations will be 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 should focus on analyzing unit strengths and weaknesses; the review 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.

A 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 self-study reporting 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 co-chairs ARPAC with the vice provost for faculty affairs as non-voting members; the executive vice provost for academic resource management, the vice chancellor for diversity, equity, and community engagement, 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 forwarded to the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Executive Committee for approval.

The committee’s reports address accountability requirements and campus planning goals. The committee is responsible for describing unit-specific and multi-unit opportunities that have arisen during the review process. Recommendations might describe resource-neutral improvements as well as investments. Units and administrators are required to respond to these recommendations. The committee reports on institutional impediments or irregularities in the purview of the provost. The committee reports to the provost on the circumstances of underperforming units.

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 must indicate if they have a conflict of interest with the unit. Those with a conflict of interest may not serve as the assigned unit liaison. The ARPAC unit liaison is responsible for documenting a summary of their findings from the discovery process and drafting a final 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 self-study report. The ARPAC unit liaison(s) are tasked with examining the unit’s self-study closely; conducting interviews and surveys with the unit’s constituents, deans, and other campus officers, as needed; 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 self-study as needed.
External Review Committee Visit Protocol
It is customary for the ARPAC unit liaison(s) and the ARPAC co-chairs to welcome and meet with external reviewers on the first day of their visit in order to brief them on the review procedures and to answer their questions. 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. In this role, the ARPAC unit liaison serves as a host to the external reviewers.

The entire committee is invited to meet with the external reviewers at an exit interview on the last day of their visit. The committee is 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 by Monday, February 21, 2022.

Report Preparation Guidelines
The discovery summary report need not to describe the unit as that has already been accomplished by the self-study report. Instead, the discovery summary report should focus on identifying any gaps in the self-study report and include a list of follow-up questions or concerns for the unit to address or provide additional clarification.

When the ARPAC co-chairs receive the discovery summary report, it is forwarded to the unit lead. The unit has 7 days to make written comments to ARPAC for the correction of factual errors and to revise the self-study report, as needed.
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 over the prior seven years.

- **Unit Overview and Analysis:** This section includes a general description of the unit and then summarizes key points raised in the self-study, internal, and external review reports with specific attention to areas such as unit personnel and governance, unit culture and inclusive excellence, faculty, undergraduate education, graduate education, staff, space and budget. These descriptions should include the unit’s characteristics in relation to other campus academic units as well as similar programs nationally. An analysis of each area follows thereafter; these are the general observations and conclusions of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC), including a summary of unit strengths and weaknesses.

- **Recommendations:** Specific and numbered recommendations for program improvement and development. Recommendation must relate in some explicit way to a finding or determination in the analysis section of the report. Recommendations are 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.

**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.

**Deadlines:**

In 2024 and 2026, the leads of the reviewed units, the deans, and the provost are expected to complete follow-up reports. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The dean reports are due after the units' follow-ups:</th>
<th>The provost reports follow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2024</td>
<td>May 1, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2026</td>
<td>May 1, 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1, 2026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requirements:**

The follow-up narrative should address 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., are of interest to ARPAC.

The deans and the provost are likewise asked to address review recommendations in their annual 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 and in the review committee’s 2022 aggregation report.

The review committee will take up the responses of the unit leads, the deans, and the provost at the outset of the fall term. It is the committee’s responsibility to make sure that the responses offer sufficient explanation and context. The unit leads are obligated to update the committee with clarifications when these are asked for. The updates are expected before the end of the fall term. The updates are not a substitute for the annual follow-up.
Contingent Review Guidelines

Occasionally a unit might require extra attention, such as when program or management difficulties impede its progress or when demands placed on the unit far exceed available resources. Additionally, administrators might wish to understand the goals of a unit not otherwise reviewed, 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 on these prompts:

- 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, would not excuse a unit from regular program review obligations.
# Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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, as a proportion of total U.S. majors 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 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.  
  **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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalent (FTE)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-term (FT)</td>
<td>Refers to data compiled as of the fall census, that is, the end of the third week of fall classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year (FY)</td>
<td>Refers to the time period from July 1 through June 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic year (AY)</td>
<td>Refers to the time period from August through May.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other common abbreviations (in alphabetical order):
- 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