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Background and BOG Requirements

Background
The Florida Board of Governors (BOG) Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review requires state universities to review all academic degree programs by CIP at least once every seven years. The program-review processes must emphasize the assessment of student learning outcomes and continuous program improvement. The results of program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level and, when appropriate, at the state level. Exceptions to this requirement may be negotiated to align with specialized accreditation cycles. Additional information is available at http://www.usf.edu/provost/offices/program-review.aspx

Requirements
Academic Program Reviews must include the following:

1. A review of the mission(s) and purpose(s) of the program within the context of the university mission and the Board of Governors’ Strategic Plan;
2. The establishment of teaching, research, service, and other program goals and objectives, including expected outcomes, particularly in the area of student learning;
3. An assessment of:
   a. how well program goals/objectives are being met;
   b. how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes;
   c. how the results of these assessments are used for continuous program improvement; and
   d. the sufficiency of resources and support services to achieve the program goals/objectives.
4. For baccalaureate programs, a review of lower level prerequisite courses to ensure that the program is in compliance with State-approved common prerequisites and (if appropriate) a review of the limited access status of the program to determine if such status is still warranted
5. A description of major changes made to the program since the previous review
6. An assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the program
7. Recommendations and/or proposed action plans developed as a result of the review
Rationale and Process

Rationale
Program review at USF serves three overarching purposes:

1. To conduct a periodic examination of a program’s academic purpose within the overall mission of the institution
2. To conduct a detailed review of
   a. Students’ progress toward meeting expected learning outcomes,
   b. Curricula, and
   c. Teaching, research and service goals and other program objectives
3. To provide a thorough audit of a program for purposes of continuous improvement
   (including the use of student learning outcome assessments)

Program review may be used by the department, college or university for other purposes, e.g. examination of flagging indicators as a rationale for continuation, but the priorities listed above are the primary foci of program review at USF.

Process
The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Academic Planning and Review (OIE) coordinates the program review and specialized accreditation processes for USF Tampa academic programs. This office also maintains the official review cycle listing for program and specialized accreditation reviews. Requests to alter the academic program-review schedule must be approved by the Office of the Provost by submitting the appropriate form located on the OIE website: http://www.usf.edu/provost/offices/program-review.aspx

The OIE maintains guidelines for the program-review process. These guidelines reflect institutional and state priorities during the seven-year cycle and as such may change accordingly. The OIE is also the official document repository for all program-review and specialized accreditation material, such as the self-study, accreditation reports, and final reports including summaries of reviews submitted to the Board of Governors.

Program reviews are conducted either on-line or by an on-site review via external consultant(s). This determination will be based on the following criteria:

- The programs operation and maintenance of physical facilities such as laboratories not easily reviewed in an on-line format.
- The interdisciplinary nature of programs that produces sufficient complexity to warrant an on-site visit.
- Other compelling arguments in favor of an on-site review to be determined jointly by the Provost or Provost’s designee and the Dean and Department Head of the program under review.
Required Documents
The program-review process includes the following documents:

1. A self-study of the academic program defined by the CIP code, prepared by the faculty and chair of the program under review.
2. A Dean’s report prepared by the Dean of the College that houses the academic program.
3. A report from one or more external reviewers selected by the OIE in consultation with the program under review and the Dean’s Office.
4. A report in response to the recommendations that must include proposed action plans made as a result of the review.
5. An executive summary report of the program review using the form provided by the OIE and submitted through the Provost (or designee) to the BOG in accordance with Regulation 8.015.
6. A one-year follow-up report detailing progress made on proposed action plans for the program submitted to the Dean of the College that houses the academic program and the OIE. Additional annual follow-up reports may be required.
Self-Study Report

Overview
The self-study report provides the opportunity for critical reflection over a seven-year period on the content and delivery of the academic program under review. In this document, the department presents an evaluation of the academic program with respect to key qualitative and quantitative measures of interest to the university, the USF BOT and the BOG. Departments that house both undergraduate and graduate programs (Master’s and/or Ph.D.) must organize the self-study document into distinct sections to address related student and curricular issues.

Sections of the Self-Study
While there may be differences in the content of the self-study across programs, the following sections should be addressed in all self-study documents.

Section I: Executive Summary (No more than 3 pages)

The Executive Summary should include a brief overview of the following. More detailed information on items 3-6 should appear in the body of the self-study.

1. Process used to prepare the self-study, including a description of those involved in the activity
2. Academic program included in the review (by program name and CIP code)
3. Continuing need for this program related to national and state workforce and economic needs (e.g. STEM, strategic state initiatives, national workforce demand, etc.)
4. Student demand for the discipline/program
5. Major changes in the academic program since the last program-review
   a. Note changes made on the basis of prior program reviews
   b. Note changes made on the basis of outcomes assessment
6. Key points addressed in the self-study. For example:
   a. Departmental characteristics
   b. Curricular characteristics
   c. Results of assessment of student learning outcomes
   d. Faculty characteristics
   e. Adequacy of facilities (library resources, laboratories, etc.)

Section II. Departmental Characteristics (Need not be repeated for multiple programs)

Please include the following in describing the department:

1. History of the department (date founded, conditions under which it was founded, leadership succession, etc.)
2. Departmental Mission statement referencing its relationship to the college and institutional mission, state priorities, and the Board of Governors strategic plan as appropriate.

3. Leadership and Governance
   - The fundamental governance structure of the department.
   - Evolution of governance, e.g. changes in administrative structure over time, addition of graduate coordinator
   - Administrative support for the department

4. Aspirational and Peer Departments
   - Briefly compare the department/program to at least two peer departments at other institutions. Briefly explain the reasons for the choice of the peer departments and identify the benchmarks used for these comparisons. Highlight apparent strengths and weaknesses of the department compared to those at the other institutions. The benchmarks should include comparison with at least one department at an AAU peer institution.
   - Briefly compare the department/program to at least two aspirational peer departments at other institutions. Briefly explain the reasons for the choice of the aspirational and identify the benchmarks used for these comparisons. Highlight apparent strengths and weaknesses of the department compared to those at the other institutions. The benchmarks should include comparison with at least one department at an AAU peer institution.
   - Please note the USF peer comparisons located at: [http://www.ie.usf.edu/Peer/](http://www.ie.usf.edu/Peer/). If using peers not included on this list, please provide information to support your choice(s).

Section III: Academic Program Overview by CIP

The overview should provide the following for each program under review:

1. Brief description of the degree program including:
   - Level
   - Emphases, including concentrations, tracks, or specializations
   - Total number of credit hours required for completion
   - Overall purpose of the program.
2. Brief summary of the current state of the discipline and emerging trends
3. National, state and/or local data that support the continuing need for more people to be prepared in this program at this level. (Reference national, state, and/or local plans or reports that support the need for graduates in this area. Provide data from reliable sources, e.g., U.S. Department of Labor Statistics.)
4. Data on job placement for program graduates. Use internal sources and/or FETPIP results for USF Tampa and USF Health on the OIE website.
5. Admission standards for the academic program.
6. List of program prerequisites with assurance that they are the same as the approved common prerequisites for other such degree programs within the SUS (see the Common Prerequisites Manual at [http://www.flvc.org/partner-portal/common-prerequisite-manual](http://www.flvc.org/partner-portal/common-prerequisite-manual), for *undergraduate* degree programs only). Response to this item is mandated by the BOG.

7. If the program is designated as limited access, briefly review the status of the program to determine if this designation is still warranted. (If the program is not designated as limited access, state “This is not a limited access program.”)

8. Description of changes in the curriculum (additions, deletions, modifications) in the last seven years and the rationale for those changes.

9. Sequenced course of study for all majors, concentrations, or areas of emphasis within the program.

10. One- or two-sentence description of each required or elective course.

11. Brief analysis of the grade patterns of courses with high failure rates or withdrawals and discussion of department action plans for improvement in these areas.

12. Description of how students are professionally prepared for employment in the field upon graduation.

13. Discussion of the relationship of unit offerings to other USF programs, including joint, dual degree, accelerated or interdisciplinary programs.

14. Evidence that courses serving as components of other programs have been reviewed by those programs and found to be of acceptable quality.

15. Description of the methods of student advising for the academic program.

16. Description of the department procedures for resolving student complaints.

17. Description of how academic integrity is maintained within the department (i.e., issues of cheating or plagiarism—refer to the “USF Student Commitment to Honor” [www.ugs.usf.edu/honor.htm](http://www.ugs.usf.edu/honor.htm)).

**Section IV: Student Learning: (For each academic program, by CIP, under review.)**

[Please note: For each academic program, an assessment plan based on measures of student learning outcomes (Academic Learning Compact for undergraduate programs) must be on file with the OIE and updated annually. For resources & templates, please see: [www.usf.edu/provost/offices/assessment.aspx](http://www.usf.edu/provost/offices/assessment.aspx)]

The following information on student learning should be included in this response:

1. Brief summaries of the following:
   - The results of assessment of student learning outcomes for up to three years focusing on how well students are achieving the defined learning outcomes;
   - How the results of the assessment of student learning outcomes have been used to implement program changes (including curriculum changes) designed to improve student performance.
2. For each academic program under review, attach the most recent academic program assessment plan (Academic Learning Compact for undergraduate programs).

**Section V: Student Profile (For each academic program under review)**

The student profile should include the following:

1. A description of students in the degree program. Please include the following metrics (if available) for the last five years. (*Based on data from departmental sources as well as the Office of Decision Support*)

   Undergraduate and Graduate Programs:
   - Number of program majors for the last five fall terms overall (USF InfoCenter)
   - The racial, ethnic and gender diversity of program majors (USF InfoCenter)
   - Number of program graduates over the past five years overall (USF InfoCenter)
   - The racial, ethnic and gender diversity of program graduates (USF InfoCenter)
   - Time to graduation over the last five years  (USF InfoCenter)
   - Information on the placement of graduates for the last five years (USF FETPIP report on the OIE website and other sources)

   Graduate Programs Only:
   - Mean GRE scores of new students
   - Undergraduate GPA of new students
   - Number of students offered admission
   - Number of students accepting offer
   - Average student financial or graduate assistance support

2. Brief description of current recruitment strategies for local, national, and international students.

3. Description of student organizations/groups that are within the department and how they operate. Discuss how each group supports the intellectual climate of the department.

4. Description of internal faculty led efforts to enhance student learning in this academic degree program, e.g. specialized study abroad programs, student clubs, student lead research initiatives, service learning courses, etc.
Section VI: Faculty

Provide a profile of program faculty including the following:

1. Brief description of the unit faculty (tenure, tenure-track, visiting, etc.). Please include the following data points:
   - Number of full-time faculty by rank
   - Number of adjuncts and part-time faculty
   - Student faculty ratio over the last five years (program majors)
   - Provide a table showing the cost per FTE faculty
   - SCH production by instructor type (full-time, part-time, GA) and by rank.
2. Discussion of the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the program’s faculty. Note any significant trends in the last five years to support procedures for increasing the racial and ethnic minority faculty and other underrepresented populations within the program.
3. In the Appendix (or on the departmental web-site), include abbreviated curriculum vitae for each faculty member that summarizes publications, honors, and awards, participation in national and international societies and meetings, editorial responsibilities, university, regional, national and/or international committees, and research funding during the past seven years.

Section VII: Research and Service

Provide an overview of current faculty efforts related to research and service

1. Describe current funding for research and provide a summary of on-going projects
2. Describe any interdisciplinary research efforts with other USF departments
3. Provide recent citations and publications of faculty
4. Describe current research directions of the department and anticipated future directions
5. Describe current service initiatives in the department
6. Describe how faculty assignments are balanced between teaching, research and service

Section VIII: Resources

Provide an overview of the adequacy of each of the resources available to the program that includes the following. Please note specifically whether each type of resource is adequate or not adequate.

1. laboratory space and equipment currently in the departmental inventory (if applicable)
2. library holdings
3. department and classroom facilities
4. other items relevant for the degree program
Section IX: Responses to Previous Program-Review Recommendations

Provide a response to recommendations presented in previous program reviews that includes the following:

1. List of prior program-review recommendations
2. Summary of how previous program-review recommendations have been used to inform any curricula, program planning, development and improvement or budgeting decisions.
3. Discussion of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that support or impede the achievement of the recommendations.
4. Discuss what the department would like the academic program(s) to be in five to seven years assuming limited additional resources. Discuss what is needed to make this happen from the departmental perspective (include budget needs, if applicable).

Section X: Questions for the External Reviewer from the Department

Please provide any questions the department believes the external reviewer should address.
Dean’s Report

The Dean’s report is a separate document prepared after the departmental self-study that provides the external consultant with information about the college and a description of its strategic direction. The report should include comments on the content of the departmental self-study and address, but not necessarily be limited to, the following aspects of the academic program(s) under review.

Section I: Overview of the College

The College Overview should include a description of the following:

1. College mission and its alignment with the University strategic plan
2. Department and program(s) mission and their alignment with the college strategic plan
3. Strategic direction of the college and aspirational goals

Section II: Academic Program Review

Please provide the following information for each program under review:

1. Using indicators of a quality program as defined in this college, provide commentary that benchmarks this academic program by those indicators in terms of the following:
   a. Assessment of the academic budget to deliver the academic program
   b. Quality of the faculty
   c. Quality of the students
   d. Quality of the facilities used by faculty and staff
   e. Quality of research space (if applicable)
   f. Student need and demand
   g. Other indicators that are relevant to this program

2. An overview of funded student credit hours for each student level in the academic program under review in comparison with the total college
3. A description of any interdisciplinary, global or other innovative aspects of the academic programs and the contributions of these initiatives
Section III: Summary Comments

Please provide the following summary statements:

1. Brief statement on the comprehensiveness and quality of the departmental self-study.
2. Overview of the department’s continuous academic improvement activities since the last program review
3. Additional comments regarding the academic program(s) under review and its curriculum.

Section IV. Questions for the External Reviewer from the Department

Please provide any specific questions that you would like the external reviewer to address in his/her review of the program.
Document Storage and Retrieval

Documents related to program review include the self-study report, dean’s report, and the external program review report. These documents and others related to the self-study will be collected in the Academic Program Review Library on the Xitracs Retrieval system in the OIE. These documents will be made available to department chairs, deans and associate deans, and the external reviewers through the use of user IDs and passwords. The OIE will provide an orientation for the use of the library and provide user IDs and passwords as required.
External Consultant Report

External reviewers are required for all program reviews. The purpose of the external review is to provide an objective analysis and discipline-based review of the academic program. External reviewers may be brought on-site to conduct their review or the review may take place online. This decision is made by the OIE in consultation with the Dean of the college and chair/director of the academic program under review. Reviewers should be aware that consultant reports are public documents in accordance with Florida’s Government in the Sunshine laws.

The report will contain at least the following sections:

**Section I: Executive Summary**

Please provide a brief overview of the following:

1. Review process including when the visit occurred (or when reviewed on-line) and the documents used in the review. Note any special meetings with stakeholders, students, administrators and/or alumni.
2. Quality of material provided to inform the academic program review.
4. Quality of outcomes assessment of the academic program.

**Section II: Evaluation of Program Quality**

For each academic program under review, please provide an assessment of the following:

1. Curriculum
2. Faculty
3. Research directions
4. Students
5. Administration
6. Resources and facilities
7. Student learning outcomes assessment. Include comments on the following:
   a. Appropriateness of goals for student learning outcomes
   b. The defined student learning outcomes
   c. Quality and appropriateness of measures used to assess student learning outcomes
   d. How well students are achieving expected learning outcomes
   e. How the results of the assessment of student learning outcomes have been used to implement program improvements focused on improving student performance
Section III: Program Strengths and Weaknesses

1. List specific program strengths
2. List specific program weaknesses

Section VI: Recommendations

Please provide recommendations to contribute to continuous quality improvement in the academic program and/or department:

a. Academic program enhancement
   • Those not requiring new resources
   • Those requiring new resources
b. Departmental enhancement
   • Those not requiring new resources
   • Those requiring new resources

Section V: Response to Department and Dean Questions

In this section, please respond to specific questions from the department chair, faculty, and the Dean.
Selection of External Consultant(s)

The external consultant is employed at the discretion of the Provost and Senior Vice President. The department will submit three to seven names and vitae of potential reviewers who meet the qualifications listed below to the Dean of the College in which the program under review is located. (The number depends on the number of reviewers being used for the program-review.) Department chairs should insure that there are no conflicts of interest with the candidates for external review. Conflict of interests include but are not limited to the following:

- Prior working history with key members of the department
- Prior work with current students
- Serving as an informal grant reviewer for members of the department
- Publishing and/or research work together.

The Dean in consultation with the Chair of the Department will review the suggested reviewers and forward a final list to the OIE. The selection of the external consultant(s) is finalized by the OIE.

External consultant nominees must meet the following criteria:

- Have no conflict of interest with USF or with the department housing the program(s) being reviewed
- Have a respected record of scholarly activity in the discipline
- Are currently active in the discipline
- Have department or related administrative university experience
- Hold the rank of Professor in a Carnegie-designated “very high research” or an AAU institution or is from an institution that is regarded as an aspirational peer for the department. (Exceptions to this requirement may be granted upon written request to the OIE. A detailed explanation for the request must be included.)
- Have experience in a publicly supported university or college.
Preparing for the External Review Visit

Once the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has contacted candidates for the external review and determined that they are eligible and interested in being reviewers for the program, contact information for the reviewers will be forwarded to the department. The department will set up the schedule for the visit in conjunction with the OIE and the reviewers themselves. For reviewers who come to campus, appropriate activities include meetings with students, faculty, staff and administrators to give the reviewers a sense of the climate of the department and concerns of various constituent groups. Other activities might include visits to laboratories and other facilities that will help reviewers determine the quality of academic resources available to students and faculty. A sample itinerary for external reviewers appears in Appendix A.

Reviewers will be paid a stipend for the review work and will be compensated for travel expenses. For USF Tampa, these costs will be paid by the Provost’s Office (OIE). Departments must allow at least six (6) weeks between the time of hiring the external reviewers and the date chosen for the visit to allow production of a purchase order to pay for the stipend and travel costs. Completed paperwork for payment of reviewers must be submitted to the OIE no less than four weeks before the visit. No one may come to campus or do work on the external review until the purchase order is generated.

For reviewers who come to campus, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will sponsor and arrange an opening dinner for up to five people including the external reviewer(s), a representative of the Provost’s Office and the Dean. The OIE will also sponsor and arrange lunch on the first full day of the review at the Top of the Palms for up to five persons including the reviewers themselves. More guests may be invited, but are the responsibility of the department.

The visit must include an exit meeting scheduled on the last day that will include the dean or his/her representative and a representative of the Provost’s Office.

Departments are welcome to encourage informal contact between students, faculty and staff with the reviewers, including escorting them to meetings, driving them to or from the airport, etc. This will give reviewers a chance to gain a sense of the institution that would not be available from formal meetings.

Departments may also utilize an off-site, electronic review if appropriate. Appropriate content for such reviews is available from the OIE. Generally, the report of external reviewers who participate via electronic means will follow the report template expected from on-site reviewers. The external report is expected to be submitted 2-4 weeks after the completion of the visit.
Final Reporting

The external review report will be submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness two to four weeks after the visit. The OIE will distribute the external review report to the department chair and dean of the college. The department chair may request clarification from the reviewers of issues in the report or request additional information that may be useful for an informed review of the program. The external review report will be shared with the faculty in the department and a reasonable time for discussion and response permitted. The department may prepare a response to the report of the external reviewers. Individual faculty members may also respond to the report. An action plan based on the self-study, dean’s report, external reviewer’s report and relevant responses to the external review will be prepared by the department.

In consultation with the faculty and the dean, the chair will submit to the OIE the response (if any) and the action plan to address issues and recommendations from the external review. The external review report, any responses of the department and/or faculty and the action plan will be forwarded to the dean for discussion and distribution. This will be submitted to the OIE within six months after the distribution of the external review report, but no less than two months before the final summary report is due to the Board of Governors.

The final reports and recommendations will be submitted to the Provost. These will include (1) the self-study, (2) the Dean’s report, (3) the External Review report, (4) the unit’s and any individual faculty’s responses and action plan and (4) the BOG Summary Report. Other relevant documents may be submitted at this time.

The Provost’s Office and Dean’s office will work with the department to determine and implement an action plan in response to the recommendations until the next review cycle.

The final step in the review is for the department is preparation of a brief summary report of the program review using the format specified by the BOG (BOG Summary Report). This report will summarize any changes since the last program review, noting strengths and weaknesses of the unit and providing a summary of recommendations and/or proposed action plans for the department. The BOG Summary Report must be submitted to the OIE by November 1 of the final year of the review period. The OIE must submit the final summary report to the BOG no later than December 31 of the final year of the review period.

For programs being reviewed in conjunction with specialized/professional accreditation, a University addendum to the accreditation self-study may be developed to address questions and issues of specific interest to USF, the BOT, and the BOG. Submission of University addenda (if required) will be coordinated with the schedule of preparation and submission of the accreditation self-study and visiting team report. All programs will provide a copy of the specialized accrediting body report and the BOG summary report to the OIE no later than November 1 of the final year of the review period.
The following provides a sample timeline for departments to follow in moving through the stages of Academic Program Review. An individual department may move through the sequence at a faster or slower pace, but the final OIE Summary Report to the Board of Governors must be submitted no later than December 31, 2016.

### University of South Florida

#### Academic Program Review

#### Sample Timeline 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Summer 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APR Orientation (OIE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Self-Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select External Reviewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviewer Visit/Online Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviewer Report (to OIE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Results (Department/Dean/Provost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental/Faculty Response (Optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report and Action Plan (to OIE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report for BOG (to OIE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report to BOG (by OIE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Sample Itinerary for External Reviewers
Program Name

- Reviewer Information

**Reviewer Name(s)**

*Reviewer’s Title (i.e. Chair, Professor, or Dean)*

*Reviewer’s Home University*

[Link to CV]

Review Dates

*Start Date – End Date*

- Agenda Template (Sample Schedule—Actual Schedules May Vary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1 – DATE</th>
<th>Flight Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flight Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival Time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name of Transporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transporter’s phone number - for the reviewer to call upon arrival (if needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotel Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restaurant Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name Reservation is Under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 5 people paid for by OIE including reviewer(s)—OIE schedules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7:00 PM

Dinner and discuss expectations with Dean’s and Provost’s staff:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 2 – Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to/from meeting</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>Take reviewer to breakfast and drop him/her off at review location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:30 AM</td>
<td>Meeting (meetings may be with the Dean of the reviewed program, professors, graduate students, undergraduate students and so on)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to/from meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00 AM</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with graduate school</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to/from meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 2:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch meeting with: Department Chair, Professor of Reviewed Program, Professor of Reviewed Program</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to/from meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:45 PM</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to/from meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:30 PM</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to/from meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer</td>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 - 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Tour of related facilities (library, laboratories, etc.), coffee break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with graduate students of the reviewed program</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to/from meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30- 5:30 PM</td>
<td>Meeting with undergraduate students of the reviewed program</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to their hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>Dinner with selected faculty members</td>
<td>Person who will be escorting the reviewer to dinner and then back to their hotel</td>
<td>off campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 3—Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Check out of hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Short Exit Meeting with Department Chair</td>
<td>Location: at reviewer’s hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 11:00 AM</td>
<td>Exit meeting with Dean and Provost’s representatives</td>
<td>Location: Patel Center, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-noon</td>
<td>Debrief and/or meetings with final group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Flight out</td>
<td>Person who will be taking reviewer to the airport</td>
<td>Flight Information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flight Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Departure Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Academic Program Review Self-Study

Check List
# Academic Program Review Self-Study Checklist

## I. Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Process used to prepare the self-study including a description of those involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Academic program in review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Program Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. CIP Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continuing need for the program related to national and state workforce and economic need (e.g., STEM, strategic state initiatives, national workforce demand, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student demand for the discipline/program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Major changes since last review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Changes made as result of prior reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Changes made from outcomes assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Key points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Departmental characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Curricular characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Results of assessment of student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Faculty characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Adequacy of facilities (library resources, laboratories, classroom space, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. Departmental Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>History of the department/program (date founded, conditions under which founded, leadership succession, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Departmental mission statement referencing its relationship to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Institutional mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. State priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. BOG strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. other as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leadership and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The fundamental governance structure of the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Evolution of governance, e.g. changes in administrative structure over time, addition of graduate coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Administrative support for the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aspirational and Peer Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Compare the department/program to at least two peer departments at other institutions. At least one of the comparison departments should be an AAU peer institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Briefly explain the reasons that these departments were chosen as peer departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Identify benchmarks used to determine that these institutions are peers (i.e. faculty/student ratio, selectivity, program characteristics, etc.) Sources: Academic Analytics, Office of Decision Support, USF Infocenter, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the USF department compared to each peer department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### II. Program Review Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insert Program CIP &amp; Level</th>
<th>Insert Program CIP &amp; Level</th>
<th>Insert Program CIP &amp; Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Compare the department/program to at least two aspirational peer departments at other institutions. At least one of the aspirational peers must be an AAU institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Briefly explain the reasons that these departments were chosen as aspirational peer departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Identify benchmarks used to determine that these institutions are aspirational peers (i.e., faculty/student ratio, selectivity, program characteristics, etc. Sources: Academic Analytics, Office of Decision Support, USF Infocenter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the USF department compared to each aspirational peer department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Academic Program Overview by CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insert Program CIP &amp; Level</th>
<th>Insert Program CIP &amp; Level</th>
<th>Insert Program CIP &amp; Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide the following for each program under review:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brief description of the degree program including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Level (Bachelor, Master, Research Doctorate, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Emphases, including concentrations, tracks, or specializations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Total number of credit hours required for completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Overall purpose of the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brief summary of the current state of the discipline and emerging trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National, state, and/or local data that support the continuing need for people to be prepared in this program at this level. Reference national, state, and/or local plans or reports that support the need for graduates in this area. (Provide data from reliable sources, e.g., U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, State of Florida)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Data on job placement for program graduates. Use internal departmental sources if available and/or FETPIP results for USF Tampa at the OIE website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Admission standards for the academic program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>List of program prerequisites with assurance that they are the same as the approved common prerequisites for other such degree programs within the SUS. See the Common Prerequisite Manual at FLVC.org at the Partner Portal. (for undergraduate degree programs only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If the program is designated as limited access, briefly review the status of the program to determine if this designation is still warranted. (If the program is not designated as limited access, state &quot;This is not a limited access program.&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Description of changes in the curriculum (additions, deletions, modifications) in the last seven years and the rationale for those changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sequenced course of study for all majors, concentrations, or areas of emphasis within the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>One- or two-sentence description of each required or elective course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brief analysis of the grade patterns of courses with high failure rates or withdrawals and discussion of department action plans for improvement in these areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Description of how students are professionally prepared for employment in the field upon graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Discussion of the relationship of unit offerings to other USF programs, including joint, dual degree, accelerated or interdisciplinary programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Evidence that courses serving as components of other programs have been reviewed by those programs and found to be of acceptable quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Description of the methods of student advising for the academic program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Description of the department procedures for resolving student complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Description of how academic integrity (i.e., issues of cheating or plagiarism—refer to the &quot;USF Student Commitment to Honor&quot;) is maintained within the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Academic Program Review Self-Study Checklist

## IV. Student Learning

The following information on student learning should be included in this response:

1. Summaries of the following:
   - a. Results of the assessment of student learning outcomes for up to three years focusing on how well students are achieving the defined learning outcomes
   - b. How the results of the assessment of student learning outcomes have been used to implement program changes (including curriculum changes) designed to improve student performance

2. For each academic program under review, attach the most recent academic program assessment plan (Academic Learning Compact for undergraduate programs).

## V. Student Profile

The student profile should include the following:

1. A description of students in the degree program. Please include the following metrics (if available) for the last five years. (Based on data from departmental sources as well as the Office of Decision Support)
   - Undergraduate and Graduate Programs:
     - a. Number of program majors for the last five fall terms (Infomart)
     - b. Racial/ethnic and gender diversity of program majors (Infomart)
     - c. Number of program graduates over the last five years (Infomart)
     - d. Racial/ethnic and gender diversity of program graduates (Infomart)
     - e. Time to graduation over the last five years (Infomart)
     - f. Information on the placement of graduates for the most recent five years (USF FETPIP data on OIE website and other sources)
   - Graduate Programs Only:
     - g. Mean GRE scores of new students
     - h. Average undergraduate GPA of new students
     - i. Number of students offered admission
     - j. Number of students accepting offer
   - k. Average student financial or graduate assistantship support

2. Brief description of current recruitment strategies for local, national, and international students.

3. Description of student organizations/groups that are within the department and how they operate. Discuss how each group supports the intellectual climate of the department.

4. Description of internal faculty led efforts to enhance student learning in this academic degree program, e.g. specialized study abroad programs, student clubs, student lead research initiatives, service learning courses, etc.

## VI. Faculty

1. Brief description of the unit faculty (tenure, tenure-track, visiting, etc.). Address unit organization and interactions among faculty of the various programs, tracks, and concentrations (if applicable). Please include the following data points:
   - a. Number of full-time faculty by rank
   - b. Number of adjuncts and part-time faculty
   - c. Student faculty ratio over the last five to seven years (program majors)
   - d. Provide a table showing the cost per FTE faculty
   - e. SCH production by instructor type (full-time, part-time, GA) and by rank.
# Academic Program Review Self-Study Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Discussion of the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the program’s faculty. Note any significant trends in the last seven years to support procedures for increasing the racial and ethnic minority faculty and other underrepresented populations within the program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In the Appendix (or on the web-site), include abbreviated curriculum vitae for each faculty member that summarizes publications, honors, and awards, participation in national and international societies and meetings, editorial responsibilities, university, regional, national and/or international committees, and research funding during the past seven years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VII. Research and Service

Provide an overview of current faculty effort related to research and service

| 1 | Provide a summary of on-going projects and current funding |
| 2 | Describe any interdisciplinary research efforts with other USF departments |
| 3 | Provide recent citations and publications of the faculty |
| 4 | Describe current research directions of the department and anticipated future directions |
| 5 | Describe current service initiatives in the department |
| 6 | Describe how faculty assignments are balanced between teaching, research and |

## VIII. Resources

Provide an overview of the adequacy of the resources available to the program that includes the following. Note specifically whether each type of resource is adequate or not:

| 1 | Laboratory space currently in the departmental inventory (if applicable) |
| 2 | Laboratory equipment (if applicable) |
| 3 | Library holdings |
| 4 | Department facilities |
| 5 | Classroom facilities |
| 6 | Other items relevant for the degree |

## IX. Responses to Previous Program-Review Recommendations

| 1 | List of prior program-review recommendations |
| 2 | Summary of how previous program-review recommendations have been used to inform any curricula, program planning, development and improvement or budgeting decisions. |
| 3 | Discussion of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that support or impede the achievement of the recommendations. |
| 4 | Discuss what the department would like the academic program(s) to be in five to seven years assuming limited additional resources. Discuss what is needed to make this happen from the departmental perspective (include budget needs, if applicable). |

## X. Questions for the External Reviewer from the Department

Please provide any questions the department believes the external reviewer should address.