|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Academic Program Review**  **Department Self-study** | |
| **CIP Code being reviewed** | |  |
| **Program College** | |  |
| **Program Department** | |  |
| **Primary Contact** | |  |
| **Primary Contact Email** | |  |

Describe the degree program(s) being reviewed:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree Title** | **Degree Level** | **Degree Type** | **Credit Hours** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Please provide a response for each of the following items.

**SECTION 1: DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW.** From the departmental website or department chair’s institutional memory.

* 1. Provide a brief history of the department and its academic program(s).
  2. Provide the department mission statement and a description of its alignment with the college mission, SUS strategic plan, and other state priorities.
  3. Describe the departmental vision (a brief description of where the department would be if it reached its full potential).
  4. Describe departmental goals for teaching, research, and service and other program goals & objectives (BOG Regulation 8.015)
  5. Describe the process used to prepare the self-study including the people involved.

**SECTION 2: BENCHMARKING AND UNIVERSITY ASPIRATIONS**

Select two departments that the department considers to be peers, and select two departments to which the departments aspires to be a peer for a total of (4) peers. The USF peer comparisons are located at [https://usfweb.usf.edu/ODS/Secure/Performance/KeyPerformanceMetrics.aspx](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fusfweb.usf.edu%2FODS%2FSecure%2FPerformance%2FKeyPerformanceMetrics.aspx&data=02%7C01%7Cmwrona%40usf.edu%7C0ea67dd7439b432d074e08d6b2dd9f7d%7C741bf7dee2e546df8d6782607df9deaa%7C0%7C0%7C636893062259961210&sdata=Nq5CNMj2680aH%2BHSIjhk17dekG1oEWFuhMKcUDH38z4%3D&reserved=0). If using peers not included on the list of USF’s National Public Peers, please provide information to justify your choice(s).

2.1 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 two departments at AAU peer institutions.***

***(2) Current Peers***

***(2) Aspirational Peers***

**SECTION 3: FACULTY EXCELLENCE (USF Strategic Plan Goal 2)**

Program and department benchmarks are aspirational and may change on an ongoing basis. Relevant department or program benchmarks are generally decided in consultation with the department chair, program director, faculty, and dean’s office. While student data are appropriate, the focus is usually on faculty-related data (i.e., publications, impact factors, etc.) **All benchmarks should help USF in the pursuit of AAU status.**

3.1 Using the data supplied by ODS, provide an overview of faculty characteristics and number including:

* + Number of full-time faculty
  + Faculty mix (full-time vs adjuncts)
  + Racial/ethnic and gender makeup of the faculty
  + SCH production by faculty type
  + Ranks and tenure status
  + Areas of expertise
  1. Describe any efforts to recruit, mentor, and retain talented diverse faculty (**USF Strategic Plan Objectives 2A and 4A**).
  2. Describe how faculty assignments are balanced among teaching, research and service.

3.4 Describe the typical teaching load for full-time faculty in the program under review. Note any differences based on tenure status or other relevant factors.

3.5 Reflecting on the data extracted from Academic Analytics or other reputable, publicly available sources, give an overview of faculty efforts related to research including anticipated future directions (**USF Strategic Plan Objective 2C**), community-engaged research (**USF Strategic Plan Objective 3D**), inter- and intra-institutional collaborations (**USF Strategic Plan Objectives 2B and 2D**), and research that results in patents and licensing efforts (**USF Strategic Plan Objective 5B**).

3.6 Describe significant professional service activities of the faculty members who contribute to the program under review: Local, State, National, and International.

3.7 Describe national or international awards or other evidence of noteworthy recognition and/or other accomplishments received during the review period by faculty who contribute to the program under review (**USF Strategic Plan Objective 2C**).

**SECTION 4: FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY (USF Strategic Plan Goal 5)**

Questions 4.1 and 4.2 would be answered by information provided by the department chair or program director based on known department practices.

4.1 Provide an overview of the sufficiency of institutional fiscal, physical, and human resources to support the program(s) under review. For example, include information on:

* Tuition revenue (ODS will provide)
* Graduate assistantships and waivers (if applicable)
* Administration support
* Laboratory space
* Laboratory equipment
* Department and classroom facilities
* Office space
* Technology support
* Library resources
* Online course/program support
* Academic Program Advisors
* Staff support

4.2 Describe any non-E&G sources of funds that support the program(s) under review; e.g. cost recovery, market rate, INTO, auxiliary funds, student fees.

4.3 Other than university resources, describe any sources of funds used to support graduate assistants; e.g., grants, fellowships, donors. ODS will provide the data. For interpretation and other questions, contact Adam Caskie at acaskie@usf.edu.

4.4 Discuss the SCH produced by the department for the rest of the university, including service courses or programs in Enhanced General Education and interdisciplinary programs (**USF Strategic Plan Objective 5C**). Information provided by the department.

4.6 List all documented community partnerships that are housed in the department (**USF Strategic Plan Objective 3D**).

4.7 In the context of the resources provided to the institution by the department, and the sufficiency of resources provided from the institution to the department, discuss any additional unmet resource needs of the program(s) under review.