



Academic Program Review

*Guidelines updated June 2021
The Office of Academic Effectiveness*

Introduction

Dear Colleagues,

The Georgia Tech Academic Program Review (APR) process is designed to be responsive to both internal needs and external requirements such as the Institute and Board of Regents policies. Having one periodic comprehensive review is an efficient means for Georgia Tech to review and report on its academic quality, viability, and productivity to multiple constituents.

These APR Guidelines explain Georgia Tech's process that addresses internal and external requirements. This model may be enhanced to address discipline or unit needs. Within this guide you will find

- a summary of the purpose for academic program reviews
- a description of the Institute review process
- key milestones and deadlines
- a list of principal materials and their purpose
- the multi-year Academic Program Review schedule:
<https://academiceffectiveness.gatech.edu/program-review>
- an appendix: templates and samples

*The Office of Academic Effectiveness; updated **June 2021***

Contact Information

INSTITUTE OVERSIGHT

Dr. Loraine Phillips Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness (OAE)
A. French Bldg. #003 Mail Code 0741
404.385.1419 loraine.phillips@gatech.edu

INSTITUTE RESOURCES

Institutional Research and Academic Data Portfolio

Sandra Kinney Senior Director, Institutional Research and Planning (IRP)
Lyman Hall, #211 Mail Code 0530
404.385.0946 sandra.kinney@irp.gatech.edu

COLLEGE CONTACTS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

<i>College of Computing</i>	Mr. David White 404.385.4301	Executive Director of OMSCS, Senior Academic Professional, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs drwhite@cc.gatech.edu
<i>College of Design</i>	Ms. Michelle Rinehart 404.385.1449	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Outreach michelle.rinehart@design.gatech.edu
<i>College of Engineering</i>	Dr. Laurence Jacobs 404.894.2344	Interim Dean Associate Dean for Academic Affairs laurence.jacobs@coe.gatech.edu
	Dr. Terri Lee 404.385.3731	Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs & Accreditation terri.lee@gatech.edu
<i>Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts</i>	Dr. David Shook 404.385.3014	Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies drshook@gatech.edu
	Dr. Carol Colatrella 404.894.1241	Associate Dean for Graduate Studies carol.colatrella@lmc.gatech.edu
<i>Scheller College of Business</i>	Dr. Soumen Ghosh 404.894.4927	Senior Associate Dean of Faculty and Research soumen.ghosh@scheller.gatech.edu
	Dr. Craig Womack 404.894.2615	Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs Craig.Womack@scheller.gatech.edu
	Dr. Katie Lloyd 404.385.5472	Associate Dean, MBA Programs katie.lloyd@scheller.gatech.edu
<i>College of Sciences</i>	Dr. David Collard 404.894.7532	Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Professor david.collard@cos.gatech.edu
	Dr. J. Cameron Tyson 404.385.0418	Assistant Dean for Academic Programs cam.tyson@cos.gatech.edu

Table of Contents

Academic Program Review 2021–2022

I. Overview	1
II. The Academic Review Process at Georgia Tech	2
A. Process Details	2
B. Recommended Calendar and Milestones	6
III. The Self-study	8
IV. The External Review	10
V. Appendices: Formats and Samples	
A. Self-study Transmittal Sheet Format	A
B. Invitation Letter Sample	B
C. Confirmation Letter Sample	C
D. Pre-visit Letter to Confirmed Reviewer Sample	D
E. Sample External Reviewer Bio sketch	E
F. Sample External Review Committee Visit Itinerary	F
G. Sample Process for Feedback Loop	G
H. Institutional Research & Planning Basic Data Portfolio Content	H
I. The last year of Annual Assessment Reports for each degree covered in the Study	I

Academic Program Review

I. Purpose and Overview

The Academic Program Review (APR) is designed to address the quality, viability, and productivity of efforts in the following areas: teaching and learning, scholarship, general education (undergraduate programs); diversity, educational, and administrative support services; and research and community/public service. Program reviews involve analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data and demonstrate that this evidence is used for progressive improvement and adjustment of the program in the context of the Institute's strategic plan and in response to findings and recommendations of the review.

Through the APR Academic Program Review (APR) process, Georgia Tech conducts a strategic evaluation of each of its academic programs on a regular cycle not to exceed every seven years. The multi-year schedule of all Georgia Tech APR reviews may be accessed at <https://academiceffectiveness.gatech.edu/program-review>.

Academic program reviews also fulfill other internal and external requirements. Among them is the periodic review of undergraduate and graduate programs required by the Board of Regents (BOR Policy Manual 3.6.3) and the University System of Georgia (USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 2.3.6), as well as the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook (4.4). Programs accredited by external entities may optimize their APR process to also cover their external review, provided the external review meets the BOR and institutional requirements for program review.

Academic Program Review involves the following materials and activities:

- self-study prepared by the faculty and approved through the college dean
- visit and review by an external review committee and a written report of the review
- commentary by the dean of the academic unit in review of the external review committee's report
- plan developed by the college outlining actions to be taken based on the results of the review
- annual progress reports submitted to the Office of Academic Effectiveness (OAE) for three years following the review

The Office of the Provost, through the associate provost for academic effectiveness (APAE) is responsible for assuring a comprehensive program review is scheduled and conducted for each academic program, and that results of the review are reported to internal and external governing offices as required. The APAE serves as the manager for Georgia Tech's APR process, a resource to academic units, and the liaison for reporting results to internal and external offices.

The associate dean, as appointed by the Dean, serves as the primary contact within each college for the APR process, including for coordinating the external review, and is the central point of contact for scheduling and communication. This greatly facilitates the process and is essential for transparent, documented communication and smooth scheduling.

These guidelines are intended to provide a framework for completing the program review. Given the diversity of academic programs at Georgia Tech, some elements may need modification to accommodate individual differences. These elements would be discussed with the college dean and faculty at the initial planning meeting held prior to the start of the review process.

II. The Academic Program Review Process

Process Overview

The APR process can be divided into six steps:

1. Planning meeting by the college dean and relevant academic unit(s).
2. Selection and approval of the external reviewers and confirmation of the visit dates.
3. Preparation of the program self-study.
4. Visit and written report by the external review committee.
5. Closure of the review with the college dean, program chair, and the APAE.
6. Progress reporting within the academic unit, college, and to the APAE.

While academic units are free to choose their own schedule, it is recommended that units conduct the self-study in the summer and fall, followed by an early spring external visit.

Following the initial planning meeting, associate deans/program chairs should decide and then advise the associate provost for academic effectiveness of the chosen APR schedule and the name of the person who will serve as the unit point of contact.

A. Process Details

1. *Planning Meeting*

Each spring semester the schedule of academic programs for review in the coming academic year are reconfirmed with the associate deans. Planning meetings with the academic units are subsequently scheduled to include the dean, associate dean(s), program chair(s), the associate provost for academic effectiveness, the executive director for institutional research and planning, and others as desired by the dean. This meeting's purpose is to discuss the scope, responsibilities, data needs, and schedule of the review.

Each year, our goal is to complete these meetings before the end of the spring semester of the year preceding the corresponding APR.

2. *External Reviewers and Visit Dates*

One of the first actions the unit should undertake is to develop a list of proposed external reviewers and confirm the dates of the review committee's visit.

The provost expects program faculty to be actively involved in the selection of the external reviewers with the college's dean approving the final list. It is recommended that the initial suggested list have more reviewers than will be needed so that replacements can be invited quickly if needed. The number of reviewers for the visit is to be decided by the college dean or program chair—four to six reviewers is standard and the recommended *minimum* for a visit is three. Less than four reviewers should be considered only for focused reviews such as the review of a multi-disciplinary degree program.

The composition of the review team should ensure that a review of all program disciplines and degree levels will occur. Other factors to be considered in identifying a list of reviewers are: capability to evaluate undergraduate and graduate curricula and their assessment procedures and practices, technical expertise in light of the program's research and outreach activities, familiarity with large research universities, administrative experience, and organizational representation (i.e., industry, government, and academia).

While it is expected that many individuals within the program will likely know the reviewers, it is also expected that conflicts of interest should be avoided.

The list of potential external reviewers should be coordinated with the Office of the Provost, providing a brief statement of how faculty were involved in the selection of the reviewers and how the invited reviewers satisfy the various diversity issues related to the unit. To facilitate this request, the Office of the Dean should forward this material to the APAE who will secure the approval of the provost. It is understood that this list is often dynamic and that this coordinating step can be difficult to implement. Therefore, each college should discuss how it will handle this step with the APAE during its planning meeting.

The dean is responsible for extending invitations to external reviewers and coordinating communication with the external review committee (see Appendices B and C for suggested letter templates).

In order to ensure the availability of the provost and vice provosts to meet with the external reviewers, the dates of the visit should also be coordinated in advance with relevant administrative offices. **The college or program is responsible for:**

- determining the visit dates of the external review committee
- coordinating those dates with the APAE
- coordinating visit arrangements
- funding the visit and any associated honorariums
- hosting the reviewers during their visit

For professional or specialized accreditation review visits that require an entrance/exit meeting with the president and/or Provost of Georgia Tech or a regent, advance notification to those offices is essential.

In advance of the visit, the full itinerary covering all time slots during the visit, a bio sketch of each reviewer (see Appendix E), and the self-study are to be submitted to the APAE so the provost and vice provosts have ample time to review the documents.

Timely completion of selecting the external reviewers and setting the external review visit dates is critical. This visit largely determines the remainder of the APR schedule. Thus, it is imperative that action on this begin as soon as possible following the planning meeting. Coordinating the calendars of the provost, vice provosts, dean, program chair, and external reviewers is among the most challenging aspects of the program review process.

3. *Preparation of the Program Self-study*

The self-study and its associated support materials are the primary artifacts submitted to the members of your external review committee to prepare them for their visit. It is highly recommended that the conduct of the self-study be inclusive of the unit as a whole. To assist in planning and conducting the self-study, the following documents are available to the program chair:

- A copy of the program's previous self-study
- A current data portfolio (Appendix H) compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) to aid in the preparation of the self-study

- The last year of annual assessment reports compiled by OAE for each degree program covered in the self-study (Appendix I).

This self-study is a second critical part in the academic program review, and its preparation should also begin shortly after the initial planning meeting with the OAE. A considerable amount of the self-study can be started while the program chair is waiting for the data profile or gathering and examining other program data.

Ideally, the self-study should be mailed to the external review committee and the APAE about one month before the visit, but no less than two weeks.

The final version of the program self-study and its appendices should also be sent electronically to the APAE at least two (2) weeks prior to the external reviewers' visit (see Appendix A for a sample transmittal memo).

4. *Visit and Written Report by the External Review Committee*

The visit by the external review committee is typically two or three days (arriving on Sunday and leaving Tuesday afternoon). The dean identifies one member of the external review committee to serve as the chair of the committee. The visit schedule is determined by the dean, with input from program chair, and chair of the external review committee. The itinerary should cover all available meeting times during the period of the external visit. During the visit, external reviewers should have time to meet with faculty without the unit leadership present (see a suggested itinerary in Appendix F).

The provost and vice provosts do not need to be included in the welcome/entrance meeting with the college dean and external review committee. However, the provost and the vice provosts *will* attend the exit meeting led by the external review committee at the end of their campus visit.

At the exit meeting, the external review committee will deliver its advisory report, which should include findings and recommendations. Most committees structure the meeting and written report around an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWAT). It is most effective if the number of recommendations are manageable by the unit. Most external review reports are between 10-15 pages in length.

By three weeks following the campus exit meeting, the chair of the external review committee is responsible for submitting the committee's written report to the provost with a copy to the college's dean and the APAE.

Prompt delivery of this written report is essential to the Institute's internal review by faculty committees and subsequent BOR review.

5. *Closure of the Review*

Once the external review committee's report has been received, the academic unit hosts a faculty meeting with their dean to discuss the review. Following this meeting, the program chair and dean develop a written response to the external review with an action plan and submits this to the OAE. Finally, the OAE schedules a follow-up meeting where the college/unit representatives meet with the provost, vice provosts, and APAE to discuss the results from the program review and action plan. All recommendations, whether accepted or not, should be addressed. The action plan should incorporate any changes recommended and agreed on in this meeting.

6. *Institute Progress Reporting*

A biennial progress report regarding the program's review and action plan updates should be submitted to the OAE by the end of the spring semester two years after the review. It is expected that this will be the result of a discussion between the program chair and the college dean. The Office of the Provost will use this report to be kept informed about the action plan.

7. *Faculty Executive Board*

The Faculty Executive Board (FEB) APR subcommittee reviews the APRs for the most recent year. The subcommittee reviews reports and findings and identifies common themes to assist the Executive Board with making recommendations as appropriate on conclusions and plans emanating from academic program reviews that have been completed. The provost responds to the subcommittee's report.

B. Recommended Calendar and Milestones

APR Schedule (16-20 months)	Actions	Responsible Parties
January	Schedule of APRs coordinated and updated with colleges' associate deans or representatives of the dean.	OAE/ APR unit dean's office
January–March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning meeting held with dean, program chair, representatives from the Offices of Institutional Effectiveness (OAE) and Institutional Research and Planning (IRP). • A point of contact for the review cycle is identified from the college dean's office. 	Dean's office
No later than end of spring semester	Proposed date for the external review visit forwarded to the OAE.	Dean's office
August	<p>Data portfolio from IRP prepared and forwarded to the unit/college, with a final copy submitted to OAE.</p> <p>Most recent cycle of annual program assessments for each program covered by the review compiled by the OAE.</p>	IRP/OAE/Dean's office
September	List of external reviewers forwarded to OAE for the provost's approval.	Dean's office
September–January	An electronic file with <i>confirmed</i> reviewers, bio sketches, and visit dates forwarded to the OAE.	Dean's office
September to early November	Self-study conducted and report completed.	Unit/Dean's office
Mid-November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-study electronically submitted to the OAE. • OAE notifies the provost and vice provosts that the APR materials are available for review. 	Dean's office
January to mid-March	Visit by external review committee and exit report by the committee on its findings.	Dean's office
Three weeks following the external committee visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written report of the external review committee received by the provost and dean. • Copy of external review committee report electronically submitted to the OAE. 	Dean's office
By end of spring semester	Dean's readout with the chair/program head program faculty.	Dean's office
May	Program/College response to the external review and action improvement plan electronically submitted to the OAE.	Dean's office
By July 30	Follow-up meeting with provost, vice provosts, APAE, dean, associate deans, and school/program chair.	OAE

By August 31	Summary report of all APRs conducted and posted to internal Georgia Tech site for access by the USG Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Provost.	OAE
--------------	---	-----

III. Self-study

The primary audience for the self-study is the external review committee. The self-study should be a forthright evaluation of each academic program under review. Consideration of the quality, viability, and productivity of each academic program using the data portfolio provided must be addressed. The purpose of the self-study is to present an honest appraisal of the current state of the program and the plans for the future. The school/program chair is encouraged to review the following materials prior to starting the self-study:

- previous academic program self-study, external review committee report, and action plans
- specialized accreditation review reports (if applicable)
- data portfolio compiled by IRP
- most recent annual program assessment compiled by OAE for each program covered in the review

The self-study should be organized into the following sections and divided into subsections as appropriate. Additional sections may be added as decided by the school/program chair. The bulk of the report should be in sections A-E and I. The other sections should primarily report highlights of a few points that support section I, with details left for the appendices. The data should primarily be presented in the data portfolio in the appendix with only pertinent information being repeated in the body of the report.

A. Executive Summary

The executive summary is presented by the academic unit's leadership to note significant and noteworthy results that have occurred since the last program review as well as to add thoughts on the outcomes of the self-study and in particular, findings as a result of analysis done in Section E. The executive summary provides the opportunity for the unit leadership to communicate information to the external reviewers that will help establish the goals for and focus of the upcoming on-site review of the academic unit.

B. Overview of the Program(s)

This section describes *each degree program* included in the self-study with regard to its role and placement within the Institute, connection to the institutional mission, and stature within its peer community. Consideration of the quality, viability, and productivity of each academic program using the data portfolio provided must be addressed, as well as observations about the annual assessment of each academic program. Major recent events that may have a significant bearing on the future direction of each of the programs should be considered for inclusion here.

C. Vision and Strategic Direction

A summary of the vision and strategic direction for the unit's programs should be presented in this section. Explicit reference should be made to the unit's and/or Institute's Strategic Plan as it has guided departmental planning and decision-making. The unit's strategic plan could be made available to the external review committee by including it as an appendix to this self-study.

D. Actions in Response to Recommendations of the Previous Self-study and External Review Committee Report

This section summarizes the recommendations of the previous self-study and external review committee report along with the unit's follow-up actions, any resulting program improvements, and documented student academic achievements as a result of those improvements.

E. Programs, General Education Curriculum, and Institutional Effectiveness

The “**viability, productivity, and quality**” of each academic program under review is to be addressed and discussed in the self-study and demonstrated by supporting data within the data portfolio and included as appendices in the self-study. Instruction by video, distance learning, and each campus location outside of Atlanta must be addressed and discussed, if applicable.

A key portion of the preparation of the self-study process is the examination of multiple years of internally collected data for each degree program. That examination should include review and analysis of information provided in the data portfolio and the from each program’s annual assessment report. Regardless, the preparation of the self-study of educational programs should include:

1. a review of each academic degree program and minor as well as each certificate program;
2. a discussion of the results and improvements from actions taken for each degree program’s annual assessment reports (include copies of the most recent annual assessment report in the appendices);
3. a description and assessment of all courses offered by the unit that are approved by the BOR as Georgia Tech’s General Education requirements; and,
4. a review of the unit/college’s diversity goals to include how the goals were met and/or are being addressed by the unit.

Underlying the idea of conducting a successful program review is to identify areas for improvement (including those within academic support and service areas), describe the actions necessary to make those improvements, and then review and assess the unit’s success in achieving the stated outcomes of the improvements.

Institutional Research and Planning will supply a basic data portfolio for the most recent period for each degree program reviewed, which should be used as supporting data in the discussion of viability, productivity, and quality. At the dean’s APR planning meeting, the unit and IRP representatives will have an opportunity to discuss additional types of data that may be available for program analysis. (Appendix H)

F. Research and Scholarship

The research activities and accomplishments associated with the unit should be presented in this section, including evidence to support the impact of research and scholarship. Among the issues to consider are research areas and directions, distribution and nature of research support, facilities, support personnel, quality of research, and faculty and student scholarship and leadership in their fields. Include examples that would serve as evidence to support the impact of research and scholarship.

G. Economic Development and Community/Public Service

The program’s contributions to economic development as well as its outreach, such as to pre-college students, non-traditional students, and practicing professionals should be discussed in this section, including evidence to support the impact of these activities. Among the areas to consider are contributions to patents, invention disclosures, new products and services, start-up companies, consulting and technical advisement, as well as pre-college recruitment or awareness programs, off-campus degree programs, and continuing education and short courses. With regard to community/public service, include activities that relate to the educational

experience and involve the unit's faculty, undergraduates, and graduate students. Include examples that would serve as evidence of efforts in these areas.

H. Organization and Facilities

A description and current state of each program's leadership and administrative organization should be presented in this section. Include findings that affect the success of the program as related to the unit's organization.

Program facilities include assigned and allocated space of all instructional facilities both on and off the GT Atlanta campus at which educational programs of the unit are offered and/or delivered.

This area may include overarching issues that do not neatly fall into the educational and research missions of the program. Consideration may be given to address the adequacy of Institute facilities as well as academic support and service offices essential to the academic unit fulfilling its educational mission as it relates to the program in review; however, this section should not be approached as an opportunity to elicit support from outside groups for facility improvements.

I. Future Opportunities

This section should summarize future opportunities in education, research, and outreach following this self-study, and how the academic unit presently plans to address them. In other words, this section should state the goals and vision that each academic program expects between the present and the next program review. This is a key section of the report as it sets the tone of the future movement of the program.

J. Additional Supporting Materials/Appendices

Additional materials in support of the self-study should be included in this section. The data portfolio and the most recent annual program assessment for each degree program covered in the review should be appendices. Other appendices could include the program strategic plan, annual reports, advisory committee studies or reports, recruitment material, development reports, related program website material, and student, faculty, and staff handbooks. If some of the material is too lengthy to include, a list of web links is recommended.

IV. The External Review

A. The Visit

The schedule below is typical for external reviews that are not conducted as part of a professional or specialized accreditation review. Academic units being reviewed by a professional or specialized accrediting organization should follow the protocols of that organization. Day One is typically a travel day for the reviewers and a business dinner meeting to outline and start the review. Day Two is a full day of meetings with the college leadership, program leadership, faculty, students, and administrators that includes a tour of the program/Institute facilities. See Appendix F for a detailed sample itinerary plan for the visit.

Day One

Arrival and hotel check-in.

Business dinner meeting hosted by the dean to welcome the reviewers, provide the charge to the committee, discuss the review and deliverables, and reconfirm the schedule. This dinner meeting

does not need to include the provost and the vice provosts. This is a time for the review committee to meet with the dean and select program faculty.

Day Two

Program review(s) begins. Among the meetings and events to plan are:

1. An overview of the program(s) by the chair.
2. Faculty introductions and meetings—allow for both individual and group times.
 - Reserved office/meeting space should be made available throughout Day Two to allow a location for faculty wishing to meet individually with reviewers.
3. Discussion time with principals involved with undergraduate and graduate programs, research programs, and outreach efforts.
4. Both morning and afternoon meeting times that will enable undergraduate and graduate students to have the opportunity to interact with the reviewers.
5. A reception at a time conducive for faculty, staff, and students to interact with the reviewers without college/school/program leadership.
 - Advanced and broadcasted announcement of the date, time, and location will help to ensure strong attendance at this event.

In the evening, time should be allowed for the review committee to draft its recommendations and prepare for the next day's exit meeting.

Day Three

Review concludes. If there is time on Day Two for the review committee to draft its written report, then the exit meeting and adjournment can be completed by noon. Otherwise, allow the review committee time in the morning of Day Three to finalize its report, time that should be included in the Itinerary, followed by the exit meeting.

1. The review committee presents an oral report (visual representation optional) at an exit meeting scheduled in advance by the provost and the dean at a time convenient to the following: the dean, provost, vice provosts and APAE, and others if decided by the provost and the dean.
2. A written report is submitted to the college dean, provost and APAE within three weeks following the campus report.

B. The Written Report

When possible, the external review committee should draft its written report on the evening of Day Two along with its oral presentation for the next day's exit meeting. In this scenario, Day Three concludes with two morning sessions: time for the committee to finalize its recommendations and if requested meet with the dean; and then an exit meeting to present the recommendations, scheduled such that it includes the dean, provost, vice provosts, and APAE. This meeting can occur in the afternoon of Day Three if the review committee needs additional time. All time slots should be included on the Itinerary.

By three weeks following the visit, the chair of the external review committee is to provide the committee's written report to the provost, college dean, and the APAE.

C. Closing the Loop: The Action Plan

The college's dean should write a response to the report that outlines the program's action plan and submit to the provost and the APAE. Each college's dean is responsible to determine a process involving faculty of the unit to determine an action plan based on the academic program review and external review report. One potential process is outlined in Appendix G. If the college chooses to develop an alternative process to that recommended in Appendix G, the college's dean should alert the APAE with documentation of that process.

Any such alternative action plan should include, at a minimum, the following components:

- Leadership by the school chair
- Involvement of the faculty of the school
- Oversight by and accountability to the college dean
- Communication to the provost and the APAE

The Office of the Provost is available to assist the dean in this important work.

V. Appendices

A. Self-study Transmittal Sheet Format	A
B. Invitation Letter Sample	B
C. Confirmation Letter Sample	C
D. Pre-visit Letter to Confirmed Reviewer Sample	D
E. Sample External Reviewer Bio sketch	E
F. Sample External Review Committee Visit Itinerary	F
G. Sample Process for Feedback Loop	G
H. Institutional Research & Planning Basic Data Portfolio Content	H
I. The last year of Annual Assessment Reports for each degree covered in the Study	I

A. Self-study Transmittal Cover Memo

This memo may serve as the transmittal cover sheet for the completed APR self-study and its appendices. The final version of the program self-study and its appendices should be sent electronically to the provost and the APAE at least two (2) weeks prior to the external reviewers' visit.

[Dean's Letterhead]

MEMORANDUM

To: Steven W. McLaughlin
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: [Dean's Name]
[Office]

Re: APR Self-study for [Program Name]

Date: [Date]

cc: [Program Chair/Director]
[Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness]

The attached self-study is submitted for your review and comment. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me [or name of program contact, if appropriate].

Reviewed and approved:

[Name, Title—School Chair or Program Director]

[Name, Title—College Dean]

Note: Include as many signature lines as appropriate, particularly for programs involving more than one school and/or college.

B. Sample Invitation Letter

[Dean's Letterhead]

Dear [Name]:

Greetings from the College/School of [as appropriate]. The [College/School] is conducting its academic program review for the [name(s) of program(s)] this fall. The primary purpose of our program review is to conduct a strategic evaluation of the [College/School] and its programs by evaluating our overall effectiveness.

My purpose in writing to you is to invite you to serve on the [School/Program] External Review Committee. The external review committee plays a valuable role by providing insight that is useful in developing future strategies.

As a member of the review committee, we would ask you to visit the campus beginning with an evening dinner, followed by a day of meetings with the Dean/Chair, faculty, staff, students, research directors, and others. That evening and the following morning would be time for the committee to draft its written report and prepare an oral presentation of your findings and recommendations. Following the oral presentation at the exit meeting in the morning will be scheduled departures by noon of the third day. Within a couple of weeks of your visit, you would send the committee's written report to me. In addition, you would receive an honorarium of \$[as determined] in appreciation for your time and service.

The School is scheduled to complete its self-study in [month/year] and that along with other pertinent materials would be sent to you in advance of your visit for preparation. We would like to schedule your visit in [month/year], ideally beginning [day of week and date], and concluding [day of week and date]. I greatly value your insights and opinions and hope you can serve on the review committee at that time.

I have enclosed a [brochure/materials] to provide some background information on the [College/School]. Thank you for considering this invitation, and please give me a call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Dean's Signature Block]

C. Sample Confirmation Letter

Note: The letter assumes a schedule that begins with business dinner on Day One.

[Dean's Letterhead]

Dear [Name]:

We are very pleased that you will be able to serve on the External Visiting Review Committee for [School/Program] on [dates] at Georgia Tech. Your advice and insight will have a great impact in guiding our [School's] future path. The members of the committee include [provide names, titles, and institution].

The review visit will begin on [date] with [highlight of Day One]. Day Two of the review visit, the committee will meet with our faculty and staff as well as undergraduate and graduate students. At the end of the day, you will have a group dinner so that you may compare notes and draft your written report. On Day Three, the committee will present its findings in an oral presentation for the exit meeting on [date], which will include [names or titles: Dean, Provost, and Vice Provost] at [time]. The committee's final written report should be sent to the Provost with a copy to me by [date].

[Person's name and contact information] will assist you in making travel plans, reserve your hotel room, and help you with arrangements for your visit to Georgia Tech. In addition, we will reimburse you for travel expenses related to this review visit. Also, we will provide you with an honorarium of [amount, if wish to include] in appreciation for your service.

The program(s) self-study and associated materials will be sent to you no later than [date]. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to call me [phone] or send e-mail [e-mail address] should you have questions concerning the review.

Thank you again for your willingness to serve on this committee.

Sincerely,

[Signature/Block of the Dean]

D. Sample Pre-visit Letter to External Reviewer

[Dean's Letterhead]

Dear [Name]:

Thank you again for participating in the evaluation of [School, Program] at Georgia Tech. Enclosed is the itinerary and information to access the self-study for your visit, as well as contact information for [person's name] who will assist with your travel plans, hotel room, and other arrangements regarding your visit. A copy is also available electronically from our secure password-protected site. If you have questions about the self-study, difficulties accessing it, or wish to receive any other materials, please contact [name of contact, title, number, e-mail address].

Allow me to summarize again the context for the visit and some important questions we would like you to consider. The APR is an Institute process in which we conduct a strategic evaluation of each academic program. In addition to helping the Institute assess its strategic progress, the reviews are also used to satisfy several internal and external requirements. Among them are the periodic review of the program chair, the periodic review of the undergraduate and graduate programs required by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and Georgia Tech statutes, and the periodic review of institutional effectiveness. [Note: Delete chair review if not applicable] As you can see, you will be helping us address a number of areas and, most importantly, providing your insight on how to ensure that [School, Program name(s)] is moving in the right direction.

We would like for you to provide an oral exit report of your observations and comments on [date], and also send your [committee's, if the Chair] written report [date that is three weeks after the campus review]. I ask that in your report to cover each area as outlined in the self-study materials as well as any additional findings you wish to include. In addition, we would like you to consider three overarching sets of questions. The questions [tailor these questions to your program] are:

- 1) Is the program pursuing appropriate strategic directions and, if so, how well are they achieving them? Are there unique opportunities the program should be exploring more fully? Are there areas being pursued that are not contributing substantially to the overall objectives of the program and the college?
- 2) Does the program have effective administrative structures, staffing, and leadership? Are fiscal and physical resources well aligned with and being fully utilized toward the program's strategic directions?
- 3) Does the program have high quality undergraduate and graduate programs, and effective assessment processes to assure their continued effectiveness?

Sincerely, [Signature/Block of Dean]

Enclosures:

1. Visit Itinerary
2. Information to access the Self-study
3. [Title of Other Materials]

E. Sample External Reviewer Bio sketch – provide for each reviewer

[Visiting Reviewer's Name]



Chair, Department of xxxxxxxxx
Distinguished Professor
[University]
[Address]

Tele: xxx.xxx.xxxx-Office
xxx.xxx.xxxx-Cell

Fax: xxx. xxx.xxxx

E-Mail: xxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx

Biographical Sketch

X is a Professor in the XXX School of Computer Science & Engineering at the University of X where he has been a faculty member since 2003. He is the X Vice Director. From 2013–2018, he held the X Professorship for Innovation in Engineering Education.

X completed his Ph.D. at X and his undergraduate studies at X. His research interests lie in the area of programming languages, ranging from theory to design to implementation. He has collaborated actively with researchers in several other disciplines of computer science, particularly computer architecture on problems at the hardware/software interface.

X has served on roughly thirty conference and workshop program committees and served as the Program Chair for PLDI 2018. He has served on the ACM SIGPLAN Executive Committee, the Steering Committee for the ACM / IEEE-CS 2013 Computer Science Curriculum, and the ACM Education Board. He currently serves on the CRA Board.

X is also the instructor for a popular MOOC on undergraduate topics in programming languages and functional programming.

F. Sample Itinerary for External Review Visit

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
SCHOOL OF _____
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

SUMMARY SCHEDULE for [dates of visit]

College Point of Contact: [name, title, phone number, email]

OBJECTIVES OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

- 1) *[Insert objective of the review]*
- 2) *[Insert objective of the review]*
- 3) *[Insert objective of the review]*

Day of Week, Date

6:30 pm Meet in [location] to travel as a group to dinner

7:30 pm Dinner: Overview of Visit and Charge to the Visiting Review Committee
[Restaurant Information and Transportation Arrangements]

Visiting Committee

- *[name, title, affiliation] – Committee Chair*
- *[name, title, affiliation]*
- *[name, title, affiliation]*
- *[name, title, affiliation]*

Georgia Tech

- *[name], Dean, College*
- *[name], Chair, School*
- *[name], Associate Dean, College*

[Day of Week, Date]

7:45 a.m.	Meet [location] for Transportation to Campus
8:00 a.m.	Breakfast [during overview]
8:15–9:00 a.m.	Overview of the Program [name], Chair, School of _____
9:00–9:30 a.m.	Tour of Instructional Facilities [names, titles]
9:30–10:15 a.m.	Tour of Research [or other educational] Facilities [as appropriate] [names, titles]
10:15–10:30 a.m.	Break

F. Sample Itinerary for External Review Visit [continued]

Day of Week, Date [continued]

10:30–11:00 a.m.	Undergraduate Program(s) [name], Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies (or equivalent)
11:00–11:30 a.m.	Graduate Program(s) [name], Associate Chair for Graduate Studies (or equivalent)
11:30 a.m.–12:15 p.m.	Meet with Undergraduate and Graduate Students [Recommend these be two separate meetings to allow for better discussion]
12:15–1:15 p.m.	Lunch [may be committee-only or with a small number of school faculty, key staff, or students and not include the school chair or college leadership]
1:15–2:15 p.m.	Meet with Assistant Professors [names, titles]
2:15–3:15 p.m.	Meet with Associate Professors [names, titles]
3:15–3:45 p.m.	Break
3:45–4:45 p.m.	Meet with Professors [names, titles]
4:45–5:15 p.m.	Discussion by Review Committee alone
5:15–5:45 p.m.	Wrap-Up Meeting [name], Chair, School of _____
5:45 p.m.	Adjourn – Committee Members Return to Hotel via [Transportation]
6:30 p.m.	External Review Committee working dinner—Location to be determined by Committee

[Day of Week, Date]

Breakfast in [location] and transportation to meeting	
9:30–11:30 a.m.	External Review Committee meeting [location, room number]
11:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.	External Review Committee Lunch [location]
1:00–2:00 p.m. *times as fit schedules of Provost and Dean	External Review Committee Exit Report [location] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steven W. McLaughlin, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs • [name], Dean, College • [name], Associate Dean, College • Steven Girardot, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education • Bonnie Ferri, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development • Loraine Phillips, Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness • [name], Chair, School of _____ [optional]
2:30 p.m.	Adjournment and Departure Transportation arranged as needed for each reviewer

G. Sample Process for Feedback Loop Following Receipt of the External Review Report

The default facilitator of this process is the associate provost for academic effectiveness. Where appropriate (see Step 3 below), this will be handed off to a different vice provost (or delegate). The facilitator's job is to ensure that the process is followed, that feedback is given and action is taken as deemed appropriate by the reviewed unit—the drivers of the action plan are the unit chair and the dean.

1. The external report is received by the unit.
2. The report is reviewed by the provost, dean of the appropriate college, and chair of the reviewed unit.
3. The dean meets with the chair to discuss responses.
4. The dean visits a faculty meeting for a “read out” discussion of the report and responds to questions.
5. An initial plan of action to respond to the report is submitted to the APAE.
6. The APAE calls a meeting of the dean, program chair, provost, vice provosts, and others as requested by the dean and program chair. At this meeting, the chair and dean will propose what actions they expect to take in response to the report.
7. It is then up to the dean and the chair to work out a calendar and schedule to carry out this action plan. The facilitator is available to assist and to provide feedback along the way.
8. A biennial progress report regarding the program's review and action plan updates should be submitted to the OAE by the end of the spring semester two years after the review.
9. The facilitator keeps the provost and other vice provosts informed at appropriate intervals.
10. The outcomes of the action plan are submitted as part of the next self-study.

H. Institutional Research & Planning Basic Data Portfolio Content

Below is a summary of the data a program/college under review can expect to receive from Georgia Tech's Institutional Research & Planning Office.

[Indicators of Viability (V); Productivity (P); Quality (Q) Measures]

I. Student Level Data (Most Recent 5-Yr Period): Bachelor's Degree Level by Program

- A. Admissions by Academic Year (V)
 - 1. Total Number of Applied
 - 2. Total Number of Admitted
 - 3. Total Number of Enrolled
 - 4. Acceptance Rate (% Accepted)
 - 5. Yield Rate (% Actually Enrolled)

- B. Fall Census Enrollment by Academic Year (V)
 - 1. Overview
 - a. Total Number of Enrolled
 - b. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) [FTE = (Total Credit Hours) / 12]
 - c. Total Credit Hours (Sum of Enrolled Credit Hours)
 - 2. Demographics
 - a. Sex # and %
 - b. Race/ethnicity

- C. Persistence Measures (P)
 - 1. Retention Rates by Cohort
 - a. Cohort inclusion criteria: Start Summer or Fall and full-time Fall
 - b. Retention = enrolled or having graduated

[Retention rates reflect students who entered into program with their cohort but may not have graduated in the same program]
 - 2. Graduation Rates by Cohort
 - a. Cohort inclusion criteria: Start Summer or Fall, and full-time Fall

[Graduation rates reflect students who entered into program with their cohort but may not have graduated in the same program]

 - b. 4-year to 8-year graduation rates

['Six-year graduation rate' is the official rate according to the IPEDS graduation rate survey definition. Cohorts without a complete 4-year graduation rate are not included. For example, if currently Spring 2018 is in progress, Fall 2014 cohort is excluded because the full AY2017-2018 is not complete.]
 - 3. Degrees Awarded by Academic Year
 - 4. Average Time to Degree in Semesters (excluding summer)

II. Student Level Data (Most Recent 5-Yr Period): Graduate Programs
[Master's Degree Program Data and Doctoral Degree Program Data will be listed separately, but the categories of data are identical, below]

- A. Admissions by Academic Year (V)
 - 1. Total Number of Applied
 - 2. Total Number of Admitted
 - 3. Total Number of Enrolled
 - 4. Acceptance Rate (% Accepted)
 - 5. Yield Rate (% Actually Enrolled)

- B. Fall Census Enrollment by Academic Year (V)
 - 1. Overview
 - a. Total Number of Enrolled
 - b. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) [FTE = (Total Credit Hours) / 9]
 - c. Total Credit Hours (Sum of Enrolled Credit Hours)
 - 2. Demographics
 - a. Sex
 - b. Race/ethnicity

- C. Persistence Measures (P)
 - 1. Degrees Awarded by Academic Year)
 - 2. Average Time to Degree in Semesters (excluding summer)

III. Faculty/Staff Level Data

- A. HR Profile – Only Active employees (V)
Counts, Average Salary, and Total Salary Outlays
 - 1. Faculty by Rank
 - 2. Postdoctoral Scholars
 - 3. Graduate Assistant by Position Type
 - 4. Staff
 - 5. Student Assistants

- B. Faculty Profile – Only Active faculty with Faculty indicator according to the Human Resources Data Mart (HRDM) (V)
 - 1. Average Annual Salary by Rank (Adjusted to 10-month Equivalent)
 - 2. Demographics
 - a. Sex
 - b. Race/ethnicity
 - c. Citizenship
 - 3. Characteristics
 - a. Total Number by Rank
 - b. Number of Faculty by Teaching CIPC

IV. External Data

- A. Starting Salary of Graduating Students (Q)
 - 1. Bachelor's
 - 2. Master's
 - 3. Doctoral

- B. Economic Development and Employer Planning System (EDEPS) (V)
 - 1. US Supply & Demand for CIP category and related job fields
 - 2. GA Supply & Demand for CIP category and related job fields

V. Space and Financial Data

- A. Space Data by Usage Type (V)
- B. Sponsored Awards (P, Q)
- C. Budget/Encumbrance/Expenditures (V)

For additional information about this data, please contact the Office of Institutional Research and Planning:

Sandra Kinney
Senior Director
sandra.kinney@irp.gatech.edu
Tele: 404.385.0946

Jason Wang
Data Management Specialist
jason.wang@irp.gatech.edu
Tele: 404.385.5727

H. The last year of Annual Assessment Report for each degree covered in the study

The Office of Academic Effectiveness will compile the most recent annual assessment reports for each degree covered in the self-study.