

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY™

POLICY ON PERIODIC UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

Approved by Undergraduate Council 3/31/2008; by Academic Council 5/6/2008

Approved by Provost 6/17/08; Updated August 2025

Introduction

Periodic academic program reviews of all programs are an expectation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). Each organization provides the institution with important information about the status of academic programs and their needs.

The main objective of periodic program reviews is to provide a mechanism for improving the quality of undergraduate degree programs at Texas Woman's University. Periodic program reviews give faculty and academic leaders important information about the effectiveness of a program including its strengths, weaknesses, and contribution to the mission of the university. In addition, information about the efficiency of programs is provided. Results of program reviews are used to give direction, set goals for the future, and ensure that general academic plans and budget decisions are based on information and priorities which match closely those of the university. Information gathered in these reviews will be incorporated in the next SACSCOC accreditation self-study. TWU will begin this process in the academic year with a five-year review cycle. The schedule for review is listed in Appendix A.

Accredited programs may use their accreditation self-studies and reports to replace the TWU review process described here (if they include assessment of student learning outcomes). A copy of the narrative of the self-study should be sent to the Office of Institutional Research and Improvement with copy of the accreditation review, recommendations and actions reports (electronic copies are preferred).

The Office of Undergraduate Studies maintains general oversight of the undergraduate academic program review process while review of all academic programs is a responsibility of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

General Procedures

Notification of Department Review

The Office of Undergraduate Studies (UGS) will notify the head of the academic unit and the academic dean of the college that a review has been scheduled at least six months prior to the review deadline. The process begins in the fall term of the academic year in which the program review is due, during which all programs under review will meet with UGS to review the process and established timeline. A timeline for the internal review only is shown in Appendix B. Consistent with the guidelines for selecting members of the review committee (p. 2), the chair will be asked to begin making a list of names of faculty members who can serve as internal review committee members for the departmental review. UGS, in consultation with the chair and academic dean, will request committee member service.

Gathering Preliminary Information

The academic department will gather internal information with assistance from the Office of Undergraduate Studies, the Office of Institutional Research and Improvement, the Office of Academic Assessment, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Finance and Administration, Institutional Development, and the office of the dean of the academic unit to be reviewed. **Each academic unit head will begin to gather evidence of effectiveness during the fall of the academic year during which the academic unit is to be reviewed.** Refer to the list of data to be gathered in Appendix D. Central coordination of institutional level data is planned so that all units to be reviewed in the next academic year will have data gathered centrally at the same time, in the same manner, and from the same sources. Departments will need to gather department-level data which is not available from central databases. A department may also gather information from peer institutions as a part of their review.

Preparation of Self-study

The self-study document should follow the format shown in Appendix D. The chair and/or program director of the academic unit being reviewed is ultimately responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the self-study. The chair may designate another faculty member or a team of faculty members to carry out the self-study, but should be continually and actively involved in overseeing the preparation of the self-study. All full-time faculty members should be involved in the preparation of the self-study. The participation of enrolled students, alumni, and professional staff is highly encouraged. The self-study should be evaluative rather than simply descriptive. It should be more than just a collection of data, but rather an **analysis of data and an academic judgment about the effectiveness of the program, students' curriculum, resources, and future directions of the academic unit.** The self-study should be one that assesses the academic unit's effectiveness in reaching goals, strengths, areas needing work, and actions needed both immediately and long-term.

Selection of Review Committee Members

During the fall term, **UGS will request a list of five to ten institutional faculty members to serve as review committee members** from the dean or program director of the academic program under review. UGS will then contact the recommended individuals to construct a **three-member internal review committee** in consultation with the academic chair and dean of the academic unit being reviewed. Committee members must be full-time faculty members. Internal review committee members cannot be from the department to be reviewed, and **no more than two can be from another department in the same college/school. The other committee member should be from departments outside the college/school.** UGS will remain in primary contact with the selected review committee members for the duration of the review period on behalf of the academic program under review.

Submission of Self-Study

One electronic copy in a single file document should be submitted to the Office of Undergraduate Studies no later than the identified due date during the academic year in which the academic unit is being reviewed. Formatting guidelines should be followed as identified in the Self-Study Elements document in Appendix D. UGS will review the self-study document for content, completeness, and accuracy, and, if necessary, request that revisions be made by the department. UGS will then forward copies of the review documents to members of the selected internal review committee, the Office of Institutional Research and Improvement, and the Office of the Provost.

The Review Process

UGS will meet with the review committee members at the beginning of the spring term of the academic year during which the academic unit is being reviewed. At this meeting, a committee chair will be elected from the three-member review committee, and instructions and advice on the review process will be given. Once the self-study document is submitted to the review committee, they will have **thirty (30) days to submit their executive summary report** to the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Guidelines for the reviewers are detailed in Appendix C. When resources permit, external

reviews are recommended to complete a review of the self-study.

Assessment of Self-Study

The Office of Undergraduate Studies will schedule a meeting towards the end of the spring term to review the self-study and executive summary report. Attendants of this meeting will consist of the chair of the academic unit, the dean of the college of the academic unit, the chair of the review committee, representatives of the Academic Program Review coordination process, and any other faculty selected by the department chair. A summary of the review will be presented by the chair of the review committee. At this meeting, the chair will be given the opportunity to respond to the report of the review committee and to add any relevant information. After a brief statement by the dean of the college, a discussion will follow. The time allotted for the meeting will be approximately 45-60 minutes.

Action of the Dean

After consultation with the Provost, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the program director or chair, **the supervising dean will submit an Improvement Action Plan report of no more than two pages outlining the follow-up steps to be taken based on the outcome of the review.** This statement should be issued within fifteen days after this meeting or by the identified deadline on the timeline. Copies of follow-up report will be distributed to the department, college, Office of Undergraduate Studies, Office of Institutional Research and Improvement, and to the Provost.

Distribution of Materials

Materials collected throughout the duration of the review process, which include the self-study document, executive summary report, and the follow-up report, will be distributed to various institutional representatives as needed. Receiving bodies may include Undergraduate Council, Academic Council, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents. All materials will be housed in the Office of Undergraduate Studies via digital copy.

Follow Up and Next Steps

Following the initial review process, it is the **responsibility of the supervising dean to follow up with the academic department in implementing next steps** that will aid in the continuous improvement of the academic program. The Provost may request progress reports as needed until the next review cycle commences.

Appendix A: Schedule for Review of Undergraduate Programs

NOTE: Self-studies completed by programs for accreditation by external accrediting agencies will be used for undergraduate program reviews if they include assessment of student learning outcomes.

Academic Year	Department
2021-2022 Years under review: 2016-2021	College of Arts & Sciences Psychology & Philosophy B.S. Psychology General Studies B.G.S. General Studies History & Political Science B.A./B.S. Government B.A./B.S. History Mathematics & Computer Science B.S. Informatics B.S. Health Informatics Visual Arts B.A. Art B.F.A. Art
2022-2023 Years under review: 2017-2022	College of Health Sciences B.A.A.S. in Health Sciences
2023-2024 Years under review: 2018-2023	Communication Sciences & Oral Health B.S. Communication Sciences Fashion & Textiles B.S. Fashion Merchandising B.A. Fashion Design Human Development, Family Studies, Counseling B.S. Child Development B.S. Family Studies Nutrition & Food Sciences B.A.S. in Culinary Science & Food Service Mgmt. B.S. Food & Nutrition in Business and Industry B.S. Nutrition
2024-2025 Years under review: 2019-2024	Professional Studies B.A.A.S Professional Studies Sociology & Criminal Justice B.S. Sociology B.S. Criminal Justice Teacher Education B.S. Education

Academic Year	Department
2025-2026 Years under review: 2020-2025	Biology B.S. Biology B.S. Medical Technology Chemistry B.S. Chemistry B.S. Biochemistry English B.A. English Health Studies B.A.S/B.S. Health Studies Kinesiology B.S. Kinesiology Math & Computer Science B.A./B.S. Mathematics B.S. Computer Science Theater B.A. Theater
2026-2027 Years under review: 2021-2026	General Studies B.G.S. General Studies History & Political Science B.A./B.S. Political Science B.A./B.S. History Math & Computer Science B.S. Informatics B.S. Health Informatics Psychology B.S. Psychology Visual Arts B.A. Art B.F.A. Art
2027-2028 Years under review: 2022-2027	Health Promotion & Kinesiology B.A.A.S Health Sciences Gender Studies B.A. Multicultural Women & Gender Studies
2028-2029 Years under review: 2023-2028	Nutrition & Food Sciences B.A.S. in Culinary Science & Food Service Mgmt. B.S. Food & Nutrition in Business and Industry B.S. Nutrition Human Development, Family Studies, Counseling B.S. Child Development B.S. Family Studies Fashion & Textiles B.S. Fashion Merchandising B.A. Fashion Design Communication Sciences & Oral Health B.S. Communication Science

Appendix B: Timeline for Reviews
(Subject to change)

Date/ Deadline	Tasks
September	<p>Notification to Academic Units of Academic Program Review</p> <p>At the beginning of the fall term of the academic year during which the academic program review is due, the Office of Undergraduate Studies (UGS) will send written notification to the academic unit head and respective academic dean identifying undergraduate academic programs under review for the academic year.</p>
October	<p>Program Review Orientation Meeting with the Academic Unit Heads</p> <p>UGS will conduct a single session orientation meeting with all academic unit heads who will be conducting degree program reviews for the upcoming academic year. Representatives from the Office of Institutional Research and Improvement, Office of Academic Assessment, and Office of Research and Sponsored Programs will be invited to present.</p>
October-December	<p>Program-Related Data Distributed to the Academic Unit</p> <p>Representatives from the Office of Institutional Research and Improvement, Office of Academic Assessment, and Office of Research and Sponsored Programs will distribute academic unit/program-related data to be used in the self-study to the academic unit head.</p>
Mid-November	<p>Submission of Recommended Review Committee Members for the Academic Unit</p> <p>Academic unit head forwards list of 5-10 potential individuals to the Office of Undergraduate Studies to serve on the Review Committee adhering to UG Periodic Program Review Policy.</p>
Mid-December	<p>Establish Review Committee Teams</p> <p>The Office of Undergraduate Studies will work to establish the three-person review committees for each academic program under review during the academic year.</p>
Early March	<p>Submission of Academic Degree Program Self-Studies</p> <p>Academic unit head/academic dean submits all designated undergraduate degree program self-studies to the Office of Undergraduate Studies(1 electronic file).</p>
Mid-March through Mid-April	<p>Academic Unit UG Program Review by Review Committee</p> <p>Review Committee evaluates all assigned degree program self-studies and writes a final Executive Summary report of committee findings and recommendations.</p>
Mid-April	<p>Submission of Review Committee Executive Summary</p> <p>The Review Committee Chair submits an electronic copy of the Executive Summary of committee findings and recommendations to the Office of Undergraduate Studies.</p>
Late April- Early May	<p>Follow-Up Meeting for Assessment of Academic Unit Program Review</p> <p>Review Committee Chair shares committee findings and recommendations of the designated degree program self-studies to the academic unit head, respective academic dean, and representatives from UGS, Office of Institutional Research and Improvement, Office of Academic Assessment, and Office of Research and Sponsored Programs</p>
Early June	<p>Submission of Improvement Action Plan</p> <p>Academic dean submits the Improvement Action Plan (written in collaboration with the academic unit head) to UGS.</p>
July	<p>Distribution of Program Review Documents</p> <p>Undergraduate Studies will submit copies of the Executive Summary, Review Committee Report, and Improvement Action Plan to the Office of the Provost</p>

Appendix C: The Task of the Review Committee

The review committee is encouraged to focus attention on questions regarding the relationship of programs to the goals of the university. It is the task of the reviewers to single out those features of the program that merit special commendation, and to make recommendations where there is room for improvement.

Reviewers should formulate their evaluations not only from the self-study document, but also from interviews with the unit chairperson, faculty members, and students.

The task of the reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate programs and provide recommendations for enhancing programs. The evaluation is concerned with quality of program design, mastery of student learning outcomes, student academic success, and administrative effectiveness. The following are important considerations:

- The overall quality and direction of the program
- The quality of faculty and professional staff
- The quality of student learning performance and outcomes
- The quality of students and supportive policies and practices
- The quality of curriculum offerings and program options
- The adequacy of resources for the program.

The Executive Report

The findings and recommendations of the committee should take the format of a **concise two to three-page executive summary**. Overall observations, strengths/ commendations, deficiencies/ recommendations, and value of the program to the mission of the university should be included in this report. Specific recommendations should be made regarding what is needed to strengthen programs that have deficiencies, or perhaps what is needed to lift an outstanding program to the top of its discipline. Specific recommendations should also be made for each program in the event that additional resources are not available.

Guidance for Reviewers

The review committee should begin the review by checking to see whether all the required data have been submitted and the report sections cover the prescribed topics. If not, a request for more complete information is sent by the chair of the review committee to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies who will work with the department to develop any needed revisions and additional data then provide it to the committee.

During the review of each academic unit, reviewers are encouraged to evaluate the academic unit with respect to the areas listed below. Reviewers should not feel confined to the areas specified and can examine and comment on other areas that they deem important to the review process.

Reviewers are also asked to provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the self-study report.

I. Program Overview and Mission

Evaluate the mission and organization of the academic unit, paying special attention to program enrollment planning, goals, and program size.

II. Institutional Effectiveness - Student Learning Outcomes

Examine the program's evidence that students achieve the learning outcomes set by the program, as well as how it is monitoring and measuring efforts intended to result in program improvements.

III. Curriculum and Programs of Study

Evaluate the curriculum and programs of study. Factors that should be considered are degree requirements, alignment of degree requirements with student learning outcomes, course offerings, frequency, areas of specialization, connection of curriculum with current developments in the discipline, and mechanisms which foster independent learning enabling the graduate to contribute to the profession and field of study. Reviewers should consider the department's comparison of the program with similar programs elsewhere.

IV. Quality and Quantity of Students and Graduates

Evaluate the quality and quantity of students and graduates. Factors to be considered are student profile, student recruitment, student retention, placement of graduates, career success of former students, students pursuing graduate studies.

V. Faculty Resources and Productivity

Evaluate faculty resources and productivity. Factors to be considered are faculty profile, faculty scholarship and awards, faculty teaching load, and faculty service.

VI. Departmental Efficiency, Effectiveness, Facilities, and Resources

Determine if existing space, library resources, information technology, and support staff are adequate to support the program.

Elements

Department Key	Primary Contact
IRDM: Institutional Research & Data Management	Tracey Stegmair, Senior Business Systems Analyst tstegmair@twu.edu
ORSP: Office of Research and Sponsored Programs	Ms. Tracy Lindsay, Director of Operations Research and Sponsored Programs, tlindsay@twu.edu
OAA: Office of Academic Assessment	Dr. Gray Scott, Director of Academic Assessment grayscott@twu.edu
UGS: Office of Undergraduate Studies	Dr. Brandi Falley, Interim Dean bfalley@twu.edu

- I. Executive Summary-Provide a one to two page overview of the report in entirety, ideally completed after the completion of the full report.
 - a. Summary of the Academic Unit
 - b. Summary of the Undergraduate Academic Degree Program-may include data highlights, areas of recognition and distinction, signature initiatives and programs that support the mission of the academic unit and the institution
 - c. Summary of actions taken to improve the academic degree program based on the previous Academic Program Review committee report and Improvement Action Plan- specifically highlighting identified areas for improvement by the review committee and actions taken to address the improvement areas

- II. The Academic Unit-Address Sections I.A.1. & 2. for the academic unit in which the undergraduate program resides. This information will provide context for the reviewers.
 - a. Unit Overview & Mission– Provide a one to two-page overview of the academic unit for the most recent year, including its mission and organization, a listing of all degrees offered (graduate and undergraduate), in addition to the elements listed below:
 - i. Faculty Resources & Productivity - Summarize faculty resources and productivity on the basis of:
 1. Profile – rank and demographics of faculty and professional staff (including full- and part- time faculty, and graduate teaching assistants) (IRDM)
 2. Workload and teaching productivity (SQL)
 3. Scholarship and creative activities (optional)
 4. Professional service (optional)

5. Professional development (optional)
- ii. Academic Unit Efficiency, Effectiveness, Facilities, & Resources
 1. Summarize academic unit efficiency and effectiveness:
 - a. External and internal grants and contracts awarded (ORSP)
 - b. Source and amount of grants and pending grants (ORSP)
 - c. Success rate of grant applications (ORSP)
 - d. Research expenditures (ORSP)
 - e. Academic unit scholarships and endowments
 - f. HEF expenditures (if applicable)
 2. Summarize the adequacy of academic unit resources for teaching and research including:
 - a. Staff support
 - b. Physical facilities
 - c. Library resources
 - d. Equipment
 - e. Research facilities
 - f. Information technology
 - g. Budget

III. Academic Undergraduate Degree Program-Address Sections II.A.-E. for the academic degree program.

- a. Academic Institutional Improvement – Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Assessment
 - i. Analyze, interpret, and report progress made on degree program improvement in student learning during the past five academic years using program SLOs assessment performance data derived from Academic Institutional Improvement Reports (AIIRs). **A key principle:** SACSCOC wants evidence that our programs are seeking improvement rather than evidence that students are meeting goals. The goals are there so that you have something to talk about or aim towards. (OAA)
 1. Discuss student progress over the five years toward meeting the goals that you have set in your assessment plans. It is okay if students aren't meeting goals. That gives you something to aim toward.
 2. Identify patterns in student achievement as measured in assessment data, not just successes but areas in which students could use more support (note: even if 100% of your students are meeting your goal, there are likely patterns with regard to areas in which they struggle).
 3. Identify actions taken/improvements made to improve student learning during the five- year period. If you don't have any, then the weakness you might home in on here is that your program hasn't sufficiently pursued improvements in learning, and you might talk about how you plan to address that going forward.
 - ii. Section Summary Analysis-Reflect on Academic Institutional Improvement/Program SLOs Assessment during the past five academic years. Using the analysis and interpretation of documentation and supporting evidence provided in this section:
 1. Identify strengths of program SLOs assessment
 2. Areas for improvement (Is the program's assessment plan working for you?)

Do you need to make changes to it?)

3. Future actions to be taken to improve student learning based on your analysis of student outcome data.

b. Curriculum & Related Program Experiences

- i. Describe and evaluate the degree program curriculum and related experiences during the past five years as it relates to:

1. Degree requirements
2. Specializations/program options (if applicable)
3. Course offerings, course frequency (IRDM)
4. Degree completion data (time to degree and average hours earned) (IRDM)
5. Course and/or program delivery modes (face-to-face, fully online, hybrid) (IRDM)
6. Program semester credit hour (SCH) production (IRDM)
7. Special course offerings (travel-related, internships, experiential learning, etc.)
8. Mechanisms fostering independent learning (active learning/high- impact strategies for student engagement, etc.)
9. Program connection to the discipline
 - a. Curriculum updates and alignment with current developments in the discipline
 - b. Advisory board recommendations and changes implemented (if applicable)
10. Undergraduate research (if applicable)
11. Marketable Skills (review of identified Marketable Skills)
12. Other

- ii. Describe how the content and delivery of your undergraduate degree program relates to other comparable programs in the State of Texas. Note: Contact IRDM to get links and relevant information.

- iii. Section Summary Analysis-Reflect on the program curriculum and related program experiences during the past five years. Using the analysis and interpretation of documentation and supporting evidence provided in this section:

1. Identify strengths of the curriculum
2. Areas for improvement
3. Actions to be taken to improve the program curriculum.

c. Quality & Quantity of Undergraduate Students & Graduates

- i. Portray the undergraduate and recently graduated students within the undergraduate degree program during the past five years:

1. Describe, analyze, and interpret degree program trends in the following areas:
 - a. Student demographic profile (IRDM)
 - b. Number of majors (number of students in the program) (IRDM)
 - c. Student/Faculty ratio (calculated from the SCH, FTE Student, FTE Faculty) (IRDM)
 - d. Student retention/persistence rates (IRDM)
 - e. Number of program degrees awarded (IRDM)

- f. Graduation rates (IRDM)
2. Describe post-graduation success evidence within the degree program including: Note: Out IRDM office is working with THECB & TWUC on this. This section is suspended for the moment.
 - a. Placement and success of graduates
 - i. Automated Student and Adult Learner Follow-Up System:
<http://www.txhighereddata.org/reports/performance/ctcassalf/exitcohorts/>
 - ii. Economic Success Metrics from: <https://educationdata.org>
3. Use the following information to evaluate the success of undergraduate students within the degree program during the past five academic years:
 - a. Degree completion GPAs (IRDM)
 - b. Student involvement in organizations related to the profession
 - c. Academic unit efforts to recruit, advise and retain students
 - d. Existence of policies and practices conducted within the degree program in support of undergraduate student success.
 - e. Student/Faculty contact opportunities beyond the classroom (frequency, type, etc.)
- ii. Section Summary Analysis-Reflect on the quality and quantity of undergraduate students and graduates within the degree program during the past five years. Using the analysis and interpretation of documentation and supporting evidence provided in this section:
 1. Identify program strengths
 2. Areas for improvement
 3. Actions to be taken to strengthen and improve the quality of degree program.
- d. Faculty Resources & Productivity (as applicable)
 - i. Describe and evaluate faculty resources and productivity of the degree program during the past five years including:
 1. Profile – rank and demographics of faculty and professional staff (including full- and part-time faculty, and graduate teaching assistants) (IRDM)
 2. Workload and teaching productivity (SQL)
 3. Scholarship and creative activities (optional)
 4. Professional service (optional)
 5. Professional development (optional)
 - ii. Section Summary Analysis-Reflect on the faculty resources and productivity within the degree program during the past five years. Using the analysis and interpretation of documentation and supporting evidence provided in this section:
 1. Identify program strengths
 2. Areas for improvement
 3. Actions to be taken to strengthen and improve the quality of degree program.
- e. Funding & Resources
 - i. Describe and evaluate the funding and resources of the degree program during the past five years including:

1. External and internal grants and contracts awarded (ORSP)
 2. Source and amount of grants and pending grants (ORSP)
 3. Research expenditures (ORSP)
 4. Scholarships and endowments
 5. Resources for teaching and research (i.e., classroom space, lab facilities, reassigned time)
 6. HEF expenditures (if applicable)
- ii. Describe and evaluate the adequacy of degree program facilities and resources of the degree program during the past five years including:
 1. Staff support
 2. Physical facilities
 3. Library resources
 4. Equipment
 5. Research facilities
 6. Information technology
 7. Budget
 - iii. Section Summary Analysis-Reflect on the efficiency, effectiveness, facilities, and resources within the degree program during the past five years. Using the analysis and interpretation of documentation and supporting evidence provided in this section:
 1. Identify program strengths
 2. Areas for improvement
 3. Actions to be taken to strengthen and improve the quality of degree program.

IV. Addendum – Undergraduate Certificate Program(s) Review-Address Section

III.A. for each undergraduate certificate program housed within the academic unit.

- a. Academic Institutional Improvement – Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Assessment
 - i. Analyze, interpret, and report progress made on improvement in student learning during the past five academic years using certificate program SLOs assessment performance data derived from Academic Institutional Improvement Reports (AIIRs) for Certificate Programs.
 1. Determine trends – Student performance on program SLOs during the five-year period
 2. Identify actions taken/improvements made to improve student learning during the five-year period
 3. Evaluate certificate program success in achieving student learning outcomes (use criterion for success/realistic program goal)
 - a. Provide evidence of success in achieving certificate program SLOs
 - b. Provide evidence of progress toward achieving certificate program SLOs
 - ii. Section Summary Analysis-Reflect on Academic Institutional Improvement/Certificate Program SLOs Assessment during the past five academic years. Using the analysis and interpretation of documentation and supporting evidence provided in this section:
 1. Identify strengths of certificate program SLOs assessment
 2. Areas for improvement

3. Actions to be taken to continue to improve student learning based on certificate program success (or lack of) in achieving the student learning outcomes.

V. Self-Study Documentation - Include the following required data and any additional data or information that provides supporting evidence (documentation) for the self-study, unless already addressed in the previous sections.

- a. Program Data-Include the following required data as addressed in the self-study:
 - i. Student demographic profile
 - ii. Number of majors (number of students in the program)
 - iii. Student/faculty ratio (calculated from the SCH, FTE Student, FTE Faculty)
 - iv. Student retention/persistence rates
 - v. Graduation rates
 - vi. Degree completions GPA's
 - vii. Profile rank and demographics of faculty and professional staff
 - viii. Workload and teaching productivity
 - ix. Number of program degrees awarded
 - x. Course offerings, course frequency
 - xi. Course and/or program delivery modes (face to face, fully online, hybrid)
 - xii. Degree completion data (time to degree and average hours earned)
- b. Academic Assessment/Institutional Improvement Plans and Reports-Include the following required Academic Assessment/Institutional Improvement data as addressed in the self- study:
 - i. Academic Institutional Improvement Assessment Plan (AIIAP)
 - ii. Academic Institutional Improvement Reports (AIIRs)
 - iii. Academic Institutional Improvement Assessment Plan (AIIAP – Certificate Programs)
 - iv. Academic Institutional Improvement Reports (AIIRs – Certificate Programs)
- c. Additional Supporting Evidence/Documentation (Optional) – Any additional documentation program faculty would like to include specific to the degree program.

VI. Self-Study Formatting Guidelines

- a. One electronic .pdf (single document)
- b. Cover sheet to include: Academic unit name, UG degree program name, Self-Study, 5 designated years addressed in the self-study, submitted by , submission date
- c. Calibri or Times New Roman font
- d. Font size for text must be 11 or 12
- e. Single space text, double space between paragraphs and sections
- f. Page numbering – “Page 1 of _”
- g. Adhere to corresponding outline format