



Florida Atlantic University Academic Program Review Instructions and Template

PURPOSE

Under Florida Board of Governors Regulation 6C-8.015 adopted March 29, 2007, all academic degree programs in State universities must be reviewed at least every seven years. Program reviews ensure that academic programs are administered and delivered effectively, efficiently, and consistent with FAU's mission and the Board of Governors' strategic priorities. 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. Program review processes in the State University System must emphasize the assessment of student learning outcomes and continuous program improvement. All aspects of a program—undergraduate and graduate education as well as teaching, research, service, and community engagement activities—are covered in the self-study. The Academic Program Review is conducted in addition to any external accreditation process and should be seen as a complement to existing accreditation procedures.

Several principles guide the Academic Program Review process:

- The review is aimed toward action plans for the future, rather than solely evaluating a unit's current situation
- The review defines a unit's goals and action plans in accordance with the overall mission and strategic plan of the university
- A clear action plan is the outcome of the review process which enables assessments of accomplishments
- The review demonstrates accountability to university stakeholders and should be considered as an additional measure of institutional effectiveness

The Academic Program Review helps the unit establish its goals and direction and allows the university to make decisions on resource allocation, priorities, and actions which strengthen and improve the unit as well as align its direction with the university's strategic plans. The results of the Academic Program Review are important for examining how the unit contributes to the university's mission and how it presents itself to external constituents.

Thus, the overall aim of the Academic Program Review is to enable continuous improvement and to support the aspirations of Florida Atlantic University.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees has ultimate authority over the Academic Program Review process. The Board approves procedures for the review and approves the final reports and action plans that are a result of the review.

Office of the Provost

The Office of the Provost has responsibility for the Academic Program Review process, ensuring that it meets state regulations and Board of Trustees priorities. Throughout the entire cycle of the Academic Program Review, the Office of the Provost provides leadership, continuity, consistency, and support to the units undergoing review, including the following responsibilities:

- Ensure that reviews are conducted according to the Board of Governors' schedule
- Initiate the process with units scheduled for review
- Orient units and review teams to the purpose and requirements of the review
- Receive nominations of review team, following approval by College Dean
- Approve the unit's self-study report
- Review for completeness the unit's response to the reviewers' report and action plan
- Communicate the results of each review to the Board of Trustees
- Oversee implementation of review recommendations and planned actions

The College

The Dean of the College is involved with the Academic Program Review process by appointing a college liaison to work with the Provost's office and guide the process within the school. The dean will approve the unit's nomination of reviewers, approve the unit's self-study report, meet with reviewers during the site visit, meet with other university stakeholders as appropriate, and review and provide feedback to the unit on their response to the reviewers' report, including the unit's action plan.

The Unit (Department, Center or Program)

The unit works with the Office of the Provost in order to understand the full scope and responsibilities of the Academic Program Review. The unit nominates potential reviewers, prepares the self-study report, schedules the site visit (in accordance with site visit protocol described later in this document), conducts the site visit, responds to the review team's recommendations, and prepares an action plan in consultation with the College Dean. The unit is also responsible for implementing the action plan and assessing its progress on key goals at the 4-year interim.

The Review Team

The Review Team is made up of internal and external members. The role of the Review Team is to ensure the integrity of the Academic Program Review, provide feedback to the unit, and provide recommendations for improvement. The Review Team reads the self-study, conducts a site visit, and prepares a final report. The external members of the Review Team receive an honorarium, and

all travel expenses are covered by the university. The internal member of the Review Team also receive an honorarium. The FAU internal reviewer is a critical member of the site team. This member is responsible for meeting with the external members of the review team and coordinating the written review. It is expected that the internal reviewer will be present at all meetings on campus and will serve as a host to the external reviewers.

PROCESS

Academic program review at FAU is composed of the following elements:

- Self-study by the unit
- Consultation on self-study with other FAU representatives (see below)
- Selection of the Review Team
- One to two-day site visit
- Report by Review Team
- Unit and College response to Review Team recommendations and corresponding implementation agreements (“Action Plan”)
- Review by Office of the Provost
- Presentation of program review to Board of Trustees for their approval

Preparation of Self-Study Report

The unit prepares a descriptive and evaluative self-study report that also outlines short- and long-term goals. The self-study should not be authored solely by a chair or one or two faculty members; rather, it is intended to be the product of the entire faculty. The self-study report is reviewed by other FAU representatives from the Office of the Provost, the Dean of the college, the Undergraduate and Graduate Colleges (as applicable), the Faculty Senate, and other constituents that a unit or college may deem appropriate (such as a member of the College Advisory Board). The Dean of the College approves the self-study report prior to review and approval by the Office of the Provost. The program review must identify the CIP/degree combinations under review and contain specific information on each degree program. It must include the components listed below.

Consultation with FAU Representatives

When the self-study report is completed, it should be sent to representatives of other FAU units, including:

- Associate Provost for Assessment and Programs
- Representative from the Undergraduate College
- Representative from the Graduate College (if applicable)
- Representatives from the Undergraduate and Graduate (if applicable) Programs Committees of the Faculty Senate
- Member of a unit’s or College Advisory Board, if desired

These representatives meet with the unit head and the college Dean to review the self-study report, offer any additional information, or recommend changes. At the conclusion of the meeting, the committee should approve the self-study document as is or with revisions.

The unit will make final revisions if needed, and then submit the revised self-study document to the Office of the Provost no later than three weeks before the scheduled site visit to ensure adequate time for the Review Team to read the document. All faculty members in the unit are expected to be familiar with the final self-study document prior to the campus visit of the Review Team.

Selection of Review Team

The Review Team consists of one or more external reviewers, as described below, and one internal (usually FAU tenured faculty) member. The head of the academic unit, in consultation with the unit's faculty, will create a list of potential external consultants/evaluators for the upcoming academic program review. Those considered should be prominent faculty and/or practitioners whose talents are relevant to the particular distinctions and aspirations of the unit being reviewed. The potential team members should also have broad interest in general issues within higher education. Team members having primary expertise in only the graduate or undergraduate aspects of the program should be noted so that the final team will include adequate representation to review both aspects. In academic programs with a professional accreditation component, at least one reviewer should be recommended who has current experience as a site visitor for the relevant accrediting agency or an equivalent level of knowledge of current accreditation standards and procedures. If there is a national organization associated with the unit, the organization may have resources for identifying potential reviewers. A brief vita for each nominated reviewer should be submitted along with a brief statement as to why the nominee is appropriate. Reviewers should come from programs/schools with similar academic levels (Masters, Ph.D.) They should be full or associate professors. Reviewers must not have a conflict of interest with faculty or programs in the department undergoing review. Reviewers should not be: a) a close colleague of a faculty member in the unit; b) a current or former external advisor to a unit's program or grant; c) a former FAU doctoral student or former FAU faculty member; d) a co-Principal Investigator on a grant with someone in the unit; or e) involved in any other activities that could be construed as a conflict of interest preventing objective review of the unit.

The unit head will consult with the Dean and Provost's staff in order to determine an appropriate review team. The unit head will be responsible for contacting potential team members to determine availability. In most cases, two external reviewers will be appointed. More may be added if necessary for especially complex reviews, and one may suffice for some smaller programs. At least one of the reviewers should be from an institution that is rated RU/VH (research universities with very high research activity) by the Carnegie Foundation or that is from a clearly defined aspirational peer of the unit.

An internal (usually FAU tenured faculty) member will also be selected by the head of the unit in consultation with the unit's faculty and with the approval of the supervising Dean and the Office of the Provost. Internal nominees need to be familiar with FAU policies and procedures and should be selected from faculty outside of the College housing the unit undergoing review.

Prior to the Site Visit

Prior to the site visit, and after the Review Team members have been chosen, the Dean and all unit heads will meet with all the internal Review Team members. This meeting serves to inform the internal reviewers of their responsibilities and duties during the site visit.

The Site Visit

The duration of the site visit depends on the size of the unit undergoing review. A small program may require that reviewers are on-site for only one day; a large department may require two full days for an adequate site visit. A draft itinerary for the site visit should be provided to the reviewers for input and comments before the agenda is finalized. Generally, the review team will meet with the following individuals or groups:

- Provost (or designee)
- Vice President for Research (or designee)
- College Dean
- Dean of Graduate Studies (or designee), as applicable
- Dean of Undergraduate Studies (or designee)
- Unit head
- Faculty and staff members from the unit under review (in groups by rank and/or tenure status)
- Current and/or former students (undergraduate and graduate)
- Advisory Board members, if desired

In addition, the Review Team will schedule specific times to be available for any confidential meetings requested by faculty, staff, students or other stakeholders.

The unit is responsible for informing its constituents (faculty, staff, students, and community members if the unit is engaged in direct community interactions) about these meetings. All meetings must be conducted in a way that affords reasonable confidentiality for participants. For example, unit faculty and staff should not be present at meetings held to elicit student comments, and chairs should not be present at meetings with the faculty. The purpose of these meetings is to provide input about overall quality and direction of the unit.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the Review Team prepares its report, which is sent to the Office of the Dean for distribution to the Provost and the unit head.

Response and Action Plan

Once a unit receives the Review Team's report, they should develop a response to the reviewers' recommendations and implementation strategies to act on these recommendations, as deemed appropriate and desirable. The response document should address each recommendation in the reviewers' report and offer reasons why the unit has chosen to address or not to address a recommendation in its accompanying Action Plan. Each action in the plan should have a priority, especially in the case of multiple or conflicting actions. It is important that the entire faculty read the report and engage in the development of the unit's Action Plan. This plan should be reviewed

with the Dean of the college, who should indicate a level of agreement or support with each item. The completed response and Action Plan is then submitted to the Office of the Provost.

Upon receipt of the response document and Action Plan, the Office of the Provost and Dean will review the documents and prepare a presentation on the review process and its outcome to the Board of Trustees.

Board of Trustees Presentation

The Provost and Dean will present the College's Academic Program Review for approval to the Board of Trustees at their October meeting. This presentation will provide:

- 1) a summary of the self-study report;
- 2) a summary of the reviewers' report; and
- 3) the unit's response and action plan.

A complete hard copy of the program review will be maintained in the Office of the Provost, Office of the Dean, and will also be posted to an [Academic Program Review website](#). Program Review Summary Reports will be uploaded electronically to a secure standardized template provided on the Board of Governors website.

Suggested Academic Program Review Time-line

Timeline for 2018-2019 Academic Program Review (APR)			
Event		Due Date	Completed?
Units Start to draft Self-Study Reports		8/15/2018	
Units Nominate Review Teams		9/15/2018	
Dean & Provost approve Review Teams		9/30/2018	
Invitation letters sent to Review Teams (sent by Assoc. Provost)		10/1/2018	
Self-Study reports are due to Dean for review		10/15/2018	
Dean approves self-studies & may request revisions		11/1/2018	
Revised self-study reports are due to Dean		11/15/2018	
Dean submits self-studies to Senior Associate Provost for approval		12/1/2018	
Associate Provost submits self-study to FAU review team & arranges for feedback		12/1/2018	
Associate Provost provides feedback (including FAU Review Team feedback) to the Dean		12/20/2018	
Review Team site-visit schedule and dates are confirmed		12/20/2018	
Self-studies sent to Review Teams		1/15/2019	
External Review Team Site Visit		Feb/March 2019 (2 day visits)	
All units will receive review team reports 2 weeks post their site-visit		TBD by site visit dates	
Unit Repsonse & Action Plans (including spradsheet) are due to Dean		6/15/2019	
Dean submits all documents from APR process to Provost, & prepares executive summary & presentation		7/31/2019	
Provost & Dean present APR report to FAU BOT		11/2019	

Suggested format for Self-Study Report:



**Florida Atlantic University
Academic Program Review
Self-Study Report**

Program:	
Program Director/ Coordinator Name:	
Program Self-Study Contact:	
Self-Study Contact Email:	
Self-Study Contact Phone Number:	

Instructions: Please respond to each of the following items, providing interpretations, self-assessment and reflection where appropriate.

A. Mission and purpose of the program. *For each Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- In the context of the BOG and FAU mission and Strategic Plans.
- Discussion of external program accreditation (if applicable)
Links: [FAU Strategic Plan](#), [BoG Strategic Plan](#)

B. Date and description of last external (i.e. accreditation) review, if applicable, and last review of this program.

1. Findings and recommendations
2. Major changes made since last review

C. INSTRUCTION: The self-study should address all aspects of programmatic quality associated with instruction. Special attention should be paid to curriculum, degree programs, and teaching quality. Student issues such as advising, retention, honors programming, occupational outcomes and placement in graduate schools should be addressed. The data in Part I of the Departmental Dashboard Indicators may be helpful from this section onwards.

Baccalaureate Programs *Please include the following information for degree programs.*

- Establishment of goals for student learning (Refer to the program's latest plan in the FAU Assessment Database, and for baccalaureate programs, attach a copy of Student Learning Outcome Assessments (SLOA), previously known as Academic Learning Compacts)
- Assessment of how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes (refer to the program's latest report in the FAU Assessment Database)
- Description of how results of assessments are used for continuous program improvement
- For baccalaureate programs, review of lower level prerequisite courses to ensure that the program is in compliance with State-approved prerequisites
- For limited access programs, review of whether such status is still warranted.
- Admissions criteria
- Enrollment information (headcount and Student Credit Hour (SCH) production)
- Average class size and faculty/student ratio
- Curriculum, including duration of program and comparison to peer programs, as identified by the unit (including aspirational peers and SUS)
- Description of internships, practicum, study abroad, field experiences
- Pedagogy/Pedagogical innovations (for example, eLearning, simulations, student centered approaches, and so on)
- Scope of institutional contributions, such as to the Intellectual Foundations Program, cross-listed courses, "service courses," inter-professional education efforts, certificate programs
- Student profile, including student diversity and demographics, scholarly activity, number of students receiving scholarships and assistantships
- Advising procedures
- Retention rates (2nd year retention/persistence rates of students with a Grade Point Average (GPA) above 2.0 - FL SUS Metric #5)
- Graduation rates (6th year graduation rates for full-time and part-time First-Time-In-College (FTIC) students - FL SUS Metric #4)
- Licensure rates (if applicable)
- Placement rates/employment profile
- Student recruitment

Graduate Programs *Please include for each degree program.*

- For limited access programs, review of whether such status is still warranted
- Admissions criteria
- Enrollment information (headcount and SCH production)
- Average class size and faculty/student ratio
- Curriculum, including duration of program and comparison to peer programs, as identified by the unit (including aspirational peers and SUS)
- Description of internships, practicum, study abroad, field experiences
- Pedagogy/Pedagogical innovations (for example, eLearning, simulations, student-centered approaches, and so on)
- Scope of institutional contributions, such as cross-listed courses, "service courses", inter-professional education efforts, certificate programs
- Student profile, including student diversity and demographics, scholarly activity, number of students receiving scholarships and assistantships
- Advising procedures
- Licensure rates (if applicable)
- Placement rates/employment profile
- Retention rates
- Graduation rates
- Student recruitment

Faculty *Include all faculty in Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- Please describe the administrative structure of the Department/Center/Unit administrative structure.
- Faculty profile, including diversity, rank, academic specialties, and mix between full and part-time faculty and how this meets or does not meet department needs
- Faculty teaching load and methods of calculation
- Summary of faculty scholarship and research productivity, including grants and publications
- Strategic planning for hires
- Abbreviated vita for each full-time faculty member

D. RESEARCH: Departments, Centers or Units should address their efforts at collaborating with internal and external partners to promote both volume and quality of faculty and student research, scholarship, creative achievements, and other forms of inquiry. They should report on interdisciplinary efforts and those initiatives that promote economic development or community engagement in the region.

- Review of Part II of the Departmental Dashboard Indicators for Department, Center or Unit faculty
- Interdisciplinary efforts and community engagement efforts
- Establishment of goals for research
- Assessment of how well goals are being met

E. Service and Community Engagement. *For each Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- Discussion of community engagement including public service, special projects, service learning, and other services to the community
- Review of Part III of the Departmental Dashboard Indicators for Department, Center or Unit
- Establishment of goals for service
- Assessment of how well goals are being met

F. Other Program Goals. *For each Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- Describe and assess how well goals are being met

G. Strengths and opportunities that support achievement of program goals. *For each Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- List and describe

H. Weaknesses and threats that impede program progress. *For each Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- List and describe

I. Resource analysis. *For each Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- Sufficiency of resources to meet program goals

J. Future Direction. *For each Department, Center or Unit within the College.*

- Anticipated changes
- 3 to 5 broad questions for the review team to answer with respect to a unit's current state and aspirations

K. If available, please include student feedback regarding programs.