Background
The Florida Board of Governors (BOG) Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review requires state universities to review all academic degree programs by CIP and level at least once every seven years. 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.

Programs holding specialized accreditation may request to use documentation from their specialized accreditation review to satisfy the BOG program review requirements. In all cases, requirements stated in the BOG regulation must be met.

BOG 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. A summary of the current strengths of the program;
7. A summary of the current weaknesses of the program;
8. A summary of the recommendations and/or proposed action plans developed as a result of the review.

Review Process:
Institutional Effectiveness (IE) in the USF Office of Decision Support coordinates the program review and specialized accreditation processes for all USF 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 “Request for Extension of Time for Program Review” form located on the IE website: https://www.usf.edu/ods/accreditation/academic-program-review.aspx.
IE 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. IE is also the official document repository for all program review and specialized accreditation material, such as the self-studies, accreditation reports, and final reports, including summaries of reviews submitted to the BOG.

Program reviews are conducted either online, on-site, or virtually via external consultant(s). The mode of review is determined by the college dean in consultation with the Office of the Provost. The determination is based on the following criteria:

- The programs operation and maintenance of physical facilities, such as laboratories not easily reviewed in an online 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.

**Required Documents**

The program-review process includes the following documents:

1. A self-study of each academic program defined by the CIP code and degree level.
2. A self-study of the department in which those programs are located.
3. All CVs of current faculty.
4. A completed itinerary which will be shared by IE and housed in Box. This document must be updated in Box as meetings are scheduled.
5. A dean’s report prepared by the dean of the college that houses the academic program.
6. A report from one or more external consultants selected by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the program under review and the dean’s office.
7. A report in response to the recommendations that must include proposed improvement plans made as a result of the review.
8. An executive summary report of the program review using the form provided by IE and submitted through the Provost (or designee) to the BOG in accordance with Regulation 8.015.
9. A one-year follow-up report detailing progress made implementing proposed improvement plans for the program submitted to the dean of the college that houses the academic program and to IE. Additional annual follow-up reports may be required.

**Document Storage**

Documents related to program review including the self-study reports, dean’s report, and the external consultant’s report will be collected in the Academic Program Review Library in Box. These documents will be made available to department chairs, deans and associate deans, and external consultant(s) by IE.
Selection of External Consultant(s)

The external consultant is employed at the discretion of the Provost and Senior Vice President. The department should submit three to five names and vitae of potential consultants who meet the qualifications listed below to the dean of the college. Department chairs should ensure that there are no conflicts of interest with the candidates for external review. Conflict of interests include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Joint publishing and/or research work with members of the department;
- Prior working history with key members of the department;
- Prior work with current USF students;
- Serving as a grant reviewer for proposals submitted by departmental faculty.

The dean in consultation with the chair of the department will review the suggested consultants and forward a final list to Institutional Effectiveness. The selection of the external consultant(s) is finalized by the Office of the Provost.

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;
- Be currently active in the discipline;
- Have departmental or related academic administrative experience;
- Have experience in a publicly supported university or college;
- Hold the rank of Professor at an AAU institution (or other Carnegie-designated R1 university) or at an institution that is regarded as an aspirational peer for the department.*

Experience evaluating programs (e.g., as accreditation or program review team member) is preferred, but not required.

*Exceptions to this requirement may be granted upon written request to IE. A detailed explanation for the request must be included.
The purpose of the external review is to provide an objective analysis and discipline-based review of the academic program. To help fulfill this purpose, external consultant(s) are required for all program reviews. The consultant(s) may be brought on-site to or virtually conduct their review or the review may take place online. The virtual review is identical to the on-site review in regards to format. This decision is made by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the dean of the college and chair/director of the academic program under review. Consultant(s) should be aware that their reports are public documents in accordance with Florida’s Sunshine laws.

At a minimum, the report should contain 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 online) 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 the defined student learning outcomes;
    b. Quality and appropriateness of measures used to assess student learning outcomes;
    c. How well students are achieving expected learning outcomes;
    d. 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:

1. Academic program enhancement
   • Those not requiring new resources;
   • Those requiring new resources;
2. Departmental enhancement
   • Those not requiring new resources;
   • Those requiring new resources.

Section V: Response to Questions from the Department and the Dean

In this section, please respond to specific questions from the department chair, faculty, and the dean.
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