

Guidelines
Academic Program Review (APR)

UMBC

Office of the Provost

November 2009

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 posted on Bb in the APR community. 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
September – 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. Responsibility for completing data tables rests primarily 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. Some data can only be provided 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. The standardized method for this is to use the UMBC format for promotion and tenure. All C.V.'s in this format 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.

- 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 its 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. Attach as appendices copies of administrative structure and operative committees. (Use data from Table 1.)

¹ 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:** UMBC's assessment program requires that at the time of the APR, departments take these four steps:

- Provide in the body of the self-study a summary of the direct assessment of student learning outcomes for an identified sample of courses, including general education courses and at least one core foundational course in the major or an alternative as specified per the departmental assessment plan. This summary includes:
 - assessments and outcomes that are consistent with the review of course level learning outcomes
 - strengths and weakness of the courses
 - changes made or proposed at the course and/or program levels to improve teaching and enhance student competencies

- Include as an appendix to the self-study more detailed information on the assessment plans for the courses:
 - specific learning activities and assessment criteria
 - aggregate data on student learning outcomes
 - changes made or proposed to improve student learning

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

- Submit to the General Education Committee (GEC) a summary of direct assessment of student learning outcomes for the sample of general education courses

- Submit to the GEC all of the department's general education courses for re-review and redesignation as a GEC course. Guidelines for these submissions are available from the GEC.

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 2 & 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. (Use data from Table 7.)

- 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. 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: opening dinner, meetings with the Provost, the collegiate dean, and the chair, as well as time for drafting the report, the debriefing meeting with the chair, and the exit meeting with senior administration.

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 completed 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.

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>Specializations within Program(s)</i>	Department	Department
2	<i>Course Presentations</i>	Registrar's Office	Registrar's Office
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 Information 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 Information System
10A	<i>Five-Year Undergraduate Student Profile</i>	Office of Institutional Research	Student Information System
11	<i>Financial Support for Graduate Students</i>	Graduate School	Graduate School
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 address the following questions 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?

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.

Appendix E

Two Examples of External Visit Schedules

DANCE

Academic Program Review
Schedule for External Visit
April 21-23, 2009

Reviewers:

Dr. Jan Van Dyke
Department Head
University of North Carolina Greensboro

Dr. Lisa Fusillo
Department Head and Associate Professor
University of Georgia, Athens

Hyatt Regency Baltimore Hotel
300 Light Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410-528-1234

Tuesday, April 21

5:45 p.m. Pick up at hotel for dinner by Dr. Antonio Moreira, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

6:00 – 8:00 p.m. Dinner with Dr. Moreira, Dr. John Jeffries, Dean of College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Professor Carol Hess, Chair of the Dance Department
McCormick & Schmick
Pier 5 Inner Harbor
711 Eastern Ave.
Baltimore, MD
410-234-1300

Wednesday, April 22

7:45 a.m. Pick up at hotel by Dr. Moreira

8:15 – 9:55 Meet with Dance Faculty
Overview of Dance Program
Tour Facilities
Review plans for new PAHF
Meet staff
FA 466

10:00 – 11:30 Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement Day
Student Performances
FA 317

11:40 – 12:50	Lunch with Faculty	Skylight Room The Commons
	Dance department escorts reviewers to and from 1 & 2 p.m. meetings	
1:00 – 1:50	Dr. John Jeffries	Physics 332
2:00 – 2:45	Dr. Elliot Hirshman Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs	Admin 1005
3:00 – 3:40	Meet with Students	FA 466
3:40 – 4:00	Observe Dance Class	FA 317
4:00 – 5:00	Meet with Faculty	FA 466
5:00	Ms. Beth Wells takes reviewers to hotel	

Reviewers dine on their own

Thursday, April 23

8:30 a.m.	Pick up by Ms. Wells at hotel	
9:00 – 12:00	Write Draft Report	Room 318 The Commons
12:00 – 12:50	Debriefing Lunch with Professor Hess	Skylight Room
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Dr. Hirshman, Dr. Jeffries, and Dr. Moreira	Admin 1005
	Dr. Moreira takes Dr. Van Dyke to airport	

ECONOMICS

Academic Program Review
Schedule for External Visit
March 26-28, 2008

Reviewers

Dr. Donald O. Parsons
Professor of Economics
George Washington University

Dr. William J. Hausman
Chancellor Professor of Economics
College of William & Mary

Wednesday, March 26

5:40 p.m. Transportation from hotel to M & S Grill Restaurant by Janet Rutledge

6:00– 8:00 p.m. Dinner with Dr. Tony Moreira, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dr. Scott Bass, Vice President for Research & Dean of Graduate School, Dr. Janet Rutledge, Senior Associate Dean of Graduate School, Dr. John Jeffries, Dean of College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences, Dr. Scott Farrow, Professor and Chair of Economics Department, Dr. David Mitch, Professor and Graduate Program Director of Economics Department

M & S Grill
1006 Harborplace
201 E. Pratt Street
Baltimore, MD
(410) 547-9333

Thursday, March 27

7:45 a.m. Transportation from hotel to UMBC by Dr. Moreira

8:15 – 8:55 Dr. Arthur T. Johnson, Provost Admin 1005

9:00 Pick up by Economics for walk to the department

9:00 – 9:30 Welcome/Questions/Overview PUP 367

9:30-10:15 Meet with individual faculty TBD

10:15-10:30 Meet with staff PUP 367

10:30-10:45 Break

10:45-11:15 Undergraduate Program Directors PUP 367

11:15-11:45 Undergraduate students PUP 367

11:45-12:00 Walk/break to Dean's office
Department escort to Dr. Jeffries' office

12:00 – 1:00 p.m. Dr. John Jeffries, Dean of College of Arts, Humanities Physics 332

& Social Sciences

1:00 –2:00	Department escort to Lunch Lunch with faculty, conference call with Advisory Board	PUP 367
2:00--2:30	Meet with individual faculty	TBD
2:30-3:00	Junior Faculty	PUP 367
3:00-3:15	Break	
3:15-4:00	Meet with individual faculty	TBD
4:00-4:30	Graduate students	PUP 367
4:30-5:00	Graduate program director	PUP 367
5:00	Transportation to hotel by Dr. Rutledge	TBA

Friday, March 28

7:30 a.m.	Dr. Parsons and Dr. Hausman will drive to UMBC	
8:00 – 10:45	Write Draft Report	AD 218
10:45 – 11:30	Exit meeting with Dr. Scott Farrow	AD 218
11:30 – 12:00	Lunch	AD 218
12:00-1:00 p.m.	Exit meeting with Dr. Johnson, Dr. Moreira, Dr. Bass, Dr. Rutledge, Dr. Jeffries	AD 218
1:00	Depart (Transportation to airport/train station by Graduate School as needed)	

Appendix F

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?