

Guidelines
Academic Program Review (APR)

UMBC

Office of the Provost

August 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Overview and purpose of the Academic Program Review (APR)
- II. APR process at UMBC
 - A. Mandate
 - B. Implementation
 - C. Follow-up
- III. Timeline and responsibilities
- IV. Procedures
 - A. Preparing for the self-study
 - 1. Data
 - 2. Faculty C.V.'s
 - 3. Draft Self-Study
 - B. Preparing for the external visit
 - 1. Proposed reviewers
 - 2. Proposed dates for external visit
 - 3. Proposed additional questions for reviewers
 - 4. Preparing the visit schedule
 - C. Preparing the external report
 - D. Campus review
 - 1. Dean's report
 - 2. Meeting with Senior Administration
 - 3. Undergraduate Council (UGC)
 - 4. Graduate Council
 - 5. Academic Planning and Budget Committee (APB)
 - 6. Faculty Senate
 - 7. Report to University System of Maryland (USM)
 - E. Preparing for the Year Three Review
 - 1. Data
 - 2. Chair's report
- Appendix A Chart of Data Tables for Academic Program Review
- Appendix B Guidelines for Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Proposed External Reviewers
- Appendix C Questions to be addressed in Report of External Visit
- Appendix D Guidelines on Costs of External Review
- Appendix E Two Examples of External Visit Schedules
- Appendix F Chair's Post-APR Meeting with Senior Administration

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.

B. Implementation

UMBC maintains a master schedule for review of all academic programs. This schedule is available from Beth Wells at bwells@umbc.edu. The Office of the Provost contacts department chairs one year before the program review is scheduled to begin, 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 a strategic plan based on the self-study, 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.

TIMELINE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

One year in advance of September start	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs meets with department chair about APR
10 months in advance of September start	Chair prepares department for review and sets up committees and self-study leadership as needed
May before the September start	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs meets with department chair (and others) about implementing the APR
October 1 –year of review	Department chair posts on Blackboard (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 15 – year of review	Chair posts draft self-study on Bb
January 25 – year of review	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Collegiate Dean and Graduate School Dean post self-study comments on Bb
February 1 – year of review	Chair posts on Bb proposed additional questions for external reviewers
February 10 – year of review	Chair posts final self-study on Bb
March 1- May 10 – year of review	External visit occurs
July – year of review	Post-APR meeting occurs with chair and senior administration
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 committees.

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 (OIR). The Registrar's Office and the Budget Office also provide data. These data are posted to Bb by August 15. Once the data are posted, staff of OIR invites the chairs doing APR to a meeting for discussion of the data. 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.

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 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, 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 Schools¹ 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. Before posting the completed self-study on Bb, departments are asked to use *Adobe Acrobat 9 Pro* to combine all aspects of the self-study (including data tables and other appendices) into one document. Departments without access to this program are encouraged to apply to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for purchase of it.

- 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,

¹ Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs: A Policy Statement. 2005. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.

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 any M.P.S. program in which the department participates. While the M.P.S. program as a whole, including all of its specialty tracks, receives its own, separate APR, discussion of the department's and the faculty's engagement with the M.P.S. should be included in the department's APR self-study. Attach as appendices copies of administrative structure and operative committees. (Use data from Table 2.)

▪ **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:** UMBC's assessment program requires that at the time of the APR, departments take these three steps:

- i. Provide in the body of the self-study a summary of the direct assessment of student learning outcomes the program, including general education courses. This summary includes:
- assessments and outcomes that are consistent with the review of program level learning outcomes
 - strengths and weakness of the program
 - changes made or proposed at the course and/or program levels to improve teaching and enhance student learning

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.

- ii. Submit to the General Education Committee (GEC) a summary of 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
 - summary of 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
 - evaluation of changes and improvements that have been made.
- iii. Submit to the GEC all of the department's general education courses for re-review and re-designation as a GEC course. 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.

- d) **Curriculum:** Discuss degree requirements, program structure, current courses, frequency of course offerings, and 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); 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 service faculty offer to the department, the University, the public, the profession. (Use data from Table 8.)
- i) **Student profile:** Discuss data and trends regarding enrollments, degrees, and demographics. (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; 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 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, 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.

B. Preparing for the external visit

1. Proposed reviewers

By October 1, 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 welcomed 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 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 refrains 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 make 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 November 1, 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 good 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

By February 1, the department posts on Bb any proposed additional questions for the 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. These additional questions are designed 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 agenda of 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 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 recommend for inclusion), 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 with 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

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 findings of the self-study and external report, along with the dean's report, and to discuss a strategic plan for the department. See Appendix F for a list of the topics covered in this meeting.

3. Undergraduate Council

If applicable, the Undergraduate Council reviews the self-study, the external report, the dean's report, and the strategic 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 strategic 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 strategic 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 September 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 strategic plan.

The Provost's Office posts the report on Bb for review by senior administration and appropriate faculty governance committees.

Appendix A

Chart of Data Tables for Academic Program Review

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

Appendix B

Guidelines for Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Proposed External Reviewers

The chair must certify 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

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. 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?
- f. 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?
- g. To what extent does or should the program collaborate with other units of the University?
- h. 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.

Guidelines on Costs of External Review

- The honoraria and travel costs for reviewers are paid by the Provost's Office or the Graduate School.
- The cost of the opening dinner with reviewers at the start of the external visit is covered by the Provost's Office or the Graduate School.
- Costs of reviewers while they are on campus can be covered with the department's D-card or by any UMBC faculty or staff member and submitted for reimbursement. Alternatively, reviewers can pay their own expenses on campus and submit them for reimbursement on their expense statements.
- Costs of reviewers' meals (except alcohol) when they are off campus will be reimbursed through their expense accounts.
- 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 D-card. The Provost's Office and the Graduate School do not reimburse these expenses. No costs of faculty and staff dining may be included on the reviewers' expense statements.
- Departments without access to *Adobe Acrobat 9 Pro* (required for consolidating self-study narrative, data tables, and other appendices into one document for posting on Bb) may apply to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for funds to purchase it.

Appendix E

Two Examples of External Visit Schedules

Emergency Health Services Program
Academic Program Review
Schedule for External Visit
April 4-6, 2010

Reviewers:

Dr. Michael Hubble
Associate Professor
Emergency Medical Care Program
West Carolina University

Dr. Peter Pons
Professor of Emergency Medicine & Surgery
Health Sciences Center
University of Colorado

Sunday, April 4

Hotel

BWI Airport Marriott Hotel
1743 West Nursery Road
Baltimore, MD 21090
(410) 859-8300

Restaurant

Café de Paris
8808 Centre Park Drive, Ste 101
Columbia, MD 21045
410-997-3904

5:45 p.m.	Pick up at hotel by Ms. Beth Wells, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
6:00 – 8:00	Dinner at restaurant with: Dr. Tony Moreira, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Dr. Janet Rutledge, Vice Provost for Graduate Education Dr. John Jeffries, Dean of the College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences Dr. Bruce Walz, Chair of EHS Dr. Rick Bissell, Graduate Program Director Ms. Beth Wells

Monday, April 5

7:30 a.m.	Pick up at hotel by Dr. Moreira	
8:00-8:45	Dr. Moreira EHS escort from Admin 1005 to Physics Bldg.	Admin 1002
9-9:30	Dr. Jeffries EHS escort from Physics to department	332 Physics
9:45-10:00	Introductions and tour of department	Rm 316, ACIV
10:00-10:45	Meet with Dr. Walz	Rm 317, ACIV
10:45-11:00	Meet with administrative assistant Ms. LeVora Perry	Rm 318, ACIV
11:00-12:00	Meet with Dr. Bissell *	Rm 318, ACIV
12:10-1:15	Lunch with EHS Faculty	Skylight Room The Commons
1:30 -2:30	Meet with Prof. Kurt Krumperman, Management Track Program Director	Rm 318, ACIV
2:30-3:00	Meet with graduate students	Rm 318, ACIV
3:00-3:30	Meet with undergraduate students	Rm 318, ACIV
3:30-4:00	Meet with Dr. Jeffery Mitchell, faculty	Rm 318, ACIV
4:00-4:30	Meet with Prof. Dwight Polk and Prof. Gary Williams Paramedic Track faculty	Rm 318, ACIV
4:30-5:00	Meet with Prof. Crista Lenk Stathers, PACE Director	Rm 318, ACIV
5:00-5:45	Meet with Dr. Walz EHS escort to Graduate School	Rm 317, ACIV
6 p.m.	Dr. Rutledge (301-523-5755) takes reviewers to hotel or restaurant for dinner on their own	

*Arrangements are being made for a possible phone or web link with Dr. Brian Maguire, Associate GPD, who is in Australia

Tuesday, April 6

8:00 a.m.	Pick up at hotel by Tony Moreira	
8:30-11:30	Reviewers draft report	318 The Commons
11:30-12:45	Debriefing Lunch with Dr. Walz and Dr. Bissell EHS escort to Admin 1005	Skylight Room
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Dr. Elliot Hirshman, Provost, and Drs. Moreira, Jeffries, and Rutledge	Admin 1005
2:00	Escort to airport/train station by Dr. Lisa Portis Morgan (410-292-7041)	

Chemical & Biochemical Engineering Graduate Program
Academic Program Review
Schedule for External Visit
May 2-4, 2010

Reviewers:

Dr. Robert Kelly
Director
Biotechnology Program
North Carolina State University

Dr. Anne Robinson
Professor & Associate Chair
Chemical Engineering
University of Delaware

Sunday, May 2

Hotel

BWI Airport Marriott Hotel
1743 West Nursery Road
Baltimore, MD 21090
(410) 859-8300

Restaurant

Roy's Baltimore
720 B Aliceanna Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410-659-0099

5:45 p.m. Pick up at hotel by Dr. Janet Rutledge, Vice Provost for Graduate Education

6:00 – 8:00 Dinner at restaurant with: Dr. Rutledge,
Dr. Tony Moreira, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Dr. Warren DeVries, Dean of the College of Engineering & Information
Technology
Dr. Julia Ross, Chair of CBE
Dr. Mark Marten, Graduate Program Director

Monday, May 3

8:15 a.m. Pick up at hotel by Dr. Lisa Portis Morgan

8:45-9:15 Dr. DeVries ITE 217
CBE escort to Admin

9:30-10:00 Dr. Elliot Hirshman, Provost 1005 Admin
CBE escort to Engineering Bldg.

10:30-11:00 Dr. Julia Ross, Chair E 314
Chemical & Biochemical Engineering

11:00-11:30	Dr. Mariajose Castellanos Chemical & Biochemical Engineering	E 319
11:30-12:00	Dr. Theresa Good Chemical & Biochemical Engineering	E 317
12:00-1:30	Lunch with CBE Graduate Students CBE escort to Admin Bldg.	Skylight Room
1:40-2:00	Dr. Antonio Moreira Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Professor, Chemical & Biochemical Engineering	Admin 1001
2:10-2:40	Meet with CBE Staff Ms. Mary Anderson, Mr. Michael Frizzell, Mr. Victor Fulda, and Ms. Denise Kedzierski	E 314
2:40-3:00	Tour of ECS facilities	E 314
3:00-3:30	Dr. Mark Marten Chemical & Biochemical Engineering	E 321
3:40-4:10	Dr. Govind Rao Chemical & Biochemical Engineering	TRC 252A
4:10-4:30	Tour of TRC facilities	TRC 252A
4:40-5:10	Dr. Julia Ross, Chair Chemical & Biochemical Engineering	E 314

6 p.m. Dr. Rutledge (301-523-5755) takes reviewers to hotel or restaurant for dinner on their own

Tuesday, May 4

8:00 a.m.	Pick up at hotel by Tony Moreira	
8:30-11:30	Reviewers draft report	Room 318 The Commons
11:30-12:45	Debriefing Lunch with Dr. Ross And Dr. Mark Marten CBE escort to Admin 1005	Skylight Room
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Dr. Hirshman and Drs. Moreira, DeVries, & Rutledge	Admin 1005
2:00	Escort to airport/train station by Dr. Rutledge	

Chair's Post-APR Meeting with Senior Administration

Topics such as the following are typically discussed in the chair's post-APR meeting with senior administration.

- What are the strategic issues for the program?
- What are the programmatic issues?
- What possibilities exist for enhanced revenue generation?
- Given current resource constraints, how can the University be most helpful to achievement of the program goals?
- Among the resources which the program may need, which one is the highest priority and/or can provide the most benefit to the program?
- In summary, what is the strategic plan for supporting and enhancing the quality of the program within the available resources? What actions will be taken?