The American University of Kurdistan
Policy of Non- Academic Program Review

CONTENT

I. INTRODUCTION

a. Authority: The Board of Trustees (herein referred to as "Board") at The American University of Kurdistan (herein referred to as "AUK" or "University") is authorized to establish rules and regulations to govern and operate the University and its

III.   DEFINTION

The Non-Academic Program Review (N-APR) is a continuous, collaborative process. Essential elements of the N-APR include: Goals, Objectives, Accomplishments, Polices, Procedures, Organizational Chart, Synopsis of Job Responsibilities, SWOT analysis, etc.

Reflections and recommendations are based upon the analysis of data from program surveys, focus groups and other engagements with a variety of stakeholders. The process of reflecting upon and using data to inform discussions and actions contributes to effe

b. The process should be broadly participatory involving university and relevant community constituents.

c. Stakeholders such as current students, alumni, employers, and other constituents must be included in the provision of feedback.

d. The N-APR should provide a framework for excellence; an opportunity to explore, enhance, and integrate improvement in all areas of the unit's mission and goals.

e. The process should facilitate short-term and long-term strategic planning in areas that match with the mission and goals of the unit and the University per best practices.

f. The N-APR provides the opportunity for the University to account for its use of human and fiscal resources.

g. Those involved in the N-APR should be actively engaged and familiar with the unit; however, it is pivotal for the effectiveness and integrity of the N-APR process that individuals involved be free of conflicts that might compromise or be perceived to compromise their critical objectivity.

h. Peer review is necessary for a successful program review. Members selected for the Review Committee must have experience and expertise in the operations of a similar unit.

i. In some cases, the standards of accrediting bodies may stipulate specific expectations and standards for assessment and compliance. In those cases, the accreditation liaison will review the N-ARP for any issues, and if there are concerns, address them with the administration.

j. The review process is designed to be transparent and inclusive, and to provide opportunities for substantive input from a range of internal and external stakeholders.

VI.   POLICY PROCEDURES

Step 1: Non-Academic Program Self-Study

The Non-Academic Program Self-Study is an opportunity for administrative staff to review and analyze the effectiveness of the program or unit through narrative, data and evidence. The self-study narrative should be no more than 40 pages (not including appendixes) and identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and make recommendations to address those identified challenges. Upon completion, the appropriate administrator submits the Self-Study to the Office Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Table of Contents for the Program Self-Study

Note that not all of the following may apply to the unit; deletions and additions need to be approved by IEP.

I. Introduction/Context

a. Internal and External Context

b. History of the Program (with an emphasis on recent history)

c. Mission Statement

II. Disposition of Last Program Review's Prioritized Recommendations and Plans

III. Evidence-Based Analysis of Program Quality

a. Customer/User Satisfaction Surveys

b. Staff Surveys

c. Administration and Personnel Quality and Qualifications

IV. Evidence-Based Analysis of Unit's Efficiency and Effectiveness

a. Expenditures and Operating Costs

b. Revenue Generation (if applicable)

c. Assessment of Workflow and Processes

V. Summary & Plans

a. Summary of Analysis

b. Plans including multi-year assessment plan

Appendices and Additional Resources to be cited and analyzed in the Self-Study

Meeting Minutes

Latest Unit-level Strategic Plan

University's Strategic Plan

Annual Reports

Previous Non-Academic Program Review Documents

Unit Mission Statement

Unit Goals and Outcomes

and all appendices are included). If there are omissions, the report goes back to the Unit for resubmission within 14 days.

2. The Review Committee includes at least one internal and at least two external members (additional members may be requested to do duties virtually). The Review Committee Chair is generally an AUK member identified by the appropriate administrator (IEP) and approved by the respective VP or the President. The Unit compiles an annotated list of suggested external-to-the-university reviewers with discipline-appropriate expertise. The IEP selects from the list and invites the external-to-the-university reviewers. If none of the names suggested are acceptable to the IEP, in consultation with the respective VP or President, then IEP will provide to the Unit a brief explanation as to why the candidates are not acceptable and tasks the Unit with expanding the list until mutually acceptable external-to-the-university reviewers are selected. The IEP, in consultation with the respective VP or President, may choose an external reviewer not from the list if a mutually acceptable name is not identified in a timely manner. Members of the Review Committee are appointed by the appropriate administrator, and typically include one member experienced in program. The qualifications for participation on the Review Committee include:

   a. Senior administration leadership in the relevant field/role (for external-to-the-university reviewers),

   b. Experience in conducting non- academic program reviews (for external-to-the-university reviewers),

   c. No conflict of interest.

3. The IEP forwards the Program Self-Study to the Review Committee members who review the contents and identify any questions.

4. The Review Committee holds meetings/conference calls to review Guidelines, the Self-Study, outline any questions related to the tasks, and establish a timeline.

5. During the "visit", the Review Committee meets with stakeholders (students, faculty, alumni, employers, program leadership) as needed to clarify issues that arose in the document review.

6. The Review Committee maintains a record of all meetings related to the review.

7. All discussions related to the program review must be conducted during meetings scheduled and documented in the review report.

8. The Review Committee prepares its Report as outlined below. The Report should reflect the opinions of all reviewers.

9. The Review Committee Chair delivers the draft review report to IEP who review for completeness.

10. If there are omissions, the document is sent back to the Review Committee for completion and resubmission within 14 days.

11. The Unit Director circulates the draft of the Report among current appropriate members of the unit for comments and corrections and sends factual corrections within 14 days.

Additional Instructions for the External-to-the-University Reviewer(s)

1. Review the Self-Study paying   attention to the field-specific parts, i.e., policies, procedures, and budgeting (especially Sections III and V), as well as appropriate international trends in best practices.

2. External-to-the-university reviewers should participate in the drafting of the Review Committee Report. In the event they are unable to participate or have additional comments, external-to-the-university members may submit a separate report to be included in the record. In the case of a site visit, the external-to-the-university draft report should be submitted before departure from Kurdistan.

3. Provide CV.

Step 4: Wrap-Up Meeting with Administration

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss and prioritize recommendations.

a. Participants: President, IEP, Unit Director, and VP under which the Unit is located.

b. Goal: Prioritized List of Recommendations and Plans, jointly approved by Administration and Unit.

c. Preparation: The Unit Director will draft a list of Prioritized Recommendations based on the Program Self-Study and Review Committee Report. Participants should review the documents and the list of Prioritized Recommendations ahead of time and be prepared to discuss and agree upon priorities and plans for the program for the coming 3-5 years.

d. Outcome: Prioritized Recommendations and Multi-Year Plan, including budgetary recommendations and Wrap-Up Memo, written by the Unit Director based on Wrap-Up Meeting, which g0 GeB41 Tm0.286 g0.286 G 0.00912 Tc[d.)]TJETQq0.000008871 0 595.32 84n2ng,

to

January: Submission of Self-Study to IEP.

February: The IEP sends Self Study to Review Committee.

February: Review Committee members meet and finalize timeline.

March: The Review Committee's Report is finished.

April: Wrap-up session held focusing on the Prioritized Recommendations and Multi-Year Plan.

VIII.   POLICY HISTORY

a.   Approved by: Board of Trustees

b.   Adopted: June 6, 2022