



UNIVERSITY OF
SAN FRANCISCO

CHANGE THE WORLD FROM HERE

Academic Program Review Guidelines

AY 2014-2015

University of San Francisco
Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support

Contents

I. Overview	3
II. Components of the Academic Program Review Process	3
III. Tasks Associated with the Academic Program Review Process.....	4
IV. Selection of External Reviewers.....	5
V. The Self-Study.....	6
VI. External Reviewers Campus Visit.....	8
VII. Action Plan.....	9
APPENDIX 1.....	10
I. Mission and History	10
II. Curriculum	11
Undergraduate Program	11
Graduate Programs	12
International and Online Programs.....	13
Admission and Transfer Policies.....	14
Advising	14
Overall Academic Quality	14
III. Assessment of Student Learning.....	14
IV. Faculty	15
Demographics.....	15
Teaching	15
Research	16
Service	16
Relationship with other Departments and Programs	17
Recruitment and Development.....	17
V. Departmental Governance.....	18
VI. Students.....	18
VII. Staff	18

VIII. Diversity and Internationalization	19
Diversity.....	19
Internationalization.....	19
IX. Technology and Informational Resources	19
Technology	19
Distance Learning or Online Learning	20
Library.....	20
X. Facilities.....	20
XI. Conclusions.....	20
XII. Comprehensive Plan For The Future	21
APPENDIX 2.....	22
University and College	22
Program	22
Logistics.....	23
APPENDIX 3	24
Curriculum Vitae	24
Biographical information.....	24
Research/Creative Work	24
Teaching	25
Service	25
Miscellaneous.....	25
Several DOs and DON'Ts in Vita Preparation	26

I. Overview

The Academic Program Review (APR) is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of most academic degree programs regardless of its mode of delivery. All programs¹ will engage in the APR process every 5 to 8 years depending on the needs of the program. Typically, the majority of programs are reviewed every 7 years. In some instances, some academic degree programs, e.g., Nursing and credential teaching programs, undergo professional accreditation and as such are exempted from this APR process since the goals and outcomes are similar. These Academic Program Review guidelines apply to all academic programs in the absence of school specific guidelines.

The purpose of an academic program review is to examine, assess and enhance the quality of academic degree programs, and to identify strengths and weaknesses so that priorities can be established for program improvement and modification. The ultimate goal is to promote and maintain academic excellence and ensure that programs are being consistent with the University's Mission and values.

The Academic Program Review is useful when it is not seen as an end in itself and when it is not perceived as a bureaucratic exercise demanded by the Dean and external accreditation agencies. Rather, meaningful program reviews can offer an opportunity for reflection, discussion and improvement for faculty, students, and staff. Program reviews are integral to formulating realistic plans for future departmental growth and improvement, and will be viewed as such by the Dean and other University administrators.

II. Components of the Academic Program Review Process

The academic program review process has three major components:

Program Self-Study

This is a comprehensive report addressing every aspect of the academic program. It should contain the program's vision, mission and goals, and make recommendations for improvement and development based upon an overall analysis of the program. The self-study allows the program *to tell its own story* to the external review team and the university administration. The document is posted on the university assessment website.

External Review

The external review team provides an objective outsider's perspective on the quality of the program. After reading the self-study and making a campus visit, the external review team will compile a report that provides an evaluation of the program. The Dean's Office summarizes the external reviewers' report in the executive summary. The summary is also posted on the university assessment website.

Action Plan

The Dean or his / her designee meets with the program to create the action plan. The action plan structures the implementation of the recommendations in the self-study and the external review report according to a reasonable timetable.

¹ "Program" is used here to denote an academic entity that awards at least one degree (Bachelor, Master, a doctorate or a professional degree).

III. Tasks Associated with the Academic Program Review Process

The list of activities provided herein intends to guide programs in planning for the APR review process. The program is charged with establishing a timeline that will allow the program to be reviewed in accordance with the review cycle deadline.

Preparation

- Update program webpage information (e.g., faculty profiles, course descriptions, program learning outcomes, etc.), if necessary.
- Solicit program data (admission, enrollment, retention, budget, course enrollment statistics). The Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (CIPE) will provide 5-year trend data upon request through Data Assist. A full list of required data elements is found at the end of this document.
- Review annual assessment reports and extract “closing the loop” examples.
- Gather teaching evaluation results, update course syllabi and curriculum vitae.
- Program drafts a list of 12 external reviewer nominees and submits it to the Dean.
- Program to plan and holds meeting(s) and/or retreat(s) to discuss and plan the self-study and external reviewer nominee list.
- Program submits a draft of the self-study document to obtain comments from the Dean. Soon thereafter, program faculty meets with the Dean or Associate Dean to discuss the first draft.
- The program self-study is made available to external reviewers and the Senior Vice Provost.
- Coordinate all site-visit logistics.

During the Site Visit

- The external reviewers team visits the campus, usually for three days.
- Program faculty should be available on the days of the visit.

After the Site Visit

- The Dean’s Office receives the external reviewers' report and forwards it to program faculty.
- The self-study, the external reviewers’ report, and an executive summary of the reviewers’ report are sent to the Senior Vice Provost.
- A clean version of the self-study and executive summary of the external reviewers’ report are posted on the university assessment website.
- The executive summary is presented to the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board of Trustees.
- The program meets with the Dean and Associate Dean to discuss the report's recommendations.

- The program faculty and the Dean formulate the action plan.
- The program may submit a separate response to the external reviewers' comments as part of the action plan. The action plan is sent to the Senior Vice Provost. The Dean discusses the entire APR with Dean's Council.
- Note: Programs that are reviewed by Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)-approved specialty accreditation organizations will follow activities as described by the accrediting agency.

IV. Selection of External Reviewers

One of the first issues that the program will need to consider is their list of potential external reviewers. The external review team will normally consist of 3 faculty members from other recognized and accredited colleges and universities. Each program under review will be asked to nominate *at least 12 candidates* for the external review team. The nominees can have no conflicts of interest regarding the program under review (e.g., not a former employee, co-author, dissertation advisor, relative or close friend of current faculty member, etc.). In general, the external reviewers should:

- hold the highest degree appropriate to the department/program under review.
- have a record of distinguished scholarship and/or professional experience appropriate to the program under review.
- be recognized as an active member of scholarly and/or professional societies appropriate to the program under review.
- be currently employed at a recognized university or college at the rank of Associate Professor or higher.
- be responsive to institutional and departmental mission.

At least one reviewer should:

- have current or prior experience at the level of department chair or higher at an institution of comparable size and reputation to the University of San Francisco.
- have prior experience relevant to the accreditation process, assessment, and/or program review process.
- hold an appointment in a prestigious and nationally recognized program or a program that the department/program wishes to emulate.
- if possible, hold an appointment at a Jesuit University.

The Dean or his / her designee assembles a team that consists of at least 1 member, but not more than 2 members, from the department/program's list of nominees and at least 1 member, but no more than 2 members, of the Dean's list of nominees. The Dean shall inform program faculty of the composition of the external review team in writing. The department chair or director in which the program is housed may request a meeting, in writing, with the Dean within 10 days of receiving the Dean's notification, if the program wishes to discuss the external review team membership.

Please read *Collective Bargaining Agreement* section 21.9 for more details about procedures related to the creation of the external review team.

Programs that are reviewed by Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)-approved specialty accreditation organizations will follow a procedure for suggesting and approving external reviewers as described by the accrediting agency.

V. The Self-Study

The purpose of the self-study is to allow faculty, students and administration to consider not only a program's recent accomplishments and challenges but also to engage in a forward-looking planning process.

The self-study is a comprehensive written document prepared by a program that is scheduled for program review. A thorough and thoughtful self-study will candidly assess a program's past efforts and will outline a realistic course of action for future development. The self-study provides the basis for the entire review process so it is crucial that the report cover all aspects of the program. The most useful self-study is a thorough but succinct, honest assessment of the program. An incomplete self study may lead to reviewers feeling confused about the program and/or many unnecessary questions during the visit.

The self-study must be a product of the program faculty. They are in the best position to raise and respond to any significant strategic and operational issues being faced by the program and they are also in the best position to use the results of the review to improve the program. Department chairs and program directors should ensure that there is full faculty participation in the preparation of the self-study.

Program Review Outline

Please refer to Appendix 1 for suggested guideline questions for each APR section. There are a variety of academic programs within the University and the following guidelines will be useful to many when they write their self-study; however, some items may not apply to any given department or program. If there is a need to go beyond the topics outlined in the suggested guidelines in order to give a more accurate picture of the program to the external reviewers, they should feel free to do so.

- a) **Mission:** Articulate the mission and purpose(s) of the program and its alignment with the institutional mission.
- b) **History:** Provide a brief description of the recommendations and major changes that have occurred since the last program review.
- c) **Curriculum:** The Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (CIPE) will provide 5-year admission, enrollment, retention, and graduation trend data for the program. These data can be requested via Data Assist. Additional required elements:
 - List of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
 - Curriculum Map showing alignment of PLOs, ILOs and courses.
 - Admission and Transfer Policies.
- d) **Assessment of Student Learning:** Review and discuss all annual assessment of program learning outcome report results and extract “closing the loop examples” important to the program mission and objectives. Reviewers should have access to the report archives.
- e) **Faculty:** Discuss faculty demographics, contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service, their relationship with other department and programs, recruitment processes and development opportunities.
- f) **Departmental Structure:** Provide a description of the sufficiency of resources and support services to achieve the program mission and objectives.
- g) **Students:** The Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will provide 5-year demographic trend data. In addition, please discuss recruitment efforts, the intellectual and social climate, and academic expectations.
- h) **Staff:** Provide a summary describing the administrative staff and their supporting role.
- i) **Diversity and Internationalization:** Discuss the program efforts in the areas of diversity and internationalization.
- j) **Technology and Informational Resources:** In this section describe how technology supports the program needs, including online education (if relevant). In addition, please describe how the Gleeson Library supports the program mission and attainment of objectives.
- k) **Facilities:** Describe the current instructional and research/creative work facilities.
- l) **Conclusion:** Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program that support or impede achievement of program objectives.

m) Comprehensive Plan for the Future: Please describe the program's plan for improvement over the next 5 years (curricular, research, facilities, faculty recruitment and development, diversity, etc.)

Note: Programs that are reviewed by Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)-approved specialty accreditation organizations will follow a report outline as described by the accrediting agency.

VI. External Reviewers Campus Visit

In the spring semester, the external review team will generally be on campus to assess the program. A successful external review team visit requires careful organization and management of time in order to ensure that the objectives of the review are met. Some flexibility in the schedule (for unanticipated events and meetings) is crucial as is time for the team to deliberate and begin drafting a report. It is important for programs to be aware of the tentative nature of the initial schedule and of the need for flexibility as the campus visit proceeds. Reviewers can, and often do, change the schedule after they arrive on campus.

The Dean's Office will provide much of the information and data that the external reviewers will need to complete their task in addition to the department self-study. In general, the external reviewers will be informed of the role academic program review performs at USF and the expectations we have of them as reviewers. But reviewers have a right to expect:

- the most current data
- timely access to a self-study that contains a comprehensive description of the program
- evidence that learning outcomes are being met
- a campus visit that gives them free access to any and all information necessary to writing an informed and useful report

Please note that the Dean's Office will handle all the logistical arrangements for the visit, including accommodation and transport.

Prior to the site visit, it is expected that the reviewers will have become familiar with the institution and the program under review based on materials sent to them by the Dean. They will have carefully read the self-study. They will have developed some preliminary questions about the program based upon these materials.

The campus visit normally lasts 3 days. During their time on campus, the external reviewers will meet with faculty, some students and administrators, inspect facilities and examine procedures, read on-campus documents and websites, and, if they wish, observe classes.

External review teams can and do request meetings not originally scheduled and arranged.

A site visit devoted solely to formal presentations by faculty members in the program is unlikely to achieve the program review's objectives. The material in the self-study should provide the most essential information and meetings with reviewers should be devoted to highlighting selected issues and concerns that are relevant to an honest assessment of the program. Maximum involvement of key academic groups (faculty, students, lecturers, administrators, etc.) is therefore essential.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the external review team will share their preliminary findings with the Dean at an exit interview. Within two months, the external reviewers submit a report based upon the department self-study and the findings and observations made by the external review team during their campus visit. The report will assess the program's strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for improvement and development. An executive summary of the report will be written and this will be presented to the Provost Council, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and any other campus constituencies deemed appropriate by the Dean and Provost.

Programs that are reviewed by Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)-approved specialty accreditation organizations will follow the guidelines for campus visits as described by the accrediting agency.

VII. Action Plan

Once the external reviewers submit their report, it will be distributed to full- and part-time program faculty members and will have the opportunity to respond to the report's findings. The Dean and the program will then begin formulating a plan of action for the future.

The action plan is a crucial step in the APR process. It is designed to respond to the findings of *both* the self-study and the external review report. The action plan indicates how the program plans to address the issues raised during the review process. The most important elements in the formulation of the action plan are:

- Compiling recommendations resulting from the self-study and external reviewers report.
- Identifying and outlining suggested strategies and ideas for responding to program goals and reviewer recommendation.
- Prioritizing goals and recommendations.
- Identifying and listing needed resources to support the action plan, clearly differentiating between what can be accomplished by redistributing existing resources and what requires new resources.
- Outlining a timeline for completion and implementation of each item.
- Documenting all actions and providing written reports of progress as scheduled.

The final goal of an academic program review is an action plan that not only records accomplishments but also acts as a guide for program revision and improvement.

APPENDIX 1

Note: Appendix 1 contains questions to guide programs in their decision about what can be included within each section of the self-study. There is some redundancy because items may be covered in several places. Programs may decide the best place to discuss each issue. Additional information may be required in the future in response to changes in WSCUC policies.

I. **Mission and History**

Mission

- What is the program's mission? Please include the program's mission statement.
- Is the mission clearly aligned with the University of San Francisco's Mission and strategic priorities? How?

History

- What is the recent history of the program and what are the most noteworthy changes that have taken place within the program since the last academic program review?
- What is the relationship of the program to other programs and administrative units within the University (e.g., interdisciplinary programs, research centers, etc.)?
- Does the program contribute to the Core curriculum? Does it service other majors, minors, or programs?
- What were the main recommendations of the previous academic program review? How did the program and administration respond to the earlier findings and recommendations? What changed after the last academic program review?
- If this is the first program review, discuss the origins of the program. Why was the program created?
- How would you characterize the morale and atmosphere within the program?

Learning Goals and Outcomes

- What, in general terms, are the goals of the undergraduate and graduate instructional programs?
- What are the student learning outcomes (SLOs) for each of these goals (in other words, what should students know, think, or be able to do as a result of completing the program)?
- What are the program's diversity goals and objectives regarding students, faculty and program offerings?

II. Curriculum

General

- If the program is in a department, please name all the degree programs offered solely by the department and name separately any interdisciplinary major or minor programs the department is involved in.
- What are the distinguishing features of the academic program?
- How many declared majors, double majors, and minors have the program had in each baccalaureate and/or graduate program over the last 5 years?
- How many degrees has the program awarded in each of the last 5 years?
- For the period since the last review, indicate and interpret trends in enrollment, retention and graduation for your program. Based upon these data, what do you project enrollments to look like in the next 5 years? 10 years?
- How does the program determine curricular content?
- How are credit units assigned to courses? Do they meet the University's Policy on credits?
- How does this curriculum compare with other programs nationally and internationally?
- What is the program's philosophy with respect to the balance between Core Curriculum courses, service courses for other departments, and major courses?

Undergraduate Program

- Please provide the Curriculum Map demonstrating the links between the learning outcomes and the courses in the program.
- Are the major and minor requirements coherent or a collection of unrelated courses? Is the program structured in a logical, sequential and consistent manner?
- Do students learn about the discipline's historical roots and development, as well as current trends and directions?
- What are the core requirements for the major and for any concentrations or specialty areas?
- How well is this faculty able to support any concentrations and specialty areas cited in the Catalogue?
- How frequently are core courses and electives offered and in what sequence?
- Do students experience any difficulties in meeting graduation requirements for the program due to the frequency of course offerings?
- What is the prerequisite sequence between lower-division and upper-division courses?
- What is the proportion of lower-division to upper-division courses offered?
- What are the average class sizes in core courses, required major courses and electives? Are

these class sizes appropriate for the learning goals/outcomes and learning objectives of the curriculum? How do they compare to those of other programs in the University?

- What is the mix of majors to non-majors enrolled in your program's courses?
- What efforts are made to incorporate new perspectives, ideas and knowledge into the curriculum and to remove outmoded methodologies and viewpoints?
- What courses have been deleted or substantially updated in the past five years? If you know what new courses are to be offered in the next five years, please include a separate list of such courses.
- What policies and practices are in place to ensure a modicum of uniformity in terms of grading standards, course content, and learning outcomes across the curriculum?
- How much and what type of writing assignments does the department require?
- What does the program offer its most outstanding students, e.g. honors track, capstone course, senior thesis, etc.?
- What opportunities exist to actively involve students in learning through internships, work-study, practicum, study abroad, etc.?
- In what ways have you been able to involve undergraduates in research? How do you assess the results?
- How well prepared are majors for graduate study in the field?
- Are undergraduates interested in graduate programs in the field? What percentage are interested and what percentage actually go on to graduate studies? What other academic and non-academic fields are they entering upon?

Graduate Programs

- Describe, in general terms, the mission of graduate program(s) offered?
- Please provide the Curriculum Map demonstrating the links between the learning outcomes and the courses in the program.
- What are the learning goals and outcomes of the graduate program(s)?
- What are the standards by which the program measures success in achieving objectives for the program(s)? Using these standards, has the graduate program met the objectives?
- What changes have taken place in recent years and what changes are anticipated over the next five years?
- How are graduate students recruited?
- Please provide a brief description and assessment of the credentials, placement, and mentoring of graduate students in your program(s).
- Are there sufficient course offerings and balance among various specialties, methodologies, theories, etc? Is there sufficient breadth and depth for specialization?

- How are courses in the graduate program coordinated? How do modifications and changes take place?
- Do courses meet student needs? In what ways, besides individual research, are graduate students actively involved in their learning (internships, practica, teaching assistantships, etc)?
- Do students have adequate resources to carry out their studies (research space, supplies, travel, photocopying, etc.)?
- How does the quality of graduate students in this (these) program compare with student quality in similar programs? Has the quality improved over the past five years?
- What is the current gender, race/ethnicity composition of the program's graduate students?
- Are stipend levels and availability adequate? What steps have been taken to improve student support and what additional support, if any, is needed to improve the program?
- What are the retention rates in the graduate program(s)?
- How do you inform your graduate students of and prepare them for the opportunities and alternatives available to them within and outside the academy upon graduation?
- Where have students who have graduated in the last five years been placed?
- How do graduates of your program(s) view their graduate experience and training?
- Does the program offer any courses taken by significant numbers of students in other programs?
- Do students from your program(s) utilize graduate courses from other departments or schools? What coordination problems, if any, have been encountered?
- What is the relationship between the graduate program and undergraduate program, if applicable? Are any courses cross-listed? If so, how do the requirements for the graduate students differ from the undergraduate students in those courses?

International and Online Programs

- For all USF programs taught overseas or online, please describe the curriculum. How is it similar or different to programs taught on the Hilltop campus or branch campuses?
- How was/is the program set up? How were/are classes scheduled?
- Who has taught in the international or online programs? Overall, what has been the quality of instruction? What support services were provided by USF?
- What have been the results of learning outcome assessment? (If no assessment has been made, simply state this and explain why not).

Admission and Transfer Policies

- Are there any requirements for admission to the program?
- Are there any internal procedures for accepting credit from elsewhere (advanced placement, transfer, study abroad, etc.)? What are they?
- Are there any procedures for awarding credit to experiences other than traditional instruction (experiential learning, undergraduate research, internships, Previous Learning Assessment, etc.)?

Advising

- How are students advised and mentored?
- Is advising valued and rewarded by the program?
- How is advising organized and how is advising quality maintained?
- How is the advising process evaluated? If it has been evaluated, what were the results of this evaluation?
- Are there less formal opportunities for faculty/student interaction?

Overall Academic Quality

- What, in the opinion of the faculty, is the overall quality of the program?
- How, in the opinion of the faculty, does the program compare with others nationally and internationally?
- Describe any special strengths and/or unique features of the program. Are there special research emphases that make a unique contribution to the program?
- In what areas has the program improved or deteriorated within the last 5 years? Please describe the evidence used to support these conclusions along with plans for eliminating any deficiencies (include expected timetables).

III. Assessment of Student Learning

- What are the program learning outcomes? Please provide access or include as hardcopies Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes reports.
- What are the standards by which you measure success in achieving the learning outcomes? Please include in the appendices any rubrics the program has designed and used in this regard.
- What are the methods by which the program assesses its success in achieving its program learning outcomes?
- To what degree have you achieved your stated program learning outcomes?
- How does the faculty utilize evidence from the Annual Assessment of Program Learning reports to make changes and inform them of the quality of student learning that occurs in the program?
- How does the program determine whether individual courses are meeting their program

learning outcomes?

- How does the program determine whether individual courses are contributing to overall program outcomes?
- What factors have facilitated or impeded the program's ability to meet its learning outcomes?
- What are the program's reflections on the data on retention and persistence to graduation?
- How are program expectations communicated to students? Are they informed as to their progress in meeting program learning outcomes?
- Has the program participated in the evaluation of any of the Core areas? Please include in the appendices the report(s).

IV. Faculty

Demographics

- Please discuss, assess and evaluate the faculty demographic data.

Teaching

- Please list for each faculty member in the program, the courses taught during the academic year along with the number of units and student credit hours.
- Do the faculty as a whole possess the appropriate background and expertise to deliver the current curriculum?
- How are teaching assignments made within the program?
- With regard to interdisciplinary programs, how are teaching loads negotiated and balanced between the home department and the interdisciplinary program?
- To what extent do faculty enjoy teaching the courses they teach?
- Do faculty wish they taught different courses or taught existing courses differently?
- Is the curriculum flexible enough to allow innovation in teaching methods and the development of new courses?
- Has new technology affected the way in which courses are taught?
- Does the program monitor its overall teaching effectiveness? How?
- What does the program do to help faculty, particularly junior faculty, improve student learning?
- Other than classroom teaching, how is the faculty involved in student learning and development (e.g. independent study, mentorship, advising)?

Research

- What are the faculty's research and creative interests and aims? Please describe the research and/or creative work of the program, focusing primarily on achievements since the last review.
- What is the recent history of research support, fellowships, grants, awards, contracts or commissions by members of the program? Please list by title and principal investigator any major research projects and include a brief description. For sponsored projects, list sources, amounts of funding and duration. (List all grant proposals made by the faculty whether funded or not).
- What has been the impact of faculty research in the field and more broadly over the last 5 years?
- What are the primary areas of emphases and strengths within the program?
- What factors have shaped and in future are likely to shape the areas of expertise in the program?
- In what ways have changes in your discipline (paradigms, funding patterns, technologies, etc.) influenced research, scholarship and creative work in the program?
- Some programs are more heterogeneous than others. What variations exist among your faculty in terms of methodologies, paradigms, or subfield specializations? Do these differences create obstacles to communication and, if so, what steps have been taken to promote communication between different constituencies? How successful have these strategies been?
- What impediments to faculty productivity exist and in what ways can these be reduced?
- What are the expectations for faculty research/artistic creation/performance in terms of quality and quantity? Are they being met, and if not, why not? How do the program's expectations compare with the College as a whole and with similar departments at other colleges and universities?

Service

- What are the major service contributions made by faculty to the college and university over the last 5 years? Please be selective and do not include or append faculty resumes or vitae.
- What are the major outreach programs that faculty have been involved in since the last review?
- In what ways are the faculty linked to the community (paid and unpaid consulting, faculty service on community boards/commissions etc.)?

Relationship with other Departments and Programs

- In what ways does the program collaborate with other departments and/or programs at USF?
- What is the program's assessment of the successes and disappointments of those collaborations?
- Are there any impediments to developing interdisciplinary research or connections to other programs?
- How could the University aid you in strengthening and developing such ties?

For Interdisciplinary and Online Programs:

- How does the director (and advisory committee, if applicable) maintain program coherence and vision when the faculty comes from a number of different departments?
- How does the director maintain relationships with contributing departments?
- Are there other departments or programs that could enhance the interdisciplinary perspective?
- Are there obstacles to approaching these departments or programs?
- How could the University aid the program in solidifying old relationships and fostering new ones?

Recruitment and Development

- In what areas and specialties does the program wish to hire in the future? What is the rationale for recruitment in these areas?
- What are the anticipated retirements that need to be taken into account in long-range planning over the next five to ten years?
- In what ways does the program help foster professional development and growth of the faculty?
- How are junior faculty members mentored with respect to their teaching, scholarship/art, and service?
- Are information and expectations communicated effectively, especially to junior faculty?

V. Departmental Governance

- How is this program organized? Describe the program's governance structure and include in the appendices the existing governance documents.
- There is an expectation of faculty participation in governance, how do faculty members in the program meet this expectation?
- What is the term of the chair and how is he/she elected?
- How well is the program governed?
- How is the work and administration allocated among individual faculty members?
- Do all faculty members feel included in decision-making? How is participation in shared governance encouraged and valued?
- How is leadership encouraged and developed, particularly among junior faculty?

VI. Students

- What is the program looking for in its students?
- What kind of students is the program well suited to serve?
- How does the program define "quality" in terms of admission to the program where relevant?
- Are there striking ethnic, racial and/or gender disparities among majors and non-majors taking courses in the program and USF students as a whole? If so, are there ways to attract those not normally attracted to the program?
- What efforts are made to create an intellectual and social climate that fosters student development and supports achievement of the program's objectives (e.g. clubs, student chapters of professional organizations, etc.)?
- Do students affect policy and operations (e.g. student membership on program committees, representation at faculty meetings, etc.)?
- How are program expectations communicated to students?
- Are students kept informed of their progress in meeting intended learning outcomes?

VII. Staff

- Please describe the administrative support staff (program assistants, student assistants, etc.).
- What has been the turnover rate in these positions during the previous 5 years? If it is high, what steps have been taken to identify and address the problem?
- What changes, if any, are underway to strengthen the staff support for the program's activities?
- What professional development and training opportunities are provided for the staff (evaluation and promotion, reclassification, opportunities to enhance/obtain skills, etc.)?

VIII. Diversity and Internationalization

Diversity

- Describe the inclusion of underrepresented groups for students (by entering cohort), faculty (by academic rank), and staff.
- What steps has the program taken to ensure an environment that values diversity and supports all faculty, students, and staff?
- What factors facilitate or impede efforts to recruit members of underrepresented groups?
- What factors facilitate or impede the program's ability to retain students and faculty from underrepresented groups once they have been recruited?
- Is there anything the University can do to help with recruitment and retention?

Internationalization

- How have international issues been integrated into course content and the curriculum?
- Have students in the program taken advantage of study-abroad programs organized by USF or other institutions?
- Have faculty participated in international programs sponsored by USF or other institutions?
- Does the program recruit and retain international students, faculty and staff?
- Does the program have any international partnerships and collaborations with educational institutions and public or private sector organizations?
- What are the goals, priorities and challenges of the program in this area?

IX. Technology and Informational Resources

Technology

- How well do the university's computer hardware and software policies and campus support for technology meet the program's needs?
- What technical computing skills are required in the discipline?
- How does the program provide students with training in appropriate technology and online skills?
- Describe how technology is used for curriculum delivery in the program.
- Does the program plan to increase the use of technology in the classroom (e.g. online courses, distance learning, CD-ROM, Internet, computer software, clickers, etc.) and in what ways?
- How effective has the program been in integrating new technology and pedagogy?

Distance Learning or Online Learning

- In what way is the program involved in distance learning or online programs?
- What is the purpose and scope of the distance learning efforts?
- What is the faculty involvement in distance learning education? How many faculty are involved and what is the percentage of total faculty teaching time devoted to this?

Library

- What is the program's assessment of the library's holdings and services?
- What are the special strengths in available resources as they relate to the current program?
- How has the program utilized its library liaison and its library budget?

X. Facilities

- Please describe the current instructional and research/creative work facilities.
- To what extent do these facilities meet the needs of the program?
- If any of these resources are inadequate, what plans have been made to correct these deficiencies?
- What additional facilities, if any, are needed in order to improve the quality of the programs or educational experiences being offered?

XI. Conclusions

- What are the program's strengths? What examples of long-term excellence, recent accomplishment, or improvement characterize the program's recent history? In what ways could the program be considered a leader in its field?
- What are the program's weaknesses? Where could the program most improve? What challenges or obstacles make it difficult to overcome these weaknesses? What further challenges do the faculty foresee in the coming years?
- What changes have occurred in teaching, research and service in the field(s) over the past five years that have influenced the program's view of its role in the University and the field?
- What changes have taken place in the relationships between the field and other related fields? What has been the impact, if any, of interdisciplinary studies, international studies, area studies, experiential and service learning, distance learning, and technological change?
- Are there differences between the program's view of its role and College/School and University expectations for the program?
- How would the faculty describe the morale and atmosphere within the program? Does the program enjoy the kind of collegial relationships between its members that are conducive to sustaining and enhancing its excellence?

XII. Comprehensive Plan For The Future

- Please indicate the program's integrated plan for improvement over the next 5 years (curricular, research, facilities, faculty recruitment and development, diversity goals, etc.
- What are the core objectives and priorities and what is the sequence of action to be taken for each item?
- How will the program position itself, given the changes likely to take place within the discipline over the next 5 to 10 years?
- What opportunities exist to extend and build on present strengths and what are the major obstacles that impede the program's progress?
- What improvements are possible through reallocating existing resources?
- What improvements can only be addressed through additional resources?

APPENDIX 2

The external review team will be provided with documents and data. The Dean's Office will compile the information below and will make data available to the program. The program is responsible for providing data concerning student activities: student organizations, student accomplishments (internships, etc.), academic advising and student post-graduation data (employments, career paths, graduate school admissions, etc.). The Dean's Office will give reviewers examples of student work, if the program provides it.

Information provided to external reviewers by the Dean's Office, either digitally or in a binder:

University and College

- USF Vision, Mission, and Values
- College/School Mission, Goals, and Strategic Initiatives
- USF General Catalog (URL)
- Academic Program Review Guidelines
- Collective Bargaining Agreement
- Average Program, College and University Teaching Evaluation Scores
- USF Fact Book
- Campus Map

Program

- Self Study
- Department/Program Website (URL)
- Department/Program Budget
- Program Requirements (from the Catalog and Program web page)
- Course Descriptions (from program web page)
- Course Syllabi
- Teaching Evaluations (by course)
- Faculty Curriculum Vitae (see Appendix 3)
- Program Data:
 - Number of majors, double majors and minors (5 years)
 - Number of graduating students (5 years)
 - Numbers of transfer students (5years)
 - Retention and attrition data (5 years)
 - Student/Faculty ratios (for the major, lower-division and upper division courses)
 - Student credit hours (program total and for lower and upper division courses)
 - Course enrollment statistics
 - Faculty demographic data (rank, years of service, etc.)
 - Numbers of non-tenure track instructional staff (term faculty, part-timers, etc.)

- Student Data:
 - Demographic and academic profile of undergraduates in the major (gender, race, ethnicity, SATs, GPAs, etc)
 - Demographic and academic profile of graduate students (gender, race, ethnicity, SATs, GPAs, etc)
 - Demographic and academic profile of entering freshmen (gender, race, ethnicity, SATs, GPAs, etc)
 - Demographic and academic profile of graduating class (gender, race, ethnicity, SATs, GPAs, etc)

Logistics

- Welcome Letter from Dean
- Overview Letter from Associate Dean
- Review Team Information
- Questions for External Reviewers
- Sample Agenda for Site Visit
- Accommodations, etc.
- Contact Information for Dean's Office

APPENDIX 3

Curriculum Vitae

Including the full curriculum vitae of all faculty members in the program produces an unwieldy notebook. The external reviewers cannot be expected to glean much from reading lengthy CV's that often obscure information that the reviewers would find useful.

Therefore, programs are asked to provide an abbreviated biography (including major publications) for each faculty member that can be included either as an appendix or in the body of the self-study. The 'bio-bib' can be one or two paragraphs and should be written in a manner appropriate to your discipline. The 'bio-bib' will give the external reviewers a brief overview of the members of the program and their interests.

Please note that the full CV of all faculty, lecturers and adjuncts will be made available to the external reviewers in a separate binder during their campus visit as part of the information provided by the Dean's Office. Full CV's should be submitted electronically to the Dean's Office as part of the preparation of the self-study

The curriculum vita (CV) is a summary of your educational and academic background. Its length can vary but please keep in mind that each discipline has slightly different standards and conventions and you should follow the common practice in your field. In general however, you should follow the format outlined below:

Biographical information

- Name, current position, date, mailing address, telephone number, email address, and fax number.
- Education (list degrees, year, institution in reverse chronological order, highest degree first. For Ph.D, please note specialty and dissertation title).
- Employment
 - a. present appointment – rank and year appointed.
 - b. previous appointments – rank and year appointed.

Research/Creative Work

- Research/Creative Endeavors – subject(s) of interest and activity
- Awards/Honors/Grants/Fellowships
- Publications (list in the following order; dissertation should be listed under education. Publications from the dissertation (a book and/or articles) should be listed separately in the publications section):

Refereed publications

- a. Books (single authored and edited collections; include publisher, place of publication and date)

- b. Refereed journal articles (single and multi-authored papers; include title, journal, volume number, inclusive page numbers and year)
- c. Chapters in books (title of chapter, author(s) of collection, publisher, place of publication and date).
- d. Abstracts

Non-refereed publications

- a) Reviews, editorials, op-ed pieces, letters to the editor, etc.

Unpublished work

Please use the following designations:

- a) “in press” – in the hands of copyeditor, typesetter, or printer.
 - b) “accepted” – publisher committed to publication; currently under revision.
 - c) “submitted” – currently under review at a journal or press.
 - d) “in progress” – not yet completed or submitted.
- Presentations
 - a) Papers presented at meetings and symposia (list in reverse chronological order and provide name of conference or event, date and location)
 - b) Invited lectures (list in reverse chronological order under the categories of local, regional, national, and international).

Teaching

- Summary of teaching responsibilities (courses taught and whether graduate or undergraduate).
- Supervised student research including graduate theses or major projects (indicate whether primary or secondary supervisor), senior theses, directed studies, etc.
- Presentations, research and publications on teaching.
- Brief description (bullet points) of any steps taken to assess and improve teaching.

Service

- Please briefly list service contributions (in reverse chronological order);
 - a) to the department
 - b) to the College/School
 - c) to the University
 - d) to the profession.
 - e) to the community.

Miscellaneous

- Professional memberships and associations
- Languages
- Related Professional Experience

Several DOs and DON'Ts in Vita Preparation

- DO make your vita a clear and concise summary of your professional qualifications. Like any good writing, every word should count.
- DO try to obtain copies of several vitae from individuals who are in your field.
- DO take the time to create an elegant and inviting format. Style matters, and your vita should appear professional, uncluttered, and friendly to the eye.
- DO be sure to check the vita carefully for mistakes and typographical errors. Without exception, it must be absolutely error-free.
- DON'T give the appearance of padding your vita by including such things as extra-wide margins, high school accomplishments, or excessive detail about your research and teaching experience (e.g., details associated with running an experiment, such as "I contacted participants, scheduled them for sessions...").
- DON'T leave out any publications, conflate published and unpublished work or list the same item more than once.
- DON'T include your dissertation as a published work – put it under education. If it is subsequently published (book or articles), make appropriate citations under published work.
- DON'T list irrelevant personal information such as height, weight, health, military status, age, marital status, or the number of children you have. Excessive detail should be avoided.
- DON'T list category subheadings that have only one item (with one exception: a section entitled "Publication" is acceptable for listing a single publication) or are more ambitious than their content.