



# University of Colorado **Boulder**

## Academic Review and Planning 2023 Program Reviews

2023 Division of Academic Affairs Review  
Units:

Academic Planning and Assessment

Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL)

Office of the Registrar

Office of Undergraduate Education

Academic Resource Management (ARM)

Academic & Learning Innovation

Continuing Education

Graduate School (GS)

Athletics-Student Services

Division of Student Affairs

Office of Diversity, Equity, & Community  
Engagement (ODECE)

Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA)

Ombuds Office

Research & Innovation Office (RIO)

# Contents

Introduction and Process History - 2

Process Timeline - 4

Self-Study Guidelines - 5

Self-Study Questions - 7

External Review Guidelines - 18

ARPAC Guidelines - 21

Contingent Review Guidelines - 24

Glossary of Terms - 25

# 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 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 2023.

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

While academic units undergo a unique unit review based on the same process, the holistic nature of the support offices of the Division of Academic Affairs requires a unique review process. These support offices will work together to answer 13 self-study questions aimed at assessing outcomes from the 2017-2018 Academic Futures report, as well as from related recent planning studies, such as the IDEA Plan and the Interdisciplinary Working Group Report. ARPAC is employing its regular review of Division of Academic Affairs support offices to understand the status of recommendations from these studies including completed implementation work, in-progress work, or cases where recommendations are no longer valid.

### ARPAC Discovery Process

In lieu of the former internal review process, ARPAC instituted a new discovery process in 2022. 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 2023 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: July 2023

The provost welcomes suggestions for further process improvements.

# Process Timeline

Timeline	What to Expect
Summer 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review guidelines and self-study questions distributed to units and posted on public website</li> <li>● Units receive deadlines for deliverables via email:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unit orientation scheduling</li> <li>○ Self-study submission (Deadline: Dec 14)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Aug 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Unit orientation: ARPAC co-chairs meet with unit leaders/unit self-study committees</li> <li>● Provost receives request for names of external reviewer nominations (Deadline: Sept 1)</li> </ul>
Sept 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provost submits names of external reviewer nominators (Deadline: Sept 1)</li> <li>● ARPAC co-chairs ask nominators for external reviewer nominee lists (Deadline: Oct 1)</li> </ul>
Nov 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● External review nominators submit nominee lists (Deadline: Oct 1)</li> <li>● External reviewer nominee lists received from nominators are shared with Provost for feedback</li> </ul>
Dec 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provost submits feedback on external reviewer nominee lists (Deadline: Nov 1)</li> <li>● External review committee (ERC) seated; ARPAC staff work with units to begin coordinating external review logistics</li> <li>● Units submit self-study to ARPAC (Deadline: December 14)</li> <li>● ARPAC members receive liaison assignment and unit materials</li> </ul>
Jan-Feb 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ARPAC discovery process takes place</li> <li>● Units respond with clarifications to discovery summary report and revise self-study as needed</li> </ul>
Mar-May 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● External reviewer visit takes place</li> <li>● Units respond to external review report</li> </ul>
Fall 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ARPAC review</li> </ul>
Jan-Feb 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chancellor signs off on ARPAC report with Provost in attendance</li> </ul>
Mar-Apr 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provost signs off on aggregation report</li> </ul>
Apr-Jun 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Units submit first follow-up (Deadline: Apr 1)</li> <li>● Responses from college/campus administrators</li> </ul>

# Self-Study Guidelines

The self-study report provides the foundation for the entire program review process and addresses a series of questions generated by members of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) with input from unit leads, the provost, and other campus officers. 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. For the Division of Academic Affairs (DAA) review, the self-study questions will assess outcomes from the 2017-2018 Academic Futures report, as well as from related recent planning studies, such as the IDEA Plan and the Interdisciplinary Working Group Report.

To launch the review process, the Provost's Chief of Staff will form a self-study committee as needed. Support offices will be assigned as principal investigator (PI) for questions best suited for their office's work; some offices will have no assigned PI role, while others may have 1-2 prompts as PI. These PI assignments were determined by the provost, with input by members of ARPAC. Support offices are encouraged and expected to assist with any question where their work and expertise can be helpful to the DAA self-study, even if they are not the assigned PI for that prompt. The support offices will work together to create one representative self-study for DAA. The self-study should be shared with each support unit before submission.

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

## Self-Study Deadline

For 2023 Program Review: Wednesday, December 14, 2022

Please submit your self-study answers and any supplied appendices via email to [arpac@colorado.edu](mailto:arpac@colorado.edu) by close of business on Wednesday, December 14, 2022.

## Formatting and Submission Requirements

### Word Count, File Type, and Naming Conventions

As much as it is possible, the prompts 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 13 self-study questions, 13 separate files should be submitted.

File names should follow this convention: "DAA\_Q.[Question number]" For example:  
*DAA\_Q.1.docx* or *DAA\_Q.3.docx*

The question numbers are based on the number assigned to each question. For example, if RIO answers 'Question 2: Research Excellence' the title of the document would be *DAA\_Q.2.docx*.

## Appendices

If you need to submit any appendices in support of your narrative, please submit them as individual files and indicate to which self-study answer they attach. Be sure to make the appendix's association to a specific self-study answer clear in its file name.

For example, if you have an appendix for the answer to question 6: Inclusive Excellence, use the file name convention: DAA\_Q.[Question number]\_Apx.docx.

For example: *DAA\_Q.6\_Apx.docx* The addition of "Apx" signals that it is an appendix belonging to Q.6.

## Additional Resources and Supplemental Information

### 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>

### 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>

# 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.

## Evaluation topic

Public good

## Topic overview

Building on CU Boulder's statutory mission as Colorado's comprehensive public university, the Academic Futures committee called on CU Boulder to embrace its core mission of furthering the public good.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to reflect on how their offices are contributing to the Academic Futures recommendation that CU intentionally frame its future around its identity as a public research university for the public good, and specifically the report's recommendations that CU Boulder commit itself anew to the value of a liberal arts education, to the financial health of the campus and its students, and to public scholarship and engagement.

The provost has asked the Associate Vice Provost and Chief of Staff to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this self-study section of the division summary.

## Evaluation prompts

- Describe and explain how DAA offices are contributing to the Academic Futures recommendation that CU intentionally frame its future around its identity as a public research university for the public good. Comment specifically on how DAA offices are contributing to the report's recommendations that CU Boulder commit itself anew to the value of a liberal arts education, to the financial health of the campus and its students, and to public scholarship and engagement. Focus should be on how DAA offices are moving the core mission of the university forward.
- Describe possible next steps for furthering the campus core mission.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

## Related link(s)

- [Academic Futures Report](#)

## Principal investigator:

Associate Vice Provost and Chief of Staff

## Assumed Co-PI(s):

Other interested DAA offices

---

## Evaluation topic

Research excellence

## Topic overview

Continued growth and excellence in existing and new forms of research, scholarship, and creative work was not singled out as a separate theme of the Academic Futures report. Rather, the Academic Futures vision recognized how these endeavors convey benefits across all of the report's major themes and projects.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to consider how their offices are contributing to research, scholarship, and creative work excellence at CU Boulder.

The provost has asked the Office of Research and Innovation to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this self-study section of the division summary.

### **Evaluation prompts**

- Describe how DAA offices have contributed to realizing the Academic Futures vision for furthering CU Boulder's research excellence, including specifically public-facing and public-serving work; student research involvement, the university's scholarly and creative enterprises; interdisciplinary work; and international work.
- Describe possible next steps for furthering the campus research mission.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

### **Related link(s)**

- [Academic Futures Report](#)

### **Principal investigator**

Research and Innovation Office

### **Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Faculty Affairs, the Graduate School, and all other interested DAA offices

---

### **Evaluation topic**

Supporting, sustaining, and inspiring our community (employee population)

### **Topic overview**

The Academic Futures committee identified better community support for faculty, staff, and students as the foundation of the group's other recommendations. Along with an inclusive culture, the committee named affordability, childcare/eldercare, a unified mentoring or professional development experience, better community spaces, and less-siloed communications as critical to community strengthening. Additionally, Academic Futures drew attention to factors specific to different campus populations: staff, faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students and postdocs.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to describe efforts to support faculty and staff members discussed in the Academic Futures report.

The provost has asked the Ombuds Office to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

### **Evaluation prompts**

- Describe the status of how DAA offices are working to move forward the Academic Futures Committee's recommendations directed at strengthening CU Boulder faculty and staff member community supports.
- What have recent developments—e.g., the COVID-19 emergency, anti-racism efforts—revealed about opportunities and challenges facing those who work to improve faculty and staff member community support and how have DAA offices responded?
- Articulate next steps for building out additional needed supports.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

#### **Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[III. Sustaining, Supporting and Inspiring Our Community: The Foundation of Academic Futures](#) (pp. 8-12)
- [Fall 2021 Campus Culture Survey](#)

#### **Principal investigator**

Ombuds Office

#### **Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Academic Resource Management, Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement, Office of Faculty Affairs, DAA Human Resources Team, Academic Communications, and all other interested DAA offices

#### **Evaluation topic**

Supporting, sustaining, and inspiring our community (undergraduate student population)

#### **Topic overview**

The Academic Futures committee identified better community support for faculty, staff, and students as the foundation of the group's other recommendations. Along with an inclusive culture, the committee named affordability, childcare/eldercare, a unified mentoring or professional development experience, better community spaces, and less-siloed and less-fragmented communications as critical to community strengthening. Additionally, Academic Futures drew attention to factors specific to different campus populations: staff, faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students and postdocs.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to describe DAA efforts to support undergraduate students discussed in the Academic Futures report.

The provost has asked the Division of Student Affairs to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

#### **Evaluation prompts**

- Describe the status of how DAA offices are working to move forward the Academic Futures Committee's recommendations directed at strengthening CU Boulder undergraduate student community supports.
- Have recent circumstances—especially the Covid-19 emergency—revealed new opportunities and challenges for developing undergraduate community supports and how have DAA offices responded?

- Articulate next steps for building out needed supports.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

### **Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[III. Sustaining, Supporting and Inspiring Our Community: The Foundation of Academic Futures](#) (pp. 8-12)
- [Fall 2021 Campus Culture Survey](#)

### **Principal investigator**

Division of Student Affairs

### **Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Academic Resource Management, Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement, Office of Undergraduate Education, Academic Communications, and all other interested DAA offices

### **Evaluation topic**

Supporting, sustaining, and inspiring our community (graduate student and postdoctoral fellow population)

### **Topic overview**

The Academic Futures committee identified better community support for faculty, staff, and students as the foundation of the group's other recommendations. Along with an inclusive culture, the committee named affordability, childcare/eldercare, a unified mentoring or professional development experience, better community spaces, and less-siloed and less-fragmented communications as critical to community strengthening. Additionally, Academic Futures drew attention to factors specific to different campus populations: staff, faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students and postdocs.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to describe DAA efforts to support graduate students and postdocs discussed in the Academic Futures report.

The provost has asked the Graduate School to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

### **Evaluation prompts**

- Describe the status of how DAA offices are working to move forward the Academic Futures Committee's recommendations directed at strengthening CU Boulder graduate student and postdoc community supports.
- Have recent circumstances—e.g., COVID-19 emergency and anti-racism efforts—revealed new opportunities and challenges for developing graduate and postdoc community supports and how have DAA offices responded?
- Articulate next steps for building out needed supports.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

### **Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[III. Sustaining, Supporting and Inspiring Our Community: The Foundation of Academic Futures](#) (pp. 8-12)
- [Fall 2021 Campus Culture Survey](#)
- [Student Experience in the Research University \(SERU\) Graduate Student Survey](#)

**Principal investigator**

Graduate School

**Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Research and Innovation Office, Office of Academic Resource Management, Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement, Division of Student Affairs, Academic Communications, and all other interested DAA offices

**Evaluation topic**

Inclusive excellence

**Topic overview**

In 2019, the campus adopted the Inclusion, Diversity, and Excellence in Academics (IDEA) Plan, which made concrete recommendations about how to make CU Boulder more inclusive. Prior to the IDEA Plan's completion and adoption by campus, the Academic Futures Committee endorsed the framework and approach to DEI adopted by the IDEA Plan Authoring Committee. Subsequently, the IDEA Council was created to guide implementation of the IDEA Plan, and the position of senior vice chancellor for diversity, equity and inclusion was created and is not responsible for leading the implementation of those priorities.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to reflect on how their offices have helped to further inclusive excellence and to describe ongoing work.

The provost has asked the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

**Evaluation prompts**

- Provide an update on recommendations found in the Academic Futures Report and the IDEA Plan to improve campus inclusive excellence, focusing especially on those areas under the purview of DAA offices.
- Describe opportunities and challenges for furthering CU Boulder's inclusive excellence, including to contextualize the findings of the 2021 Campus Culture Survey, the work of the IDEA Council, and the campus priorities articulated under the leadership of the senior vice chancellor for diversity, equity and inclusion.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

**Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[II. Inclusive Excellence](#) (pp.29-31)
- [IDEA Plan](#)
- [Fall 2021 Campus Culture Survey](#)

**Principal investigator**

Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement (ODECE)

**Assumed Co-PI(s):**

All other DAA offices

---

**Evaluation topic**

Student-centered learning

**Topic overview**

The Academic Futures report issued a clarion call to faculty and staff to declare CU Boulder a student-centered campus, improving undergraduate teaching and learning through a common curricular experience, the creation of a teaching and learning center, and a unified approach to undergraduate advising.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to reflect on how their offices are contributing to improving undergraduate student success.

The provost has asked the Office of Undergraduate Education to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

**Evaluation prompts**

- Update ARPAC on DAA work that has been accomplished, or brought into motion, since the Academic Futures Report focused on advancing teaching and student learning.
- Describe DAA plans for furthering these efforts, and related efforts, including to provide a potential timeline of anticipated future implementation steps.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

**Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[Project 1: A Common Student-Centered Approach to Learning](#) (pp.41-50)

**Principal investigator**

Office of Undergraduate Education

**Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, Division of Student Affairs, and all other interested DAA offices

---

**Evaluation topic**

Interdisciplinarity

**Topic overview**

The Academic Futures Committee made clear the potential impact of interdisciplinary opportunities at CU Boulder and recommended increasing support for, and breaking down barriers to, interdisciplinary teaching, research, scholarship, and creative work.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to assess how DAA offices have contributed to increasing support for, and breaking down barriers to, interdisciplinarity.

The provost has asked the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

### **Evaluation prompts**

- Provide an update and discussion on recommendations made by the Academic Futures Committee and the 2019 Working Group on Interdisciplinary Education to facilitate greater interdisciplinarity at CU Boulder and describe how DAA offices have contributed to increasing support for and removing barriers to those efforts.
- Describe possible next steps for furthering the campus interdisciplinarity goals.
- Engage leaders of CU Boulder interdisciplinary teaching, research, and creative work endeavors, in particular the leaders of research and creative work centers and institutes and the deans of colleges and schools, asking for their perspectives on the enhancements described in the Academic Futures and interdisciplinary working group reports, and on any other changes they see as important.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

### **Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[Project 2: Interdisciplinary Teaching, Research, and Creative Work](#) (pp. 51-58)
- [Interdisciplinary Education, Research and Creative Works Working Group Report](#)

### **Principal investigator**

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment

### **Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Graduate School, Office of Undergraduate Education, Research and Innovation Office, and all other interested DAA offices

---

### **Evaluation topic**

Internationalization (undergraduate student population)

### **Topic overview**

Although geopolitical circumstances have changed significantly over the past few years, and although international exchange was temporarily stalled by the pandemic, the Academic Futures Committee's recommendation to increase opportunities for international education, research, and creative work, and to support international students at CU Boulder, remains sound.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to describe how today's circumstances impact the Academic Futures Report's guidance for enhancing CU Boulder's international profile, for better supporting international undergraduate students at CU Boulder, and for supporting US-based undergraduates in studying abroad.

The provost has asked the Office of Undergraduate Education to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

### **Evaluation prompts**

- Evaluate the adequacy of arrangements to support international undergraduate students studying at CU Boulder and make recommendations to DAA offices to improve.
- Describe the status of Academic Futures recommendations for making study abroad options for domestic undergraduate students more compelling and accessible and make recommendations to DAA offices to improve.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

### **Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[Project 3: Internationalizing Our Campus](#) (pp.59-63)
- [Fall 2021 Campus Culture Survey](#)

### **Principal investigator**

Office of Undergraduate Education

### **Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Academic Resource Management, Office of Academic and Learning Innovation, Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement, and all other interested DAA offices

---

### **Evaluation topic**

Internationalization (graduate student population)

### **Topic overview**

Although geopolitical circumstances have changed significantly over the past few years, and although international exchange was temporarily stalled by the pandemic, the Academic Futures Committee's recommendation to increase opportunities for international education, research, and creative work and to support international students at CU Boulder remains sound.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to describe how today's circumstances impact recommendations in the Academic Futures Report intended to enhance CU Boulder's international profile, especially the call to better support international graduate students at CU Boulder.

The provost has asked the Graduate School to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this self-study section.

### **Evaluation prompts**

- Describe what the Spring 2021 SERU survey says about the satisfaction of CU Boulder's international graduate students and evaluate what these results, and other evidence, suggest about CU Boulder's standing among international graduate students and the adequacy of campus supports for this student population. Make recommendations to DAA offices to improve.

- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

**Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[Project 3: Internationalizing Our Campus](#) (pp.59-63)
- [Flagship 2030 Report](#)
- [Student Experience in the Research University \(SERU\) Graduate Student Survey](#)

**Principal investigator**

Graduate School

**Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Academic and Learning Innovation, Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement, and all other interested DAA offices

---

**Evaluation topic**

Technology and education/online and distance education

**Topic overview**

Following the Academic Futures report, the Provost convened a working group to propose a campus strategy on online and distance teaching and learning and created the new role of senior vice provost of online education. Shortly thereafter, the pandemic catapulted CU Boulder into a massive experiment in near-universal remote education.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to examine the role of their offices in creating and supporting online and distance learning innovations and strategies.

The provost has asked the Senior Vice Provost of Online Education to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

**Evaluation prompts**

- Provide an update on recommendations to better support online and distance education found in the Academic Futures and the Online and Distance Education Working Group reports.
- In completing this update, describe the “lessons learned” from the university’s recent COVID-19-related online and distance education accommodations.
- Describe the role of DAA offices in creating and supporting online and distance learning innovations and strategies.
- To the extent the lessons learned change previous recommendations, make alternative recommendations to DAA offices.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

**Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[Project 4: Teaching and Technology, Online and Distance Education](#) (pp. 64-69)
- [2019 Online and Distance Education Working Group Report](#)

**Principal investigator**  
SVP for Online Education

**Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, Office of Academic Resource Management, Division of Continuing Education, Office of Academic and Learning Innovation, and all other interested DAA offices

---

**Evaluation topic**

Faculty governance

**Topic overview**

The Academic Futures Report made three recommendations to more effectively engage faculty members in unit, school/college, and campus decision making.

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to return to these recommendations and to describe related developments since the report, including plans to create new faculty governance bodies at the school/college level.

The provost has asked the Office of Faculty Affairs to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

**Evaluation prompts**

- Provide a status update on Academic Futures' faculty shared governance recommendations.  
Including:
  - An overview of faculty shared governance on campus.
  - Additional recommendations to support continually improving faculty shared governance and input with DAA offices.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

**Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[V. Governance](#) (pp.70 - 73)

**Principal investigator**

Office of Faculty Affairs

**Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, and all other interested DAA offices

---

**Evaluation topic**

Campus physical and financial resources

**Topic overview**

In the years since the Academic Futures Report, the campus has completed the [Financial Futures](#) initiative, a [budget model redesign](#), and a [decadal campus master plan](#),

As part of its 2023 review, the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee asks Division of Academic Affairs leaders to return to the infrastructure and financial planning needs identified by Academic Futures and to reflect on recent developments, including the manner in which the campus master plan, Financial Futures, and the new budget model have taken into account the vision and needs articulated in the Academic Futures Report.

The provost has asked the Office of Academic Resource Management to lead this analysis, but the expectation is for all involved or interested division offices to contribute to this section of the division summary.

### **Evaluation prompts**

- Describe how DAA units have contributed to and benefited from initiatives and projects designed to improve resource prioritization and allocation across CU Boulder. Additionally, describe the role of shared governance groups with this work.
- Describe DAA future steps and DAA recommendations to ensure DAA priorities are understood and met as these initiatives and projects continue to mature.
- Engage DAA contributors working on other focal areas and, as appropriate, draw connections between this evaluation topic and theirs.

### **Related link(s)**

- Academic Futures Report:  
[VI. Campus Success: Physical and Financial Resources](#) (pp.74 - 76)
- [Campus Master Plan](#)
- [Financial Futures](#)
- [2022 "New Budget Model"](#)

### **Principal investigator**

Office of Academic Resource Management

### **Assumed Co-PI(s)**

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, the DAA Budget and Finance Team, and all other interested DAA offices

# 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 and its progress toward meeting larger campus planning goals; and
- provide a broad and comparative perspective.

As area experts, external reviewers are well qualified to apply a specific academic affairs perspective to strategic questions and to appraise the division's organization and efficacy.

## External Review Committee (ERC)

### Composition and Selection Criteria

- There will be three external reviewers for the Division of Academic Affairs cohort. These external reviewers will be current or former provosts from institutions outside of CU.
- To facilitate the selection of unbiased external reviewers, a double-blind selection process is employed. By this arrangement, the provost 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 provost as an alphabetized list. Nominators will not be identified. The provost 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 provost if they pass through his edit.
- The ARPAC co-chairs will make final selections, considering the provost's ranking 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 leads across the Division of Academic Affairs units are informed of the names of the external reviewers and work with ARPAC staff and the external reviewers to select and coordinate visit dates.
- 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 self-study, discovery summary report, and other relevant documents.

- The external review will be held remotely via web conferencing tools. All 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.
- ARPAC staff will provide the unit leads with detailed instructions once the visit dates and meeting links are confirmed. All meeting links will be created and facilitated by ARPAC staff.
- 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 and second 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 third 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, 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](mailto: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.

It is customary for 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. Additionally, the ARPAC unit liaisons will have a meeting scheduled for the morning of the second day of the visit; ARPAC unit liaisons should try to make themselves available to the external reviewers as a resource for information about the review process and the campus. The 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.

# 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 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; typically, members of the provost's cabinet such as 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 serve as standing, non-voting members. 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, as well as 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 co-chairs to welcome and meet with external reviewers on the first day of their visit to brief them on the review procedures and to answer their questions. Additionally, the ARPAC unit liaisons will have a meeting scheduled for the morning of the second day of the visit; ARPAC unit liaisons should try to make themselves available to the external reviewers as a resource for information about the review process and the campus.

The unit liaisons are expected to meet with the external reviewers at an exit interview on the last day of their visit. The entire committee is invited to attend the exit meeting.

## Fall Meetings

The ARPAC staff will send a meeting schedule to committee members and provide the group with relevant materials. Committee members are asked to inform the director of academic program review of planned 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](mailto:arpac@colorado.edu) by Monday, February 13, 2023.

### 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 14 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 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 2025 and 2027, the leads of the reviewed units 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:

<b>The unit leads must complete their reports by these dates:</b>	<b>The provost reports follow:</b>
April 1, 2025 April 1, 2027	June 1, 2025 June 1, 2027

### 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 provost is likewise asked to address review recommendations in their annual replies. As with recommendations addressed to the units, other campus leaders will find recommendations addressed to them in most unit reports.

The review committee will take up the responses of the unit leads 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

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

Full-time equivalent (FTE)	FTE is defined as the equivalent of one position, continuously filled, full-time for the entire fiscal year and which may comprise any combination of part-time and full-time positions. It provides an estimate of the total full-time employment by converting part-time employees to a full-time derived statistic. This general definition of FTE is adjusted, however, for academic year appointments.
Fall-term (FT)	Refers to data compiled as of the fall census, that is, the end of the third week of fall classes.
Fiscal year (FY)	Refers to the time period from July 1 through June 30.
Academic year (AY)	Refers to the time period from August through May.
<p>Other common abbreviations (in alphabetical order):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● CE – Continuing Education</li> <li>● CTL – Center for Teaching and Learning</li> <li>● DAA – Division of Academic Affairs</li> <li>● ERC - External review committee</li> <li>● IR - Institutional Research, a division of the Office of Data Analytics</li> <li>● ODA - Office of Data Analytics</li> <li>● ODECE – Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement</li> <li>● OFA – Office of Faculty Affairs</li> <li>● OIEC - Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance</li> <li>● RIO – Research and Innovation Office</li> <li>● SCH - Student credit hours</li> <li>● TTT - Tenured and tenure-track faculty</li> </ul>	