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Manual for Comprehensive Program Reviews

“We should all be obliged to appear before a board every five years, and justify our existence.”

George Bernard Shaw

Of course, George Bernard Shaw lived to be 96 without ever justifying himself to anyone! Universities, however, have a public responsibility and must be accountable for the use of public funds. Through program reviews, the university examines itself critically, seeking to insure that its students are the beneficiaries of an excellent education. This manual provides general guidelines to units under review and also serves as a resource to members of program review teams.

The Role of Program Reviews

The Program Review is designed to enhance the educational mission and outcomes of the University of Alabama in Huntsville. An appropriately structured program review allows faculty and leadership of an academic unit to conduct critical self-assessment and articulation of future directions. The self-assessment is paired with expert assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of an academic unit by specialists in the field from outside of UAHuntsville, who can evaluate the program’s overall quality including its faculty, academic programs, students, curricula, and resources. Taken together, these internal and external evaluations allow the faculty, Dean, and Provost to assess the “health” of a program, determine future priorities and action items, and define a timeline for implementation necessary to build, maintain, and/or enhance excellence in an academic unit. It is not expected that the unit under review will address issues in the course of the review, but rather will develop plans to do so in a timely fashion following the review.
In addition to the previously described internal motivations, there are external requirements driving the Program Review Process. The University of Alabama System Board of Trustees, the legal entity under which we operate, requires this type of review as an important part of the planning process. UA System Board requirements are provided in Appendix A. The program review process is also critical for addressing several standards required by The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), our primary accrediting body, and the SACS accreditation process. A list of SACS principles that are partially addressed through the Program Review process is provided in Appendix B; Appendix C provides a list of data required for SACS reviews, which may also be useful for Program Reviews.

Overall, the reviews may be regarded as an assessment tool designed to provide a basis for the improvement of quality for UAH's academic programs and to facilitate budgetary planning. Carefully done and properly followed up by unit and administrative action, the reviews strengthen the university as a whole by bolstering the colleges and units. The results of such reviews will be seriously considered and integrated into the university planning and budgeting processes.

**Professional Accreditations and the Program Review Process**

For many years, department and college program reviews have been conducted in association with accreditation requirements by external agencies such as the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business-International, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, the Alabama Board of Nursing, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the National Association of Schools of Music, the National Association for Schools of Art and Design, and the Alabama State Board of Education. Other reviews were conducted to satisfy the reporting requirements of agencies such as the Alabama Commission on Higher Education. Yet such reviews, by their nature, do not necessarily address all of the issues and concerns facing an academic unit; they
validate program quality only from a specific external perspective. Hence the need for comprehensive internal review every 5 to 10 years is justified, whether or not external accreditation exists, to insure the quality of programs being offered.

When appropriate the external review conducted by external agencies may form part of the internal review mentioned earlier. Such reviews provide the opportunity for reflection on how the unit fits within and contributes to the overall university mission, and as the basis for how the program can be improved. They provide a common base for evaluating all programs, using university-wide criteria but recognizing the uniqueness of each program. They provide a tool for the evaluation of program quality, productivity, diversity, and relevance within the university, the state, the region and beyond. The reviews employ the perspective of faculty colleagues from other units within the university and peers from other universities.

THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Academic program reviews are designed to be a fully participatory process with input from faculty, students and staff of the unit under review, as well as from other collaborating programs. These reviews provide a time of internal reflection where units can critically evaluation themselves, and address critical questions about future strategic priorities. Each unit is tasked with completing preparations for its program reviews. The program organizes the preparation of the program review document by defining tasks, establishing work groups, assigning tasks and resources to accomplish them, orienting the faculty involved, setting timelines in conjunction with deadlines associated with the review, and establishing coordination and communication. The program should work with the Office of Institutional Research and the Provost’s Office, its Dean’s office, and other areas of the University, as appropriate, in compiling and analyzing data relevant to the program review document. The components that will guide the review process are defined below.
Selection of Units for Review and Sequence of Activities

The program review process begins when the Provost designates the units (e.g., college, department, interdisciplinary program, non-degree-granting unit) to be reviewed and develops a schedule for reviewing them. For reviews of degree-granting units (e.g., colleges, departments, interdisciplinary program), the Provost will consult with the responsible college Dean(s) regarding the schedule. Because of differences in structure across colleges, the level of program analysis differs. Based on feedback from Deans, colleges will conduct reviews as follows:

College of Business Administration. The CBA will conduct a single program review with separate sections assessing each major, as well as each masters program.

College of Engineering. The COE will conduct program reviews by department, with separate reviews for each undergraduate and graduate programs within each department. The Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering will conduct reviews of the MS, and Ph.D.; Chemical and Materials Engineering will review their programs in the MSE, and the Ph.D. in Material Science; Civil and Environmental Engineering will review the MSE, and Ph.D. in Civil Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering will review the MSE, MS in Software Engineering, Ph.D.’s in Computer Engineering and Electrical Engineering; Industrial and Systems Engineering will conduct reviews of the MSE, MS in Operations Research, Ph.D.’s in Industrial Engineering, Engineering Management, and Mechanical Engineering. The BSE degrees in mechanical, aerospace, chemical, civil, electrical, computer, optical, and industrial and systems engineering programs hosted within the five academic departments will be reviewed separately, but will be done in coordination with COE ABET review

College of Liberal Arts. The COLA will conduct program reviews by department, with reviews for undergraduate and graduate programs combined in their respective departments. The Department of Art and Art History will conduct a review for the BA and BFA; Communication Arts will review the BA; Education will conduct reviews for the BA in Elementary Education, BA in Secondary Education, Special Education, and the Certifications; English will conduct
reviews for the BA and MA in English; Foreign Languages will review the BA in French, German, Russian, and Spanish; History will review the BA and MA; Music will review the BA; Philosophy will review the BA; Political Science will review the BA as well as the MA in Public Affairs; Psychology will conduct reviews for the BA and MA; Sociology will review the BA.  

**College of Nursing.** The CON will conduct separate program reviews for the B.S. in Nursing, Master of Science in Nursing, and Doctor of Nursing Practice.  

**College of Science.** The COS will conduct program reviews by department, with reviews for undergraduate and graduate programs combined in their respective departments. The Department of Atmospheric Science will submit a review for the BS in Earth System Science, as well combined review for the MS and Ph.D.; Biological Sciences will submit a review for the BA, BS, and MS degrees; Chemistry will review its BS and MS; Computer Science will submit a review assessing the BS, MS, and Ph.D. in CS, as well as the degree programs in Modeling and Simulation; Mathematical Sciences will submit a review encompassing the BA, BS, MA, MS, and Ph.D. in Applied Mathematics; Physics will review the BS, MS, and Ph.D.

Appendix D provides a Master Schedule and Timeline for Program Review and Accreditations.

The Provost and the person who will coordinate the review (e.g., an associate Provost, college Dean or graduate Dean) meet with the units to discuss the course of the review process and the outcomes anticipated. The timetable for the review and the responsibilities of each participant are established at this initial meeting. The Provost will stress the need for cooperation and candor in the process. The unit will be assured that the follow-up action recommended will be given serious attention by the central administration.

**Suggested Sequence for Program Reviews:**

1. **Initial Meeting:** Meeting with Dean, associate Dean, institutional research director, and department chairs/program heads to define dates and describe procedures for conducting the self-study.
2. Formation of Internal Program Review Committee:

3. Selection of External Reviewers: Program director/department chair, the College Dean, and the Provost will form a review committee of at least four individuals. (This process is detailed below.)

4. Self-Study: Program prepares self-study. The self-study process should involve all members of the program or department, with the effort chaired by the program director, department chair, or her/his designee. Self-study should include department/program data through the current calendar year. Once completed, the study must be submitted to the Dean.

5. Review of Self Study by Dean and Internal Evaluators: Chair/dept. head will forward the self-study to Dean's office for review. Once satisfied, the Dean will transmit the documents along with his/her own evaluation to the Provost. The Dean will also identify units on campus that collaborate with the unit being reviewed and will forward the review documents to those units. The unit heads will review the documents along with pertinent personnel in their unit and will forward an evaluation to the Provost.

6. Final Self Study Document Completed: Once internal review and revision is complete, the self-study document will be sent to External Reviewers in preparation for visit.

7. Reviewer Visit: Schedule for reviewer visit should be developed by the Provost in consultation with the Dean and Program Director/Department Chair.

8. External Reviewer Report: The external review team will visit campus for at least one day to meet with personnel in the unit being reviewed and will transmit the completed review to report to the Provost who will forward it to the Dean and Department Chair.

9. Self-Study Feedback and Response. It is expected that the Provost will meet with the Dean and Department Chair no later than one month after receiving the final reviewer
report and will discuss recommendations and the steps that will need to be taken as a result of the review.

10. **Post-Review Progress Report:** It is expected that a follow up will be conducted one year later to assess changes made and results achieved.

---

**Self-Study**

Each unit under review is responsible for preparing a self-study as part of its program review process. The chair or director of the unit being reviewed initiates the self-study of the unit following the guidelines published in this manual. Because of unique cultures, goals, and structures, programs are afforded some latitude in how they structure the self-study. However, all program reviews will follow a format that requires the assembling of certain quantitative measures, supplemented by subjective assessments.

As part of the self-evaluation, each academic unit must have a purpose that is consistent with the university mission. Each program or department must formulate educational goals that can be objectively measured. The units must also develop procedures for evaluating the extent to which their educational goals are being achieved. The results of the assessment process must feed back into the planning and budgeting process. The heart of this process is the department or program self-study. Thus, the comprehensive program review must begin with a thorough self-study by the unit. The self-study will include the following seven criteria, which are detailed in Appendix E.

1. Program goals and directions
2. Students
3. Faculty
4. Curriculum and Outcomes
5. Resources and Physical Facilities
6. Overall Summary and Recommendations

Wherever possible, data should be provided for the previous five years, and in cases where a previous review has been conducted, since that review. Considerable data on programs may be obtained from the Office of Institutional Research. It is expected that each unit will also have collected pertinent data on an annual basis and this will be used for the report. Quantitative data should be provided where possible, e.g., on enrollments, graduation rates, faculty salaries, student-teacher ratios, etc.

The last section of the report is perhaps most because it is here that the unit plans for the future, including a vision for the next five to ten-year period and a plan for fulfilling the vision. Here, programs should use data to critically evaluate all aspects of the program and answer questions, such as: Are we serving the right audience? Are we in the right place with curriculum, degrees, and majors? Do we have the right faculty to execute our vision?

It is expected that programs will spend considerable time evaluating and revising the self-study internally. This process will likely include feedback and revision from the program faculty, chairs/head, Dean, and Provost. Once satisfied, the self-study is ready for review by the external review team.

Constitution of the Review Team

The Provost appoints a review team based on input from the Dean and Program Coordinator/Department Chair. The team shall consist of four members with both internal and external reviewers, as appropriate to the unit’s scope and programs. The internal reviewers for degree-granting academic units must be tenured, senior faculty members who have distinguished credentials, and are usually selected from disciplines related to the program under review. For degree-granting academic program reviews, at least one of the two internal reviewers will come from the same college as the unit being reviewed. If a graduate program is included in the
offerings of the unit being reviewed, the graduate Dean recommends an internal reviewer. The unit director and the Provost will select internal reviewers for non-degree academic units.

The external reviewers are generally selected from a list submitted by the academic unit. The list should include the professional qualifications of the individuals being recommended. They are assumed to be academic professionals, in the field being reviewed, from peer or comparable institutions. Prospective reviewers should have administrative experience, evidence of excellence in teaching, and scholarly profile. Professional organizations often maintain lists of qualified reviewers and may be consulted. The Dean of the College will submit the list with recommendations (which could include additional names to the Provost). The Provost’s office will invite the reviewers and handle all logistics including the selection of dates for the visit of the review team to the campus.

If review of graduate programs is involved, the external reviewer should have experience with graduate education unless the reviewer is chosen from a nonacademic setting in order to bring a wider perspective to the review. In some cases, it may be desirable for one external reviewer to be a practicing professional outside of academe. In such cases, the professional must have outstanding qualifications and should have had some experience with a university of the scope of UAH. When contacting external reviewers, the Provost or college Dean, as appropriate, will brief them on the nature of the comprehensive program review process and what the academic program or department will gain from the review.

While most costs of the self-study will be borne by the unit being reviewed, expenses associated with report production and those associated with the review team, such as travel expenses, meals, etc., will be funded by the Office of the Provost. The review coordinator will establish a budget for each review.

**Actions of the Review Team**

The review team reviews carefully the self-study report before the campus visit and prepares a list of questions and concerns to be addressed during the on-campus review. The
review coordinator usually conducts an orientation for the internal members of the review committee prior to the on-campus review, and all members of the review team are expected to participate fully throughout the review process, which normally covers a two-day period.

The Provost and review coordinator meet with the review team at the beginning of the visit. The team will normally have a full schedule of meetings with pertinent individuals and groups during the first day. The second morning will begin with a team meeting and discussion of findings. A final group of appointments and luncheon discussions will end the interactive part of the review. The team will reconvene and draft its major findings preceding an exit interview with the chair/s or program director, college Dean, review coordinator, and Provost. The review team submits a narrative report, containing both an assessment and recommendations. The external reviewer’s final report should address the following:

a. Overall quality of the Program Review document.
b. Evidence of student learning in the program.
c. Evidence of quality in students’ work (such as portfolios or other projects).
d. Demonstrated competency of faculty
e. Report from meetings with the Dean, groups of students, alumni, and faculty (without the program director or department head).
f. Strengths and “best practices” evidenced in the program.
g. Weaknesses/challenges identified in the program.
h. Strategies the program might take to address weaknesses/challenges.

Response to the Review Team Report

Once the external review team has completed work, the review coordinator distributes the report to the Provost and/or Dean and the chair/director. The chair/director provides a written response to the Provost and/or Dean, and the review coordinator and participates in the follow-up process. For degree-granting academic units, the departmental faculty is usually involved at each stage and is always kept informed of progress by the chair (or, in the case of colleges that have no
departments, the Dean). When graduate programs are involved, the Graduate Council is provided a summary of findings and the recommended follow-up actions, which are placed in the Graduate Council minutes. When undergraduate programs are involved, the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is provided a summary of findings and the recommended follow-up actions, which are placed in the Faculty Senate minutes.

Within two months following receipt of appropriate reports and after discussions with the Dean and chairs or unit director, the Provost and Dean/director meet with the unit being reviewed to discuss the recommended actions and the level of administrative support available.

After the college or unit meeting, the college Dean or unit supervisor will prepare and submit an executive summary of the program review report to the Provost. After appropriate changes, the Provost will transmit a final summary to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The executive summary will follow the outline for The University of Alabama System Existing Academic Program Review, which is located in Appendix A.

**Follow-up Actions**

The Provost or college Dean, as appropriate, administers the follow-up planning and implementation, in concert with the chairs/director, and integrates the review findings into the annual planning and budgeting process. The Provost or college Dean, as appropriate, has responsibility for planning and implementation of the follow-up review and report. A program review follow-up summary report is distributed within one month of this meeting and contains:

- An introduction written by the review coordinator
- A list of reviewers' recommendations, together with a list of the responses from the unit, college, and Office of the Provost, indicating plans for implementation
- A page for signatures of the parties responsible for implementation of agreed-upon improvements.

After a period of time specified in the follow-up summary report, a follow-up review is conducted to evaluate progress made in the implementation of agreed upon recommendations.
The review coordinator administers this review; the results are reported to the Office of the Provost, and the Provost and review coordinator meet with the unit to review the status of the program or department.
APPENDIX
Appendix A: University of Alabama System Board of Trustees Manual

504. Review of Existing Academic Programs

I. Policy Statements

The Board of Trustees requires the institutions of The University of Alabama System periodically to review and evaluate all programs of instruction, research, and service.

The review and evaluation results must be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office as an Executive Summary.

II. Guidelines for the Review of Existing Programs

A. Objectives

1. The major value of any program review process derives from the degree of self-evaluation, which a serious review catalyzes and promotes. The purpose of this process is to provide for a formal, systematic review of the many programs being offered under the auspices of the campuses. The intent is not to duplicate or supplant the program reviews conducted by various professional accrediting agencies (such as exist in Business, Education, and others), but rather to provide a means for internal review free from the specific goals and constraints of such external reviews. Every effort will be made, however, to coordinate internal and external reviews in order to avoid duplication of data collection.

2. More specifically, the aim of the review of existing programs is to raise the quality of education in The University of Alabama System through:

a) Acting as a catalyst for self-evaluation and self-improvement by the faculty in specific program areas;

b) Identifying concerns and problems common throughout the university and those unique to specific programs;

c) Identifying strengths and weaknesses in the University’s overall programs, examining alternatives for correcting and eliminating deficiencies, and making recommendations to the appropriate campus and System authorities.
B. Review Procedures

1. The administrative responsibility for the review process on each campus shall be that of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The responsibility for coordinating the review process for the System is assigned to the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs.

2. The review of programs will be guided by three major principles:
   a) Improvement of education can be fostered most effectively by collecting and reviewing essential information about the program under review;
   b) Similar disciplines on a campus should be reviewed at the same time whenever possible; and
   c) All of the university's programs selected for review should be subject to comparable procedures, including a common format for the collection of information, and considered in accordance with the approved purposes of the program and the mission, role, and scope of the campus.

3. It is the responsibility of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs to provide the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs a description of the academic program review process for his/her campus.

4. Upon completion of each program review, an Executive Summary shall be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(Adopted September 17, 1980 as Rule 520; revised November 1, 1996; amended and renumbered December 5, 1997; amended November 14, 2008)
Appendix B: SACS Standards Addressed Through Program Review

Core Requirements:

2.5 The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (Institutional Effectiveness)

2.7.2 The institution offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education. (Program Content)

2.8 The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs.

2.11.2 The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. (Physical Resources)

Comprehensive Standards:

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty. (Responsibility for curriculum)

3.4.11 For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. (Academic program coordination)

3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution.

3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

Federal Requirements:

4.1 The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations; student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals. (Student achievement)

4.2 The institution’s curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded. (Program curriculum)
Appendix C: SACS Data Requirements for Programs

1. Summary of Prior Program Reviews/Administrative History
2. Faculty
   a. FTE faculty
   b. FTE faculty by gender and race
   c. FTE faculty by rank
   d. % of CH taught by FT vs PT faculty
   e. Hire and Separation Data
   f. Year-to-Rank Data
   g. Faculty Workload Measures
   h. Student FTE by level
   i. Ratio of FTE students/ Full-time FTE faculty, Part-time FTE faculty, and GTA
   j. Number of classes per FT FTE faculty, PT FTE faculty and GTA
   k. Teaching performance (SIE scores, course grades, success rates)
   l. Productivity data
      (1) Scholarly research (# journal articles, books, presentations)
      (2) Grant and extramural funding
      (3) Service activities
      (4) Students mentored/supervised
3. Research and External Funding Sources
   a. Faculty activity in soliciting outside research and training funds (i.e., number of proposals and dollar amounts requested)
   b. Annual dollars awarded by source and type
   c. Total prorated sponsored project awards per permanent faculty FTE.
4. Student Data
   a. UG vs Grad majors, headcount, CH
   b. Admissions data
   c. Headcount of majors by gender and ethnicity
   d. Ratio of majors / faculty FTE
   e. Average time to degree
   f. Retention and progression data
   g. Course completion and grades
   h. Quality of students
   i. Student Outcomes (measures of learning, comprehensive examinations, certifications, placement data)
   j. Summary and analysis of information obtained from graduating student surveys
5. Curriculum
   a. Courses Taught by Type of Instructor
   b. Percent of Courses Taught by Ladder Faculty
   c. Course enrollment activity:
      (1) Counts of enrollments arrayed by level (Lower Division, Upper Division, Graduate) and type
      (2) Average enrollment for unit-bearing classes.
   d. Assessment of general education requirements (MAPP)
   e. Unit and Program Outcomes
   f. Changes to programs based on assessment
   g. Degrees and certificates awarded/viability
   h. Curriculum development and approval
   i. Program length and credit hours
## Appendix D: Master Schedule for Program Review and Accreditations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEGREES</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>LAST REVIEW</th>
<th>NEXT REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>B.S.B.A., M.Acc.</td>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S.B.A., M.B.A.</td>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>B.S.E</td>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>B.S.B.A., M.S.I.S</td>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>B.S.B.A.</td>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>B.S.B.A.</td>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil/Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Systems Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.E.</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, General (Masters Programs)</td>
<td>M.S.E.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Systems Engineering</td>
<td>M.S., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>M.S.S.E.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Research</td>
<td>M.S.O.R.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERAL ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>NASAD</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Arts</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ, Secondary</td>
<td>6-12 Certification</td>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ, Special (Collab Tchr)</td>
<td>K-6 , 6-12 Certification</td>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>6-12 Certification</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREIGN LANGUAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>B.A., 6-12 Certification</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>B.A., 6-12 Certification</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>B.A., 6-12 Certification</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>B.A., 6-12 Certification</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS (cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>B.A., 6-12</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification, M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>B.A., P-12</td>
<td>NASM</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>B.A., 6-12</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>B.S.N., M.S.N.</td>
<td>CCNE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>D.N.P.</td>
<td>CCNE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Science</td>
<td>M.S., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>B.A., B.S., 6-12</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification, M.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>B.S., 6-12</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification, M.S.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>CAC/ABET</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>M.S., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth System Science</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>B.A., B.S., 6-12</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification, M.A., M.S.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>B.S., 6-12</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Outline of Potential Components for a Self-Study Report

The program review should be reflective of those years since the last program review was conducted. The program review narrative should be organized according to the following outline and be no longer than 25 single-spaced pages, excluding appendices. Please respond to each question, using tables or bullets when appropriate, keeping in mind that the document’s emphasis should be on analysis and evaluation rather than description.

1. **Introduction and brief history of unit.** Provide sufficient information so that an outsider will understand when the unit was formed and when its various programs and other major activities were initiated. It would also be useful to discuss briefly any critical events that may have occurred in the recent history of the unit.

2. **Mission and goals.** Give the most current unit mission and goals. Describe how these may have changed since the last report. Describe how the unit’s mission and goals relate to the university’s mission and goals. Discuss any plans that the unit may have for future growth or program modifications.

3. **Students.** If applicable, provide tables with official data on student enrollment in the unit's courses, and/or participation in the unit’s activities, and programs for the past five years. As a minimum, units that offer courses should include data that show total credit hour production by term or semester. Also, units that offer courses should show year by year, for the last five years, enrollments and graduation or completion rates in the various programs of the unit. Discuss the quality of the students being enrolled or served and provide data to support your conclusion. What measures does the unit have of the success of the program in meeting the needs of the students? Do the students persist at UAH through graduation? Do the students report satisfaction with their educational experiences and the quality of student life at UAH? Do they receive rewards and/or recognition for special achievements at UAH? Do they get jobs? Do they advance in their profession? Do they engage in graduate study? Where? Discuss the available facts that relate to the quality of students and to program effectiveness. Describe recruitment activities and student advising. Does the unit have an effective advising program?
Does the department attract a diverse student population? What steps are being taken to assure that activities and programs accommodate a diverse student body?

4. Faculty or Professional Staff. Provide a brief overview of faculty or professional staff qualifications, curricular and research expertise, and contributions to the department, the college, the university, and the profession. Note especially faculty or professional staff strengths and weaknesses and relate these to the unit's mission and goals. If significant gains or losses have occurred since the last review, discuss how these have affected the faculty or staff effectiveness. What changes are necessary, if any, in order for the unit's mission and goals to be achieved or sustained? In this section, if applicable, summarize appropriate data for the faculty to give a composite for the faculty. Include a summary on average teaching loads, credit hours generated per FTE (including part-time faculty in this calculation but deducting for research buyouts), number of refereed publications and creative works, and a summary of research activities. Also include a section on part-time faculty. Provide a summary showing how many part-time faculty were used each semester and summer term during the past five years. Include a brief vita for each part-time faculty member that includes as a minimum, where they obtained their degrees, qualifications to teach, information on their professional competence in the field, and a list of courses that they have taught and those courses they are approved to teach but have not yet taught. Is the faculty a diverse or homogeneous group? What steps are being taken to assure that students are being exposed to a faculty with diverse backgrounds and cultures? Append a vita for each faculty member, including a summary of the following information for the last five years:

- courses/sections taught each year with enrollments and course evaluation summaries
- graduate students advised (include student's names and degrees awarded)
- publications in refereed journals
- books published
- other publications or creative works
• presentations at regional, national or international professional meetings
• university service (university and committees, etc.)
• community service
• professional consulting activities
• teaching, research or other professional awards or recognition
• professional memberships
• professional service activities (journal editorial boards, activities in professional organizations, etc.)
• contracts and grants awarded by agency and amount

5. Resources and Physical Facilities. Provide an assessment of the physical facilities and how they affect the academic program. In particular, discuss the available classroom and laboratory space and available equipment.

6. Curriculum and Outcomes. For each degree and certificate program or major program activity administered by the unit, discuss in some depth the following:

• program goals and special features; include program options, etc.
• student recruitment and selection procedures
• program description (courses required, qualifying exams, etc.)
• operational features (e.g., Who makes up the exams? Who appoints the students committees? How do students select advisors? Who markets the program? How do students provide input on customer services and program activities? Etc.)
• provide a self-assessment of the quality of the program keeping in mind that the review team will assess (i) program goals and objectives for instruction, research, public service, quality of student activities, and customer relations, (ii) suitability and quality of the faculty or professional staff, (iii) quality of services for students, (iv) suitability and quality of the curriculum or programming for constituents, (v) admission, instruction, examination procedures, if applicable, (vi) achievements of students and alumni
• summarize with recommendations for the program. Make recommendations that could enhance its effectiveness. In completing this section remember that there are never enough funds to do all things. This is your chance to provide justification for continuing this program. If the unit believes that the resources could be better spent on other programs within the unit such a recommendation would be valuable.

7. **Overall Summary and Recommendations.** Provide a summary of principal conclusions of the self-study and any recommendations for action. Recommendations for action should include suggested roles and responsibilities for implementation of the action, such as the department, the college, or the university.