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The Program Review process provides programs the opportunity to showcase program’s strengths and weaknesses and address continuous improvement.

1. **Program Profile**
   1. Degrees, diplomas, certificates, and/or minors and the mission and goals of each. Sources: UAS Catalog, UAS IE
   2. Brief history of program. Sources: UAS Catalogs, Program internal documents.
   3. Summary of strengths and deficiencies, and recommendations of previous reviews. Source: Previous reviews.
   4. Program consistency with UAS mission and Core Objectives. Sources: UAS Strategic and Assessment Plan and School/Program Plans.
   5. Interactions and/or duplication with other programs on campus (support for other majors, general education, etc.). Sources: Program internal documents.
   6. Transferability to and from similar programs at other University of Alaska institutions
   7. Statewide implications or mission. Source: UA Board of Regents Strategic Plan.
   8. List program student learning outcomes, describe how they are assessed and summarize how well students are meeting the outcomes. Sources: Annual Assessment plan and reports.
   9. Alignment, correlation, and integration of the program with respect to accomplishment of the core objectives. Source: Metrics from the UAS IE, narrative from faculty.
   10. Continuous improvement review: Analysis of coherent program design, breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, and synthesis of learning. Source: Annual Assessment Plan and Reports.
   11. Other appropriate data from the department records.
2. **Faculty Profile**
   1. Headcount and instructional full-time equivalent (FTE) for full and adjunct faculty for each of the past five years. Source: UAS IE
   2. A profile of unit faculty with degrees, areas of specialization, rank and tenure status, years of experience, gender and minority composition. Sources: UAS IE and program internal documents.
   3. A program profile of the productivity of the faculty, including teaching, service, research and creative activities, and administrative responsibilities for each of the past five years. Sources: Program internal documents.
   4. Average student credit hours (SCH) per full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty per academic year, for each of the past five years. Source: UAS IE.
   5. Average class size by full-time and adjunct faculty. Source: UAS IE
   6. Student/faculty ratio. Source: UAS IE
3. **Student Profile**
   1. Student credit hours (SCH) generated for each of the past five years. Source: UAS IE
   2. Special admission standards or other measures of selecting students, if applicable. Source: Program internal documents
   3. Number of admitted students including pre-majors in programs, where applicable. Source: UAS IE
   4. Annual number of graduates by completion level (certificate, diploma, degree) for each of the past five years. Source: UAS IE
   5. Retention profile for the past five years. Source: UAS IE
   6. Completion Profile for the past five years. Source: UAS IE
   7. Analysis and commentary on enrollment trends and attrition or retention rates. Source: Program internal documents.
   8. Quality of graduates (criteria used by the program in their self-study and/or by reviewers should be clearly defined). Source: Program assessment plan documents.
   9. Employment demand for and placement rate of graduates for each of the past five years (This may include informal data gathered by the programs). Source: UAS IE and Program internal documents.
4. **Program Support**
   1. Adequacy of library holdings. Source: Egan Library Reports
   2. Adequacy of facilities, technology, laboratory and other equipment, including plans for equipment maintenance and replacement. Sources: Program internal documents and peer data when available.
   3. Adequacy of professional development funds. Sources: Program internal documents and peer data when available.
   4. Adequacy of staff/student support. Sources: Program internal documents and peer data when available.
   5. Adequacy of budget. Sources: Program internal documents and peer data when available.
   6. Other
5. **Qualitative Information**
   1. Special departmental characteristics, including, for example, unique features, benchmarking with other programs and program simulations. Sources: Program internal documents and materials from other higher education reports.
   2. Programs with advisory committees should provide a list of members of the advisory committee, the business/ industry each member represents, and results of committee activities concerning curriculum, equipment, and faculty. Sources: Program internal documents.
   3. Innovations in pedagogy, professional development, application of technology, etc. Sources: Program internal documents
   4. Other
6. **Review committee recommendations and comments**
   1. Program strengths
   2. Program weaknesses/ deficiencies
   3. Recommendations for change
   4. Recommendation for continuance/ discontinuance
7. **Departmental responses to the recommendations of the review committee**

No action required after submission.

1. **Dean/director’s responses to the recommendations of prior reviews**

No action required after submission

1. **Provost’s response to dean/ director and prior review**

No action required after submission. No action required.