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Introduction

What is Academic Program Review?
Academic program review (APR) is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of all academic programs offered on the campuses of the three Arizona state universities. The Arizona Board of Regents’ (ABOR) Policy 2-225 (Academic Program Review) http://www.azregents.edu/policymanual/default.aspx states that academic departments are the basic unit of review. Both departmentally based programs and programs administered by committees are reviewed at least once every seven years. According to Board policy, the standard review consists of a self-study, followed by a review that includes experts from outside the University. An academic program review is not a review of the unit head.

Purpose
According to ABOR policy, academic program review fulfills several purposes. The process is designed to assess program quality and facilitate program improvement where appropriate and to assist in achieving the best use of institutional resources. The information gathered in the course of the review will assist in University and State planning efforts.

The primary purpose of academic program review is to examine, assess, and strengthen programs. The areas in which program quality is evaluated include, but are not limited to: (a) the quality of teaching and educational programs, including an assessment of student outcomes; (b) the quality of research, creative activity, or scholarly work; (c) the quality of outreach activities and service to the University, the profession, and the community; (d) the contribution or importance of the program to other campus programs; and (e) the potential and future expectations for the program. The review is intended (1) to enhance the quality of a program and to assist in determining a program’s ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities, (2) to evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and thus, determine future priorities, and (3) to aid in shaping the strategic plan for the program.

APR Administration at the UA
Academic program reviews are overseen by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. For departments/programs in the Health Sciences (Colleges of Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Public Health), the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences will also provide oversight of the review. The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs administers the process. Members of the Office of Curricular Affairs serve as consultants to academic units, particularly as questions arise in the preparation of self-studies, and provide assistance to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in the culminating phases of the review process. Assessment specialists in the Office of Instruction and Assessment will provide support for student learning outcomes assessment.

Seven-Year APR Schedule and Accreditation Reviews
The seven-year APR schedule is developed in consultation with the deans of the various colleges and conforms to ABOR calendar requirements. Under exceptional circumstances and with the approval of the dean and the Provost, a review may be extended or postponed. When possible, the schedule is coordinated with other review and accreditation obligations of the programs. In some instances, the review teams have been the same for both reviews. It is important to note that accreditation reviews are conducted for other purposes and might not take the place of the academic program review.
The Process

The academic program review process includes the five major steps outlined below. These steps are: (1) initial planning, (2) self-study, (3) joint internal/external review, (4) discussion of findings, and (5) the report to the Arizona Board of Regents. The explanation of each step includes guidelines for the review process. While the guidelines are not binding and may be adapted to the needs of the individual program under study, they should be followed as closely as possible.

The timetable required for the review of an academic program should be one academic year. A model timetable for the entire review process is found in Appendix A. While the actual time for each step will vary according to the department, it is critical that the review process be completed before May so that required reports can be submitted to ABOR.

1. Initial Planning

The academic program review process will be initiated each academic year by the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

- In the spring semester that precedes the academic program review year, letters will be sent to the appropriate deans notifying them of the programs under their purview scheduled for review.
- Later in the same spring semester, unit heads, and appropriate staff will be invited to participate in an orientation workshop to launch the academic program review process. This workshop will serve as an introduction to the APR process and its purposes, and it will provide guidelines for successful completion.
- Also late in the spring semester, unit heads and personnel involved in assessment will be invited to participate in a workshop, presented by the Office of Instruction and Assessment, focused on best practices in student learning outcomes assessment.

As with any review process, there is a need for support, ranging from administrative assistance to payment of expenses for external reviewers. It is expected that such support for the APR will be provided by the program being reviewed, its college, or a combination of the two. Costs should be part of the department head-dean discussion at an early date. Hotel and travel arrangements for out-of-town APR committee members should be made as early as possible to avoid increased costs and limited availability due to conflicts with other events such as Rodeo Days and the Gem and Mineral Show.

2. The Self-Study

A. Guidelines

A thorough and thoughtful self-study will candidly assess a program’s past and present efforts and will outline a realistic course for the program’s future. The self-study provides the basis for the entire review process. Therefore, it is critical that the study cover all aspects of the academic program. It is of particular importance that the self-study pays special attention to measures of quality. If a self-study has been undertaken within the previous year for accreditation or other purposes, it is possible, with appropriate modifications and updating, to adapt parts of that study for academic program review purposes.

The areas and issues to be covered by the self-study are reflected in the Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline (Appendix B). The self-study should:

- Go beyond the issues and questions raised in the outline, as necessary,
• Disregard questions not pertinent to the program,
• Provide the general framework of the review,
• Be augmented by whatever supplemental information is deemed necessary to create an effective self-assessment, and
• Be succinct, yet thorough.

B. Composition and Appointment of the Self-Study Committee
• Membership of the self-study committee generally is recommended by the program head with final appointments made by the dean.
• Membership usually consists of three or more faculty from the unit being reviewed.
• It is recommended that committee members be selected from among those faculty with a good understanding of the department, as well as of the discipline/profession.
• This group should include both junior and senior faculty, staff, and student representatives.

C. Procedures
• The self-study should be started immediately following the orientation workshop so that it can be completed in time for a detailed review by the Office of Curricular Affairs and then mailed to the review team at least three weeks before the review. (See Appendix A).
• The model timetable allows sufficient time for the completion of a comprehensive report.
• No specific procedures have been established for how the self-study is to be conducted.
• By following the outline provided in Appendix B and expanding upon those areas of special relevance to a particular review, the report will be responsive to the requirements and intent of the academic program review process.
• It is important that every effort be made to ensure that the process and the resulting report are comprehensive but concise. The text shouldn’t be more than about 80 pages, if single-spaced.
• It is also essential that the process and results be open and available to all members (faculty, students, and staff) of the department or program.

D. Data for the Self-Study
It is recommended that:
• The Self-Study Committee should make a special effort to gather all relevant data and present the findings clearly in ways that serve as a basis for the review;
• Interview or survey all faculty and selected representative students and alumni; and
• Gain information from other campus and non-campus resources, as appropriate.

Data for the report should include information about the students, faculty, and staff. (See Appendix B). Most of the student data for the seven-year APR period may be pulled by a designated member of your unit or APR Self-Study Committee from an APR Dashboard in UAccess Analytics. Data stored in UAccess Analytics includes the number of majors and minors, student FTE and SCH enrollment, faculty and staff FTE, and number of graduates from the program, department or college. Seven years of financial data (i.e, total state expenditures and sponsored project expenditures) are now available on the Dashboard; your business manager may obtain more detailed funding data from UAccess Financials. The person designated to pull student data from UAccess Analytics will need “Medium Level” authorization to access this dashboard. Please notify Celeste Pardee by mid-July with the name and e-mail address of the APR data contact(s) for your unit.
Student and personnel data for the seven-year APR period ending in June (to include May graduates) will be available from the Dashboard in late July. If APR data contacts would like dashboard training, they should make an office hours appointment with a UITS trainer, http://uits.arizona.edu/workshops/workshop_detail?view=215. Data that is not available in UAccess Analytics will be pulled from the Integrated Information Warehouse (IIW) by Celeste and sent to the data contact for the unit. For example, for 2015 the Dashboard will have 6 years of data on personnel (i.e., faculty, staff, graduate assistants); the first year of data will be pulled from the IIW.

Questions about the APR data may be directed to Celeste, cpardee@email.arizona.edu or 621-5375. Questions about the APR Dashboard may be directed to Sabah Currim, Computer Scientist with Institutional IT Applications, scurrim@email.arizona.edu or 626-1176.

Information about data presentation:
- Please include only information available since the last APR report, no more than 7 years.
- Note that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), prohibits releasing any personal data on a student, i.e., grade point averages, standardized test scores, etc., without written permission from the student (http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/default.htm), but this information can be presented collectively.
- ABOR has a policy on the number of degrees that need to be produced. Low-degree producing programs (see Appendix C) will be notified by the Office of Curricular Affairs and provided with information that will need to be included in the self-study.

E. Review of Self-Study Report
- A working draft of the self-study report (Appendix B) should be sent electronically to Celeste Pardee (cpardee@email.arizona.edu), in the Office of Curricular Affairs, no later than 8 weeks prior to the site visit.
- An initial review will be performed and feedback will be provided by Celeste. This step gives the Self-Study Committee an opportunity to polish the report before it is submitted to the college dean.
- Once completed and approved by the dean, two hard copies and one electronic copy of the self-study report should be sent to the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at least three weeks before the visit. A hard copy should also be sent to the dean.
- A copy of the self-study report should also be sent to each member of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee at least three weeks before the visit. Consider asking whether they would prefer an electronic copy or a hard copy.
- Electronic copies of the self-study report should be sent to the departmental faculty at this time.
- An electronic copy of the self-study report will be forwarded to the Office of Instruction and Assessment. The student learning outcomes assessment sections (H5 and I4) will be evaluated using a rubric. (See Appendix I). The scored rubrics will be provided to the APR committee at the time of the site visit, and information from the rubrics will form the basis of a post-APR improvement plan, if necessary.

3. Joint Internal/External Review Committee

A. Selection of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee
As early as possible, but no later than late August, the Self-Study Committee should suggest possible nominees for the Joint Internal/External Review Committee. (See below.) The recommendations should be made to the unit head who will convey the recommendations to the dean. The
recommendations to the dean should include at least two possible reviewers for each position described below.

B. Joint Internal/External Review Committee Composition
The review committee should include seven members:
- 3 external committee members (selected from the unit’s current and aspirational peers)
- 2 internal committee members
  - one from within the college of the department under review
  - one from a college other than the department’s college
- 1 community member
- 1 recent alumnus

Characteristics of the External members of review committee:
- Represent the various academic areas covered by the program and be familiar with the various research specializations or scholarly work of the faculty.
- Be full professors or department heads with a national stature.
- Be free of conflicts of interest that would prevent them from conducting an objective review; should not be alumni from the program or have collaborations with members of the program.
- Should include members of underrepresented groups and women.

Characteristics of the other members of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee:
- Community committee members could be members of advisory groups (college, unit, or University) or professionals in a related field working in the community. They should not have an appointment in the department under review.
- Alumni can be community members working in the area, but should not be a current member of the department under review. Recent graduates, within the last five years, are preferred.
- Internal committee members should generally be full professors, and should not have a joint appointment in or collaboration with faculty in the unit under review.

C. Selection of Possible Dates for the Site Visit
- By September 1st, it is the responsibility of the unit head to have established two sets of possible site visit dates with the dean and then with the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- Consult with Barbara Martinez, Executive Associate to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (626-4099; bmartii@email.arizona.edu), to ensure that the potential dates for the site visit work for the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences if appropriate) and for the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Two suitable site visit dates will be reserved on their calendars.
- The site visit takes two full days and must be completed by late April in order to prepare reports for ABOR.

D. Selection Process for the Reviewers
- The department head should contact the possible external and internal, community and alumni review committee nominees informally very early in the process to determine their interest and availability for two sets of possible site visit dates. The nominees should be informed that the site visit is two full days, and the nominees should be asked to hold these dates on their calendars.
- Every effort should be made to consider diversity when assembling the list of potential reviewers.
Two nominees for each position on the site visit committee should be submitted to the dean for review and approval. (See Appendix A)

Following approval from the dean, the list of 14 nominees (two candidates for each position on the site visit committee) is then submitted to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

The list of nominees must include a brief biosketch and complete contact information (mailing address, email address, and phone number). (See Appendix D)

The review committee and committee chair will be selected by the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

When the review team membership and site visit dates are confirmed, the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will send letters (Appendix E) formally inviting the chair and review committee members to participate. This mailing will include the website address for the APR Manual and a list of committee members invited to serve.

E. Communication with the Joint Internal/External Review Committee

The unit head should mail or email electronic copies of the final self-study, faculty CVs, and other appropriate material to the reviewers approved by the Senior Vice Provost at least three weeks prior to the visit.

Some reviewers may also want this information in an electronic format (sent as attachments to an email); please check with reviewers about their preferences.

The college deans pay a $500 honorarium to each of the external reviewers as compensation for the work related to the review. The honorarium should come from the dean rather than the department or program to eliminate the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Other members of the review team normally will not receive an honorarium. Internal reviewers may consider this to be university service and include this work as such on their annual review. Community reviewers may consider this public service to the community (i.e., the university). Alumni who participate in this review may consider this donated service to give back something to the institution.

The unit head should make arrangements for hotels and transportation with the review committee members from out of town. This information should be communicated as soon as all Joint Internal/External Review Committee members are confirmed. Payment for these expenses is the responsibility of the program being reviewed, its college, or a combination of the two.

F. Itinerary for the Site Visit

During the summer, or as early as possible in the fall semester, it is the unit's responsibility to schedule the Joint Internal/External Review Committee's meetings with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, (the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences if appropriate), and the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (see sample itinerary Appendix F).

The Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will assist with scheduling these meetings.

Three weeks before the visit, a draft site visit itinerary should be prepared and sent to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Executive Associate to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, (bmarti@email.arizona.edu) for review.

After the draft itinerary has been approved, the final itinerary should be prepared and sent to the reviewers no later than two weeks before the visit.

The schedule should be sufficiently flexible to allow the inclusion of additional appointments at the committee’s request.
• The visit should span **two full days** to allow sufficient time for reviewers to meet with administrators, senior faculty, assistant professors, students, staff, and others; to visit facilities; and to prepare a draft of their review report.

• It is appropriate for the unit head to meet with the review committee for one breakfast or one lunch, but generally not more. The committee needs time alone for discussion.

• The committee will review the self-study in depth, and interview faculty members, staff, students, and other individuals as appropriate (college and university administrators, faculty and/or department heads of related departments, and public or private groups with whom the department interacts).

• The review committee may request additional information or data that may be deemed necessary and appropriate to do a complete review.

**G. Joint Internal/External Review Committee Should Examine:**

• Undergraduate and graduate programs and student quality, as appropriate,

• Student outcomes assessment,

• Research, teaching, and academic outreach efforts of the faculty,

• Fiscal and physical resources,

• Recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented ethnic or minority groups and women,

• Academic and administrative organization, and

• Inter- or cross-disciplinary cooperation with other units.

These suggestions are not exhaustive. The Joint Internal/External Review Committee is encouraged to be responsive to other issues that come to the fore in the course of the review. It is expected that the review committee will make specific recommendations for improvement of the quality of the program, as well as identify those aspects of the program(s) that are exemplary.

• The external reviewers, as experts in the discipline, will be encouraged to evaluate the program in its national context.

• Attention should be given to the depth and breadth of faculty scholarship, the quality of undergraduate and graduate education, the status of the department as a learning community, and the commitment of individuals to support the department, college, and university vision.

• The reviewers should feel free to respond to the findings of the self-study and comment upon any other issues that bear upon the quality of the academic program.

**H. Joint Internal/External Review Committee Final Report**

• The committee should provide its final report to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs within three weeks of the conclusion of the site visit.

• The report will be distributed to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the dean and unit head, and, if appropriate, the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.

• The final report should include: a) Introduction, b) Strengths, c) Weaknesses, and d) Recommendations.

• The report of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee should make specific suggestions for improvement of the program.

• When the report is forwarded to the University of Arizona, it will be considered a public document that will be shared with faculty, students, staff, and others upon request.
4. Discussion of the Findings: Conclusions and Recommendations

- Following the receipt and subsequent distribution of the Joint Internal/External Review Committee’s report, a concluding conference with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (and, as appropriate, the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences), the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the dean, and the program head will be scheduled.
- The unit self-study and Joint Internal/External Review Committee report will provide a basis for discussion at this meeting. Additionally, an evaluation of the self-study section on student learning outcomes assessment (undergraduate and graduate) will be given to the program head. The Associate Vice Provost for Instruction and Assessment will then contact the program head to schedule a discussion on steps that can be taken to improve assessment.
- The unit head may also provide a two-page letter of response to the dean, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (and, as appropriate, the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences), and the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs regarding the conclusions and recommendations in the report from the Joint Internal/External Review Committee prior to this final meeting.
- This meeting will be scheduled by the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- The purpose of the meeting is to consider the findings and recommendations of the review.
- The decisions reached at the concluding conference are documented in the report to ABOR.

5. Report to the Arizona Board of Regents

The final step in the Academic Program Review process is preparation of a summary report on the year’s academic program reviews for the Arizona Board of Regents. Upon ABOR request, a three-page narrative summary report will also be prepared for the Board and will include: (a) a description of the program; (b) an outline of the most recent previous review and responses; (c) procedures used in the review process; (d) major findings and conclusions of the review; (e) future plans for the program; and (f) a follow-up monitoring and reporting plan. A data summary will be appended to the narrative. A copy of the report will be sent to all those involved in the process.
## APPENDIX A
### ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TASK TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who/What</th>
<th>When (Deadline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Head</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends APR Orientation</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with dean to create budget for APR</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits nominations for Self-Study Committee to dean</td>
<td>Early June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives charge to Self-Study Committee &amp; ensures progress on SSR</td>
<td>Late June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with the dean’s office and Senior Vice Provost’s Office to identify 2 sets of possible site-visit dates</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates 14 nominees for Joint Internal/External Review Committee submitted by Self-Study Committee</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts Joint Internal/External Review Committee nominees to confirm their availability on the two sets of site-visit dates identified</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits nominees’ names, brief bios &amp; contact information to dean (See Appendix D)</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirms final site visit dates with dean’s office and Senior Vice Provost’s office</td>
<td>August – September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon notification of Joint Internal/External Review Committee members, makes travel &amp; lodging arrangements for site visit</td>
<td>August – September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwards draft copy of SSR to Office of Curricular Affairs</td>
<td>8 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits final draft of SSR to dean for approval, and a hard copy when approved</td>
<td>5 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends 2 hard copies &amp; 1 electronic copy of approved SSR to Senior Vice Provost</td>
<td>4 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends SSR, CVs and other relevant materials to Joint Internal/External Review Committee members</td>
<td>4 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends draft site visit itinerary to Senior Vice Provost for review</td>
<td>3 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends final site visit itinerary to Senior Vice Provost, dean and Joint Internal/External Review Committee members</td>
<td>2 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE VISIT</td>
<td>No later than April 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes response to the Joint Internal/External Review Committee Report and submits to Senior Vice Provost</td>
<td>1 week before Final APR Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Final APR Meeting with Provost, Senior Vice Provost and Dean</td>
<td>After receipt of Joint Internal/External Review Committee Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Unit Self-Study Committee**                                           |                 |
| Chair of Self-Study Committee attends APR Orientation                   | Spring          |
| Completes SSR with support from Office of Curricular Affairs           | July – August   |
| Submits 14 Nominees for Internal/External Committee to Department Head | July – August   |
| Submits Draft SSR to Department Head                                   | 9 weeks before the site visit |

<p>| <strong>Office of Curricular Affairs</strong>                                       |                 |
| Provides consulting to units in the preparation of SSR                 | July – August   |
| Provides coordination &amp; guidance in obtaining institutional data for SSR | July – September |
| Reviews and forwards feedback on draft SSR to the unit                 | August – 8 weeks prior to site visit |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepares SSR Summary for Provost and Senior Vice Provost</td>
<td>1 week before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares APR summary for ABOR following site visit</td>
<td>May - July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with department head to create budget</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates nominations submitted by department head and appoints Self-Study Committee</td>
<td>Early June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves 14 Joint Internal/External Review Committee nominees and forwards list to Senior Vice Provost</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures progress on Self-Study Report</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves final Self-Study Report</td>
<td>4 weeks prior to site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Site Visit Day 1 &amp; Day 2 meetings with Joint Internal/External Review Committee</td>
<td>Dates of Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Final APR Meeting with unit head, Senior Vice Provost and Provost</td>
<td>After receipt of Joint Internal/External Review Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Vice Provost for Instruction and Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates SSR on learning outcomes assessment; submits evaluation to Vice Provost</td>
<td>1 week prior to site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with unit head/program director to discuss an assessment plan for units</td>
<td>After Final APR Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates APR process by contacting colleges &amp; departments to schedule Orientation</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with unit for initial planning as needed when requested by unit</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews list of Joint Internal/External Review Committee nominees—selects seven members and notifies department head and dean</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends invitation letters to the Joint Internal/External Review Committee</td>
<td>July – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwards feedback on draft itinerary to the unit</td>
<td>3 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwards Self-Study to Associate Vice Provost for review of student learning outcomes</td>
<td>2 weeks before the site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with Joint Internal/External Review Committee for Orientation at the beginning of the site visit</td>
<td>Site Visit – Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits graduate/undergraduate assessment rubrics to Joint Internal/External Review Committee</td>
<td>Site Visit – Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with Joint Internal/External Review Committee and Provost for Exit Meeting the last day of site visit</td>
<td>Site Visit – Day 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributes Joint Internal/External Review Committee report to unit head, dean, and Provost</td>
<td>Upon receipt of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Final APR Meeting with unit head, dean, and Provost</td>
<td>Shortly after receipt of report from Joint Internal/External Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes final report for ABOR</td>
<td>Usually in Early December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with Joint Internal/External Review Committee for Exit Meeting on last day of site visit</td>
<td>Site Visit – Day 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds Final APR Meeting with unit head, dean and Senior Vice Provost</td>
<td>Shortly after receipt of Joint Internal/External Review Committee Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY OUTLINE

A. SELF STUDY SUMMARY

Provide a short summary that includes:

1. Short statement about the administrative home of the unit (School, College, etc).
2. List of the number of faculty at various ranks.
3. List of the number of lecturers, adjunct instructors, and post-doctoral fellows.
4. List of the academic programs for undergraduates, graduate students, and professional students, as appropriate, and indicate number of students enrolled in each program.

B. UNIT DESCRIPTION AND GOALS

Briefly describe the unit under review, including research centers sponsored by the unit, with statements on:

1. Mission, role, and scope
2. Major goals or strategic directions for the next 5 years (may append a strategic plan)
3. Relationship of goals to the University Strategic Plan and Mission as expressed in the University of Arizona’s Never Settle Strategic Plan 2014-2018 (http://neversettle.arizona.edu/)

C. UNIT HISTORY

1. Describe any major changes that have occurred in the unit since the last review including new academic programs and programs that have been renamed, merged, or disestablished.
2. Provide a summary of the recommendations of the previous academic program review and changes made in response to the recommendations.

D. OVERVIEW OF THE UNIT’S ACADEMIC QUALITY

1. Outline the reputational and outcome indicators and sources of information by which the unit is judged including national or international ranking, or other judgments of the program and the program’s students, faculty, resources, and productivity; list major faculty and student honors and awards.
2. Identify five aspirational peer programs among public research universities. Describe how this unit compares and the sources of information used for the comparison. Use of Academic Analytics data (see E.1.) should be included.

E. FACULTY

1. Briefly describe the overall nature and breadth of the faculty’s research and other scholarly contributions in the generation of knowledge, exemplary practice or creative performance with an appraisal of the most significant contributions to advancing the field or discipline.

The University of Arizona participates in data collection on research productivity and faculty
awards with Academic Analytics. Contact Wendy Miley (mileyw@email.arizona.edu) in the Office of Institutional Research and Planning Support to obtain the data for your department/graduate program. Wendy can help your Self-Study Committee interpret the data.

2. Provide a table of current and pending grants, contracts, patents and license agreements, list faculty and principal investigator names, funding source and amount, and funding period.

3. List the faculty’s participation, leadership, and influence in the academic profession through such avenues as professional associations, review panels, and advisory groups.

4. Describe or list the teaching load and activities of the faculty. Provide summarized documentation about the quality of the teaching activities by faculty and lecturers in this unit. Use Teacher-Course Evaluations, Peer Review of Teaching, complete and include the Rubric for Evaluating Departmental Teaching Quality (Appendix G) and discuss outcomes in the text of the self-study, and other sources of data that address teaching quality.

5. Briefly describe recent faculty recruiting and planned directions for future faculty hires. Provide a table for the last seven years outlining the number of faculty at all ranks who were hired, retired or resigned, and reviewed for promotion and tenure (including results).

6. Provide a table showing faculty compensation range and average comparisons by rank with relevant aspirational peer programs named in section D-2.

7. Provide a table with the number of faculty by gender and race/ethnicity. Briefly describe efforts to recruit and retain faculty from underrepresented groups.

8. Provide up-to-date short biographical sketches or CVs (include in an appendix) of each faculty member that include recent publications or listing of scholarly work, current grant funding, recent invited lectures, honors, major service or committee assignments, etc.

F. UNIT ADMINISTRATION

1. Provide an organizational chart for the unit and describe the governance structure and involvement of faculty, professors of practice and multi-year lecturers in governance.

2. Provide a table of classified staff and professional staff by appointment type. Comment on any unusual annual turnover rates in the years since the last APR. List the members by gender and race/ethnicity. Describe efforts to recruit and retain staff and appointed personnel from underrepresented groups.

3. Briefly comment on the adequacy of staff support and any plans for reconfiguration to improve efficiency.

G. UNIT RESOURCES

1. Describe briefly and appraise support services available in the unit for teaching, research, creative production, and other scholarly activities; outreach, including professional and community service; and administration.

2. Describe, as appropriate, any specific resource needs, e.g., library, laboratory, classrooms, classroom support, office space, technology support, office personnel, research assistants, and how they are typically funded.

3. Describe changes accomplished by the department/program to increase efficiency with respect to business practices, administration, teaching and other departmental functions.
4. Comment on projected changes in unit activities and quality outcomes if additional resources were available. Describe unit efforts to obtain non-state funding for new or needed resources.

**H. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS, DEGREE PROGRAMS AND OUTCOMES**
(If none, please so indicate.) The goal of this section is to provide descriptions and supporting data on undergraduate programs.

When reporting student data, please follow FERPA guidelines, available at [http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/default.htm](http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/default.htm).

1. Describe the undergraduate degree program(s) and certificate programs offered by the unit, including tracks or options within your programs. List the CIP codes for each program.

   The CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is a six-digit code developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify the primary discipline of an academic program. CIP codes are widely used in both national surveys and studies, and are the accepted government taxonomy standard for higher education program classification. It is recommended that units cross reference their unit with the CIP code on the NCES web site ([http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55](http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55)) to confirm alignment of unit’s mission with current CIP code. Current CIP codes can be obtained from Celeste Pardee.

2. List the contributions of the unit to offering foundations and general education courses including who teaches, how quality is assessed, and how updating is monitored. Describe the planning process and how these courses are coordinated with other courses.

   For Tier One and Tier Two General Education courses, complete the two templates in Appendix H. The templates are also available at: [http://gened.arizona.edu/faculty/ge_outcomes_template](http://gened.arizona.edu/faculty/ge_outcomes_template).

   Provide information on the writing assignments and the learning outcomes for each General Education course that your unit offers. Also include a copy of the syllabus for each Tier One and Tier Two course taught by your unit as listed in Appendix H. In the future, the Office of Instruction & Assessment (OIA) will contact you to collect information on how you are assessing the General Education learning outcomes.

3. Undergraduate Programs - major(s) and minor(s) curricula and courses
   a. Provide a table of the enrollment trends for each undergraduate degree program, providing student data pulled from the APR Dashboard in UAccess Analytics. Indicate the course(s) and/or grade requirements, if any, for admission to the program.

   b. Describe how the undergraduate curriculum reflects the basic goals of the academic program. If there are options or tracks in the degree program, describe these and discuss efforts to improve curricular and instructional efficiencies. Include program and/or courses available at UA South, if applicable.

   c. Does an accrediting body prescribe the curriculum(s)? If yes, name the accrediting body, briefly summarize the outcome of the most recent accreditation or include the letter from the accreditation body in the appendix, and indicate the date of the next review.

   d. Briefly describe how the degree programs compare to similar programs nationally and any plans that are underway to change or strengthen courses or course sequencing in the curriculum.
e. Discuss any challenge with course availability in your program and in other programs that are needed by your students.

f. Describe active learning strategies that are used within each degree program, including active engagement in the classroom and internships, practica, work-study, or seminars.

g. Describe the use of instructional technology within program courses. For example, do your faculty use: 1) D2L for content delivery and to receive student assignments, 2) response devices (clickers), 3) podcasting, 4) UA YouTube presentations, 5) Collaborate for voice, video, or text sharing online, 6) Second Life, 7) Instructional Blogging, etc.

h. Discuss whether online courses are available for required or elective courses. If you are planning to offer the full undergraduate program(s) online, please describe when you expect that the complete program will be available.

4. Undergraduate Students:

a. Summarize available data in a table on the quality of students selecting the unit’s degree programs compared with the quality of students, graduation rates, and time to degree in other fields at the University of Arizona.

b. Provide information in a table on gender and race/ethnicity composition of the students in the unit (majors). FERPA rules require that you do not list students by name. Describe activities enacted for recruiting and retaining students from underrepresented ethnic groups, including the challenges and the successes.

c. Describe any efforts being done to attract and retain Honors undergraduate students. List in a table Honors courses available in the undergraduate program(s).

d. Explain how undergraduates majoring in the unit’s program(s) are advised and any challenges to the process or plans for change.

e. Summarize any data on how graduating seniors or alumni of the undergraduate degree programs view their educational experience. List data on graduation outcomes (percent attending graduate school, types of jobs obtained following graduation, etc.)

5. Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Address bullets a-d in this section of the self-study. Please separate undergraduate degrees with different learning outcomes and address bullets a-d for each degree in a separate subsection. If your assessment of student learning outcomes is incomplete, please describe your planned work in parts a-d below. Refer to bullet e for additional requirements on regular program assessment reporting. Refer to Appendix I to view the rubric that will be used by the assessment specialists in the OIA to evaluate this section of the self-study report. To review exemplary learning outcome assessment plans for undergraduate programs, see http://assessment.arizona.edu/exemplary/ug.

a. EXPECTED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: List and number the expected student learning outcomes for each undergraduate degree program offered in the unit. We recommend a total of 4-5 learning outcomes.

b. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: List and briefly discuss the activities used to measure the expected student learning outcomes. Activities should include direct and indirect measures of outcomes. Summarize assessment activities in a table; an example is shown in Appendix J. Include copies of the tools (e.g. rubrics) that you use to collect assessment data. These can be included in an appendix of your Self-Study Report.
Describe how faculty, staff, and students are involved in the development and implementation of the activities.

c. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: Report and discuss the actual findings from learning-outcome assessment activities. Examples of findings may include summaries of rubric scores, exit exam scores, survey responses to targeted questions, or narrative responses.

d. CHANGES MADE IN RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: Indicate how the assessment findings are used to: 1) improve student learning and classroom instruction, 2) assist in strategic program planning, and 3) review, evaluate, and modify the curriculum in the programs. See Figure 1.

e. Examine the information for your academic unit on the UA assessment website at [http://www.assessment.arizona.edu](http://www.assessment.arizona.edu). Before submitting the self-study, be sure that your program’s pages on the website have been updated with all of the information you have reported in this section. For assistance with webpage updating, contact Becky Perez at rperez@email.arizona.edu. Programs are expected to update assessment webpages annually, by June 1 of each year.

![Assessment Diagram](image)

**Figure 1: A Faculty-Driven Process for Program Level Assessment of Student Outcomes**

1. **GRADUATE STUDENTS, DEGREE PROGRAM(S) AND OUTCOMES**

   (If none, please indicate this.) The goal of this section is to provide descriptions and supporting data on the graduate program.

   Please follow FERPA guidelines, [http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/default.htm](http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/default.htm) when reporting student data.

   1. Overview:

      Describe the graduate degree program(s) offered by this unit. Include, as appropriate, approved options within your programs, dual degrees, joint degrees, accelerated masters programs and post-baccalaureate and/or graduate certificate programs. Describe any changes that have occurred in recent years and changes planned for the future.
The CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is a six-digit code developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify the primary discipline of an academic program. CIP codes are widely used in both national surveys and studies, and are the accepted government taxonomy standard for higher education program classification. It is recommended that units cross reference their unit with the CIP code under the NCES website (http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/ciplist.asp) to confirm alignment of unit’s mission with current CIP code. Current CIP codes can be obtained from Celeste Pardee.

2. Graduate Program - Curriculum and Courses:
   a. Provide a table of the trends, time to degree, and number completing the degree for the last seven years, for each graduate degree program, providing student data pulled from the APR Dashboard in UAccess Analytics. Also indicate the six and eight year completion rates.
   b. Describe the extent to which the courses in the graduate degree program(s) are sufficient and balanced among various specialties, options, tracks, or career directions to meet student needs and interest.
   c. Describe active learning strategies that are used within each degree program, including active engagement in the classroom and internships, practica, teaching internships, and/or assistantships.
   d. Describe the use of instructional technology within program courses. For example, do your faculty use: 1) D2L for content delivery and to receive student assignments, 2) response devices (clickers), 3) podcasting, 4) UA YouTube presentations, 5) Collaborate for voice, video, or text sharing online, 6) Second Life, 7) Instructional Blogging, etc.
   e. Discuss whether online courses are available for required or elective courses and whether you offer, or plan to offer any online graduate programs.
   f. Comment on the adequacy of the resources available for graduate students to carry out their studies, e.g., office and lab space, supplies, travel, photocopying, etc.
   g. Comment on the proportion of PhD students in your program who take courses or complete minors in other disciplines and the proportion of PhD students from other disciplines who take courses or complete a minor in your programs. Discuss any coordination problems.
   h. Provide the link to an electronic copy of your graduate student handbook or add a copy to the appendices. Forward the link or an electronic copy to the Graduate College, attn. Associate Dean Janet Sturman (sturman@email.arizona.edu), for review and feedback.

3. Graduate Students:
   a. Describe mechanisms used to recruit students and how well the program is competing for the top students. Compare the quality of students in this (these) graduate program(s) with students in other similar programs and the quality since the last APR review (based on GREs, GPAs, or other admissions criteria).
   b. Provide data in a table on gender and race/ethnicity composition of the current graduate students with majors in the unit and comment on similar graduate programs at other schools. Describe efforts to increase representation of under-represented groups.
   c. Comment on the number and adequacy of the stipends and assistantships. In addressing this, indicate the percentage of graduate students in the program(s) that have a teaching or
research assistantship; the salary range of stipends for half-time research assistantships and teaching assistantships; travel support provided to students presenting scholarly papers.

d. Comment on the average ratio of student/faculty thesis and dissertation supervision in each graduate program since the last APR and compare to other programs in this discipline. Summarize information from exit interviews in your programs. Provide a list of the graduate student placements since the last APR.

e. Discuss the scholarship activities of your graduate students (being mindful of FERPA policy), such as conference presentations and publications.

4. Graduate Student Learning Outcomes Assessment:
Address bullets a-d in this section of the self-study. Please separate graduate degrees with different learning outcomes and address bullets a-d for each degree in a separate subsection. If your assessment of student learning outcomes is incomplete, please describe your planned work in parts a-d below. Refer to bullet e for additional requirements on regular program assessment reporting. Refer to Appendix I to view the rubric that will be used by the assessment specialists in the OIA to evaluate this section of the self-study report. To review exemplary learning-outcome assessment plans for graduate programs, see http://assessment.arizona.edu/exemplary/grad.

a. EXPECTED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: List and number the expected student learning outcomes for each graduate degree program offered in the unit. We recommend a total of 3-5 learning outcomes.

b. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: List and briefly discuss the activities used to appropriately measure the expected student learning outcomes. Activities should include direct and indirect measures of outcomes. Summarize assessment activities in a table; an example is shown in Appendix K. Include copies of the tools (e.g. rubrics) that you use to collect assessment data. These can be included in an Appendix of your Self-Study Report. Describe how faculty, staff, and students are involved in the development and implementation of the activities.

c. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: Report and discuss the actual findings from learning-outcome assessment activities. Examples of findings may include summaries of rubric scores, exit exam scores, survey responses to targeted questions, or narrative responses.

d. CHANGES MADE IN RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: Indicate how the assessment findings are used to: 1) improve student learning and classroom instruction, 2) assist in strategic program planning, and 3) review, evaluate, and modify the curriculum in your programs. See Figure 1.

e. Examine the information for your academic unit on the UA assessment website at http://www.assessment.arizona.edu. Before submitting the self-study, be sure that your program’s pages on the website have been updated with all of the information you have reported in this section. For assistance with webpage updating, contact Becky Perez at rperez@email.arizona.edu. Programs are expected to update assessment webpages annually, by June 1 of each year.
5. Post-Doctoral Fellows
   Describe your post-doctoral fellowship program, if applicable. How many post-docs have positions in your unit? In what ways do your post-doctoral fellows contribute to the unit? List the range of time and mean length of time that post-docs stay in your unit. List the positions post-docs have taken when they leave the program.

J. ACADEMIC OUTREACH
   Outreach refers to educational efforts, leadership, and sharing of knowledge off-campus, for example in the local community and throughout the State.
   1. Describe the nature and outcomes of academic outreach activities in this unit.
   2. Comment on these activities and support with the goal(s) of the unit and the particular needs of Arizona.

K. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER UNITS
   Outline the main collaborations of your unit with other departments, schools and/or colleges, include joint or dual degrees and Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs, as appropriate.

L. FACULTY PLANNING
   1. What is the faculty’s collective view of the program’s future, its desired directions, and its means for reaching these objectives?
   2. How do planning and incentives direct the program to these ends?

M. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: THRESHOLD FOR DEFINING PRODUCTIVE PROGRAMS
   ABOR requires that programs with low degree production (degrees produced below established threshold, see table below) do an evaluation and report the results to ABOR as part of the APR. Units with programs that have failed to attain the required number of degrees over the three years
will be notified by the Office of Curricular Affairs. Methodology for this report is found in Appendix C. Contact the Office of Curricular Affairs if you have questions. Discuss this issue in the self-study.

Threshold for Defining Productive Programs
Arizona University System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Degree</th>
<th>3-Year Degree Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>24 or more degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>9 or more degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6 or more degrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING LOW PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS

As part of the Academic Program Review, degree programs will be reviewed for degree productivity using the methodology outlined below. Reports on low productivity are provided to the Arizona Board of Regents each year following the APR and potentially at other times, when requested.

Identify Programs with Degree Production below Thresholds

Undergraduate

Institutions will review degree information for each academic program for the most recent three years for which degrees-awarded data are available. Each degree and each major earned by a given student will count as a degree for this purpose (following IPEDS).

- Academic programs are expected to award twenty-four or more undergraduate degrees over the most recent three-year period.
- Degrees are counted according to the fiscal year for graduates completing in August through May.
- Degrees with differing titles (e.g., B.A., B.S., etc.) for a given major will be combined for purposes of the threshold analysis if substantial overlap of course work exists among the different degrees.
- Degrees granted to students with dual majors are counted with each major.
- The review of undergraduate programs excludes interdisciplinary programs.

Graduate

For programs granting degrees at the masters or doctoral level, institutions will review the number of degrees granted in the most recent three years for which degrees-awarded data are available.

- Academic programs are expected to grant nine or more masters degrees and six or more doctoral degrees over the most recent three-year period.
- Degrees are counted according to the fiscal year for graduates completing in August through May.
- In programs that offer both master’s and doctoral degrees, the doctoral degree numbers will be used to identify productivity of the program (i.e., if the number of doctoral degrees awarded is above the threshold, the masters program need not meet or exceed the threshold for masters degree programs.
- Degrees with differing titles (e.g., M.A., M.S., etc.) for a given major will be combined for purposes of the threshold analysis if substantial overlap of course work exists among the different degrees.
- Dual degrees granted to a student are counted separately.
- The review of graduate programs excludes interdisciplinary programs.

Low degree production may occur because:
- The program no longer accepts students and is in the process of being phased out or has temporarily suspended admissions to undergo restructuring.
• The program was approved by the Arizona Board of Regents and implemented by the institution within the last six years. (Curriculum Office staff will provide each program with the year of ABOR approval).
• The program is offered at an off-campus location or at an alternate campus that offers unique degree programs or is an online program that is unique from other programs offered at the University. Degrees from university programs that are offered at other sites are counted with the majors and degrees offered on campus. Justifications for the low degree production and a plan for improvements must be provided.

Programs with low degree productivity should be reviewed for viability. If a low productivity degree is duplicative, a plan should be developed to assess its viability relative to similar programs at other Arizona’s state universities and implement steps to modify or eliminate the program.

Review Programs that Are Below the Low Degree Production Threshold for Criteria that Might Support Retention

A program might be recommended for retention if one of a variety of institutional priorities is met. These recommendations may be made by the Provost in a report to the ABOR. These might include:

• **Basic academic subject:**
  The program is considered a basic academic subject offered by a majority (8 or more) of our peer institutions. The most recent IPEDS Degree Completion report should be used to compare CIP code and degree levels at the peer institutions.

• **Program quality:**
  Quality may be demonstrated by student, faculty, or overall program quality. Examples of measures include evidence of instructional effectiveness, student performance and outcomes, employer satisfaction, student placement, research/scholarship/creative/artistic excellence, external funding, external recognition and national rankings, and accreditation.

• **Centrality to university mission:**
  Universities have complex missions with multiple goals. A program’s contribution to the university mission is evidenced by identifying the university goal that the program fulfills.

• **Contribution to other programs in the university:**
  Universities have responsibilities to provide students access to courses and programs of study that support both broad educational goals (such as general education) and specific student needs (such as certificate programs). Evidence of a program’s contribution to other programs in the university includes the number of student credit hours (or full-time equivalent students -- FTE) taught, courses taught that meet general education requirements, students completing minors, students completing certificates, courses required by other majors, and non-majors in courses required of majors.

• **Contributions to workforce development:**
  The program prepares graduates that are valuable and needed by industry, business, and other stakeholders in Arizona.
• **Program uniqueness:**
The program is important to Arizona by virtue of its unique educational contribution. Uniqueness is evidenced by a distinctive program focus (such as community partnerships, internships, interdisciplinary, or unique intellectual focus).

• **Program Growth:**
The program has recently been modified and there has been a significant increase in the number of students entering this major such that the number of degrees is expected to meet threshold within the next six years.

• **Program/unit revenue:**
The unit housing the program generates significant revenue that can be used to support the program.

• **Access**
The program provides opportunities to earn degrees to students that, for geographic or other reasons, would not be able to participate in other programs. The measure of access will be the number of students enrolled in the program from rural or otherwise under represented populations.

• **Other**

**Recommendations for programs not meeting any of the above conditions**

Based on the information provided from the reviews outlined above, the University will provide a recommendation to ABOR for each program that does not produce enough degrees to meet threshold. Recommendations may include that the program should be retained, eliminated, merged, or in some way modified.
APPENDIX D

Nominee Bio and Full Contact Information

Jane Doe
Professor of Global Seismology, Department of Geosciences
Department of Geosciences
Gould-Simpson Building, Room 510
PO Box 210077
Tucson, AZ 85721-007
CAMPUS

Email: jdoe@email.arizona.edu
Phone: (520) 621 1234

Ph.D. (Seismology), 1987, University of Colorado
Doe’s research involves using broadband seismology to understand mountain belts, earthquakes, and faulting. She is interested in the evolution of the North and South American Cordilleras, with much of her current research on the south central Andes. She also is working on earthquakes and Earth structure associated with subduction zones and strike-slip plate boundaries. Department Head, Geosciences, University of California at Santa Barbara 2000-2007. Served on National Science Foundation Grant Review Committee 2002-2005; editor of International Review of Seismology 2009-present. Awards include: the 2004 Sally Smith Award for Research in Seismology by the American Association of Seismology and University of Arizona College of Science Innovative Teaching award (2001). Published 80 peer reviewed articles and currently has NSF and DOE research grants.
**APPENDIX E**

Senior Vice Provost’s Letter of invitation to Committee Members

John Doe, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Geosciences
University of California
552 University Road
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Re: Academic Program Review for University of Arizona Department of Geosciences

Dear Dr. Doe:

Under Arizona Board of Regents policy, all academic programs at the University of Arizona receive a thorough review every seven years. I am writing to invite you to participate on the Academic Program Review (APR) Committee for the Department of Geosciences. I understand that arrangements are being made for the site visit on February 20-21, 2014.

Comprehensive academic program review is an essential part of the University of Arizona’s effort to enhance the institution, as well as to ensure and improve the quality of its programs. The APR process involves a self-study by the unit and evaluation by a committee consisting of experts from outside the institution, two University of Arizona faculty members from related units, an alumnus, and a community member.

Your role, in collaboration with your fellow team members, will be to evaluate thoroughly all aspects of the unit, including as appropriate, faculty, students, academic programs, research, outreach efforts, diversity and administration/governance. We will look to your team for a candid report on the unit, assessing the quality of these efforts and for recommendations for their improvement. Time will be allotted in the itinerary for report preparation. The enclosed list shows the team composition.

The procedure manual for Academic Program Reviews is available on the Provost’s web site at [http://www.academicaffairs.arizona.edu/](http://www.academicaffairs.arizona.edu/). The dean’s office will send you other background documents in preparation for your work. This includes the unit’s self-study, the itinerary, and any additional information that would be helpful to you. If you need further information, please feel free to contact Barbara Martinez, Executive Associate to the Senior Vice Provost, at (520) 626-4099 or bmarti@email.arizona.edu, or you may contact me directly at gburd@email.arizona.edu or via the same phone number.

I appreciate your willingness to assist us in this important evaluation effort.

Sincerely,

Gail D. Burd, Ph.D.
Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

cc: Joaquin Ruiz, Dean, College of Science
Peter Reiners, Department Head, Department of Geosciences
**APPENDIX F**

**SAMPLE ITINERARY**

### Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-8:30 am</td>
<td>Orientation with Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9 am</td>
<td>Meet with Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-9:30 am</td>
<td>Meet with Self-Study Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:45 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45 am</td>
<td>Meet with Assistant Professors (untenured, tenure track)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:45 am</td>
<td>Open Meeting with Graduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 1 pm</td>
<td>Lunch with Department Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 pm</td>
<td>Tour Facilities or Non-Tenure Track Faculty or Additional Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 pm</td>
<td>Meet with Tenured Faculty Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 pm</td>
<td>Meet with Other Department Heads in the College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5:30 pm</td>
<td>Begin Draft Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Dinner Off-Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include meeting with Graduate College Dean, etc., as appropriate*

### Day 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-9 am</td>
<td>Meet with Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 am</td>
<td>Meet with Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-10:15 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-12:00 pm</td>
<td>Meet with chairs of undergraduate or graduate programs or other campus individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1:30 pm</td>
<td>Working Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:30 pm</td>
<td>Meet with Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3 pm</td>
<td>Travel to Administration Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 pm</td>
<td>Exit Meeting with Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5:30 pm</td>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Working Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include meetings with community members and alumni, as appropriate*

### Contact Name and Phone Number

This should be a person who has knowledge of the itinerary and committee members, and who is available throughout the two-day site-visit for a phone call in case of unexpected delays, questions or additional requests from the Committee.
APPENDIX G

FROM FINAL REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON TEACHING QUALITY
University of Arizona, January 5, 2015
http://www.academicaffairs.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/task_force_teaching_quality_gb_final.pdf

5. Measuring the Teaching Quality of a Department or Academic Program

One goal of this Task Force has been to develop a mechanism that could be used in the Academic Program Review self-study and would demonstrate the quality of teaching performed by faculty in the department. Measures could include TCEs, demonstration of student learning in department courses, and peer review of teaching. The goal is to document that the department takes its teaching mission seriously, makes efforts to improve, and shows improvement over time. Graphs, pie charts, and tables with data on teaching quality could be used.

a. Rubric for Evaluating Departmental Teaching Quality

We ask that the following rubric be used to assess teaching quality in a program or department undergoing Academic Program Review. The rubric will be used by the APR self-study committee and department head to provide an evaluation of the quality of teaching done in the department. It will also provide a context for the self-study committee and department head to discuss what improvements are planned for the future. The self-study committee and department head will need to describe what evidence they have used to document teaching quality for the evaluation and provide that evidence as an appendix in the report. Unlike the review of the assessment plan, activities, findings, and changes in response to findings that are part of the APR process, the review of teaching quality data would be done solely by the department self-study committee and department head and presented in the self-study for the APR Committee review.

Note: In the rubric instructors are defined as tenured or tenure track faculty, professors of practice, lecturers, and adjunct lecturers. Teaching assistants who are the instructors-of-record for a course may be considered under this rubric, but departments are expected to provide documentation demonstrating that teaching assistants receive significant departmental training on teaching and grading practices before they begin teaching and should be mentored and report to a member of the faculty or lecturer while they are a teaching assistant.
## Rubric for Self-Assessing Departmental Teaching Quality in the APR Self-Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Assessing Teaching Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations for Teaching Quality:</strong> A department is EXEMPLARY for this criterion if it has established a set of expectations for high-quality teaching at all levels of the curriculum that are clearly conveyed to all instructors. Expectations are based upon effective teaching practices demonstrated to improve student learning outcomes. All instructors are held to these expectations to the extent that is appropriate to the classes they teach and the terms of their appointments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Teaching Development:</strong> A department is EXEMPLARY for this criterion if it has in place standard processes for encouraging professional development towards high-quality teaching across the whole unit. These processes include the provision of clear information about and ready access to resources, inside and outside the department, that can help all instructors develop the quality of their teaching. All these processes are aligned with the department’s established expectations for teaching quality. Avenues for development may include, but need not be limited to, peer coaching, consultations with OIA, and support for attending workshops and conferences focused on enhancing the quality of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Teaching:</strong> A department is EXEMPLARY for this criterion if it has an established and transparent process for evaluating teaching quality for all instructors. The evaluation criteria are tightly linked to the department’s established set of expectations for teaching quality. The evaluation process includes, but is not limited to, student evaluations, peer evaluation of teaching, and instructor self-reflection. Evaluating teaching quality is a key part of annual reviews as well as promotion and tenure reviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying Findings to Teaching Improvements:</strong> A department is EXEMPLARY for this criterion if it has an ongoing process that includes steps in which teaching evaluations are reviewed and incorporated into department plans for both programmatic and individual goals improvement. All steps of this application phase are linked to the department’s established set of expectations for teaching quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H

**General Education course writing requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course prefix and number</th>
<th>Number of pages of writing required in the course</th>
<th>Are comments on the first draft of at least one writing assignment provided to students with an opportunity for revision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Example) ABE 150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that Each General Education course should provide an opportunity for student learning aligned to at least one General Education student learning outcome. *Each course is not expected to, and many cannot, assess all four student learning outcomes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course prefix and number (for courses with multiple sections with different instructors, create a line entry for each section)</th>
<th>University-wide General Education student learning outcomes</th>
<th>No opportunity</th>
<th>Low opportunity</th>
<th>Moderate opportunity</th>
<th>High opportunity</th>
<th>Very high opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (Example)  
ABE 150 | Think critically | | | | X |
| | Communicate effectively | | X | | |
| | Understand and value differences | X | | | |
| | Use information effectively | | | X | |
| | Think critically | | | | |
| | Communicate effectively | | | | |
| | Understand and value differences | | | | |
| | Use information effectively | | | | |
APPENDIX I
RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING APR ASSESSMENT PLANS

Rubric for Assessing APR Assessment Plans

Program: 
Date Reviewed: 

Each program’s Academic Program Review Self-Study was reviewed for each of the criteria below and scored between 1 (Inadequate) and 4 (Excellent). See back page for more detailed explanation of scoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (1-4)</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| select      | **Expected Learning Outcomes:**  
Expected student learning outcomes identify the intended knowledge, understandings, or abilities that students will acquire through the academic program. Outcomes are included which explicitly describe what students know, understand, or are able to do.  
Comments: |
| select      | **Assessment Activities:**  
Activities for assessing outcomes are listed and described for each outcome. The activities appropriately measure the outcomes. Direct and indirect measures of outcomes are collected through the activities. The ways in which faculty and staff are involved in the development, implementation, and use of student learning outcomes assessment are described.  
Comments: |
| select      | **Assessment Findings:**  
The findings describe what was learned from the assessment activities. Findings from assessment activities are summarized and clearly reported in ways that align with expected outcomes. If the findings are not yet available, rubrics or other tools to be used for data collection are linked.  
Comments: |
| select      | **Changes in Response to Findings:**  
The findings are used to drive change and improvement in the program. Assessment findings are appropriately used as information that drives improvement in learning, instruction, curriculum, or strategic planning. Specific changes are described that clearly link to the findings.  
Comments: |

**Reporting on the Assessment Website:**  
(Indicate yes or no for each item.)

| select | Material on the program’s assessment webpages matches what is provided in the Self-Study Report.  
Comments: |
| select | Assessment webpages were updated within the last year (based on the automated update date and time on the Assessment Website).  
Comments: |

Scoring: 4 = Excellent, 3 = Achieving, 2 = Needs Development, 1 = Inadequate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Learning Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected student learning outcomes identify the intended knowledge, understandings, or abilities that students will acquire through the academic program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outcomes are included which explicitly describe what students know, understand, or are able to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcomes are included, but do not explicitly describe what students know, understand, or are able to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes are included that describe course level evaluation. No program level outcomes are included that explicitly describe what students know, understand, or are able to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outcomes are absent. Rather, the expected learning outcomes section describes program goals and objectives rather than student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities for assessing outcomes are listed and described. The activities appropriately measure the outcomes, and include direct and indirect measures. Faculty and staff involvement in the development, implementation, and use of student learning outcomes is described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Activities are listed and described for each outcome. The activities are appropriate measures of the outcomes. Direct and indirect measures of outcomes are collected through the activities. Involvement in the assessment process by faculty and staff is described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Activities are listed and described for each outcome. The activities are appropriate measures of the outcomes. Activities do not include direct and indirect measures OR involvement in the assessment process by faculty and staff is not described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Activities are listed and described for each outcome. Some activities may not be appropriate measures of the outcomes. Activities do not include direct and indirect measures OR involvement in the assessment process by faculty and staff is not described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A discussion of assessment activities is absent or vague OR assessment activities are not linked to Learning Outcomes. In the absence of measurable learning outcomes, this criterion receives a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Findings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The findings describe what was learned from the assessment activities. Findings from ongoing assessment activities are summarized and clearly reported in ways that align with expected outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Findings from assessment activities are summarized and clearly reported in ways that align with expected outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Findings from assessment activities are linked to learning outcomes. However, findings are not reported in a clear and concise way. If findings are not yet available, rubrics or other tools to be used for data collection are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Findings from assessment activities are linked to learning outcomes. However, findings are only from indirect measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No findings from assessment activities are reported OR the findings are not linked to Learning Outcomes. In the absence of measurable learning outcomes, this criterion receives a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in Response to Findings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The findings are used to drive change and improvement in the program. Assessment findings are appropriately used as information that drives improvement in learning, instruction, curriculum or strategic planning. Specific changes are described that clearly link to the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Changes are described that link back to findings from assessment of student outcomes and contribute to program improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Changes are noted but are not linked to assessment findings. There is insufficient evidence that changes were related to program improvement. If insufficient data have been collected to justify changes, the report should note this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Changes are included but there is no evidence that changes are related to improving student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Changes are not described. No evidence is provided that indicates a connection between assessment findings and program improvement. In the absence of measurable learning outcomes, this criterion receives a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: 4 = Excellent, 3 = Achieving, 2 = Needs Development, 1 = Inadequate
## Sample Assessment Activities Table
### Undergraduate Political Science Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Courses</th>
<th>Students will be able to…</th>
<th>PSci 180 Pre-Test</th>
<th>PSci 310 Research Paper*</th>
<th>PSci 460 Post-Test</th>
<th>PSci 493</th>
<th>PSci 498 Portfolio* Oral Presentation*</th>
<th>Exit Survey**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>critically analyze political information given an issue important in modern U.S. society</td>
<td>communicate effectively orally and in writing.</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Research Paper*</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differentiate the theoretical, structural, historical, and scientific dimensions of politics.</td>
<td>demonstrate sensitivity and tolerance of racial, cultural, and other human differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Paper*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate commitment to being a politically responsible citizen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rubrics are used to evaluate these. Each rubric has criteria that link to the associated learning outcomes.

**Students are asked to assess their attainment of each of the learning outcomes.
## Sample Assessment Activities Table
Graduate Biology Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Activities</th>
<th>Students will be able to…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrate broad knowledge of his/her field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>critically analyze published research results in his/her area of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct original research on a significant biological problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effectively communicate and defend results of research to peers and broader scientific audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Qualifying Exam</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written &amp; Oral Comprehensive Exams</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Dissertation &amp; Oral Defense</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubrics are used to evaluate the exams, dissertation, and defense; each rubric has criteria that link to the associated learning outcomes. In the Exit Survey, students are asked to assess their attainment of each of the learning outcomes.