

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW



PROCEDURE MANUAL 2017-2018

**Division of Strategic Planning, Analysis, and
Institutional Effectiveness
Office of Program Quality
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
301 Foote-Hilyer
Tallahassee FL 32307**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Procedures of Program Review.....	4
Initial Planning.....	4
Self-Study	5
External Reviewers.....	6
Criteria	6
Action Plan	7
Summary Report to the Board of Governors	7
Responsibilities of the Dean	9
Responsibilities of Program Review Contact.....	10
Responsibilities of Program Review Coordinator.....	11
Responsibilities of University Consultant.....	12
APPENDIX A	13
Program Enrollments: 2012 - 2017.....	13
Degree Productivity: 2012 - 2017	14
Annual Student Productivity (Fundable FTE Generated)	15
APPENDIX B	19
Timeline of Reviews: 2017-2018 Program Reviews	19
APPENDIX C	21
Self-Study Process, Guidelines and Format	21
APPENDIX D	27

2017 – 2018 Program Reviews

05'	Major Code	Major Description	AREA, ETHNIC, CULTURAL, AND GENDER STUDIES	Program Level
05.0201'	25103	African American Studies	African American Studies	Bachelors
45			SOCIAL SCIENCES	
45.0101	27181	Psychology	Master of Applied Social Sciences (MASS)	Masters
45.0101	27182	Global Security and International Affairs	Master of Applied Social Sciences (MASS)	Masters
45.0101	27183	Political Science	Master of Applied Social Sciences (MASS)	Masters
45.0101	27185	Sociology	Master of Applied Social Sciences (MASS)	Masters
45.0101	27187	Public Administration	Master of Applied Social Sciences (MASS)	Masters
45.0101	27188	History	Master of Applied Social Sciences (MASS)	Masters
45.0101	27189	Criminal Justice	Master of Applied Social Sciences (MASS)	Masters
45.1001	25301	Political Science	Political Science	Bachelors
45.1001	25303	Public Administration	Political Science	Bachelors
54				
54.0101	25101	History	History	Bachelors

Introduction

Academic Program Reviews are a systematic evaluation of undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU). Board of Governors (BOG) regulation 8.015 requires a seven-year cyclic review of all academic programs offered within the State University System. Under this regulation, academic programs must conduct a comprehensive program review documenting how students have demonstrated learning outcomes and programmatic objectives consistent with the mission and strategic plan of the university.

At FAMU, program reviews may be conducted as a stand-alone review of specific programs or as part of a specialized accreditation visit. Each review must include at a minimum: (a) review and mission of the program; (b) student productivity data, including admissions, enrollment and graduation; (c) expected student learning outcomes; (d) assessment of whether students are meeting learning outcomes and program objectives; (e) how the results of the assessments are used for continuous improvement of the program; (f) faculty effort in teaching, learning, and service; and (g) efficiency of resources used for the program.

Comprehensive program reviews may enhance the quality of a program as well as respond to future opportunities or challenges that may exist. It also provides direction for strategic planning of the program and for the university as a whole.

Procedures of Program Review

The academic program review process includes initial planning conducted by the college/school and department, a self-study, external review by an expert in the discipline, discussion of the findings, action plan created by the department, and a report to the Board of Governors, State University System of Florida.

Initial Planning

Generally, the Office of Program Quality within the Division of Strategic Planning, Analysis and Institutional Effectiveness (SPAIE) initiates the academic program reviews. In the fall semester preceding the year of the review, letters are sent to the deans notifying them of the reviews that will fall under their purview for the upcoming program review cycle. Following, an orientation is conducted for the deans and their designees who will assist and coordinate the actual review. The orientation provides an overview of the State University System requirements for program review and direction on how the program reviews should be conducted.

Prior to orientation, the deans identify a program contact and coordinator. The program review contact will be responsible for oversight of all program reviews involving the college, school, or institute on an on-going basis. The program review coordinator is responsible for coordinating the collection of information needed for the review and compiles the self-study document using the specified format in this manual. Both the program review contact and coordinator attend the orientation with the dean and/or department chairs so that he/she is knowledgeable of the entire program review process.

If a consultant is utilized the program review contact or coordinator also provides oversight in the nomination of the consultants, obtains their vitae, and arranges the site visit schedule in consultation with the Office of Program Quality and the Division of Academic Affairs.

Self-Study

The self-study provides the general framework for the program review and should emphasize strengths as well as areas for improvement. Self-studies and the supporting documentation should be brief. The self-study should be written with four constituencies in mind: the University, Board of Trustees, Board of Governors, and the public. In most cases it is advisable to utilize an external consultant to review the self-study, conduct a site visit and provide a report. The decision to utilize a consultant will be made by the Office of Program Quality in consultation with the dean and department Chair. It is also recommended that input from faculty, staff, and students be gathered and used for completion of the self-study. Student input and input from alumni may be collected through the use of electronic or printed questionnaire surveys. The results should be summarized in the self-study.

Writing of the self-study should begin shortly after the orientation conducted by the Office of Program Quality. Data collected at the central university level (see Appendix A) will be available at the orientation to include in the self-study document as well as in this manual. It is imperative that the colleges/schools and departments follow the established timeline for completion of the self-study so that the external reviewer can conduct a comprehensive review of the program in the Spring.

There is no set format for writing the self-study. However, it is recommended that the guidelines provided in Appendix C be used in the development and formatting of the self-study. The first draft of the self-study should be provided to the Office of Program Quality by May 5, 2017. The second draft should be sent to the office by October 29, 2017. Final copies are due December 1, 2017. At least three copies of the final document should be submitted. Following the review of the self-study by the Office of Program Quality, a copy will be forwarded to the external consultant for review and to prepare for the site visit in March 2017.

External Reviewers

Consultant nominees provided by the academic unit to the Office of Program Quality should meet the following criteria. In addition to these criteria, preferred qualifications are also listed. At least three nominees who meet the specified criteria should be submitted to the Office of Program Quality by August 2017. The Office of Program Quality will contact the nominees and select the consultant. The Office of Program Quality will also provide information regarding honorariums and travel. If an on-site visit by the consultant is planned, the Office of Program Quality will determine, with the consultant and the College, the dates for the visit.

Criteria

- Holds the rank of Associate Professor or higher;
- Is from an institution outside the State of Florida;
- Is from an institution which offers the degree being reviewed or the degree sought in the proposal;
- Has administrative experience;
- Has no conflict of interest with the university or individuals in the program;
- Is currently active in the discipline; and
- Has a respected record of scholarly activity in the discipline if reviewing doctoral programs.
- Has experience evaluating programs; e.g., site visitor for accreditation, consultant for program review.
- Is well-respected in the discipline;
- Is from an institution whose program the university wishes to emulate or with which the program wishes to be compared; and
- Is from a public institution or has had public institution experience.

Prior to the visit, the consultant should review all information provided by the university. While conducting the visit, it is recommended that the consultant review the programs' self-study and conduct an assessment of the program paying close attention to student learning outcomes and assessment, faculty effort and scholarship, fiscal and physical resources and recruitment and retention of students. These suggestions are not all inclusive. The consultant should feel free to make recommendations in any aspects of the program as deemed appropriate to the quality of student learning, organization, and instruction. It is expected that the external reviewer not only comment on the strengths and areas of improvement, but also make note of areas in which the program has excelled or would be considered exemplary.

Recommendations included in the consultant's reports should be made in two categories: those which are within the purview of the program to implement,

and those which may require some decisions or resources at the college, school, institute or university level. The final report should focus on findings. Any recommendations that develop out of the program review must be supported by review findings. Preliminary findings of the report should be provided to university administrators at the exit interview. The final report should be provided to the Office of Program Quality within two weeks after the site visit.

The Office of Program Quality will prepare the contract for the consultant/external reviewer. This contract will cover all of the duties, responsibilities, timeframe for the performance of these tasks, and method of payment for the honorarium. The Office of Program Quality using the following guidelines for expenses will prepare travel authorization and travel reimbursement forms for the consultant:

Hotel Accommodations (cost plus tax)

Meals @ \$36/day

Mileage @ \$0.445/mile (if private car is used to and from airport)

Airline ticket (coach)

Federal Express or express mail cost for mailing reports to the university

All receipts must be provided to the Office of Program Quality within four weeks following the visit.

Action Plan

Following submission of the external reviewer's report, the dean and department chair/director are to meet with faculty to discuss the findings of the report. After consultation with the faculty, the department chair/division director should derive an action plan of the steps that will be completed in the next year to address the recommendations of the consultant. The action plan should be submitted to the Office of Program Quality within three weeks following receipt of the final consultant's report.

Summary Report to the Board of Governors

The last step in the program review process is to compile a summary report for the Board of Governors Office, which is due in December of each year. The summary report should include at a minimum: (a) a brief description of the program, (b) responses to previous reviews, (c) major findings from the current review, including strengths and weaknesses, and (d) future direction of the program.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Program Review

Responsibilities of the Dean

- Identifies a program review contact who will be responsible for oversight of all program reviews involving the college, school or institute on an on-going basis.

- Identifies a program review coordinator for each program or cluster of programs undergoing review prior to the initial meeting. In schools, which undergo only a single program, review (e.g. nursing, architecture) the program review contact may also serve as the coordinator.

- Along with the program review contact and coordinator, attends the initial program review meeting.

- Reviews self-study document.

- May provide a brief evaluation and recommendations based on self-study, external consultant's report if any, and own observations.

- Meets with the Provost to discuss the program review findings and recommendations.

- Develops an action plan for approval by the Provost, delineating actions to be taken as a result of program review.

- Follows up to ensure actions in the action plan are undertaken.

Responsibilities of Program Review Contact

- Along with the Dean and program review coordinator, attends the initial program review meeting;
- Provides guidance and oversight for all program reviews in the college/school/institute, from year to year;
- Ensures that program coordinators receive any necessary assistance in developing the self-study and coordinating other program review activities;
- Ensures that program review coordinators meet deadlines;
- Reviews draft self-studies to assure accuracy and quality of the document;
- If consultants are utilized, provides oversight in the nomination of the consultants, arrangements, and site visit arrangements;
- Keeps Dean apprized of the program review activities;
- Assists the Dean in developing the action plan subsequent to the meeting with the Provost; and,
- Assists the Dean in following up to ensure actions in the action plan are undertaken

Responsibilities of Program Review Coordinator

- Attends initial program review orientation meeting and all subsequent meetings scheduled by the Office of Program Quality;
- Adheres to the timeline;
- Requests data necessary for review;
- Seeks input and information from appropriate individuals and offices, including students;
- Coordinates collection of information needed for the review and writes or compiles the self-study document according to the specified format;
- If an external consultant is to be utilized, nominates individuals to serve as consultant and obtains their vitae, arranges site visit and interview schedules in cooperation with Dean's Office, Provost's Office, and the Office of Program Quality;
- If a consultant is to conduct a site visit, makes arrangements for persons to be interviewed. Notifies participants of the time and place for meetings;
- Arranges for transportation for consultant from airport and hotel, and to meetings on campus during entire site visit;
- Arranges for refreshments, working lunches and other hospitality arrangements, excluding entertainment, for consultant;
- Assists Dean and Program Review Contact in drafting the action plan;
- Assists with follow-up as assigned.

Responsibilities of University Consultant

- Makes travel arrangements related to program review using procedures agreed to by the university.
- Keeps appropriate records for travel reimbursement.
- Reviews information provided by university in preparation for site visits.
- Makes site visit.
- Requests schedule modifications and additional interviews, data, and other information when useful.
- Conducts the scheduled interviews for the site visit.
- Provides preliminary findings at the exit interview with university administrators.
- **Develops preliminary report for the program under review and submits report (electronic) to the Provost's office within two weeks after the Site Visit (Word for Windows format is required).**
- Remains accessible for follow-up and questions of university administrators after preliminary report is submitted.
- Finalizes report, making any necessary corrections on factual matters and providing additional information if requested, and submits it to the Provost's office.
- Submits all necessary reimbursement forms to university as soon as possible.

APPENDIX A
2017-2018 Program Review Data

**F=Female M=Male

Program Enrollments: Fall 2012 – Spring 2017

Table 1

Degree and Level	Program Title	CIP Code	Major Code
Bachelors			
Masters			
Doctorate			

Table 2

			Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
		Lower Division Undergraduate					
		Upper Division Undergraduate					
	Total Undergraduate						
		Master's					
	Total Graduate						
		Lower Division Undergraduate					
		Upper Division Undergraduate					
	Total Undergraduate						
	Master's						

	Total Graduate						
		Lower Division Undergraduate					
		Upper Division Undergraduate					
	Total Undergraduate						
		Lower Division Undergraduate					
		Upper Division Undergraduate					
	Total Undergraduate						
		Masters					
		Doctorate					
	Total Graduate						

Degree Productivity: 2012 - 2017

Table 3

		AY12-13	AY13-14	AY-14-15	AY15-16	AY16-17
	B					
	M					
	B					
	M					
	B					
	B					
	M					
	D					

Course Coverage

Table 4

AY16-17

	Number of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)	Percentage of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)
Regular Faculty		
Adjuncts		
Graduate Assistants/OPS		
Overload		
Total		

AY16-17

	Number of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)	Percentage of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)
Regular Faculty		
Adjuncts		
Graduate Assistants/OPS		
Overload		
Total		

AY16-17

	Number of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)	Percentage of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)
Regular Faculty		
Adjuncts		
Graduate Assistants/OPS		
Overload		
Total		

AY16-17

	Number of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)	Percentage of Courses Taught (Most Current Academic Year)
Regular Faculty		
Adjuncts		
Graduate Assistants/OPS		
Overload		
Total		

Annual Student Productivity (Fundable FTE Generated)

Fundable FTE Generated:

Table 5

26.0101 – Biology							
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y12-13 (__ Ranked Faculty teaching undergraduate courses and __ ranked faculty teaching graduate courses)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Graduate I (Masters)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y12-13 (__ Ranked Faculty teaching undergraduate courses and __ ranked faculty teaching graduate courses)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Masters						
	Doctoral						

	Total Graduate						
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y13-14 (__ Ranked Faculty teaching undergraduate courses and __ ranked faculty teaching graduate course)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Masters						
	Doctoral						
	Total Graduate						

Fundable FTE Generated:

Table 6

40.0501 - Chemistry							
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y11-12 (__ Ranked Faculty teaching undergraduate courses and __ ranked faculty teaching Graduate courses)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Graduate I (Master's)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y12-13 (__ Ranked Faculty teaching undergraduate courses and __ ranked faculty teaching Graduate courses)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Graduate I (Master's)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y13-14	Lower Division						

(__ Ranked Faculty teaching undergraduate courses and __ ranked faculty teaching Graduate courses)	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Graduate I (Master's)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						

Fundable FTE Generated:

Table 7

50.0409 – Graphic Design							
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y11-12 (__ Ranked Faculty)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Graduate I (Master's)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y12-13 (__ Ranked Faculty)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total Undergraduate						
	Graduate I (Master's)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						
	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y13-14 (__ Ranked Faculty)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						

	Total Undergraduate						
	Graduate I (Master's)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						

Fundable FTE Generated:

Table 8

51.2099 – Pharmaceutical Science							
Year	Level	Fundable FTE	Total FTE	Fundable FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Total FTE (Ranked Faculty)	Fundable FTE per Ranked	Total FTE per Ranked
Y11-12 (__ Ranked Faculty)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total						
	Graduate I (Master's)						
	Graduate II (Doctoral)						
	Total Graduate						
Y12-13 (__ Ranked Faculty)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total						
	Master's						
	Doctoral						
	Total Graduate						
Y13-14 (__ Ranked Faculty)	Lower Division						
	Upper Division						
	Total						
	Master's						
	Doctoral						
	Total Graduate						

APPENDIX B

Timeline of Reviews: 2017-2018 Program Reviews

If program review is synchronized with an accreditation review, utilize the timeline from the accrediting body and provide a copy to the Office of the Provost and the Office of Program Quality. All other program reviews should follow the timeline outlined below.

Office of Program Quality

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| September | Office of Program Quality requests and obtains necessary data for review from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) for the previous academic year. |
| October/Nov. | Orientation meeting with Dean or designee, coordinators for the program reviews, and Provost or designee for preliminary discussion of review. |

School/College/Department

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Nov-May | Department conducts faculty meetings, using self-study format, and makes self-study assignments. The self-study should serve as the vehicle for departmental discussion and reflection. It should not be the sole responsibility of one individual. |
| March-April | Faculty examine and analyze data, and discuss implications for self-study. |
| June | Dean's Office and program review coordinator meets with Office of Program Quality to discuss the completed data tables for the self-study with a brief analysis of the implications |
| August | Submit to the Office of Program Quality the names of at least three nominees who meet the specified criteria. The Office of Program Quality will contact the nominees and select a consultant. |
- If an on-site visit by the consultant is planned, the Office of Program Quality and the Division of Academic Affairs will

determine, with the consultant and the College/School, the dates for the visit.

September If the program serves other departments or has significant collaborations with other departments, input from those departments is sought.

May – October Utilizing the specified format, draft the self-study. The faculty, chair and dean should review the draft. Drafts for 2017-2018 reviews should be submitted to the Office of Program Quality by October 29, 2017. Three copies of the final document are due by December 1, 2017.

Office of Program Quality

November Make travel and hotel reservations and contract for consultants.

December 6 Receive 3 copies of the final self-study document from the department.

January Provide a copy of the self-study to the consultant.
(Institutional Effectiveness)

Office of Program Quality and Department

January The program review coordinator, in consultation with the Dean and Office of Program Quality, Division of Academic Affairs and the consultant, makes arrangements for the consultant's visit and provides a draft site visit schedule.

February Site visit schedule is finalized.

February-March Welcome and orient consultant. Conduct actual site visit. Obtain consultant's report (two weeks following visit). Review report and request and corrections.

May Consultant submits final report.

June The Program Review Summary is provided to the Board of Governors.

July-August The Department, through the Dean, submits an Action Plan to the Office of Program Quality.

APPENDIX C

Self-Study Process, Guidelines and Format

Program Review Summary

Please provide, in a separate document, a summary of the program review, using the attached summary format. **Limit your summary to no more than 5 pages.**

Purpose

- The purpose of the self-study is threefold:
 - (1) to provide program faculty the opportunity to reflect on and analyze all aspects of the program and plan for its future directions;
 - (2) to help administrators and, if necessary, external consultants, understand and evaluate the program; and
 - (3) in the case of units anticipating new degree programs, to aid in preparing to offer the proposed program.

Process

- All degree programs at state universities must, by BOG regulation 8.015, undergo periodic program review. Each undergraduate and graduate degree program that is part of a periodic review completes a self-study using the format provided by Academic Affairs.
- Programs that undergo specialized accreditation may utilize that process and accreditation self-study guidelines in lieu of the program review self-study guidelines, as long as the elements in the Self-Study format are included. A hard copy and an electronic copy of the accreditation self-study must be submitted to the Office of Program Quality prior to the deadline. The Program Review Summary template on the BOG website must also be completed prior to the deadline.
- In most cases, it is advisable to utilize an external consultant to review the self-study, conduct a site visit and provide a report. The decision to utilize a consultant will be made by the Provost in consultation with Dean and Department Chair. Students in the program will be part of all program reviews. The program should seek student input and input from graduates during the development of the self-study through questionnaire surveys. The results should be summarized in the self-study. Students should be included during an external consultant's site visit.

Each college or school should designate an individual who will be responsible for overseeing all program reviews occurring within the college or school and who will serve as the program review contact. At the beginning of a program review cycle, the Office of Program Quality will arrange a meeting with all individuals responsible for the program reviews occurring during that cycle to clarify the process, responsibilities and timelines.

- The program review self-study report must be reviewed and approved by the Academic Dean prior to review by the Office of Program Quality. The Dean will also complete a “Program Review Summary Form” including recommendations based on the external consultant’s report (if available) and his/her own observations. The Program Review Summary Report is submitted to the Board of Governors on schedule. Once final consultant reports or accreditation reports are received, the Dean will ensure that an action plan is developed. Subsequently, the Dean will meet with the Provost to discuss and seek approval of the action plan. Recommendations ensuing from program reviews and assessments will inform the planning and budgeting process at the school, college, institute and institutional level.
- The Dean will provide a follow-up report one year after the action plan is developed.

Self-study Guidelines

- The self-study and the program review process should provide a periodic in-depth view of the program, while building upon an on-going system of continuous improvement within the program. The program faculty as a whole should participate in the development of the self-study and be involved in the program review process.
- Self-studies should follow the attached outline and insert the program review forms either in the body of the text or in the appendices. Please keep narratives short and succinct, but feel free to include additional material necessary to represent programs fully. Submit the final document in hardcopy (letter size, 3 copies) and electronically. Programs may wish to include peer comparison data. If so, the measures should be reviewed by the Dean and Office of Program Quality office prior to data collection.
- Once the report is approved and finalized, an official electronic copy, in “read only” format, will be maintained in the Office of Program Quality, the Dean’s office, and with the FAMU Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) liaison.

Format for Self-Studies

1. Status of the Discipline

- Brief description of the national status of the discipline, including emerging issues and trends.

2. Program

- Brief overview of program
- Mission statement for the program: Reference its relationship to college and institutional mission, state priorities and Board of Governors strategic plan as appropriate.
- Goals and objectives of the program relative to teaching, research and public service.
- Student Learning Outcomes of the program: Student learning outcomes should identify in behavioral terms the broad skill areas students should master as a result of the program by the time they graduate. A matrix indicating which courses address each of the outcomes identified should be included. Attach a copy of the Academic Learning Compact for each reviewed baccalaureate degree program.
- Governance structure of the program
- Admissions requirements (including limited access requirements if applicable, and an assessment of whether limited access needs to continue).
- Degree requirements (including credit hours to degree).
- Curriculum
- Prerequisites. Ensure that prerequisites to enter baccalaureate majors are identical to the statewide common prerequisites found at www.facts.org under the “Advising Manuals” link.
- Associated institutes and centers
- Involvement of business and industry in establishing goals, objectives, learning outcomes and curriculum (this item is required for science and technology programs, recommended for others).
- Community college articulation (in the case of baccalaureate programs)

3. Program Evaluation

- Provide an assessment of program performance in relation to the program goals and objectives listed under the “Program” section above.
- Describe briefly the means of assessing student-learning outcomes. Means of assessing outcomes may include but are not limited to standardized tests, capstone course/program examinations, analyses of theses, portfolios and recitals. Attach the Assessment Planning Form completed for the Office of University Assessment.

- Describe briefly the continuous improvement plan utilized to assess and improve the program on an on-going basis. Assess how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes. Summarize improvements made as a result of the continuous improvement plan.
- Provide a brief analysis of the grade patterns of courses with high failure rates or withdrawals and delineate an action plan for student improvement in these areas.
- Provide results of surveys of students, graduates, and employers.

4. Students

- Enrollment
- Degree productivity
- Student services
- Outcomes information including student performance on licensure/certification exams, job placement of graduates, student, alumni and employer surveys

5. Faculty

- Teaching productivity and activities designed to enhance teaching and the curriculum
- Research productivity
- Service, including service to public schools
- Faculty development plans

6. Facilities and Resources

Address the adequacy of resources and support services to address the goals and objectives of the program.

- Library
- Laboratories
- Equipment
- Space
- Support personnel

7. Responses to Previous Program Review Recommendations

- Itemize each major recommendation and state the response.
- Summarize how previous program review results have been used to inform any of the following that apply: the refinement of mission and goals/objectives; program planning, development and improvement; and budgeting decisions.

8. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)

- Identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that support or impede achievement of program goals, objectives and expected outcomes.

9. Vision and Plans for the Future of the Program

- Provide a vision statement of what the department would like the program to be in six years; assuming only costs to continue, with no additional state resources. In order to reach this goal, state the plans for the next 3 years and the next 6 years, including actions, which need to occur.
- Provide a vision statement of what the department would like the program to be in six years, if additional resources are available. In order to reach this goal, state the plans for the next 3 years and the next 6 years, including actions, which need to occur, and resources required at each stage.

10. Unit Recommendations

- Identify recommendations for improvement of the program
 - Recommendations for changes, which are within the control of the program, including curricular changes if appropriate; and
 - Recommendations for changes that require action at the Dean, Provost or higher levels

Program Review Summary Report

In addition to the self-study submitted by each academic unit undergoing a program review, this summary report is to be completed by the Dean and **limited to no more than 5 pages**. The format below contains the items to be reported to the Board of Governors, as required BOG Regulation 8.015.

Program Name:

Degree Level: _____ **CIP Code:** _____

Please respond to each of the items below.

1. Please provide a brief synopsis of actions taken in response to recommendations from previous reviews for this program. If the program is new and has had no previous reviews, address any previous recommendations for the academic unit offering the program.

2. Attach a copy of the Academic Learning Compact for each reviewed baccalaureate degree program.

3. Identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) that support or impede achievement of program goals.

4. Recommendations based on review findings (if the accrediting body's recommendations or program review consultant's recommendations are not available yet, provide them in a separate summary document as soon as they are finalized.)

I confirm that each program review prepared and being submitted to the Board of Governors includes all of the processes as outlined in the Board of Governors' regulation of academic program reviews and was conducted according to Florida A & M University's approved policy for program reviews.

Respectfully submitted:

Provost

APPENDIX D

Sample Itinerary

Day 1

8:15 a.m.	Transport External Reviewer to University
8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Meet with Provost
9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.	Transport Reviewer to Mtg. w/ Dean
9:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.	Meet with Dean of College or School
10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	Meet with Chair of Program
11:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Tour of library and discussion of holdings with Librarian
12:30 p.m. – 1:45 p.m.	Lunch (Office of Program Quality)
1:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.	Transportation to next meeting
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Meeting with faculty (all except Chair)
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Individual meetings with faculty
4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Review of on-site documents and materials (include full faculty vitae, course syllabi, sample student products, report of other evaluations of the program in the past 7 years, and previous program review report)
5:00 p.m.	Transport external reviewer back to hotel

Day 2

8:30 a.m.	Pick up consultant from hotel
8:45 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	Tour of relevant facilities
10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	Meeting with students in program
11:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	Meeting with faculty from collaborating programs (if any)
11:45 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.	Working lunch
12:45 p.m. – 1:45 p.m.	Meeting with alumni and employers in area (if available), advisory council members, and granting agencies (if available)
1:45 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Consultant working session preparing for exit interview
3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Provost