

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
MANAGEMENT TEAM
FOR CLINICAL DEPARTMENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE**

**Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
626-4099**

Gail D. Burd, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
gburd@email.arizona.edu

Barbara J. Martinez
Special Assistant to the Vice Provost
626-4099
bmarti@email.arizona.edu

Office of the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Medicine

Phil Malan, Ph.D., M.D.
626-3868
malan@email.arizona.edu

Office of Academic Affairs

Celeste F. Pardee
Curriculum Associate
621-5375
cpardee@email.arizona.edu

Information Warehouse

Rachel Serrano
Manager of Data Warehousing & Business Intelligence Services
621-9273
rstclair@email.arizona.edu

Academic Year 2009-10 Clinical Academic Program Reviews

Pediatrics and Surgery

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Academic Program Review Management Team

Introduction 1

The Process

Initial Planning 2

Self-Study 3

Joint Internal/External Review 5

Discussion of the Findings: Conclusions & Recommendations 8

Report to the Arizona Board of Regents 8

Appendices

Appendix A Academic Program Review Task Guideline

Appendix B Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline

Appendix C Sample Itinerary

Introduction

For Clinical Departments in the College of Medicine

What is Academic Program Review?

Academic program review (APR) is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of all academic programs offered on the campuses of the three Arizona state universities. Arizona Board of Regents' (ABOR) policy 2-208 (Academic Program Review) states that academic departments are the basic unit of review. Both departmentally based programs and programs administered by committees are reviewed at least once every seven years. According to Board policy, the standard review consists of a self-study, followed by a review that includes experts from outside the University. An academic program review is not a review of the unit head.

Purpose

According to ABOR policy, academic program review fulfills several purposes. The process is designed to assess program quality and facilitate program improvement where appropriate and to assist in achieving the best use of institutional resources. The information gathered in the course of the review will assist in University and State planning efforts and guide University and ABOR evaluation of new program proposals, budget requests, and capital project requests.

The primary purpose of academic program review is to examine, assess, and strengthen programs. The areas in which program quality is evaluated include, but are not limited to: (a) the quality of educational and training programs, including an assessment of trainee outcomes; (b) the quality of research, creative activity, or scholarly work; (c) the quality of outreach activities and service to the University, the profession, and the community; (d) the contribution or importance of the program to other campus programs; and (e) the potential and future expectations for the program. The review is intended (1) to enhance the quality of a program and to assist in determining a program's ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities, (2) to evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and thus, determine future priorities, and (3) to aid in shaping the strategic plan for the program.

APR Administration at the UA

Given their central role in guiding academic decision making, academic program reviews are overseen by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and, in the College of Medicine, by the Vice President for Health Affairs. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs administers the process. Members of the Office of Academic Affairs and the Vice Dean of the College of Medicine serve as consultants to departments, particularly as questions arise in the preparation of self-studies, and provide assistance to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in the culminating phases of the review process.

Seven-Year APR Schedule

The seven-year APR schedule is developed in consultation with the deans of the various colleges and conforms to ABOR calendar requirements. When possible, the schedule is coordinated with other review and accreditation obligations of the programs. It is important to note that accreditation reviews are conducted for other purposes and do not take the place of the academic program review. However, elements of and preparation for these reviews may overlap. Many accreditation or other reviews have a self-study that requires many if not most of the items

suggested for the APR self-study in Appendix B, and the APR self-study or the accreditation/other review self-study can be tailored to meet the needs of the other. In some instances the review teams have been the same for both reviews.

Under exceptional circumstances, the seven-year schedule may be revised by the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in consultation with the appropriate dean. A department head, with the approval of the dean, may request an academic program review at any time. On rare occasion, when circumstances warrant, a review may be extended or postponed.

The Process

The academic program review process includes the five major steps outlined below. These steps are: (1) initial planning, (2) self-study, (3) joint internal/external review, (4) discussion of findings, and (5) the report to the Arizona Board of Regents. The explanation of each step includes guidelines for the review process. While the guidelines may be adapted to the needs of the individual program under study, they should be followed as closely as possible.

The timetable required for the review of an academic program should be one academic year. A model timetable for the entire review process is found in Appendix A. Actual time for each step will vary according to the department and the unique needs of each review. Some reviews may be completed in substantially less time. The one-year schedule, however, allows for occasional and often unavoidable interruptions in the process. It is critical that the review process be accomplished within the proposed time frame so as to not overlap with the next cycle.

Initial Planning

The academic program review process will be initiated each academic year by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Late in the spring semester preceding the academic program review year, letters will be sent to the appropriate deans notifying them of the programs under their purview scheduled for review. Early in the fall semester, deans, unit heads, and appropriate staff will be invited to participate in an informational meeting to launch the academic program review process. This meeting will serve as an introduction to the APR process and its purposes, and it will provide guidelines for successful completion. If there are unique needs left unaddressed at the meeting, the dean and/or the head of the academic unit may contact the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for further discussion.

As with any review process, there is a need for support, ranging from secretarial assistance to payment of expenses for external reviewers. It is expected that such support for the APR will be provided by the program being reviewed, its college, or a combination of the two. Costs should be part of the department head-dean discussion at an early date. Hotel and travel arrangements for out-of-town APR committee members should be made as early as possible to avoid increased costs and limited availability due to conflicts with other events, i.e., Rodeo Days, the Gem and Mineral Show, etc.

Self-Study

A. Guidelines

A thorough and thoughtful self-study will candidly assess a program's past and present efforts and will outline a realistic course for the program's future. The self-study provides the basis for the entire review process. Therefore, it is critical that the study cover all aspects of the academic program. It is of particular importance that the self-study pays special attention to issues and measures of quality. If a self-study has been undertaken within the previous year for accreditation or other purposes, it is possible, with appropriate modifications and updating, to adapt parts of that study for academic program review purposes.

The areas and issues to be covered by the self-study are reflected in the *Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline* (Appendix B). The outline provides an overview of the features of the program that should be examined. Such features include the goals and history of the program, an overview of program quality and ranking; faculty research, clinical practice, and teaching (including an assessment of the post-tenure review process in the unit, as required by ABOR); graduate and professional students and curricula (including alumni feedback); student outcomes assessment; academic and clinical training of residents; academic outreach; resources; administration; and diversity/affirmative action. It is also important to ensure that student privacy is respected, as required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 (See <http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/>). In addition, the Office of the Provost and the College may identify particular areas to be examined in the self-study. It must be noted that the academic program review is not a department head review.

Because of the variety of academic programs, it is assumed that the self-study may go beyond the issues and questions raised in the outline or may disregard questions not pertinent to the program. The outline is intended to provide the general framework of the review and should be augmented by whatever supplemental information is deemed necessary to create an effective self-assessment. This additional information may be presented as an extension of the information suggested in the outline. In writing the report, please be succinct, yet thorough.

B. Composition and Appointment of the Self-Study Committee

Membership of the self-study committee generally is recommended by the program head; final decisions and appointments are made by the dean. The self-study committee usually consists of three or more faculty from the department or program being reviewed. It is recommended that committee members be selected from among those faculty with a good understanding of the department, as well as of the discipline/profession. When possible, this group should include both junior and senior faculty, staff, and students or residents.

Alternatively, it may be beneficial to have all faculty members participate in the self-study process through the use of subcommittees.

C. Procedures

The self-study should be started immediately following the informational workshop so that it can be completed by the beginning of the spring semester (see Appendix A). The self-study is the

most time-consuming part of the APR process. The model timetable allows sufficient time for the completion of a comprehensive report on the important aspects of the review. No specific procedures have been established for how the self-study is to be conducted. By following the outline provided in Appendix B and expanding upon those areas of special relevance to a particular review, the report will be responsive to the intent of the academic program review process. It is important that every effort be made to ensure that the process and the resulting report are comprehensive. It is also essential that the process and results be open and available to all members (faculty, students, residents, and staff) of the department or program.

It is recommended that the self-study committee make a special effort to gather all relevant data and present the findings clearly in ways that serve as a basis of information for the review; to interview all faculty and selected representative students and alumni; and to gain information from other campus and non-campus resources, as appropriate. Relevant data include faculty vitae, annual reports, prior review reports, information pertaining to grants and research, and data accessible through the Integrated Information Warehouse (<https://admin.iiv.arizona.edu>.)

The Office of Academic Affairs will provide a set of APR data reports to units being reviewed through a password-protected web site (<http://apr.web.arizona.edu/Home>). Each unit head will be provided with a password that will be used to access the APR data reports relevant to his/her unit. The password should be shared with internal and external reviewers as deemed necessary and appropriate by the unit head. All data provided must be included in its entirety in the appendices of the self-study report. Select portions of the data provided may be used in the body of the self-study report as desired and additional data provided by the department may also be added as deemed necessary and desirable. Please include only information available since the last APR report. Keep in mind that the self-study report will be the review team’s first comprehensive introduction to the program. Note that FERPA, prohibits releasing any personal data on a student, i.e., grade point averages, standardized test scores, etc., without written permission from that person (<http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/>).

In spring 2003, ABOR eliminated its policy requiring system-wide review every five years of “low-degree-producing programs.” Instead, the academic program review policy was revised to include the following new requirement: “For low productive degree programs with graduations below established thresholds, an evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the Board-approved guidelines as set forth in a document entitled “A Methodology for Identifying Low Productive and Duplicative Programs” (Appendix D) and reported to the Board. Generally, clinical departments in the College of Medicine will not have BS, MS, or PhD programs, and thus this review will not apply.

Threshold for Defining Productive Programs
Arizona University System

Type of Degree	Type of Campus	3-Year Degree Total
Baccalaureate	Main	24 or more degrees
Baccalaureate	Non-main	15 or more degrees
Masters	Main	9 or more degrees
Masters	Non-main	6 or more degrees
Doctorate	Main (only)	6 or more degrees

D. Review of Self-Study Report

A working draft of the self-study report should be sent electronically to Dr. Phil Malan, Vice Dean, College of Medicine (Malan@email.arizona.edu) who will perform an initial review and provide feedback. This step gives the self-study committee an opportunity to polish the report before it is submitted to the dean. Once completed and approved by the dean, a copy of the self-study report should be forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for review no later than January 15.

Joint Internal/External Review

A. Guidelines

The self-study committee should suggest possible members for the joint internal/external review committee to the program head and dean early in the process, and no later than November 1 (see “Composition and Appointment of the Review Committee” below). The College/Department should clear visit dates with Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (who will check dates on calendar of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Health Affairs), the dean, and the entire review committee before submitting the committee list to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for approval. These recommendations are due to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs by November 15.

The joint internal/external review committee will be appointed by the Vice President for Health Affairs. The review committee should make every effort to review the department or program within the context of the University’s Strategic Plan (http://president.arizona.edu/university_5year.cfm). Among the features of the unit that should be examined are the medical student teaching and residency programs; graduate programs; assessment of teaching and programs; research, teaching, and academic outreach efforts; faculty post-tenure review process and outcomes; fiscal and physical resources; recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and trainees from underrepresented ethnic or minority groups; and academic and administrative organization. In addition, opportunities for inter- or cross-disciplinary development and cooperation should be explored. The committee may consult the *Academic Program Review Self-Study Outline* (Appendix B) for the range of subjects that are within its purview.

These suggestions are not exhaustive. The joint internal/external review committee is encouraged to be responsive to other issues that come to the fore in the course of the review. It is expected that the review committee will make specific recommendations for improvement of the quality of the program, as well as identify those aspects of the program(s) that are exemplary.

B. Composition and Appointment of the Review Committee

Prior to completion of the self-study, after consultation with the program head, and no later than November 15, the dean should submit the names of potential joint internal/external review committee members to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

A review committee will usually consist of seven members.

Review Committee:

3 external committee members (selected from the unit's current and aspirational peers)

2 internal committee members

 one from within the college of the department under review

 one from a college other than the department's college

1 community member

1 recent alumnus

It is anticipated that the selected reviewers will reflect the various academic areas covered by the program, be of national stature, be familiar with the various research specializations of the faculty, and be free of conflicts of interest that would prevent them from conducting an objective review. Every effort should be made to include members of under-represented groups and women on the committee. Community committee members could be members of college, unit, or University advisory groups or professionals in a related field working in the community; they should not have an appointment in the department under review. Alumni could be community members working in the area, but should not be a member of the department under review.

The list of recommended reviewers submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs should include at least two names for each committee member "slot." The list should include a brief biosketch and contact information (mailing address, email address, and phone number). Prior to submission of the list, the unit head or dean should contact potential internal/external review committee members to ensure their willingness to serve on the review team and general availability in the likely timeframe for the site visit. The dean may list those recommended in priority order, indicating any preference for a committee chair. The committee chair will usually be selected from among the external reviewers.

The dean will then be notified of the prospective members approved by the Vice President for Health Affairs and asked to finalize the committee's composition and site visit dates. It is important to consult the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Barbara Martinez (626-4099 or bmarti@email.arizona.edu) to ensure that the Vice President for Health Affairs is available at the end of the visit and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs is available at the start and end of the visit to meet the review team. When the review team membership and site visit dates are confirmed, the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs should be notified, so that letters formally appointing the chair and committee members can be sent. This mailing will include a copy of the *Procedures Manual for Academic Program Reviews* and a list of committee members invited to serve.

The dean may also correspond with members of the review team stating clearly the nature and purpose of the review and the reviewers' role. The unit head should also mail the self-study, faculty CVs, and other appropriate material to the reviewers following their acceptance of the appointment, but at least three weeks prior to the visit. Some reviewers may also want this information in an electronic format (sent as attachments to an email or on a CD); please check with reviewers about this issue. The reviewers need this information in advance to be sure they have adequate time to review materials before the site visit.

No specific guidelines have been established for the remuneration of external reviewers. This matter is the responsibility of and at the discretion of unit heads and deans.

C. Procedures

It is the unit's responsibility to schedule the team's meetings with the Vice President for Health Affairs and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. It is advisable to do the scheduling well in advance of the site visit as the calendars fill up quickly. The Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs can assist with scheduling the meetings that include the dean and Vice President for Health Affairs. Generally, it is advisable to block tentative visit dates on the calendars when the original suggested list of reviewers is sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Note that the joint internal/external review team site visit should be completed no later than mid-April in the spring semester following the completion of the self-study.

A draft APR review team itinerary should be prepared and sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Gail Burd (Admin. 501, gburd@email.arizona.edu) and Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Barbara Martinez (Admin 501, bmarti@email.arizona.edu) for review. A sample itinerary is provided in Appendix C. After the draft itinerary has been reviewed, the final review team itinerary should be prepared and sent to the reviewers no later than a week before the visit. The schedule should be sufficiently flexible to allow the inclusion of additional appointments at the committee's request.

The visit should span two full days to allow sufficient time for reviewers to meet with administrators, faculty, medical students, residents, and others; to visit facilities; and to prepare a draft of their review report. Committee members should be provided time at the beginning of the visit to discuss among themselves how to proceed. The Vice Provost, on behalf of the Vice President for Health Affairs, will join the committee at its initial meeting to discuss procedures, scope, and issues unique to the particular review.

The committee may receive an additional charge from the dean related to college-based considerations. An opportunity will be provided at the end of the schedule for the committee to brief the Vice President for Health Affairs about issues and outcomes of the review.

Generally, the committee will review the self-study in depth, and interview faculty members, staff, students, residents, and other individuals as appropriate (college and university administrators, faculty and/or department heads of related departments, and public or private groups with whom the department interacts). The review team may request additional information or data that may be deemed necessary and appropriate to do a complete review.

The external reviewers, as experts in the discipline, will be encouraged to evaluate the program in its national context. Attention should be given to the depth and breadth of faculty research and clinical practice, the quality of formal medical student teaching and residency training, and the commitment of individuals to support the department, college, and university vision. The reviewers should feel free to respond to the findings of the self-study and comment upon any other issues that bear upon the quality of the academic program.

It is anticipated that the joint internal/external review committee will complete its work within a period of no longer than three to four weeks. The committee should provide its final report to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs within four weeks of the conclusion of the site visit. The report will be distributed to the Executive Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Health Affairs, the unit head, and the dean. The final report should include: a) Introduction, b) Strengths, c) Weaknesses, and d) Recommendations.

The report of the joint internal/external review committee should make specific suggestions for improvement of the program. When the report is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost, it will be considered a public document that will be shared with faculty and others upon request.

Discussion of the Findings: Conclusions and Recommendations

Following the Vice President for Health Affairs receipt and subsequent distribution of the joint internal/external review committee's report, a concluding conference with Vice President for Health Affairs, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the dean, and the department/unit head will be scheduled. The unit self-study and the review committee report, including a summary of its recommendations, will provide a basis for discussion at this meeting. The Vice President for Health Affairs invites the dean and unit head to provide their perspectives regarding the conclusions and recommendations. A short memo of comments in response to the report of the joint internal/external review committee may be prepared by the unit head and distributed to the dean, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Health Affairs prior to this final meeting. This meeting will be scheduled by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

The purpose of the meeting is to consider the findings and recommendations of the review. It may be preceded by a meeting of the dean and unit head. The decisions reached at the concluding conference are documented in a memorandum from the Vice President for Health Affairs.

Report to the Arizona Board of Regents

The final step in the Academic Program Review process is preparation of a summary report on the year's academic program reviews for the Arizona Board of Regents.

Upon ABOR request, a three-page narrative summary report will also be prepared for the Board and will include: (a) a description of the program; (b) an outline of the most recent previous review and responses; (c) procedures used in the review process; (d) major findings and conclusions of the review; (e) future plans for the program; and (f) a follow-up monitoring and reporting plan. A data summary will be appended to the narrative. A copy of the report will be sent to all those involved in the process.

APPENDIX A
College of Medicine – Clinical Departments
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TASK GUIDELINE

<i>Who/What</i>	<i>When (Deadline)</i>
<i>Unit Head</i>	
Attends APR kickoff	September
Submits recommendations for self-study committee members to Dean	September
Ensures progress on self-study report (SSR)	September - November
Blocks two sets of site visit dates w/Vice Provost & Vice Pres. Health Affairs	September - October
Identifies, contacts & blocks dates with 14 review committee nominees	September - October
Forwards list of 14 willing review committee nominees to Dean	Early November
Confirms dates for visit with Vice Provost & Vice Pres. Health Affairs	Late December-Early January
Forwards copy of SSR to the Vice Dean College of Medicine	Early January
Sends 3 copies of final Self Study Report & materials to Vice Provost	January
Sends self-study report to each review committee member	One month before visit
Sends draft site visit itinerary to Vice Provost for review	One month before the visit
Sends final itinerary for site visit to Vice Provost and review committee	Three weeks before the visit
SITE VISIT	No later than April 30
Attends final meeting with Dean, Vice Provost & Vice Pres. Health Affairs	Shortly after receipt of rev cmte report
<i>Dean</i>	
Appoints self-study committee	September
Approves 14 review team nominees and forwards list to Vice Provost	November
Ensures progress on self-study report (SSR)	September - November
Attends final meeting with unit head, Vice Provost & Vice Pres. Health Affairs	Shortly after receipt of rev cmte report
<i>Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</i>	
Meets with unit for initial planning when requested by unit	September
Reviews list of review committee nominees	November
Notifies department of Provost's selection for review committee	Mid-December
Sends invitation letter to the review committee	Late December-Early January
Forwards feedback on draft itinerary to the unit	Shortly after receipt of itinerary
Distributes review cmte report to unit head, Dean & Vice Pres. Health Affairs	Shortly after receipt of rev cmte report
Attends final meeting with unit head, Dean & Vice Pres. Health Affairs	Shortly after receipt of rev cmte report
Completes final report for ABOR	October
<i>Vice President for Health Affairs</i>	
Meets with review committee on last day of site visit	Preferably no later than April 30
Holds final meeting with unit head, Dean and Vice Provost	Shortly after receipt of rev cmte rpt
Concludes academic program review process after receiving commentary from the unit head and/or Dean	
<i>Office of Academic Affairs and/or Vice Dean, College of Medicine</i>	
Provides consulting to units in the preparation of self-study	Fall term
May provide some institutional data for self-study	Fall term
Prepares summary for ABOR	September of following year

APPENDIX B
CLINICAL DEPARTMENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY OUTLINE

A. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND GOALS

1. Briefly describe the unit under review; this should include a statement of the unit's mission, role, and scope.
2. Briefly describe each of the academic degree programs under review, including the name of the degree and major and the purpose and scope of the program.
3. What are the major goals of this academic unit? If these have changed over the past 5 to 7 years, provide a summary of the changes. How are these goals expected to change in the future? (Append the program's or unit's strategic plan.)
4. How do these goals relate to the University's strategic plan and mission as expressed in the University of Arizona's Five-Year Strategic Plan?
(http://www.president.arizona.edu/university_5year.cfm)

B. PROGRAM HISTORY

1. Describe the program's history since the last program review or within the past 5 years, emphasizing major changes that have occurred. Include information on academic programs that have been renamed, merged, or disestablished.
2. Provide a summary of the recommendations of the previous academic program review and the unit's responses to those recommendations.

C. OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM'S QUALITY

1. In the view of the faculty, what is the overall quality of this program?

The quality of an academic unit can be assessed in many ways. In addressing this question, the faculty should consider all three of the illustrative criteria below. In each case, the status of this academic unit should be considered, and the information used to make these judgments should be described.

- a. Resource criteria, e.g., selectivity of the student and residency pool; faculty prestige and training; grants and contracts; library; equipment; and support staff.
- b. Reputational criteria, e.g., national or international ranking, or other judgments of the program's research and/or clinical practice; quality of residents; faculty honors, awards, and reputation.

- c. Outcome criteria, e.g., faculty scholarly productivity, research contributions, teaching and clinical performance, service to state and nation; student and resident gains in knowledge, students' and residents' professional achievements, placement, personal/or career development; and program alumni opinion.
2. In what areas has the program improved or deteriorated within the last 5 to 7 years? Describe the evidence used to support these conclusions.
3. Describe new directions in curriculum and training programs, resources, research, reorganization, staffing, or residents planned for the next few years and aimed at strengthening the program.
4. Identify the top five programs in this field. How does this program compare with others nationally? What evidence suggests this conclusion?

D. FACULTY

1. List the faculty in the department along with their titles. Summarize the faculty's overall strengths and weaknesses. What information has been used in identifying these strengths and weaknesses, and what conclusions have been drawn from this information? What plans have been implemented to capitalize on individual faculty strengths and to overcome weaknesses?
2. Describe the overall nature and breadth of the faculty's research and clinical contributions made through active participation in the generation of knowledge and exemplary practice. If there is a means for doing so, provide an appraisal of the significance of these contributions in this field.
3. Describe the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty. How are these faculty assigned their workloads? Do part-time faculty members participate in the academic program's meetings and discussions, and in strategic planning in the department? How are part-time faculty identified, and how are their credentials evaluated?
4. Describe this faculty's participation, leadership, and influence in the academic profession through such avenues as professional associations, review panels, and advisory groups. Include the faculty's contributions to the University of Arizona through such activities as committee work. Provide short biographical sketches of the faculty in the self study and supply in the appendix, complete, up-to-date curriculum vitae (P&T approved format preferred).
5. Considering the academic unit's faculty as a whole, describe the faculty's potential for response to change -- to urgent discoveries, changing directions, and/or new external demands. What is the level of morale, commitment, and

sense of continuing self-improvement? What is the balance of scholarly depth and breadth in the faculty, and what is the balance of traditional views with work taking place at the field's frontiers?

6. What is the faculty's collective view of the program's future, its desired directions, and its means for reaching these objectives? How do planning and incentives direct the program to these ends?
7. The unit head/chair should supply a brief overview of the post-tenure review results for the unit. This description should indicate how many tenured faculty were reviewed, how many reviews were satisfactory, how many reviews were not satisfactory and the nature of the improvement plan(s), and an aggregate description of how the tenured faculty contribute to the unit's mission.

E. UNDERGRADUATE , GRADUATE, AND MEDICAL STUDENT TEACHING

(If none, please so indicate)

Please follow FERPA guidelines, <http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/> when reporting student data.

1. Describe, in general terms, the teaching activities performed by this academic unit.

The CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is a six-digit code developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify the primary discipline of an academic program. CIP codes are widely used in both national surveys and studies, and are the accepted government taxonomy standard for higher education program classification. It is recommended that units cross reference their unit with the CIP code on the NCES web site (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/ciplist.asp>) to confirm alignment of unit's mission with current CIP code. This will not apply to residency programs.

2. Describe your department's role in the college and University in offering courses and one-on-one education for undergraduates, graduate students, and medical students.

Who teaches these courses or students, and what is the evidence of instructional quality for these courses? How (with particular emphasis on "outcomes") is the quality of these courses assessed? What plans are underway to strengthen these offerings? Describe the process for planning and updating these courses.

What efforts are made to involve students and residents actively in their learning through such opportunities as internships, practica, work-study, or seminars?

F. RESIDENCY PROGRAMS

Please follow FERPA guidelines, <http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/ferpa/> when reporting residency data.

1. Overview:
 - a. Describe, in general terms, the residency program(s) offered by this unit. How does (do) the program(s) reflect the basic goals (Section A) of the academic and clinical programs? What changes have occurred in recent years, and what changes are contemplated for the future?
 - b. What evidence (resources, reputation, outcomes, or other criteria) is available concerning the quality of this unit's residency program(s)? How is this information used to strengthen the program(s)?
2. Curriculum, courses, clinical training and research activities:
 - a. What evidence is there of sufficient course offerings and balance among the various specialties? Are the opportunities for residents to do research? Is the clinical training broad enough and at the same time with sufficient depth to provide adequate clinical education? What plans are underway to modify the program(s) in the light of available information?
 - b. Do residents have adequate resources to carry out their training, e.g., office and lab space, travel, etc.? Is the workload appropriate and comparable to our peer institutions? What additional resources would be required to improve the quality of the program substantially?
3. Residents:
 - a. What mechanisms are used to recruit quality residents? Is the program competing well for top candidates? How does (do) the quality of residents in this (these) program(s) compare with quality in other similar programs? Has the quality improved over the last 5 years.
 - b. What is the current gender and race/ethnicity composition of the unit's residents? How do these figures compare with data for similar programs at other schools?
 - c. Discuss the placements in academic institutions and private practice? How does this compare with 5 years ago? How do they compare to other programs in this field? How do alumni of your program view their experience, and how are their views solicited? What program modifications do these views suggest?

G. STUDENT AND RESIDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Refer to Draft of the University of Arizona Assessment Plan http://assessment.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/Assessment_Plan_2009_draft_04-07-09.pdf and the UA assessment website (<http://assessment.arizona.edu>).

1. List the intended learning and training outcomes desired from your residency program. Describe what residents should know, understand, and be able to do at the conclusion of the program.
2. List and characterize the different methods used to assess intended outcomes. Describe how the data are collected. Are the data collected from a representative sample?
3. Specify how the learning and training outcomes are related to the mission and goals of the program, college, and University (<http://plan.web.arizona.edu/>).
4. Describe how faculty and residents are involved in the development, implementation, and use of outcomes assessment.
5. Describe results of the outcomes assessment from your program and indicate how these will be used to improve learning and instruction. We encourage you to place the outcomes assessment of your unit's academic programs on the UA Assessment Website (<http://assessment.arizona.edu/>).
6. Explain how the results of outcomes assessment are incorporated in strategic planning processes in your unit.

H. ACADEMIC OUTREACH

This term refers to educational efforts, leadership, and sharing of knowledge off-campus, for example in the local community and throughout the State. Service to the campus and national academic profession is addressed in Section D-4.

1. Describe the nature of academic outreach activities in this academic unit.
2. How do these activities reflect the goal(s) described in Section A, and the particular needs of Arizona?
3. What evidence is available to document the quality and effects of these activities?

I. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER UNITS

1. What are the other departments, schools and/or colleges to which your unit contributes and/or with which it collaborates most frequently? Describe the nature of those efforts and an assessment of successes and disappointments.
2. What changes are contemplated in these collaborative efforts? How will these changes be implemented?

J. RESOURCES

1. Provide data showing faculty compensation comparisons with peer institutions, including as many as appropriate of the institutions named in Section C-4 (Provide a range compensation for each level of faculty).
2. Describe and appraise support services for the unit's: (a) teaching program, (b) research and clinical activities, (c) outreach, including professional and community service, and (d) administration.
3. What are the program's specific resource needs, e.g., library, laboratory, office personnel, research assistants, clinical space or clinical equipment, etc? Describe the units' efforts to find external donors who could help support the mission of the unit.
4. What changes in program quality might be projected if additional resources were available, and what would be the expected effects of those changes?

K. ADMINISTRATION

1. How is this unit organized? Describe the unit's governance structure and give an overview of the more important policies and procedures. (Note: the APR is not a review of the department head; this is accomplished at another time).
2. Summarize the program-related aspects of the last unit review(s) and efforts undertaken as a result of the review(s).
3. Describe the classified staff and professional staff in this academic unit. What has been the turnover rate in these positions during each of the previous five years? If high, what steps have been taken to identify and address the problem(s)? What changes are underway or contemplated to strengthen the staff support for the program's activities?

L. DIVERSITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Refer to The University of Arizona Diversity Action Plan that appears at <http://diversity.arizona.edu/>.

1. What is the gender and race/ethnicity composition of the faculty? Describe the major features of the program's plan for the recruitment, retention, and equity of a diverse faculty.
2. Describe the program's efforts toward the recruitment, retention, and equity of a diverse staff.
3. Describe the unit's plan for recruitment and retention of students and residents from underrepresented ethnic groups and the degree to which this plan has been realized.
4. Describe steps taken to create a welcoming and supporting climate inclusive of diversity in the unit.

M. DEPARTMENT DATA PROFILES

1. Interpretations of data provided by the Office of Academic Affairs (which should be included in the self-study appendices) not discussed in preceding sections should be summarized here. APR data reports are available at <http://apr.web.arizona.edu/Home>.

Note: It may be helpful to contact a unit that has recently completed an academic program review to discuss the process. The following units completed academic program reviews in A.Y. 2008-09:

Agriculture & Biosystems Engineering	Music
Astronomy/Steward Observatory	Neurology
Emergency Medicine	Pathology
Entomology	Radiation Oncology
Linguistics	School of Natural Resources
Mathematics	Soil, Water & Environmental Science
Mining & Geological Engineering	

APPENDIX C
CLINICAL DEPARTMENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
SAMPLE ITINERARY

Day 1

8:00 – 8:30 a.m.	Orientation with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
8:30 - 9:30 a.m.	Meeting with Dean
9:30 - 10:30 a.m.	Meeting with Self-Study Committee
10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 - 11:45 a.m.	Meet with junior faculty members
11:45 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch with Department Head
1:00 – 2:00 p.m.	Open meeting with residents
2:00 - 3:00 p.m.	This will provide you time to take a tour of research and clinical facilities and/or for meetings with other administrators (VP for Research, other Dept. Heads in the College, etc)
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Meeting with senior faculty
4:00 - End of Day	Review committee begins to draft report

Day 2

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Meeting with staff
9:00 -10:00 a.m.	Meeting with hospital administrators
10:00 - 10:15 a.m.	Break
10:15 - 12:00 p.m.	Meet with individual faculty members or full faculty
12:00 – 1:30 p.m.	Working lunch
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.	Meeting with Dean
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Exit interview with Vice President for Health Affairs and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
4:00 – End of Day	Write report

**Include meeting with community members and alumni, as appropriate*