

CU at a glance

Fall 10 Enrollment

Boulder	30,502
Colorado Springs	8,892
Denver	14,619
Anschutz	3,348

Fall 10 Faculty

Instructional Faculty

Tenured & Tenure Track

Boulder	1,090
Colorado Springs	221
Denver	364
Anschutz	1,314

Non-Tenure Track

Boulder	960
Colorado Springs	144
Denver	675
Anschutz	851

Research Faculty/Academic

Research Staff & Public

Service Faculty

Boulder	1,749
Colorado Springs	48
Denver	79
Anschutz	2,023
Denver/ Anschutz	18

FY 10 Degrees Awarded

Boulder	7,748
Colorado Springs	1,741
Denver	3,274
Anschutz	926

FY 10 Research Awards

Boulder	\$454.4 M
Colorado Springs	\$8.3 M
Denver	\$22.2 M
Anschutz	\$399.2 M



University of Colorado

Boulder | Colorado Springs | Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Academic Affairs Highlights: Program Review

The Program Review Process

Academic program review was instituted to promote and maintain efficiently administered, high-quality academic programs. The faculty and administration develop criteria and procedures to review all colleges, schools, and academic units once every five years where feasible, but at least once every seven years. Review procedures are designed to identify strengths and weaknesses of academic programs and to recommend any needed alternatives or modifications for program development. Program reviews may be scheduled to coincide with professional accreditation reviews.

The review serves as a basic planning document for a program, assisting departments, the campus and the university system with decision-making regarding issues such as resource allocation, faculty staffing, program focus, admission standards and curriculum content. Components of program review include an internal review performed by the unit, a campus-level review performed by a panel, an external review by noted professionals, and a review by campus and system administration. Program reviews include an action plan and are evaluated in subsequent years to determine whether significant issues have been addressed.

Program review reports are submitted to the CU System Office of Academic Affairs on an annual basis. As part of this submission, the campuses also provide progress reports for all programs reviewed in the prior three years. The progress reports address major developments indicating achievements, an implementation schedule for major issues not yet addressed or completed, and a general statement as to the status of program improvement, the review process, and any links with student outcomes assessment. The Office of Academic Affairs provides a summary report to the Board of Regents.



Policies Relevant to Program Review

Program review is mandated by Regent Policy 4-C and specific requirements are outlined in Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1019. The APS was revised in July 2010 to stipulate that the process include a review of the unit's criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and post-tenure review. The criteria are assessed to determine whether they 1) reflect appropriate and current standards of professional performance and, 2) serve to ensure that faculty have the professional competence needed to achieve the goals of the department, school/ college, campus, and Board of Regents.

Regent Policy 4-C can be viewed at www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy4C.htm.

The APS on program review can be viewed at www.cu.edu/articles/upload/1019.pdf.

Academic Affairs Highlights

Page 2

Campus Role and Mission Statements

Boulder

"shall be a comprehensive graduate research university with selective admissions standards. The Boulder campus of the university of Colorado shall offer a comprehensive array of undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degree programs..."

Colorado Springs

"shall be a comprehensive baccalaureate university with selective admission standards. The Colorado Springs campus shall offer liberal arts and sciences, business, engineering, health sciences, and teacher preparation undergraduate degree programs, and a selected number of master's and doctoral degree programs..."

Denver

"shall be an urban comprehensive undergraduate and graduate research university with selective admission standards. The Denver campus shall offer baccalaureate, master's, and a limited number of doctoral degree programs, emphasizing those that serve the needs of the Denver metropolitan area..."

Anschutz

"shall offer specialized baccalaureate, first-professional, master's, and doctoral degree programs in health-related disciplines and professions. It shall be affiliated with the University of Colorado Hospital and other health care facilities that offer settings for education, clinical practice, and basic and applied research..."

Components of the Internal Unit Review

As indicated by the chart on page one, the program review process begins with an internal unit review. This is a comprehensive assessment that covers a broad range of issues. For example, academic units at the Denver and Anschutz Medical Campuses¹ must address the following topics in their internal review.

1. Introduction, overview and unit description (organizational structure, purpose, programs)
2. Mission, Vision and Values, and Strategic Plan (consistency with the UC Denver strategic plan and the extent to which program goals and objectives are being met)
3. Progress since last review (implementation of previous program review recommendations)
4. Academic programs and the educational experience (educational activities; enrollment trends; degrees; majors; relevance and rigor of the curriculum; student support services; student outcomes assessment)
5. Faculty activities (numbers of faculty by rank; criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review; faculty recruitment; faculty development; research and creative work; service activities, teaching quality)
6. Diversity (recruitment of diverse students, faculty and staff; how diversity issues are addressed in the curriculum; faculty engagement with students from diverse communities and diverse perspectives)
7. Resources (facilities and fiscal resources; source of funds; adequacy of resources)
8. Summary (analysis of units scope of responsibilities, strengths and weaknesses; evaluation of emerging opportunities, important trends, significant accomplishments; recommendations for program improvement)

¹ The School of Medicine has adopted a different set of guidelines, although many of the same topics are covered.

Source: www.ucdenver.edu/about/departments/OARS/AcademicProgramReview/Pages/SelfStudyGuidelines.aspx

Campus Program Review Schedules and Related Information

Boulder	www.colorado.edu/pba/depts/arp/index.html
Colorado Springs	www.uccs.edu/~provost/docs/AcademicProgReviews.doc
Denver/AMC	www.ucdenver.edu/about/departments/OARS/AcademicProgramReview/Pages/default.aspx

2009-10 Campus Program Reviews—Summary of Key Issues

An analysis of the campus program review reports revealed a process that is both rigorous and comprehensive. Strengths and weaknesses of academic programs are discussed candidly by the departmental self-study teams, the external review teams, and the campus program review committees.

As noted in previous reports, space continues to be in short supply, and departments ranging from the arts to the sciences reported the needed to update facilities and equipment. The reports for many schools, colleges, and departments also point out a need to hire more tenure-track faculty members. In some cases, this is due to increasing student-to-faculty ratios; in others it is because of the large number of courses taught by adjunct faculty, the anticipated retirement of a large percentage of the current faculty over the next five years, or the loss of faculty to other institutions. Many units employ graduate students or instructors to teach lower-division courses, often including core curriculum courses and those for non-majors. Increased training of these individuals is commonly described as a need in response to student perceptions of teaching deficiencies when compared to courses taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

The program review reports also point to a ubiquitous lack of sufficient funding for graduate students, leading to heavy teaching loads that may negatively impact both recruitment of highly promising graduate students and the ability of these students to achieve their educational goals in a timely fashion.

Despite the above concerns, the 2009-10 program reviews show ongoing, significant progress in numerous departments. Research productivity is up, as is fundraising, and projects to improve teaching and learning are underway across all campuses. Interdisciplinary initiatives continue to flourish, as do outreach programs. Many programs have attained or are poised to achieve national recognition for excellence.