

# University of Alabama at Birmingham

## Academic Program Review

### Background

The University of Alabama System Board Manual includes requirements for academic program review. It aligns with Board Rule 504, which mandates regular program reviews to ensure high educational standards. These reviews are part of a structured, periodic evaluation process designed to assess and enhance the quality and effectiveness of academic programs.

An Academic Program Review work group was established by the Provost's Office in February 2025, tasked with researching, reviewing, and developing a consistent, standardized academic program review process and template to be shared across the institution. This standardization of processes and documents promotes consistency, ensuring all programs are evaluated using the same criteria and methods. This leads to fair and comparable evaluations, high educational standards, alignment with UAB's strategic goals and mission, and a level of transparency expected of higher education institutions.

The work group researched other quality processes for academic program review, including multiple institutions identified by Hanover Research as exemplars. It also viewed research and best practices offered by the Council of the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges.

The review process typically involves a comprehensive self-study, followed by an external review, culminating in the development of a strategic action plan. This ensures that academic programs continuously improve and align with the university's strategic goals.

As a pivotal part of our efforts to establish and maintain high standards of excellence in all aspects of academic quality and rigor, this document aims to support faculty and administration in conducting thorough evaluations of undergraduate and graduate academic programs at UAB.

Academic program reviews, mandated by the Provost to meet UAS Board Rule 504, serve several key purposes:

Departmental Reflection and Future Planning – These reviews allow faculty to assess their department holistically and consider its future direction.

Internal and External Feedback and Evaluation – Distinguished internal and external colleagues offer insights on departmental strengths, weaknesses, and strategic plans.

Administrative Discussions – The process fosters dialogue between the department head and the dean, focusing on the self-study and the reviewers' report.

Institutional Assessment – The reviews provide the Deans and the Provost with a comprehensive understanding of the department's strengths and areas for improvement.

The primary audience for the Self-Study is the internal and external academic reviewers and the dean. While the Provost and the Graduate School Dean will carefully review both the self-study and the external reviewers' report, most resulting issues, whether positive or negative, will be addressed through discussions between the dean and the department.

### **Timelines**

The provost's office requires that UAB conduct a periodic, comprehensive academic program review (APR) of each academic program every five to seven years. Programs/schools that undergo accreditation by a professional association may not be required to complete this form of Academic Program Review. Still, they may request an exemption from the Academic Program Review. The accredited program/school must be in good standing with the accreditation and must:

1. Submit the full Self-Study reviewed by the accreditor to the Provost Office with a request from the Dean indicating which academic programs are covered by the specialized accreditation.
2. Feedback from the accreditor showing that the academic program(s) are in good standing with the accreditor or responses from the accreditor requesting further review. When further review is required, that document must also be submitted to the Provost's Office.
3. Official letter of accreditation from the accreditor.

### **Primary Goal**

The Academic Program Review aims to assess the overall health and alignment of programs with the institution's goals and their contributions to achieving these goals.

### **Definition and Scope:**

An Academic Program is a structured set of courses and requirements designed to lead to a degree or certificate, including undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs. The APR is conducted at the academic program level and includes all courses the program offers or those in which its faculty provides instruction. Academic department heads should collaborate with the dean to determine the scope of the review.

### **Definition of "Health":**

For the APR, "health" refers broadly to both past performance and future positioning across all aspects of UAB, including:

- Teaching and learning
- Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
- Research (where applicable)
- Human, Physical, and Financial Stability

### **Objectives of the APR:**

- Assess the program's performance across all activities.
- Gather external feedback on past achievements and plans.

- Foster dialogue between the program and college leadership regarding status, future goals, and resource needs.
- Provide actionable insights to enhance the overall health and effectiveness of the academic program.

The review should incorporate both quantitative and qualitative metrics. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analysis, through a Common Data Set, and the Graduate School will provide core quantitative data. Departments should also consult their school or college-level data office, such as the Registrar's Office, for specialized data.

### **Process and Document**

The Provost's Office will coordinate programs/schools to support the process of developing and reviewing the APR.

#### *Initial Activities (August)*

A kickoff meeting typically introduces department representatives to contacts in the IEA and the Provost's Office. Standard inclusion metrics are listed. The narrative integrates and analyzes these metrics central to the APR. Metrics may be embedded in the document's main text or an appendix. Training, support, and assistance are available from the Provost's Office throughout the APR process.

#### *Self-Study Preparation (August-March)*

The academic program prepares the Self-Study, with faculty involvement encouraged. Some academic programs form committees to develop the document. Given the extensive preparation required, the Self-Study should be completed on a timeline that allows for review by faculty, the program head, and the dean.

This document includes an APR Template that should be followed to ensure consistency across academic programs. The Self-Study should use data from IEA to ensure consistency in key definitions and metrics across programs. This should include an analysis of trends over several years. While not all metrics will be relevant to every program, departments may supplement them with additional indicators specific to their needs.

Peer benchmarking should be part of the self-study. The department should recommend peer institutions, which the dean must approve. The department's list of peer institutions should be reviewed regularly, as these institutions may change over time. It is acknowledged that a discipline's peers might differ from the university's peers. In recognition that UAB's programs vary in mission and emphasis, the program may customize the report by augmenting the topics presented.

The final, vetted, and approved version of the APR Self-Study should be submitted to the Provost's Office within the timeframe stated in the kick-off meeting. (March)

The Dean may request an external review and should provide a rationale, potential reviewers, and credentials.

### *Post-Review Process (March-August)*

The academic program submits a response to the dean, who then responds to the program. The provost receives a comprehensive report, including the Self-Study, external review, and responses. The dean and the Provost discuss the next steps, followed by a discussion between the dean and the department head.

If issues or opportunities arise, the program submits a follow-up response. As needed, the Provost, dean, and department head develop an action plan with a timeline set by the Provost and dean.

If no significant concerns are identified, the following review cycle must discuss how past recommendations were addressed.

### **Periodic Review of the APR Process**

The Academic Program Review (APR) process should be periodically evaluated to ensure effectiveness while remaining stable for at least 10 years. Regular assessments will help refine processes and update metrics to reflect changes in disciplines, institutions, and higher education. The Office of the Provost oversees these reviews, with input from department heads and deans.

Key considerations:

1. The role of peer benchmarking in the Self-Study should be determined in coordination with the dean.
2. The Provost's Office will maintain a university-wide calendar for external reviews.
3. College strategic plans may provide additional context for program evaluations.

## **Appendix A**

### **Timeline**

#### **August 25**

Kick-off Meetings with Programs

#### **September**

Ongoing support and APR work

#### **October 15**

Ongoing support and APR work

Academic Program Annual Academic Assessment Reports Due

#### **November – March**

Ongoing APR work and Support

#### **March**

Completed APR submitted for Review

#### **May**

Internal feedback is due to the Academic Program, which evaluates and shares it with the Dean.

#### **June/July**

If no external review is requested, the Dean and the Provost's Office meet to discuss.

If an external review is requested, planning for the external review begins.

#### **August**

Dean and Academic Program Leadership discuss and respond to external feedback.

Dean shares external feedback with the Provost's Office.

#### **January**

Follow-up Report on Action Plans submitted to the Provost's Office

## **Appendix B**

### **APR Template and Metrics**

#### **Academic Program Review Template and Benchmarks**

Program Name:

Degree Level: (e.g., BA, MS)

Review Period: (e.g., 2020–2025)

Date Submitted:

Review Team: (List members)

The following sections outline the key components of the Self-Study. Each set of metrics is designed to help gather, analyze, and reflect on actionable data that supports decision-making and promotes continuous quality improvement. This format offers the program an opportunity to assess its progress and development from multiple perspectives. Engaging in discussions among program constituents will be essential to fostering meaningful reflection and ensuring a comprehensive evaluation process.

The benchmarks and targets provided will guide the reviewer's evaluation and recommendations for each section. Each metric should be addressed within the reflective narrative of this part of the self-study.

#### **SECTION 1: PROGRAM OVERVIEW, MISSION, AND STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT**

**Questions to Consider:** These questions are designed to prompt thoughtful reflection on each component and help identify areas of strength, as well as opportunities for improvement.

- What evidence can be provided to show the program's alignment with the university's mission?
- Are there any program goals that seem disconnected or only loosely aligned with the university's mission? If so, why?
- How can the program enhance its connection to the university's mission in areas that might be underrepresented?
- Are there any strategic plan objectives the program is not addressing, and why is that the case?
- How can the program expand its support for additional strategic plan objectives moving forward?

**Consider and identify the following:**

- Strengths
- Areas for Improvement

- Needs
- Recommendations

## **SECTION 2: CURRICULUM AND LEARNING OUTCOMES**

This section focuses on evaluating the program's curriculum and the effectiveness of its student learning outcomes (SLOs). The data and reflections gathered here will guide the reviewer's analysis and recommendations for potential improvements. It is important to ensure that all metrics are thoroughly addressed in the reflective narrative, as this section plays a critical role in assessing how well the curriculum aligns with program goals and how effectively learning outcomes are being achieved.

The benchmarks and targets provided will guide the reviewer's evaluation and recommendations for this section. Each metric should be addressed within the reflective narrative of this part of the self-study.

Review the curriculum to determine if each course has specific SLOs tied to it. Ensure that all courses, whether core, elective, or required, have measurable learning outcomes that align with the program's goals. Calculate the percentage of courses with mapped SLOs and provide an explanation if any courses do not meet this target.

**Questions to Consider: These questions are designed to prompt thoughtful reflection on each component and help identify areas of strength, as well as opportunities for improvement, within the curriculum and learning outcomes.**

- What processes are in place to ensure that SLOs are updated or revised as the curriculum evolves?
- How do faculty ensure that SLOs are consistently taught and assessed across all courses in the program?
- Is the curriculum updated regularly, and does it reflect current trends, standards, and best practices in the field?
- How does the program ensure that curriculum updates are comprehensive and not just limited to isolated areas?
- How do program stakeholders (e.g., faculty, industry experts, alumni) contribute to the curriculum revision process?
- How do recent curriculum updates reflect emerging trends, technological advancements, or changes in professional standards?
- Are there any gaps in the curriculum that need to be addressed during future updates?
- Are the program's curriculum and student learning outcomes compared to top programs in the field to ensure competitiveness and relevance?

**Consider and identify the following:**

- Strengths

- Areas for Improvement
- Needs
- Recommendations

### **SECTION 3: FACULTY AND RESOURCES**

This section focuses on evaluating the program's faculty and the resources available to them, with the goal of ensuring the program has the necessary support to meet its objectives and provide high-quality education to students. You will assess faculty qualifications, student-to-faculty ratios, budget allocations, and faculty satisfaction with resources. The data and reflections collected in this section will help identify whether there are adequate resources and faculty support and will guide recommendations for enhancing the program's overall effectiveness.

**Questions to Consider: These questions are designed to prompt thoughtful reflection on each component and help identify areas of strength, as well as opportunities for improvement.**

- Are there areas where faculty members' qualifications fall short of the desired level? If so, what is being done to address this gap?
- How do faculty with terminal degrees contribute to the academic rigor and reputation of the program?
- What steps are being taken to ensure that faculty maintain or enhance their qualifications through professional development?
- Is the current ratio adequate for fostering a supportive learning environment and ensuring program objectives are met?
- How does the program plan to adjust faculty resources if the student-to-faculty ratio becomes unbalanced?
- Does the current budget allocation adequately support the program's growth, faculty development, and student needs?
- How does the program ensure that budgetary decisions align with its strategic goals and enhance the overall educational experience for students?
- Are there resource constraints that impact the program's ability to offer competitive opportunities to students or faculty?
- How are faculty needs and concerns about resources identified, and how are these issues addressed?
- Are faculty provided with the necessary tools, support, and resources to effectively teach and conduct research?
- What steps are being taken to improve faculty satisfaction with resources, and how does the program evaluate the success of these efforts?

**Consider and identify the following:**

- Strengths



- Areas for Improvement
- Needs
- Recommendations

#### **SECTION 4: STUDENT ENROLLMENT, RETENTION AND SUCCESS**

This section is focused on evaluating the program's enrollment trends, student retention rates, and overall student success. You will assess how well the program attracts and retains students, as well as how successfully students progress through the program to graduation. This data will provide insight into the program's ability to meet the needs of its student population and its effectiveness in promoting academic achievement. Additionally, the section will help identify any barriers that may hinder student success and retention, and provide recommendations for improvements.

**Questions to Consider: These questions are designed to prompt thoughtful reflection on each component and help identify areas of strength, as well as opportunities for improvement.**

- Are enrollment trends increasing, decreasing, or remaining stable? What factors may be influencing these trends (e.g., changes in the field, external factors, marketing efforts)?
- How does the program's enrollment compare to similar programs in the field or at peer institutions?
- What efforts are being made to attract students to the program, and how successful have these efforts been?
- How does the program's retention rate compare to national or institutional averages for similar programs?
- Are there specific stages or points in the program where students are most likely to leave (e.g., after the first year, after a certain course)?
- What strategies are in place to support students and increase retention, such as advising, mentoring, or academic support services?
- What challenges are students facing that may contribute to lower retention rates, and how are these being addressed?
- How do the program's students perform academically (e.g., grade point average, honors, awards)? Are there trends in student success over time?
- What support systems are in place to help students succeed academically (e.g., tutoring, study groups, faculty office hours)?
- How do students' progress through the program (e.g., are there high rates of course completions, successful transitions between stages of the program)?
- What types of academic, career, and personal support services are available to students, and how frequently do students utilize these services?
- How well do the program's advising and mentoring structures support student success and retention?
- Are there any gaps in student support that could be addressed to improve retention and success?

- Have there been any significant changes in the program (e.g., curriculum revisions, changes in admissions policies, faculty changes) that have had an impact on enrollment, retention, or student success?
- How have recent changes or innovations in the program affected student satisfaction and outcomes?
- Have any new strategies been implemented to improve retention or academic success? If so, what impact have these strategies had?

**Consider and identify the following**

- Strengths
- Areas for Improvement
- Needs
- Recommendations

**SECTION 5: ASSESSMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

In this section, you will evaluate the effectiveness of the program's assessment processes and continuous improvement efforts. This includes reflecting on how well Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are measured, how assessment data is used to drive improvements, and the overall strength of the assessment process. You will assess whether the program is actively engaging in continuous improvement by analyzing how assessment results inform changes or refinements to the curriculum, teaching methods, or other areas of the program.

**Questions to Consider: These questions are designed to prompt thoughtful reflection on each component and help identify areas of strength, as well as opportunities for improvement.**

- Does the program collect measurable data for each of the SLOs, and is the data comprehensive enough to provide insights into student performance?
- Are there any SLOs for which measurable data is currently unavailable? If so, what is being done to address this gap?
- How is the data used to gauge whether students are achieving the desired outcomes and how well they are progressing toward mastering key skills or knowledge areas?
- How many improvement actions have been implemented in the past year as a result of assessment findings?
- Are improvement actions being implemented based on data-driven insights from assessments, and how are these actions tracked and evaluated for effectiveness?
- What types of improvements have been made (e.g., changes in curriculum, instructional methods, student support services)?
- What evidence is there that the implemented improvement actions have had a positive impact on student learning, program quality, or other program outcomes?

- Are the results of assessments shared with key stakeholders (e.g., faculty, administrators, students), and is there a feedback loop that leads to meaningful improvements?
- How does the program ensure that the assessment process is transparent, inclusive, and aligned with the program's mission and goals?
- What steps are taken if the assessment process is found to be weak or developing, and how are improvements made?

**Consider and identify the following**

- Strengths
- Areas for Improvement
- Needs
- Recommendations

**SECTION 6: STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK**

This section focuses on gathering and reflecting on the feedback from key stakeholders of the program, including students, alumni, employers, and other relevant groups. Stakeholder feedback is critical for evaluating the program's effectiveness and understanding its impact on students, graduates, and the broader community. You will need to assess both quantitative ratings (e.g., satisfaction scores) and qualitative feedback (e.g., open-ended responses) to identify key themes and actionable insights. The goal is to determine how well the program is meeting the needs and expectations of its stakeholders and to identify areas for improvement.

**Questions to Consider: These questions are designed to prompt thoughtful reflection on each component and help identify areas of strength, as well as opportunities for improvement.**

- What specific aspects of the program (e.g., curriculum, faculty, resources, support services) do students report as strengths? Are these strengths aligned with the program's mission and goals?
- What areas do students report as needing improvement? Are there consistent themes in their feedback regarding challenges or areas of dissatisfaction?
- How does the program address student concerns, and what actions have been taken to improve student satisfaction in response to feedback?
- What feedback do alumni provide regarding the relevance of the curriculum, faculty support, and their overall educational experience?
- Are there any gaps identified by alumni in the program's ability to meet current industry demands or student needs?
- How do employers perceive the preparedness of program graduates in terms of skills, knowledge, and work readiness?
- Are employers satisfied with the graduates' ability to meet industry expectations? What specific competencies or skills do employers feel are most valuable?

- Do employers suggest areas where the program could better align with industry needs, or are there skills that graduates lack according to employer feedback?
- What recurring themes emerge from the open-ended feedback collected from students, alumni, and employers?
- Are there actionable insights or specific suggestions for improvement based on stakeholder comments?

**Consider and identify the following**

- Strengths
- Areas for Improvement
- Needs
- Recommendations

**SECTION 7: PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY**

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the long-term viability and sustainability of the academic program. This includes assessing the program's financial health, resource allocation, alignment with institutional priorities, and its capacity to adapt and grow in response to changing demands. A sustainable program ensures that it can continue to deliver high-quality education and maintain its effectiveness over time, even as external conditions, resources, and student needs evolve. By assessing sustainability, the program can identify potential challenges or areas that may require attention to ensure its continued success.

**Questions to Consider: These questions are designed to prompt thoughtful reflection on each component and help identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.**

- Are there any concerns regarding the program's budget, such as inconsistent funding, cuts, or reliance on external sources?
- What efforts are being made to secure additional funding (e.g., grants, partnerships, donations) to support the program's growth and stability?
- Are the program's resources (e.g., faculty, facilities, technology, student support services) sufficient to meet current and future demands?
- How effectively are resources allocated to support the program's goals, and are there any areas where resource allocation could be improved?
- Does the program have the necessary infrastructure to support student learning and faculty development (e.g., classroom space, labs, online tools)?
- Are there any resource gaps that could hinder the program's ability to meet its objectives or sustain its operations in the future?
- Is the program an integral part of the university's overall academic offerings and future direction?

- How does the program support institutional priorities, such as diversity and inclusion, research excellence, community engagement, or sustainability?
- What mechanisms are in place to regularly assess and respond to changes in the academic or professional landscape (e.g., evolving industry needs, emerging fields of study)?
- What impact does the program have on its students, the community, and the industry it serves? How is this impact measured and communicated?
- How well does the program engage with external partners (e.g., alumni, employers, community organizations, industry professionals) to ensure its relevance and effectiveness?
- Does the program have a strong reputation among prospective students, employers, and other stakeholders, and how is this reputation sustained?

**Consider and identify the following**

- Strengths
- Areas for Improvement
- Needs
- Recommendations

## Summary of Findings

The Summary of Findings section is an essential part of the academic program review, providing a high-level synthesis of the program's performance across the seven core components. This section should highlight key strengths, areas for improvement, and actionable insights drawn from the data review and stakeholder feedback. The summary will provide a comprehensive overview of the program's effectiveness, sustainability, and alignment with institutional goals, helping inform decisions about future program development and improvements.

### Instructions:

In this section, you will synthesize the findings from each of the seven core components of the academic program. These components include:

1. Program Overview and Mission Alignment
2. Curriculum and Learning Outcomes
3. Faculty and Resources
4. Student Enrollment, Retention, and Success
5. Assessment and Continuous Improvement
6. Stakeholder Feedback
7. Program Sustainability

For each of these components, provide a concise summary of the following:

**Key Strengths:** Identify areas where the program is excelling or performing above expectations.

**Areas for Improvement:** Highlight areas where there are challenges or where improvements are needed.

**Actionable Insights:** Based on the findings, suggest clear actions that could improve the program or address identified weaknesses.

**Alignment with Institutional Goals:** Assess how well the program aligns with broader institutional priorities, mission, and strategic goals.

**Action Plan:** An action plan is a strategic document that outlines specific actions, timelines, responsible parties, and resources needed to address the findings and recommendations from the academic program review. Based on the Summary of Findings, the action plan should provide a clear roadmap for the program's continuous improvement, focusing on enhancing strengths and addressing areas for improvement. The program will be asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the Action Plan within one academic year.

**University of Alabama at Birmingham  
Academic Program Review Rubric**

<b>Degree Program Information</b>	
Degree Program Level	
Name of Degree	
CIP	
Departmental home(s)	
School or College	
Review Period	

<b>Type of Review</b>	
Internal or External	
Programmatic or part of a Departmental review	
Date submitted	

<b>Review Team</b>	

## Program Overview

1. Criteria		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1.1	The departmental mission is clearly articulated.					
1.2	The program directly aligns with the institution's mission.					
1.3	The program's curriculum, activities, and initiatives are supporting and advancing the university's strategic priorities.					
1.4	The program and department contribute meaningfully to Blazer Core (UG level).					
1.5	The program's goals support a quality curriculum and student growth.					
1.6	The program demonstrates outcomes and achievements that contribute to the university's strategic goals and enhance its reputation.					
1.7	The program demonstrates vitality through its efforts for visibility.					

## Curriculum

2. Criteria		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
2.1	The curriculum content and organization are reviewed regularly, and results are used for curricular improvement.					
2.2	The program has developed a process to ensure courses are offered regularly and that students can make timely progress towards their degree.					
2.3	The program incorporates appropriate pedagogical innovations that enhance student learning into the curriculum.					
2.4	The program cultivates a culture of learning and innovation, as exemplified through the incorporation of appropriate technological innovations that enhance student learning.					
2.5	The curricular content of the program reflects current standards, practices, and issues in the discipline.					
2.6	The curriculum fosters analytical and critical thinking, communication skills and problem-solving skills.					
2.7	The curriculum reflects a progressive challenge to students. It uses scaffolding to develop the depth and rigor required for careers or advanced study.					



<b>2.8</b>	The curriculum exposes students to discipline-specific research strategies or experiential learning.					
------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

### Assessment and Continuous Improvement

<b>3. Criteria</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>3.1</b>	The program demonstrates a strong commitment to continuous academic quality improvement.					
<b>3.2</b>	Program and student learning outcomes are clearly identified and measurable.					
<b>3.3</b>	The program uses appropriate evidence to assess achievement of program and student learning outcomes.					
<b>3.4</b>	The program's action plans are clear and detailed. They make use of information from its program assessment for continuous improvement.					
<b>3.5</b>	The program has clearly defined Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that are directly aligned with the program's mission, goals, and the university's educational objectives.					
<b>3.6</b>	Course-level outcomes and activities map effectively to program-level SLOs, ensuring coherence and consistency.					
<b>3.7</b>	The program has a structured and ongoing process for assessing its SLOs, utilizing appropriate, reliable, and varied methods and tools.					
<b>3.8</b>	The program's assessment cycle is documented, transparent, and includes timelines for data collection, analysis, and reporting, facilitating a culture of continuous improvement.					
<b>3.9</b>	The program analyzes SLO assessment data and uses the findings to make informed, evidence-based improvements to the curriculum, teaching methods, student support services, or other program elements.					
<b>3.10</b>	The program provides clear examples of changes or enhancements (e.g., curriculum redesign, new teaching strategies, targeted student support) that directly result from assessment data.					
<b>3.11</b>	The program regularly evaluates and enhances the quality, reliability, and effectiveness of its assessment methods and tools.					

## Student Success

4. Criteria		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
4.1	The program demonstrates stable or growing enrollment over the last three years.					
4.2	The program demonstrates a culture of reflection regarding its enrollment / graduation trends and their implications.					
4.3	Evidence exists of targeted strategies (e.g., marketing campaigns, partnerships, programmatic or departmental efforts) that attract qualified student populations.					
4.4	The program systematically tracks student retention from year to year, highlighting strengths and areas needing improvement.					
4.5	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality.					
4.6	A high percentage of graduates secure employment or enroll in further education (not applicable to doctoral programs).					
4.7	Career preparation and post-graduation student success are discussed and analyzed by the program.					
4.8	The program demonstrates proactive interventions (e.g., use of early-alert systems, structured academic support) to help students remain on track.					
4.9	Student success and wellbeing is supported in an effort to enhance the undergraduate educational journey.					
4.10	The program is committed to the enhancement of its students' learning experience.					
4.11	The program or department incorporates student feedback from IDEA and surveys of instruction to improve and therefore demonstrate its commitment to the enhancement of its teaching effectiveness as a unit.					
4.12	The program offers students opportunities for extracurricular participation and supports a culture of student holistic growth.					
4.13	Student progress towards graduation as well as their growth and development are supported through quality advising.					

<b>4.14</b>	The program measures student satisfaction regularly through surveys or feedback mechanisms to assess perceptions of the program's quality, including teaching, resources, and overall experience.					
<b>4.15</b>	The program is consistent and thoughtful in aligning activities and experiences for face-to-face and online students.					

## Faculty and Resources

5. Criteria		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
5.1	The program maintains a high percentage of faculty members who hold terminal degrees in their field.					
5.2	The program uses an appropriate faculty evaluation process to cultivate and improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.					
5.3	Faculty are encouraged to engage in ongoing professional development (e.g., workshops, sabbaticals, grant opportunities) to enhance their pedagogical, research, and leadership skills.					
5.4	Faculty members demonstrate ongoing professional engagement (e.g., publications, conference presentations, relevant industry experience) relevant to their academic rank that contributes to a robust academic environment.					
5.5	Faculty use the Center for Teaching and Learning and remain engaged in their pedagogical journey.					
5.6	The program maintains a student-faculty ratio that supports effective teaching, mentoring, and academic oversight.					
5.7	Faculty success and wellbeing are supported in an effort to enhance the faculty professional journey.					
5.8	Faculty are encouraged to engage in community engagement activities.					
5.9	Regular surveys (or other feedback mechanisms) indicate faculty satisfaction levels with facilities, technology, administrative support, research funding, and professional development opportunities.					

## Stakeholder Feedback

6. Criteria		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
6.1	The program measures current students' satisfaction with key aspects of the program, such as teaching quality, curriculum relevance, academic support, wellbeing support, resources.					
6.2	The program evaluates alumni satisfaction with how well the program prepared them for their careers or further education, including metrics like employment rates, career advancement, and the relevance of skills gained.					
6.3	The program assesses employers' perceptions of graduates' readiness for the workforce, focusing on their skills, knowledge, professionalism, and ability to meet industry demands.					
6.4	The program systematically uses feedback from students, alumni, and employers to improve areas like curriculum, teaching methods, or student support.					

## Program Support and Sustainability

7. Criteria		N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
7.1	The program needs are consistently supported, financial support is appropriate.					
7.2	The program is committed to securing a variety of funding sources, such as grants, donations, or partnerships, that enhance financial resilience.					
7.3	The program is financially efficient in terms of the cost per student credit hour without sacrificing education quality (student success).					
7.4	The program is sustainable based on current enrollment numbers, potential and projections of future demand based on industry or academic trends.					
7.5	The program shows responsiveness to market trends.					
7.6	The program demonstrates interest in staying nimble and competitive compared to similar programs at other institutions in areas like quality, cost, unique features, or graduate outcomes that differentiate the program and make it attractive in a competitive market.					

<b>7.7</b>	The program has the capacity to evolve by incorporating new teaching methods, technologies, or curriculum updates in response to changing educational needs, industry standards, or student expectations.					
<b>7.8</b>	The program displays quality and rigor and displays commitment to excellence.					