Guidelines
Academic Program Review (APR)

UMBC

Office of the Provost

September 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

Academic program review has five general purposes, as recognized by USM and the Council of Graduate Schools: quality assurance, quality improvement, accountability, identification of strategies for improvement, and providing the institution with information for prioritization of resources. Reviews share certain key characteristics:

A. Program review is evaluative, not just descriptive. It requires academic judgments about the quality of the program and the adequacy of its resources. It goes beyond assessment of minimum standards to subjective evaluations of quality by peers and recognized experts in the discipline or field.

B. Review of academic programs is forward-looking; it is directed toward improvement of the program, not simply assessment of its current status. It makes specific strategic recommendations for future changes, as part of the long-range plans of the institution, the department, and other coordinating units.

C. Program review is an objective process. It asks programs to engage in self-studies that assess, as objectively as possible, their own programs. It brings in faculty and administrators from other institutions to review the self-studies and to make their own evaluations.

D. Academic program review is an independent process, distinct from any other review. Data collection and parts of the self-study may often serve a number of review purposes. However, to be effective, program review must be a unique, identifiable process that stands on its own, draws its own set of conclusions, and directs its recommendations to the only individuals with the power to improve the program: the faculty and administrators of the institution.

E. Program review results in action. Based on the reviewers' comments and recommendations, as well as the program faculty's response to the review report, the institution develops and agrees on a strategic plan, based on available resources, to implement the desired changes or improvements according to a specific timetable.

Incorporating these characteristics, a successful academic program review answers the following questions:

1. To what extent is the program:
   - advancing the state of the discipline?
   - effectively teaching the students?
   - contributing to the mission of UMBC?

2. How do experts in the field assess the program's quality?

3. What are the vision and future goals for the program and what is the strategy for achieving these?

4. What specific aspects of the program can be improved and how?

APR PROCESS AT UMBC

A. Mandate

The University System of Maryland's accountability obligation includes a requirement that each academic program be reviewed every seven years[1].

B. Implementation

UMBC maintains a master schedule for review of all academic programs. This schedule is regularly updated and is posted online in the APR section of the website of the Provost (see Policies and Guidelines). One year before the scheduled review of the program, the Office of the Provost contacts the department chair to start the process.

C. Follow-up

After each program is reviewed (including self-study and external report), the following actions occur:

1. Department chair meets with senior administration to develop an action plan based on the self-study, recommendations in the external report and available resources.

2. APR documents are made available to faculty governance committees, including APB, UGC, and the Graduate Council, which report to the Faculty Senate.

3. UMBC reports to USM on programs reviewed each year.

4. At the end of the third year following the external visit, the department develops a Year Three Report to assess progress since the APR. The chair meets with senior administration and the report is shared with the faculty governance committees.

[1] USM policy permits the University to consider the self-study and external review of a program required by an accrediting body in place of the APR. The substitution plan must be submitted to the Provost's Office, and UMBC's requirements of the dean's response to the external report, development of a post-APR action plan, and Year Three Review must still be met. Contact Beth Wells for details.

TIMELINE AND RESPONSIBILITIES –*Usual Fall to Spring Schedule*

10 months in advance of September start	Chair prepares department for review and establishes committees and self-study leadership as needed
May before the September start	Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs meets with chair and others for kick-off
September 15 – year of review	Data are posted to Bb by IRADS and Provost's Office
October 1 –year of review	Department chair posts on (Bb) a list of proposed external reviewers with biographical information
November 1 – year of review	Department chair posts on Bb available and unavailable dates for spring external visit
By winter break – year of review	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (in consultation) selects external reviewers and schedules dates for external visit
January 10 – year of review	EAA sends name & contact info on hotel & restaurant to Assistant Vice Provost
January 15 – year of review[1]	Chair posts draft self-study on Bb
January 25 – year of review	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Collegiate Dean post self-study comments on Bb
February 1 – year of review	Chair posts on Bb up to six proposed additional questions for external reviewers (beyond those in Appendix D)
February 10 – year of review	Chair posts final self-study on Bb
March 1- May 10 – year of review	External visit occurs
Spring/summer – year of review	Post-APR meeting occurs with chair and senior administration
	Reports and plans are distributed to faculty governance
June – third year following review	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs requests data from campus offices and posts on Bb
At the end of the third year following the APR	Chair develops Year Three Report and meets with senior administration for discussion
	Year Three Report is shared with faculty governance

[1] The chair may send a request to Beth Wells for up to a one-week extension. If it is granted, the self-study must be posted by 1/22, and it is the chair's responsibility to notify the dean and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs when the self-study has been posted to Bb.

TIMELINE AND RESPONSIBILITIES –*Special Spring to Fall Schedule*

At least 10 months in advance of spring start	Chair prepares department for review and sets up committees and self-study leadership as needed
Before the spring start	Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs meets with chair and others to kick off the APR process
September 15 – year of review	Data are posted to Bb by IRADS and Provost's Office
February 1 –year of review	Department chair posts on Bb a list of proposed external reviewers with biographical information
March 1 – year of review	Department chair posts on Bb available and unavailable dates for fall external visit
By spring break – year of review	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (in consultation) selects external reviewers and Assistant Vice Provost schedules dates for external visit
April 1 – year of review	EAA sends name & contact info on hotel & restaurant to Assistant Vice Provost
April 15 – year of review[2]	Chair posts draft self-study on Bb
May 1 – year of review	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Collegiate Dean post self-study comments on Bb
May 1 – year of review	Chair posts on Bb proposed additional questions for external reviewers (besides those in Appendix D)
May 10 – year of review	Chair posts final self-study on Bb
Mid-September– Mid-November-year of review	External visit occurs
February – year of review	Post-APR meeting occurs with chair and senior administration
	Reports and plan distributed to faculty governance.
June – third year following review	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs requests data from campus offices and posts on Bb
At the end of the third year following the APR	Chair develops Year Three Report and meets with senior administration for discussion
	Year Three Report is shared with faculty governance

[2] The chair may send a request to Beth Wells for up to a one week extension. If it is granted, the self-study must be posted by 4/22, and it is the chair's responsibility to notify the dean and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs when the self-study has been posted to Bb.

PROCEDURES

A. Preparing for the self-study

1. Data

   Data for inclusion in the self-study come from several sources, including the department itself. Responsibility for completing several data tables rests with the Office of Institutional Research Analysis and Decision Support (IRADS). The Provost's Office also provides data. These data are posted to Bb by September 15. Once the data are posted, staff of IRADS invites the chairs doing APR to a meeting for discussion of the data, if desired. Some data (Tables 2, 3, 11-13, and 15) can only be completed by the department. See Appendix A for a chart of the tables to be included in the self-study, with a listing of responsibility for completion and data sources. Departments should also prepare to have all course syllabi available for examination by the external reviewers during the external visit.

2. Faculty C.V.'s

   Faculty C.V.'s are required to be available for review. All of the C.V.'s from any department are required to be in the same standardized format. The department may choose whether its faculty will use the UMBC format for promotion and tenure, the format required by an accrediting body, or the NIH format. All C.V.'s in one of these formats are included in one document, which is transformed into a PDF file.
   The PDF file is uploaded to Bb.

3. Draft Self-Study

   The self-study process is most valuable to the program when all members of the program – junior and senior faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, staff, and administrators - are involved or represented in the self-study. A coordinator of the self-study is named by the chair.

   The Council of Graduate Schools[3] describes the self-study prepared by the faculty of the department as "descriptive, evaluative, and aspirational." It provides basic information on the program, gives the faculty's assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses, and presents the faculty's vision for the program's future.

   The information described below should be included in the self-study. Wherever possible, data should be provided for at least the previous five years. The self-study as a whole includes the narrative, followed by the data tables and other appendices. See Appendix I for instructions on how the department should post the draft self-study and the final self-study to Bb.

   a) **Executive summary.** Once the self-study is completed, provide an executive summary of five pages or less. If multiple program improvements or expansions are recommended, describe the one or two that will yield the most benefit for the program and estimate the associated cost.

   b) **Description of the program.** Provide a narrative description of the program and its history, including mission, organization, specializations, and relationship to UMBC mission. Include in the description and other relevant parts of the self-study any M.P.S. program in which the department participates. Attach as appendices copies of administrative structure and operative committees. (Use data from Table 2.)

[3] Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs: A Policy Statement. 2005. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.

- List degrees offered by the department   First year offered

- List non-degree programs offered   First year offered

c) **Educational goals, learning outcomes, and program assessment plan. See Appendix C. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes** for detailed information on the self-study assessment reporting and documentation requirements and the APR-concurrent submissions to GEC.

d) **Curriculum:** Discuss degree requirements; program structure; current courses; frequency of course offerings; how the curriculum reflects the current state of knowledge in the discipline/field; and substantive changes to the program since the last review. Include in appendices list of courses not offered in the past five years. (Use data from Tables 1 & 3.)

e) **Faculty profile:** Discuss the data and analyze trends in the number and distribution of faculty (full/part-time, visiting, tenure/non-tenure track, part-time). Include total number of faculty. (Use data from Tables 4 & 5.)

f) **Faculty research and scholarly activity:** Describe primary areas of faculty research and scholarship, level of external grants submitted and funded, and notable scholarly achievements. (Use data from Table 6.)

g) **Teaching quality:** Describe how the department encourages high quality teaching. Describe the incentives and rewards that are offered, and the mechanisms in place for mentoring new faculty. (Data from Table 7 may be helpful. Program should include additional data and narrative to address teaching quality.)

h) **Service:** Describe the service faculty offer to the department, the University, the public, and the profession. (Use data from Table 8.)

i) **Student profile:** Discuss data and trends regarding enrollments, degrees, and demographics. Discuss the trends in enrollments and degrees. Identify any special circumstances that have posed challenges to the number of enrollments and degrees. Where numbers are low or trends are downward, outline an action plan and timeline for increasing enrollments and degrees. (Use data from Tables 9, 9A-1, 9A-2, 10 & 10A.)

j) **Student advising:** Describe how both graduate and undergraduate students are advised.

k) **Financial support for graduate students:** Describe the philosophy of support for graduate students; amount of departmental, program, and institutional funding for students; types of support-- stipends, teaching/research assistantships; tuition remission, scholarships, fellowships, and loans; and the selection process. (Use data from Table 11.)

l) **Student research:** Discuss undergraduate research and the number of graduate theses and dissertations for the last five years; student publications, exhibitions, and professional presentations. Include list of graduate and undergraduate student research projects for the past three years in appendix.

m) **Facilities:** Evaluate the adequacy of space (classroom, research, office, student congregate space), laboratory, and core facilities resources. Include library and computer resources. (Use data from Table 12.)

n) **Climate:** Assess the scholarly community in the department; co-curricular activities for students;

quality of student mentoring; esprit de corps; critical mass of faculty and students; and activities that promote diversity among students and faculty.

o) **Profile of graduates:** For the past five years, indicate the number of graduates and survey 25 of them for information on job placements and continued contributions to the field or profession. Include list of job or graduate school placements in appendix. (Use data from Tables 13 & 14.)

p) **Budget:** Use the data from Table 5 to discuss the adequacy of the budget.

q) **Evaluation:** Provide a summary evaluation of the quality of the program, taking into account all of the factors listed above. Describe the criteria on which the evaluation is based.

r) Future directions:

- Discuss the vision and future goals for the program and the strategies being developed or implemented to achieve these. If there are regional or national aspirational peers for the program, identify these and provide the rationale for their selection.

- Provide degree projections and discuss resource needs to support new faculty hires; new courses; new facilities; and new or expanded research and curricular thrusts. Prioritize the list of new resources needed in terms of the greatest benefit for the program. Discuss the first priority in detail. Identify and discuss potential new sources of revenue for the program. (Use data from Table 15.)

In addition to the generic items included above, there may be specific questions, issues, or foci that the chair or dean may want addressed in the self-study. Any additional program-specific elements should be identified before the self-study begins. If there are additional questions on which the department seeks consultation from the reviewers, post these on Bb by February 1 (for a fall-spring APR schedule) or by May 1 (for a spring-fall APR schedule).

B. Preparing for the external visit

1. Proposed reviewers

By the date listed in Timeline and Responsibilities (page 5 or page 6), the department posts on Bb the names and biographical and contact information for at least six proposed reviewers. ***In posting this information, the chair affirms that there are no known conflicts of interest for these proposed reviewers.*** Criteria for determining whether conflicts of interest may exist are listed in Appendix B. Chairs are encouraged to consult with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs with any questions on potential conflicts of interest. Selected reviewers are also asked to certify that no conflicts of interest exist.

Each review team typically includes two reviewers. (In some special circumstances a decision is made to include three reviewers. A chair who believes that three reviewers are needed for appropriate coverage of the programs is welcome to make this recommendation, with accompanying justification, for consideration by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.) Proposed reviewers should have administrative experience at the level of department chair or higher. The department may recommend particular pairings of reviewers for best coverage of specialties in the program. At least one of the team members must come from outside the State of Maryland, and at least one must come from a public institution.

It is strongly preferred that the department refrain from contacting proposed reviewers. It is the responsibility of the Provost's Office to consult with the dean and to select a review team that is qualified to render an evaluation of the program. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs contacts the selected reviewers and works with them to ascertain their availability/interest to serve as reviewers and to schedule the visit dates.

2. Proposed dates for external visit

   By the date listed in the Timeline and Responsibilities (see page 5 or page 6), the department posts on Bb two lists of dates. The first list includes dates requested to be excluded from consideration for the external visit. The reasons for exclusion are also noted. Examples of valid reasons are: Most of the faculty will be at a conference, or the chair will be away. The second list includes dates that are especially good for the department to have the external visit.

   Because scheduling external visits is very challenging, departments are advised to request exclusion of as few dates as possible, and only for very strong reasons. The Provost's Office makes every effort to honor the department's requests.

3. Proposed additional questions for reviewers

   The standard questions that all reviewers are requested to address in the external report are shown in Appendix C. Departments are encouraged to propose up to five additional questions for reviewers to address. By the date listed in the Timeline and Responsibilities, the department posts on Bb any proposed additional questions for the reviewers. These additional questions are designed by the faculty to solicit the reviewers' consultation for the department on curricular, organizational, or other matters that will be of benefit to the department. Departments that propose additional questions increase their benefit from the external report. After consultation with the dean, the Provost's Office posts on Bb the final set of questions for the reviewers.

4. Preparing the visit schedule

   Once the review team is selected, the Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs schedules the dates for the visit with the reviewers, using the dates proposed by the department whenever possible. See Appendix D, which describes costs of the review visit and how they are paid.

   The framework of the schedule of visit meetings is also prepared by the Provost's Office. This framework includes the following

   - an opening dinner with the reviewers, the collegiate dean, the graduate dean (if applicable), the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the chair and GPDs.
   - individual meetings with the Vice Provost, the collegiate dean, and the chair
   - meetings with faculty, staff, and students
   - optional meetings with alumni, advisory board, affiliated researchers, or time for observation of student performances or other creative work
   - time for drafting the report, the debriefing meeting with the chair (and any additional program or department leaders the chair wants to include), and the exit meeting with senior administration

   Covering all elements of this framework usually results in a visit that starts with the opening dinner, followed by one full day of meetings, followed by a half-day that includes drafting of the visit report and exit meetings. Under special circumstances, additional time can be added to the visit, if needed. A chair who wants to increase the length of the visit makes the request of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, including justification. Before making such a request, a chair should be mindful that lengthening the visit can make it more difficult for the top-choice reviewers to commit to the lengthened visit.

Once the framework is set, the chair is asked to propose the meetings within the department. These meetings include:

- faculty (grouped according to the chair's discretion)
- administrative staff
- students
- tour of facilities
- observation of classes, students' performances, etc., if desired

Examples of two review schedules are included in Appendix E.

C. Preparing the external report

The reviewers are given time during the visit to draft their report. The final report is due to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs within two weeks of the visit. The chair and dean are given the opportunity to correct errors of fact before the final report is accepted. The Provost's Office posts the final report on Bb.

D. Campus review

1. Dean's report

Following receipt of the external report, and after consultation with the department chair, the collegiate dean sends a report to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

The chair is welcome to submit a response to the external report, but is not required to do so. If a chair's response is sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, it will be shared with the governance groups listed below at the time it is received.

2. Meeting with Senior Administration and Post-APR Action Plan

Following receipt of the external report and the dean's comments, a meeting is held with the Provost and staff, collegiate dean, chair, and the deans of Graduate School and Undergraduate Education (as applicable). The purpose of this meeting is to:

- review the evaluations and recommendations made by the external reviewers in their report and
- develop an action plan agreed upon by all parties

In preparation for the meeting, the dean and the chair prepare a post-APR Action Plan that lists the major recommendations made by the reviewers and addresses each of them with regard to action plans proposed to be accomplished by the college or the department. This draft action plan is then sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at least two weeks before the scheduled meeting. The draft action plan forms the agenda for the chair's meeting with senior administration, and it is finalized in the meeting. Instructions and the format for the Post-APR Action Plan can be found here. https://provost.umbc.edu/policies/

3. Undergraduate Council

If applicable, the Undergraduate Council reviews the self-study, the external report, the dean's report, and the action plan developed with senior administration and sends a report to the Faculty Senate.

4. Graduate Council

   If applicable, the Graduate Council reviews the self-study, the external report, the dean's report, and the action plan developed with senior administration and sends a report to the Faculty Senate.

5. Academic Planning and Budget Committee

   The Academic Planning and Budget Committee reviews the self-study, the external report, the dean's report, and the action plan developed with senior administration and sends a report to the Faculty Senate.

6. Faculty Senate

   The Faculty Senate determines whether to accept the reports of its committees.

7. Report to USM

   In October of the year following the review, the Provost's Office sends a report on the review to the Chancellor of USM.

E. Preparing for the Year Three Review

1. Data

   Data for inclusion in the Year Three Report are posted on Bb for the department and include student enrollments, faculty, staff, and information from the computer replacement initiative. The department may include additional data, if desired.

2. Chair's report

   The chair prepares a report of approximately five pages that summarizes program progress since the development of the post-APR action plan.

   The Provost's Office posts the report on Bb for review by senior administration and appropriate faculty governance committees. Instructions and format for the Year Three Report and Action Plan can be found here. https://provost.umbc.edu/policies/

3. GEP review

   Though GEP review is separate from the Year Three Review, General Education Committee (GEC) policy requires departments to submit for review concurrently with the Year Three Review all courses that received GEP designations in the three years prior to the APR. Guidelines for this submission are available from the GEC.

Appendix A

Chart of Data Tables for Academic Program Review			
Table #	**Table Title**	**Responsibility for Completion**	**Data Source**
1	*Course Presentations*	Provost's Office	REX
2	*Specializations within Program(s)*	Department	Department
3	*Substantive Program Modifications*	Department	Department
4	*Five-Year Faculty Profile*	IRADS	Human Resource Files
5	*Resources*	IRADS & Provost's Office	Human Resources/ Budget
6	*Indicators of Academic Program Cost & Productivity: Scholarship & Research*	IRADS	Faculty Annual Report
7	*Indicators of Academic Program Cost & Productivity: Teaching*	IRADS	SA
8	*Indicators of Academic Program Cost & Productivity: Service: Institution, Profession, Public*	IRADS	Faculty Annual Report
9	*Graduate Student Enrollment & Degrees: Five Year Trend Data*	IRADS	SA/Degree Information System
9A-1	*Five-Year Master's Student Profile*	IRADS	SA
9A-2	*Five-Year Doctoral Student Profile*	IRADS	SA
10	*Undergraduate Student Enrollment & Degrees: Five Year Trend Data*	IRADS	SA/ Degree Information System
10A	*Five-Year Undergraduate Student Profile*	IRADS	SA
11	*Financial Support for Graduate Students*	Department	Department
12	*Assessment of Physical Facilities and Resources*	Department	Department
13	*Placement of Graduates*	Department	Department
14	*Results from Surveys of Recent Graduates (One-Year Follow-Up)*	IRADS	IRADS/ MHEC Alumni Survey
15	*Majors and Degree Projections*	Department	Department

Appendix B
Guidelines for Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Proposed External Reviewers

By submitting the names of proposed reviewers on Bb, the chair certifies that proposed reviewers do not have any real or perceived conflicts of interest with the program being evaluated. Real or perceived conflicts may occur if an individual has:

- a close, active association with the program or institution;
- a financial or personal interest; or
- any reason the individual cannot render an unbiased evaluation.

A close, active association includes, but is not limited to the following:

- past employment with UMBC as faculty or staff;
- current or past (within the last 7 years) discussion or negotiation of employment with UMBC;
- employment as a consultant by the institution or program within the last 7 years;
- a record of publication or research with a member of the academic unit within the past 7 years;
- attendance as a student at UMBC within the last 7 years;
- current close family relationship with a student or employee at UMBC; or
- an unpaid official relationship with UMBC, such as membership on an industrial advisory board.

Selected reviewers are also asked to certify that no conflicts of interest exist. Questions about conflict of interest may be directed to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

Appendix C
Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

A. Context: Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

The purpose of assessment is to *improve student learning* by:

- Crafting transparent student learning outcomes
- Offering scaffolded learning opportunities (curricular and co-curricular) to enable students to achieve those outcomes (typically documented in a curriculum map)
- Measuring student learning with direct and indirect measure and gathering evidence on what students are and are not learning and
- Identifying and implementing useful evidence-informed interventions to instruction or curriculum (closing the loop).
- Assessing if the changes improved student learning (double-loop analysis)

Program-Level Assessment has four steps in a continuous cycle of improvement:

1) Articulating learning goals or objectives and aligning them to UMBC Functional Competencies: What do you want students to be able to know and be able to **do** as a result of completing this program? (Courses should have course-level outcomes that are aligned to the program outcomes and appear in course syllabi.)

2) Analyzing the learning opportunities the program offers to help students achieve the learning outcomes (i.e., curriculum mapping).

3) Measuring and collecting direct and indirect evidence of student achievement of these goals.

Direct evidence requires specific measures of student learning, typically analyzed by a subject matter expert, such as:

- performance on exam questions explicitly aligned to program (or course and program) learning outcomes, not just overall grades
- performance on written work aligned to specific learning outcomes as evaluated by specific criteria or rubrics
- performance in capstone experiences, portfolios, exhibitions, presentations, internships, or creative or research experiences aligned to specific learning outcomes as assessed using specific criteria or rubrics
- scores on standardized national tests or pass rates on certification or licensure exams aligned to program outcomes. It's especially helpful if the standardized tests have sections that allow you to see where students are achieving specific learning aims and where they are not.

Indirect evidence includes measures such as:

- surveys or focus groups of students' or alumni perceptions of their own learning;
- surveys of employers;
- placement of graduates into jobs, or graduate and professional programs;
- department or program review data;
- student achievements such as honors, awards, and scholarships;
- exam or course grades

4) Integrate multiple measures—both direct and indirect evidence—to identify and implement closing-the-loop interventions to improve student learning.

Double-Loop Analysis: Repeat the process in a continuous cycle of improvement as results from assessment of implemented changes become available.

For examples of evidence of student learning see https://www.msche.org/publications/examples-of-evidence-of-student-learning.pdf from the Middle States Commission of Higher Education web resources reprinted from Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

B. Reporting Student Learning Outcomes as Part of the Self-Study

Below is more detailed information about incorporating evidence of student learning into the Self-Study as specified in section A3c, of the APR Guidelines.

1. **Educational goals, learning outcomes, and program assessment plan. UMBC's assessment program requires that at the time of the APR, departments take these three steps:**

   Provide in the body of the self-study a discussion of direct and indirect student learning evidence for each program (undergraduate, graduate, certificates), including closing-the-loop interventions, and follow-up (double-loop analysis), including general education courses.
   - **Include a copy of each program's assessment plans in the appendix followed by the biennial reports for the APR period. The discussion should refer to the data collected over the APR period and should specify how each program closed the loop, measured the impact, and analyzed the results (double-loop analysis). (If your progam has not submitted biennial reports, please use the Closing-the-Loop Template available on the FDC's website to present data from each program.)**
   - **Include a text or visual curriculum map for each program documenting how students cultivate program student learning outcomes across courses and co-curricular learning opportunities. Indicate how program outcomes align to the UMBC Functional Competencies.**
   - **Stipulate how programs share learning outcomes, curriculum maps, results, and interventions with students. (At a minimum, programs should document where these materials are posted on their websites.)**

   For additional information and support, please contact the Faculty Development Center Associate Director for Assessment at jharrison@umbc.edu.

C. APR-Concurrent Submissions to the GEC

The following submissions, while not a part of the APR, per se, are required as part of UMBC's Assessment Plan and are prepared in conjunction with the APR.

i. Submit to the General Education Committee (GEC) an analysis that integrates indirect and direct assessment of student learning outcomes for a sample of general education courses. Information submitted should include:

   - summary of how the course addresses the distribution area(s) designated
   - analysis with data about how the course addresses and measures each of the functional competencies designated
   - examples of learning activities and assessment criteria for measuring designated functional competencies
   - summary of assessment results on student learning outcomes regarding designated functional competencies
   - changes made or proposed to improve student learning (closing the loop)
   - assessment of changes and improvements that have been made (double-loop analysis)

ii. Submit for review by the GEC all courses that have GEP designations except those that have received GEP designations in the three years prior to the APR. (Courses that fall into this latter category should be submitted by the department for review concurrently with the Year Three Review.) Guidelines for these submissions are available from the GEC.

For questions or additional information about APR-concurrent submissions to the GEC, contact the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs at mcdermot@umbc.edu.

Appendix D

Questions to be addressed in Report of External Visit

Evaluators are requested to explore during their visit to UMBC all matters they deem relevant to gathering the most comprehensive and accurate understanding of the program(s) under review. Reviewers are asked to conduct their meetings with faculty, staff, students, and administrators in a way that helps them to evaluate the program. Finally, reviewers are asked to address the following questions in their written report, within the framework of the current resources of the department and to address any ways the program might work differently with those resources. Comments are not limited to these areas. Evaluators are invited to provide advice on any areas that would benefit from improvement. A general guideline for report length is up to five single-spaced pages.

a. Please comment on the appropriateness of general goals and specific objectives of the program. How are they being met?

b. What is the students' perception of the quality of the program and their evaluations of the faculty's teaching and mentoring?

c. Are the proposed directions of growth of the program consistent with the nature, mission and overall plans and priorities of the College and the University? Please comment on the overall quality of the program relative to its aspirational peers.

d. What is the quality of the curriculum? Do teaching materials and pedagogical methods reflect state of the art within particular areas?

e. Considering the program's assessment of student learning outcomes, discuss ways the faculty might most effectively "close the loop" by enhancing its use of the outcomes of assessment to improve teaching and learning.

f. Is the level of scholarly work by faculty members in the program suitable for this program? Does the program as operating or planned provide sufficient opportunities for continued growth in quality of scholarship, creativity of faculty, and research opportunities for students?

g. Please comment on the adequacy of program's facilities for fulfilling its goals.

h. Given your review, do you think the program resources are being used effectively? Are there other ways you can suggest for them to be used? Are there additional ways the program might generate revenue?

i. To what extent does or should the program collaborate with other units of the University?

j. With regard to any resources identified as needed in the self-study or the external evaluation, which one is most urgent and/or most likely to benefit the program and how?

Each department undergoing an academic program review is given an opportunity to supplement the generic questions above with particular questions formulated by the chair and faculty of the department. Reviewers are asked to address individually in the report each of the questions formulated by the department.

Appendix E

Guidelines on Costs of External Review

- The honoraria, travel costs, and a stipend for local expenses for reviewers are paid by the Provost's Office

- The cost of the opening dinner with reviewers at the start of the external visit is covered by the Provost's Office

- On-campus dining costs of faculty and staff while meeting with the reviewers may, at the department's discretion, be covered on the department's P-card. The Provost's Office does not reimburse these expenses. Costs of faculty and staff dining may not be included on the reviewers' expense statements

Appendix F

Two Examples of External Visit Schedules

Final Visit Schedule
Physics
April 3-5, 2016

Reviewers:

Dr. George Welch	Dr. Kenneth Voss
Chair	Professor
Physics and Astronomy	Physics
Texas A & M University	University of Miami

Sunday, April 3

Hotel
The Hotel at Arundel Preserve
7795 Arundel Mills Boulevard
Hanover, MD 21076
410-796-9830

Restaurant
George Martin's Grillfire
7793 Arundel Mills Boulevard
Hanover, MD 21076
410-799-2883

5:50 p.m.	Dr. Tony Moreira, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs picks up reviewers at hotel
6:00 p.m.	Dinner with reviewers and charge Dr. Moreira Dr. Bill LaCourse, Dean of College of Natural and Mathematical Science Dr. Janet Rutledge, Vice Provost & Dean of the Graduate School Dr. Michael Hayden, Chair, Physics department Drs. Todd Pittman and Zhibo Zhang, Graduate Program Directors

Monday, April 4

7:30 a.m.	Pick up at hotel by Dr. Moreira	
8:00	Dr. Moreira PHYS escorts reviewers to next meeting	Admin. 1005
9:00	Dr. LaCourse	UC 116
10:00	PHYS escorts reviewers to next meeting	
10:10-11:00	Dr. Hayden gives tour of Physics facilities	
11:00-11:45	Reviewers meet with Assistant Professors Drs. Pelton, Zhai, Meyer, Zhang, and Kestner	Room 221
11:45-12:30	Reviewers meet with Associate Professors	Room 221

	Drs. Worchesky, Pittman, Gougousi, Takacs, Henriksen, George, Georganopoulos, Sparling	
12:30-1:30 (tour)	Lunch with selected faculty TBD	Skylight/CASTLE
1:30-2:15	Reviewers meet with Professors Drs. Shih, Martins, Turner, Johnson, Franson, Demoz	Room 221
2:15-3:00	Reviewers meet with Lecturers Drs. Anderson, Cui, Sen	Room 221
3-3:45	Reviewers meet with Staff Ms. Wimpling, Mr. Ciotta, Ms. Salmi, Mr. Crowe, Ms. Tignall	Room 221
3:45-4:30	Reviewers meet with Undergraduates John Hannegan, Philip Dang, Wei Trinh, Michael Wolfe Natalie DeNigris, Blake Hipsley, Madeline Swanson Kevin Whitley, Thomas Hyatt, Davis Wootton-Klebanoff	Room 221
4:30-5:15	Reviewers meet with Graduate students Brian Carroll, Brent McBride, Lipi Mukherjee, Dan Miller Neetika Sharma, Garret Hickman, Haixu Leng, Paul Berkins, Jaron Kropp, Brian Ute, Mary Keenan	Room 221
5:15-5:45	Reviewers meet with Dr. Hayden	Room 218
5:45	PHYS escorts reviewers to 1001 Administration	
6:00	Transport to hotel by Dr. Moreira Reviewers dine on their own	Admin. 1001

<u>Tuesday, April 5</u>

8:00 a.m.	Dr. Moreira picks up reviewers	
8:30	Reviewers draft report	The Commons Room 332
11:30 p.m.	PHYS escorts reviewers to Skylight Room	
	Debriefing lunch with Dr. Hayden and Drs. Zhang and Pittman	Skylight Room
	PHYS escorts reviewers to Admin. 1005	
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Dr. Philip Rous, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Moreira, Dr. LaCourse, and Dr. Rutledge	Admin. 1005 UMBC
	UMBC Provost’s Office provides transportation for reviewers	

Final Visit Schedule
English
May 1-3, 2016

Reviewers:

Dr. Rebecca Bushnell	Dr. Kristine Blair
Professor	Chair
English	Department of English
University of Pennsylvania	Bowling Green State University

Sunday, May 1

Hotel
The Hotel at Arundel Preserve
7795 Arundel Mills Boulevard
Hanover, MD 21076
410-796-9830

Restaurant
Vivo
7793 Arundel Mills Boulevard
Hanover, MD 21076
410-799-7440

5:50 p.m.	Dr. Tony Moreira, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs picks up reviewers at hotel	
6:00 p.m.	Dinner with reviewers and charge Dr. Moreira Dr. Scott Casper, Dean of College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Dr. Janet Rutledge, Vice Provost & Dean of the Graduate School Dr. Orianne Smith, Chair of English Department Dr. Lucille McCarthy, Graduate Program Director	

Monday, May 2

7:30 a.m.	Pick up at hotel by Dr. Moreira	
8:00	Dr. Moreira	Admin. 1005 UMBC
	ENGL escorts reviewers to next meeting	
9:00	Dr. Casper	FA 429 UMBC
10:00-10:30	Dr. Smith and Ms. Carol Fitzpatrick, Director of WARD, pick up reviewers and escort to PAHB; brief tour of English Department	
10:30-11:15	Reviewers meet with Associate Professors: Drs. Fernandez, Gwiazda, Maher, McKinley, Osherow and Shipka	PAHB 428
11:15-12:00	Reviewers meet with Professors of the Practice and Writer-in-Residence: Mr. Corbett, Ms. Purpura and Ms. Rudacille	PAHB 428

12:00-1:00	Reviewers meet with Assistant Professors: Drs. Belilgne, Ceraso and DiCuirci, for lunch	Skylight Room
	ENGL escorts reviewers back to PAHB	
1:15-1:35	Reviewers meet with Staff: Ms. Harrell, Ms. Minnigh and Ms. Chang	PAHB 422
1:35-1:55	Reviewers meet with Undergraduate Students	PAHB 422
1:55-2:15	Reviewers meet with Graduate Students	PAHB 422
2:15-2:30	Break	
2:30-3:15	Reviewers meet with Professors: Drs. Berman, Falco and McCarthy	PAHB 422
3:15-4:00	Reviewers meet with Senior Lecturers and Instructors: Mr. Fallon, Dr. Farabaugh, Ms. Mabe, Mr. McGurrin and Ms. Shivnan	PAHB 421
4:00-4:45	Reviewers meet with Lecturers: Drs Olson, Pekarske, Sorokin and Varlack, Mr. Bloom and Mr. Dunnigan	PAHB 421
4:45-5:30	Reviewers meet with Dr. Smith	
5:30	ENGL escorts reviewers to 1001 Administration	
6:00	Transport to hotel by Dr. Moreira Reviewers dine on their own	Admin. 1001

<u>Tuesday, May 3</u>

8:00 a.m.	Dr. Moreira picks up reviewers	
8:30	Reviewers draft report	The Commons Room 332
11:30 p.m.	ENGL escorts reviewers to Skylight Room	
	Debriefing lunch with Dr. Smith and Dr. McCarthy	Skylight Room
	ENGL escorts reviewers to Admin. 1005	
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Dr. Philip Rous, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Moreira, Dr. Rutledge, and Dr. Casper	Admin. 1005
	UMBC Provost's Office provides transportation for reviewers	

Appendix G

Guidance for Reviewers on Meetings

Past reviewers have indicated that guidance on campus meetings would be helpful. We recommend the following principles:

- Meetings with faculty, staff, administrators, students, alumni, and others are for the benefit of the reviewers in their development of a comprehensive picture of the program

- Reviewers are encouraged to initiate, guide, redirect, or close discussion topics in meetings in ways that ensure that the reviewers gain the maximum benefit of information and perspectives in the limited time available in each meeting

- Reviewers are encouraged to ask questions, if they so choose, that elicit comments from all meeting participants

- Reviewers are encouraged to mind the time allotted for each meeting. If the reviewers would like to have more time than is scheduled to talk with an individual or group, they are encouraged to make the request of the department chair or Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

- Reviewers are encouraged to request to see relevant documents (e.g., course syllabi, planning documents, etc.) that will aid their efforts to gather information about the program during the visit

Appendix H

Technical Instructions for Preparing & Posting Documents: Self-Study, Tables, Attachments, and C.V.s

Prepared by Susan Mocko August 9, 2018

The Academic Program Review Self-Study is prepared in two stages:

- *Draft Self Study* – Posted in Word (narrative) and Excel (tables) formats on Blackboard in "Preparing for Self-Study" folder for review by Dean and Vice Provost

- *Final Self Study* – Posted in PDF format (one document that includes narrative, tables, attachments, and C.V.s) in "Final Documents" folder after final changes have been made, based on comments received from Dean and Vice Provost

<u>The draft version should be posted by the date shown in the Timeline and Responsibilities (see page 5 or page 6)</u>. The documents – posted in Word and Excel -- should be posted and shown on Bb in the order they will appear in the final version of the self-study, i.e., narrative, tables, C.V.s and appendices.

- The documents should be paginated. This will help when comments are provided by the Dean and Provost for editing
- Prior to posting the documents, please make sure to preview them to ensure that they print properly

<u>The final version should be posted by the date shown in the Timeline and Responsibilities (see page 5 or page 6).</u> After the comments from the Dean and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs are incorporated into the self-study, the final documents (self-study, excel tables, C.V.s and any other documents that are to be included in the final self-study) are converted to PDF and then combined.

- A cover page is also recommended
- Please make sure to prepare a table of contents for this final document
- Please make sure to paginate the document for ease of use for the reviewers
- If the self-study was prepared by multiple individuals, it is important to edit it so the formats and fonts are the same throughout the documents.

The department is responsible for posting the documents in the proper formats and folders.

- Departmental administrative staff should have or develop knowledge in using the Word, Excel and PDF applications <u>well in advance of the due dates for preparing and posting self-study documents</u>
- Tutorials for Adobe Acrobat are included below
- The Provost's Office can provide technical advice on this, but it is the department's responsibility to format and post the documents properly
- Adobe Acrobat (the application) can be downloaded free of charge by going to my.umbc.edu, guide, computing & technology, software downloads, faculty & staff, adobe creative cloud. If you have any problems downloading the software, please contact the Technology Support Center at 53838.

If the department is using a Mac version of Adobe Acrobat, Word or Excel, it is the department's responsibility to test the transferability of the documents to the PC version.

Please visit the link below to learn more about Adobe Acrobat DC. If you need help with downloading the application or have questions, please put in an RT Ticket with the Technology Support Center.
Adobe Creative Cloud help: https://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html