

Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD)

Addendum to Guidelines — August 28, 2006

I. Recap:

A. One aspect of the system-wide accountability process, which in turn responds to a legislative mandate

B. Basic features

- 1. Seven-year review cycle**
- 2. All degree programs in a department reviewed at the same time**
- 3. Department completes self study; external team visits campus; Dean responds to review findings**

II. Status

A. Beginning second seven-year cycle of reviews

- 1. To date, 58 departments have been reviewed; 13 more are scheduled for 2006-07; the one remaining department is scheduled for 2007-08.**

B. Original schedule modified many times:

- 1. 6 reviews cancelled because of program consolidation**
- 2. 28 conducted on the original schedule**
- 3. 7 moved forward**
- 4. 30 delayed by one or more years**
- 5. Common reasons for delay: changes in leadership; organizational/structural changes; accreditation issues**

C. Need to update and revise schedule of reviews for the next cycle

- 1. Slippage in original schedule created a bow wave of reviews at the end (± 12 /year)**
- 2. Looking ahead, some “load-leveling” is needed**

- a) Simply extending cycle to reflect changes to date might result in as many as 18 reviews in one year.

3. Developed revised schedule for next round of reviews

- a) All programs with reviews completed on original schedule remain on that schedule
- b) Most programs advanced or delayed remain on new schedule
- c) A few programs delayed in the first round are advanced one year in the second round
- d) Not ideal; still years with a dozen departments, but additional re-scheduling does not help very much
- e) Wild card is timing of certain accreditation reviews

D. Management of second round

- 1. Will continue to try to accommodate modifications of schedule, but things will be tight**
- 2. Want to encourage consideration of “6.5” option (team comes in fall, rather than spring)**
- 3. Review draft; will finalize and distribute**

III. Changes to the process at both the system and campus levels

A. Campus Level

- 1. Departments having their second review should explicitly address the main issues raised in the first review**
 - a) What happened as a result of the first review? How has the situation described seven years ago changed?
 - b) The visiting team will be provided with a summary of the first review.
- 2. Address impact of new faculty**
 - a) Departments should indicate how recent faculty hiring (since the last review) relates to the initial action plan, and to the directions and strategies laid out in the second self-study.

- b) The productivity of the recently hired faculty should be described in terms of the indicators selected by the department for the research benchmarking process.

3. Address instructional resources and quality

- a) Resources: the self-study should explicitly comment on the findings of the Instructional Allocation Model (e.g., if departments are under stress, what is being done to manage the situation? If instructional resources seem adequate, how is this reflected in research activity, etc.?).
- b) Quality: the self-study should comment on the available data on the quality of the educational experience, especially at the undergraduate level, with explicit reference to relevant data from SRTI, the Senior Survey, and NSSE.
- c) Summaries of instructional productivity and student experience data will be provided to the visiting teams.

4. Incorporate research benchmarking

- a) The self-study should make explicit reference to and comment on the research benchmarking data. How do these data suggest the department is positioned within the discipline? How do the data relate to the strategies described in the self-study? How do recent and proposed faculty hiring support research productivity gains?

5. Role of the Provost

- a) The Dean will continue to be responsible for setting the expectations for the self-study and the visiting team, but the process will also include an opportunity for the Provost to identify specific issues or questions that should be addressed in the review.
- b) The Dean will continue to be responsible for identifying the members of the visiting team, but the Provost will approve team membership and may add a member.

B. System Level

1. Assessment of student learning outcomes

- a) In the second cycle of AQAD reviews, campuses will be expected to give greater emphasis to questions related to “teaching/learning environments that facilitate student success” (section 4).
- b) Reviews must address the following questions:

(1) Does the department have articulated learning outcomes?

(2) What means are identified to measure student attainment of those outcomes?

(3) How does the department use the assessment data on student learning outcomes?

c) Assistance in meeting these requirements is available from OAPA.