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# Introduction

Virginia Tech’s Academic Program Review (APR) process provides a mechanism for ongoing, systematic review of academic departments, schools, and programs with the explicit purpose of fostering continuous improvement. Unlike other reporting and review processes that focus on what units have already accomplished (e.g., annual departmental reports) and/or meeting external standards (e.g., discipline-specific accreditation processes), APR provides units with opportunities to develop a strong vision for where the unit wishes to be in the future and to create specific plans to accomplish this vision.

The APR process is designed to benefit participating academic units and their respective academic colleges. Units and colleges are encouraged to utilize the APR process to help create new strategic plans; revise curricula; better support students, faculty, and staff; etc. The APR process is designed to complement, not duplicate, existing improvement processes. Since Virginia Tech’s academic colleges have different areas of focus, APR is structured a bit differently across the colleges to better meet academic unit and college needs.

Each academic unit at Virginia Tech conducts a comprehensive evaluation of its activities approximately every five or six years. The review schedule is set in collaboration with the college deans and may vary slightly to avoid conflicts with discipline-related requirements. The standard timeframe for data included in the self-study is the past five years.

APR focuses on an academic department, school, or program inclusive of all degree and certificate programs, intercollege programs, online programs, etc. Results are archived by the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit in the Office of Analytics and Institutional Effectiveness. Administrative support for this process is provided by IE, Strategic Analysis (formerly Institutional Research), and other appropriate university units.

Virginia Tech’s APR process is designed to be:

* Meaningful
* Functional
* Flexible

The process emphasizes:

* Reflection
* Conversation
* Feedback
* Improvement

The process facilitates:

* A strong vision for the future
* An honest assessment of unit strengths/weaknesses/opportunities for improvement
* Documentation of resource needs

# **A** Snapshot of the APR Process

As part of the APR process, units complete a [self-study report](#_Self-Study_Report_Template) that is reviewed and evaluated by a team of peer reviewers. This self-study report is designed to encourage units to reflect on their current operations, develop a vision for the future, and create and implement a plan for continuous improvement. The analysis included in the report should be informed by data provided to the unit from sources such as IE and Strategic Analysis, as well as current trends in the field and faculty interests.

By providing an analysis of how the department/school/program is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations in core areas, the self-study report goes beyond describing unit activities. The self-study report is not only designed to foster analysis and reflection, but discussion – discussion within the unit, with external stakeholders, with the peer review team, and with the unit’s respective dean(s). The final written report narrative is typically 25-30 pages (not including data tables or other appendices).

Each academic unit submits its completed self-study report to IE, which distributes the report to the unit’s respective peer review team. The table below describes the sequence of events once the self-study report has been received by the peer review team. For an overview of the entire APR process from start to finish with key dates, please refer to the [timeline](#_Timeline_for_Academic) on page 8.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Self-Study Report Review Period | Peer review team members independently analyze the self-study report, using the [APR Rubric](#_Academic_Program_Review) as a guide. |
| Peer Review Team Meeting | An IE professional facilitates a meeting of the peer review team to discuss the self-study report. During this meeting, the team also identifies questions it would like to ask the unit in order to clarify information presented in the report and develop a deeper understanding of the unit. |
| Peer Review Team + Academic Unit Meeting | An IE professional facilitates a meeting between the review team and the academic unit to ask clarifying questions and discuss the self-study report, where the unit hopes to be in the future, and how it plans to get there. It is common for a total of 2-4 members of a unit to attend the meeting with the peer review team. |
| Peer Review Team Report | The peer review team utilizes the self-study report and additional information gathered in the discussion with unit representatives to craft the peer review team report. The APR Rubric serves as the template for the peer review team report. |
| Academic Unit Written Response (OPTIONAL) | After receiving the peer review team report, the unit is given the opportunity to submit a written response, if it so desires, to clarify or highlight points in the peer review team report. This part of the process is optional. |
| APR Products Delivered to Dean’s Office | The self-study report, peer review team report, and any optional written response are sent to the unit’s respective dean. |
| Academic Unit + Dean’s Office Meeting | Unit leaders meet with the dean(s) to discuss the findings of the review process and the unit’s plans for the future. |
| Memo of Understanding from Dean’s Office | The Dean’s Office composes a memo documenting the conversation with the unit, the unit’s plans for moving forward, and expectations for action items to be implemented by the unit by the next APR cycle. The memo is shared with the academic unit and the IE unit, which is responsible for archiving all APR materials. |

## Including Unit Stakeholders

Academic units are strongly encouraged to include evidence of broad participation in the self-study process. Stakeholders include faculty members from different classifications (e.g., instructional faculty, research faculty) and ranks, staff members, current students (e.g., undergraduate students and graduate students), alumni, advisory boards, employers, and industry partners.

Feedback may be obtained through a variety of data collection methods and discussion venues that include meetings, retreats, surveys, focus groups, interviews, Google Docs, annual activity reports, etc.

# Peer Reviewers

Peer review teams include individuals with disciplinary expertise similar to the unit being reviewed and expertise distinct from the unit in order to provide diverse perspectives. Teams typically include four faculty members plus a professional from the IE unit (5 members total). Although most peer reviewers are from Virginia Tech, many units have found including an external peer reviewer from another university/organization to be very helpful. Reviewers from other institutions can easily participate in the APR process via Zoom meetings.

Faculty peer reviewers must be from outside of the academic unit being reviewed. Each faculty peer reviewer should represent a unique department, school, or program. Peer review teams typically include:

* Two participants from other disciplines within the unit’s academic college.
	+ As mentioned above, one of the four faculty members may be an individual from outside of Virginia Tech if desired (e.g., from another university, industry, etc.). If the unit selects an external peer reviewer from its discipline, this individual counts towards the “within academic college” contingent.
* Two participants from disciplines outside of the unit’s academic college (i.e., from other academic colleges at Virginia Tech).

A key determinant of units receiving meaningful feedback at the end of the APR process is selecting strong peer reviewers. Units may consider nominating potential peer reviewers that (a) are familiar with the unit’s programs and/or have collaborated with the unit in the past, (b) the unit wishes knew more about its programs and/or might be future collaborators, (c) will provide the unit with a fresh perspective, etc. When developing a list of potential peer reviewers, the unit should not include individuals with conflicts of interest (e.g., individuals serving on the unit’s alumni or advisory board). Any questions about potential conflicts of interest should be directed to the IE unit.

As part of the APR process, unit leaders are charged with compiling a list of individuals that the unit believes would be strong reviewers of the academic unit and submitting it to IE. **Academic units do not invite their own peer reviewers. Rather, the IE unit invites APR peer reviewers on each academic unit’s behalf.** It is very helpful to send multiple options for each peer reviewer category (e.g., reviewers within the unit’s academic college; reviewers from other academic colleges) since some individuals may not be able to participate due to scheduling conflicts and some individuals may be recommended by multiple units participating in peer review during the same semester.

After a peer review team has been finalized by the IE unit, all of the reviewers on the team participate in an initial meeting/training session led by an IE professional at which the APR process, timeline, and peer reviewer responsibilities are discussed in detail. Both internal and external peer reviewers are offered a $500 stipend per completed review. Peer reviewers may serve on only one Virginia Tech peer review team per semester.

Once each peer review team member has reviewed the self-study report individually, an IE professional facilitates a second meeting with the peer review team where the team discusses the self-study report as a group and identifies questions it would like to ask academic unit representatives during the team’s third and final meeting.

Peer Review Team + Academic Unit Meeting

During the review team’s final meeting, peer reviewers participate in a conversation with unit representatives to discuss the unit’s self-study report, where the unit hopes to be in the future, and how the unit plans to get there. **This meeting is an opportunity for peer reviewers to gain additional information to inform the peer review team report AND for unit representatives and peer reviewers to share ideas for how the unit can move forward. The peer review team will NOT present its findings at this meeting.**

Decisions regarding who will join the unit leader at the meeting with the peer review team are made by the unit leader. It is common for a total of 2-4 members of a unit to attend the meeting with the peer review team. Other participating unit representatives are often associate or assistant department heads/school directors, undergraduate program coordinators, graduate program coordinators, and/or assessment leads.

# Responsibilities

Expectations for the different groups of individuals participating in APR are detailed below.

## Academic Leader/Unit Responsibilities

* Compile and submit a list of potential peer reviewers to the IE unit. **\*The IE unit will contact all potential peer reviewers on the unit’s behalf.\***
* Conduct a comprehensive self-study of the academic unit. The completed self-study report should be submitted to the IE unit by the communicated deadline.
* Meet with the peer review team to discuss the unit’s self-study report, vision for the future, and plans for moving forward.
* Meet with the college dean(s) to discuss the review process and action items.
* Facilitate and track progress on the implementation items outlined in the self-study report/dean’s memo.

## IE Unit Responsibilities

* Provide support and information about the APR process to department chairs/heads, school directors, and program directors.
* Coordinate with the Strategic Analysis unit in the Office of Analytics and Institutional Effectiveness to provide relevant data for units participating in APR.
* Invite and train peer reviewers, schedule APR meetings, and share each unit’s self-study report with the respective peer review team.
* For each peer review team, facilitate meetings, create a first draft of the peer review team report by compiling individual peer reviewer rubrics into one comprehensive document, and send the final peer review team report to the unit.
* Send final APR reports to the respective college dean(s) and archive all APR-related materials.

## Peer Reviewer Responsibilities

* Thoroughly read and analyze the unit’s self-study report.
* Participate in all peer review team meetings, including engaging in dialogue at the meeting with unit representatives.
* Complete an individual evaluation of the self-study report using the APR Rubric.
* After the IE team member has compiled all of the individual rubrics into one comprehensive report, help review, edit, and finalize the peer review team report. Comments included in the peer review team report are not attributed to specific individuals but represent the team as a whole.

# Data Policies

The IE unit keeps an archive of each department/school/program’s APR documents. Information in this archive is shared with the associated college deans as part of the regular APR process. Reports might also be presented to Virginia Tech’s regional accrediting agency, SACSCOC, as examples of demonstrating compliance on specific accreditation standards. The IE unit will not release data and reports kept in the archive to other individuals without first seeking approval of the associated unit leader.

# Timeline for Academic Units Reviewed in Fall 2024

**\*Key deadlines and activities for unit leaders are highlighted below\***

* January/February 2024:
	+ Departments/schools/programs are notified that they will participate in the Academic Program Review (APR) peer review process during the Fall 2024 semester.
	+ Charge meetings are held with unit leaders and professionals from the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) unit within the Office of Analytics and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE).
	+ Data compiled by OAIE are shared with each unit.
* **By March 15, 2024:**
	+ Unit leaders submit a list of potential peer reviewers to the IE unit. **\*The IE unit will contact all potential peer reviewers on the unit’s behalf.\***
* April/May 2024:
	+ Peer review teams are confirmed for each unit.
* September 2024:
	+ Each peer review team participates in an initial meeting/training session led by IE.
* **By October 1, 2024:**
	+ Unit self-study reports are submitted to IE. IE professionals distribute the self-study reports to peer review teams.
* October/November 2024:
	+ Peer reviewers analyze their assigned self-study report.
	+ Each peer review team meets to discuss initial perceptions related to the self-study report and any questions, challenges, etc. that the review team would like to discuss with the unit.
* **By December 1, 2024:**
	+ Each peer review team participates in a conversation with unit representatives to discuss the self-study report, where the unit hopes to be in the future, and how the unit plans to get there. **\*This meeting is an opportunity for unit representatives and peer reviewers to engage in dialogue that provides additional information to inform the peer review team report and the unit’s plans for moving forward. The peer review team will NOT present its findings at this meeting.\***
* By January 15, 2025:
	+ Each peer review team submits its final peer review team report to its respective unit. This report consists of the completed APR Rubric and a short narrative (3-4 pages).
* By February 15, 2025:
	+ If desired, units prepare a short written response to the peer review team report and submit it to the IE unit.
	+ IE professionals send each unit’s self-study report, the peer review team report, and written response to the peer review team report (if created) to the dean(s) of the unit’s academic college.
* By March 15, 2025:
	+ Conversations between each unit and its respective dean(s) are held to discuss program review findings and, most importantly, the unit’s plans for moving forward. These conversations provide an opportunity to discuss implementation items and resource priorities. The goal of each discussion is to reach a consensus on what actions are to be taken by the unit before the next APR cycle.
* By April 15, 2025:
	+ After each conversation with a unit, the respective dean writes a memo noting his/her conversation with the unit, the unit’s plans for moving forward, and the dean’s expectations for what the unit will accomplish before the next APR cycle. This memo is shared with the unit and the IE unit. The IE unit is responsible for archiving all APR materials.

# Self-Study Report Template

The self-study report for each academic unit should be inclusive of all degree and post-baccalaureate certificate programs (e.g., intercollege programs, online programs, etc.).

**Report Components**

The Virginia Tech Academic Program Review self-study report has three major sections that correspond to the following three overarching questions:

1. Where is the academic unit now?
2. Where does the academic unit hope to be in 5 years?
3. How will the academic unit get there?

Executive Summary

The self-study report should begin with a brief, two-page synopsis of the analysis presented in Part I, Part II, and Part III of the report.

Part I: Where is the academic unit now?

*A. Academic Unit Overview*

This section of the report should provide an overview of the academic unit and include the following information:

1. A brief history of the unit.
2. The unit’s organizational/leadership structure.

Note: It can be helpful to include an organizational chart here.

1. Mission, goals, and strategic priorities of the unit.
2. Alignment of the unit’s goals and priorities with college and institutional goals and priorities.

Note: Refer to [Virginia Tech’s current strategic plan](https://strategicaffairs.vt.edu/StrategicPlanning/the-vt-difference-advancing-beyond-boundaries.html) as well as the unit’s academic college strategic plan.

1. A summary of recommendations from previous reviews, internal and/or external, and any changes made in response.
2. Significant accomplishments, challenges, and changes (e.g., curricular, structural) that have occurred in the most recent 5 years.
3. What are the emerging trends in your discipline? Based on these trends, how is the unit responding or how does it propose to respond?

*B. Academic Program Information*

The narrative for this section should provide reviewers with an understanding of the unit’s academic degree and post-baccalaureate certificate programs, recent trends in enrollment, and challenges or opportunities related to program sustainability. The following information should be included:

1. Please complete Table 1 that provides a brief summary of each degree and certificate program (e.g., BS, MS, PhD) offered by the unit, including any majors or concentrations offered.

Table 1. Degree and post-baccalaureate certificate programs offered by the unit.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree and Certificate Programs Offered** | **Majors / Concentrations Offered (if applicable)** | **Location(s) Offered** | **Format****(e.g., face-to-face; online; hybrid)** | **External Program Accreditations (if applicable)** |
| e.g., Name, BS | Major 1; Major 2 | Blacksburg  | face-to-face |  |
| Name, BS Website: https://www. |
| e.g., Name, MS | Concentration 1; Concentration 2; Concentration 3 | Greater Washington D.C. Metro Area | hybrid |  |
| Name, MS Website: https://www. |
| e.g., Name, Post-baccalaureate certificate |  | Blacksburg and Greater Washington D.C. Metro Area | online |  |
| Name, Post-baccalaureate Certificate Website: https://www. |
| Add/delete rows as needed… |  |  |  |  |

1. Briefly describe the curriculum for each degree and certificate program, including required courses and electives.

Note: Providing degree checksheets in an appendix is a concise way to describe the unit’s curricula.

1. How does the unit contribute to general education (Pathways) or other service teaching areas (if applicable)?

Note: Provide information on Pathways courses and minors taught. Does the unit teach any service courses for graduate students (e.g., methods courses)?

1. If the unit has a graduate degree(s), describe graduate admission processes in the unit.
	* What admissions criteria are utilized?
	* How many assistantships does the unit typically provide?
		+ What type of assistantships are offered (e.g., GTA, GRA, GA)?
		+ What percentage of graduate students are fully funded?
2. Based on the data provided in the unit’s “Interactive Data Visualizations for Academic Units” site and other sources, summarize successes and challenges the unit has encountered in terms of student recruitment, enrollment, retention, time to degree, and graduation rates/number of degrees conferred at each level. For each degree or certificate program offered:
	* How well does the unit attract and retain high quality students?
	* What is the 5-year trend in terms of enrollment and degrees conferred?
	* How is the unit responding to these trends?
	* What potential external events could affect the number of students in the unit?

*C. Student Learning and Support*

The narrative for this section should provide an analysis of student learning, including information on assessment processes for each program within the unit, recent changes/improvements programs have made to enhance student learning, and student support services offered by the unit. The following information should be included:

**Student Learning**

1. For each degree and post-baccalaureate certificate program, what are the program’s student learning outcomes (SLOs)?

Note: This information is part of the unit’s annual assessment reports. Provide a sample annual assessment report for each degree and certificate program in an appendix.

1. How/where are SLOs taught in program curricula?

Note: A streamlined way to present the relationship between courses and SLOs is to provide a curriculum map.

1. What has the unit done to enhance student learning during the past 5 years?

Note: Provide specific examples of changes made by each program to improve student learning. At least some of these examples should be based on findings from annual academic program assessment reports.

**Student Perceptions**

1. How does the unit collect feedback from its students?
	* Summarize these findings in terms of areas where students feel the unit is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting their expectations.

Note: Data frequently utilized here include results from student surveys (e.g., [Virginia Tech’s Senior Survey](https://aie.vt.edu/institutional-effectiveness/survey-and-results.html) or a unit-based senior survey); course evaluations; student focus groups and/or exit interviews; alumni surveys; program outcome findings; etc.

**Unit Services**

1. How does the collection of unit services (e.g., advising and mentoring), activities (e.g., student organizations), and experiential education (e.g., internships, study abroad, undergraduate research) foster student success?

Note: Data frequently utilized here include availability/quality of academic advising; availability/quality of student organizations/co-curricular activities related to degree programs; opportunities for/participation in high-impact educational practices such as internships, undergraduate research, study abroad, and service learning; etc.

1. How does the unit prepare students for their chosen careers?

Note: Data frequently utilized here include availability/quality of job placement support; job placement information for graduating students; graduate school acceptance rates; starting salary information for graduates; alumni survey results; etc. The [First Destination Survey](https://career.vt.edu/about/first-destination/report.html#full) administered by Virginia Tech’s Career and Professional Development unit is a helpful resource for many units with undergraduate programs.

1. If the program has undertaken other initiatives to enhance the student experience, please describe them here.

Note: Potential elements that could be discussed here include new courses/curricula; policies; processes; faculty/staff hires; facilities; etc.

*D. Faculty and Staff Profile*, *including Research/Creative Activity/Scholarly Work, Teaching, and Outreach*

Note: Data in this section may be pulled from sources such as annual unit reports, faculty activity reports, the “Interactive Data Visualizations for Academic Units” site, etc.

This section should provide information on faculty expectations, productivity, and expertise as well as information related to unit staff. The following information should be included:

1. Who currently works in the unit? What is the breakdown of faculty and staff by rank and position?

Note: Please include demographics related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the next section.

1. How is success/productivity defined and communicated to faculty members?

 Note: Discuss guidelines for promotion and tenure as part of this section.

1. In what ways are unit faculty exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for research, creative activity, and/or scholarly work?

Note: Data frequently utilized here include quantity and quality of publications (e.g., journal articles, books, book chapters); exhibitions; grants; conference presentations; invited lectures; awards; etc.

1. In what ways are unit faculty exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for teaching/ pedagogical competency?

Note: Data frequently utilized here include course evaluations; peer teaching observations; teaching awards; engagement in professional development related to teaching; conference presentations related to teaching; etc.

1. How do staff positions support the work of the unit?
2. What has been the impact of new hires and departures in the unit over the past 5 years on program quality (e.g., research productivity, teaching quality, administrative processes)? Are there any trends?

Note: Departures include faculty/staff who retired, resigned, or were not awarded promotion and tenure.

1. How well does the unit support the professional growth of its faculty and staff members?

Note: Components frequently discussed here include mentoring programs; writing groups; unit research seminars; support (e.g., time and/or money) for professional development activities; support for travel to conferences; assistance with preparing P&T dossiers; etc.

1. How well does faculty and staff expertise support the strategic direction of the unit?
2. In what specific ways does the unit engage in outreach and contribute to the university’s land-grant mission?

Note: This question encompasses both local and international work.

*E. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion*

Note: Please utilize demographic data for students and faculty/staff provided in the unit’s “Interactive Data Visualizations for Academic Units” site.

This section should address the unit’s work in relation to goals created by the unit, the unit’s respective academic college, and Virginia Tech associated with diversity, equity, and inclusion. The following information should be included:

1. In what specific ways does the unit contribute to academic college and university strategic plans related to diversity, equity, and inclusion?
2. How is the unit exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for recruiting underrepresented students, faculty, and staff?
3. How is the unit exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for retaining underrepresented students, faculty, and staff?
4. How does the unit create an environment where people from diverse backgrounds want to study and work?

**\*Part II and Part III of the self-study report are forward-looking and designed to provide the unit with a concrete plan for continuous improvement.\***

Part II: Where does the unit hope to be in 5 years?

1. Based on the analysis reported in Part I, describe the unit’s vision for where it will be 5 years from now. Consider all relevant aspects including academic programs; student learning and support; faculty and staff; research, teaching, and outreach; and diversity, equity, and inclusion.
2. What are the gaps (if any) between where your programs are now and where you would like them to be?
3. Describe the extent to which available resources reflect the unit’s capacity to achieve its desired goals. Consider the following types of resources in your analysis:
	* Personnel (e.g., T/R faculty, A/P faculty, support staff)
	* Financial (e.g., salaries, educational and general program budgets)
	* Facilities (e.g., classrooms, office space, lab space, equipment)
	* Technology and technology support
	* Other resources needed to accomplish the unit’s goals

Part III: How will the unit get there?

*Improvement Strategy*

Based on the vision for the unit described in Part II, provide a narrative describing the unit’s overarching plans for improvement over the next 5 years. Considerations for a unit’s Academic Program Review improvement strategy include:

1. What does the data analyzed during the program review process suggest in terms of unit strengths, weaknesses, needs, and opportunities for improvement?
2. What can the unit accomplish using existing resources?
3. What additional resources (if any) are required?

*Implementation Items*

What steps will the unit take to turn the vision described in Part II into reality? An important component of Part III is the creation of 5 high-priority, actionable items that the unit believes will lead to improvement in academic program quality. Implementation items should be informed by the data presented in this report and any internal or external challenges facing the unit. What can the unit do to close any gaps identified in Part II between where programs are now and where the unit would like them to be?

Implementation items may include new initiatives, modification of current initiatives, or elimination of current initiatives. Items should be sufficiently detailed to allow faculty and staff to enact the implementation items in subsequent years. In the tables below, please provide detailed information on each action that the unit plans to take within the next 5 years to achieve its goals. For each implementation item, describe the following:

1. The specific area where improvement is needed,
2. Evidence supporting the recommended change,
3. The specific person(s) responsible for implementing the change,
4. The proposed timeline for implementing the change,
5. The resources you will need to successfully implement the change (e.g., personnel, financial, facilities, etc.), and
6. The unit’s plan to assess change after implementation.

Table 2. Implementation Item #1

|  |
| --- |
| Implementation item description: First, provide a brief description of the action item in this row. Next, provide detailed information related to the following six items. Please change the row heights to fit the amount of entered text. |
| Specific area where improvement is needed: |
| Evidence supporting the recommended change: |
| Person(s) responsible for implementing the change: |
| Timeline for implementing the change: |
| Resources needed to implement the change: |
| Plan to assess change after implementation: |

Table 3. Implementation Item #2

|  |
| --- |
| Implementation item description: First, provide a brief description of the action item in this row. Next, provide detailed information related to the following six items. Please change the row heights to fit the amount of entered text. |
| Specific area where improvement is needed: |
| Evidence supporting the recommended change: |
| Person(s) responsible for implementing the change: |
| Timeline for implementing the change: |
| Resources needed to implement the change: |
| Plan to assess change after implementation: |

Table 4. Implementation Item #3

|  |
| --- |
| Implementation item description: First, provide a brief description of the action item in this row. Next, provide detailed information related to the following six items. Please change the row heights to fit the amount of entered text. |
| Specific area where improvement is needed: |
| Evidence supporting the recommended change: |
| Person(s) responsible for implementing the change: |
| Timeline for implementing the change: |
| Resources needed to implement the change: |
| Plan to assess change after implementation: |

Table 5. Implementation Item #4

|  |
| --- |
| Implementation item description: First, provide a brief description of the action item in this row. Next, provide detailed information related to the following six items. Please change the row heights to fit the amount of entered text. |
| Specific area where improvement is needed: |
| Evidence supporting the recommended change: |
| Person(s) responsible for implementing the change: |
| Timeline for implementing the change: |
| Resources needed to implement the change: |
| Plan to assess change after implementation: |

Table 6. Implementation Item #5

|  |
| --- |
| Implementation item description: First, provide a brief description of the action item in this row. Next, provide detailed information related to the following six items. Please change the row heights to fit the amount of entered text. |
| Specific area where improvement is needed: |
| Evidence supporting the recommended change: |
| Person(s) responsible for implementing the change: |
| Timeline for implementing the change: |
| Resources needed to implement the change: |
| Plan to assess change after implementation: |

# Academic Program Review Rubric

\*This rubric will be completed individually by each member of the peer review team. Comments and ratings will be combined to form the Peer Review Team Report.\*

**Academic Unit Name:**

**Degree Programs and Certificates Offered by the Unit:**

**Rubric Scale:**

* **Absent: No substantive information is provided.**
* **Developing: Some substantive information is provided, but the description and/or discussion is incomplete.**
* **Developed: Substantive information and/or discussion is provided on all key components.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Part I: Where is the academic unit now?** |
| **Part IA. Academic Unit Overview** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 1. Brief history of the unit | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 2. Unit’s organizational/leadership structure | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 3. Mission, goals, and strategic priorities of the unit | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 4. Alignment of the unit’s goals and priorities with college and institutional goals and priorities | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 5. Summary of recommendations from previous reviews and any changes made in response | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 6. Significant accomplishments, challenges, and changes that have occurred in the most recent 5 years | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 7. Emerging trends in the discipline and how the unit is responding | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IA Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the unit has done) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IA Overall: The report narrative is supported by unit/program-level data or other documentation | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
|  |
| **Part IB. Academic Program Information** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 1. Brief summary of each degree and certificate program offered by the unit* Table 1 is complete
 | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 2. Description of the curriculum for each degree and certificate program | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 3. Contribution to general education (Pathways) and/or other service teaching areas (if applicable) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 4. Description of graduate admission processes* Includes admissions criteria and information on graduate assistantships
 | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 5. Successes and challenges related to student recruitment, enrollment, retention, time to degree, and graduation rates/number of degrees conferred | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IB Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the unit has done) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IB Overall: The report narrative is supported by unit/program-level data or other documentation | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
|  |
| **Part IC. Student Learning and Support** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 1. **(Student Learning)** Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are provided for each degree and certificate program | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 2. **(Student Learning)** Description of how/where SLOs are taught in program curricula | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 3. **(Student Learning)** Specific examples of changes/improvements made to enhance student learning | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 4. **(Student Perceptions)** How the unit collects feedback from its students* Findings are summarized in terms of areas where students feel the unit is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting their expectations
 | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 5. **(Unit Services)** How unit services, activities, and experiential education foster student success | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 6. **(Unit Services)** How the unit prepares students for their chosen careers | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 7. **(Unit Services)** Other initiatives undertaken to enhance the student experience | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IC Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the unit has done) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IC Overall: The report narrative is supported by unit/program-level data or other documentation | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
|  |
| **Part ID. Faculty and Staff Profile** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 1. Description of who works in the unit | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 2. How success/productivity is defined and communicated to faculty members | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 3. How faculty are exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for research, creative activity, and/or scholarly work | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 4. How faculty are exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for teaching/pedagogical competency | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 5. How staff positions support the work of the unit | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 6. Impact of new hires and departures on program quality | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 7. How the unit supports professional growth of faculty and staff members | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 8. How faculty and staff expertise support the strategic direction of the unit | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 9. How the unit engages in outreach and contributes to the university’s land-grant mission | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part ID Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the unit has done) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part ID Overall: The report narrative is supported by unit/program-level data or other documentation | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
|  |
| **Part IE. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 1. How the unit contributes to college and university strategic plans related to diversity, equity, and inclusion | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 2. How the unit is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for recruiting underrepresented students, faculty, and staff | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 3. How the unit is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for retaining underrepresented students, faculty, and staff | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| 4. How the unit creates an environment where people from diverse backgrounds want to study and work | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IE Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the unit has done) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part IE Overall: The report narrative is supported by unit/program-level data or other documentation | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part II: Where does the unit hope to be in 5 years?** |
| **Unit Vision** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| Unit presents a vision for where it would like to be in 5 years* Vision addresses all relevant aspects, including academic programs; student learning and support; faculty and staff; research, teaching, and outreach; and diversity, equity, and inclusion
 | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Description of any gaps that exist between the unit’s vision for the future and where it is now | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Description of the extent to which available resources reflect the unit’s capacity to achieve its desired goals* Types of resources include personnel, financial, facilities, and technology
 | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part II Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the unit has done) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Part II Overall: The report narrative is supported by unit/program-level data or other documentation | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part III: How will the unit get there?** |
| **Improvement Strategy and Implementation Items** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| Unit presents an overarching plan for continuous improvement over the next 5 years | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Continuous improvement plan includes 5 high-priority, actionable implementation items | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Implementation items are detailed enough to effectively guide unit improvement efforts | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Implementation items are consistent with the unit’s vision for the future | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Implementation items are supported by data and trends presented in the report | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Implementation items appear to be feasible (e.g., mixing items utilizing existing resources with items requiring additional resources may be more feasible to implement than every implementation item requiring additional resources) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Self-Study Report/Process** |
| **Self-Study Report** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the unit has done) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Unit uses data/supporting evidence to inform improvement efforts | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |
| Evidence of participation/feedback from a wide variety of unit stakeholders (e.g., faculty members, staff members, current students, alumni, etc.) | Absent | Developing | Developed |  |

**Brief Narrative Report (3-4 pages):**

The review team’s narrative report will include summaries of the unit’s strengths and opportunities for further reflection and action. The review team will focus on the unit’s interpretation of data presented, depth of analysis/reflection, and resulting implementation items with a focus on alignment rather than making judgments on the overall quality of the unit. The primary goal of the Academic Program Review peer review process is to support units’ continuous improvement efforts.

**Strengths of the unit include (narrative or bullets):**

**Opportunities for further reflection and action include (narrative or bullets):**

**Suggestions for moving forward include (narrative or bullets):**