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Quality Enhancement Review (QER): Purpose and Overview

Purpose of the QER Process:

The Quality Enhancement Review process serves as a tool for ensuring that the university fulfills and maintains its mission. Generally, the process enables the university to provide quality assurance, maintain academic standards, ensure continuous improvement of academic programs, and improve the university's reputation. Specifically, the process serves to implement recommendations of the state and university's strategic plans to permit continuous improvement and to advance FSU into the top tier of public research universities.

The Quality Enhancement Review's primary purposes are (a) to examine the institutional effectiveness of a department or program, its national position with respect to comparable programs, what it needs to improve or sustain performance and (b) to serve as a basis for administrative decisions on the investment of new and existing resources. A program is evaluated on the basis of its mission and that mission’s relation to the university mission, student-learning and program outcomes specified by the program, and the assessment and continuous evaluation of program and learning outcomes. The Quality Enhancement Review also permits a "streamlined" continuous evaluation system by combining:

- the statutorily required Florida Board of Governors’ seven-year program reviews (6C-8.015 Academic Program Review),
- the Graduate Policy Committee's (GPC) reviews of graduate programs,
- the Undergraduate Policy Committee’s (UPC) reviews of undergraduate programs,
- independent external evaluation
- the Provost's internal reviews of programs relative to unit productivity and outcomes.

It is also scheduled, to the extent possible, to coincide with any external accreditation review.

The entire review process is monitored by the Office of Planning and Programs through the academic dean of the relevant college. The Office of Planning and Programs may revise the policies and procedures, as appropriate, after timely consultation with interested parties.

Components of the QER Process:

The Quality Enhancement process is founded on an extensive self-examination. Members of each academic department or program under review prepare a self-study binder that articulates the programs goals, objectives, and intended student-learning and program outcomes in relation to its mission.

The self-study addresses a number of questions integrating the concerns of the Florida Board of Governors, the Undergraduate Policy Committee, the Graduate Policy Committee, and the Provost. The measures used in Quality Enhancement Reviews of graduate and undergraduate programs include indicators of:
Instructional activities,
Research and creative effort
Faculty citizenship and service

The review also asks for an evaluation of the quality of degree programs based on qualitative measures of the reputation of the faculty, significance of research and scholarly activities to the profession, and the currency of the curriculum, all ascertained by external review. In addition, the QER evaluates the program's student achievement by reviewing its follow-up on graduates, for example its success in placing graduates in graduate schools or employment in relevant fields, as well as employer satisfaction, student satisfaction with FSU academic experience at FSU, the extent to which program and student-learning outcomes have been evaluated and achieved, and the levels of continuous improvement.

An independent external reviewer, contracted with the university, provides an external perspective on the department or program. The external reviewer reviews the self-study binder, conducts onsite interviews, and prepares and submits a report indicating the findings of the site visit. The external reviewer synthesizes findings into a final report that also makes recommendations for improvement. The report forms the basis for later stages of the QER process.

The self-study material prepared by the department/program is reviewed, along with the report of the external reviewer, by the academic dean, the Graduate Policy Committee, the Vice President for Planning and Programs, and other faculty and administrators. Academic deans review and act on findings of the QER, including the report and recommendations of the GPC, and submit an action plan to the Office of Planning and Programs. The Vice President for Planning and Programs, along with representatives of the Provost’s Office, review the dean’s report. The Provost assesses the dean's action plan and makes budgetary, planning, and performance assessments against the dean’s action plan. The academic dean prepares a summary report for each academic program reviewed using the Florida Board of Governors template. The Vice President for Planning and Programs reviews and submits the final reports to the Florida Board of Governors in accordance with state guidelines.

Both the Graduate Policy Committee and the Office of Planning and Programs conduct follow up inquiries on recommendations emerging from the QER process two years after the initial reports are issued.
Quality Enhancement Review: Process Guidelines

1. An annual informational meeting is conducted with all deans, department chairs, and directors undergoing review (semester of review or before).

2. The Office of Institutional Research provides departments/programs under review with profiles of their performance on key measures. Sponsored Research Services within the Office of the Vice President for Research provides relevant information on departmental/program contracts and grants for each review.

3. Departments/programs, in consultation with the relevant academic dean, nominate external reviewers and submit the nominations to the Faculty Development and Advancement Office for review and approval by the Provost. The nominations must also disclose all affiliations between the proposed reviewer, Florida State University, and any of the program faculty.

4. Each department prepares self-study documents.

5. Departments/programs arrange with the Faculty Development and Advancement Office for external reviewers’ site visits and schedule them.

6. (a) Each department/program submits seven copies of the Departmental Self Study in written form to the Office of Planning and Programs, before August 15 (for fall reviews) or December 8 (for spring reviews) but at least two weeks before the external reviewer site visit.

One electronic copy in PDF format should be sent to James Beck (jpbeck@fsu.edu) for the Graduate Policy Committee on or before August 15 (for fall reviews) or December 8 (for spring reviews). All questions relating to the GPC submission requirements should be directed to the Lee Stepina, Chair of the GPC (lstepina@fsu.edu).

One electronic copy in PDF format should be sent to the chair of the UPC for the Undergraduate Policy Committee on or before August 15 (for fall reviews) or December 8 (spring reviews). All questions relating to the UPC submission requirements should be directed to Jen Koslow, chair of the UPC (jkoslow@fsu.edu).

(b) The Office of Planning and Programs distributes copies of the report as follows: Office of Planning and Programs (2 copies), Office of Institutional Research (1 copy), Graduate School (1 copy), external reviewer (1 copy), Faculty Development and Advancement Office (1 copy), and academic dean (1 copy).

(c) The department/program should retain a copy for its records.

7. The external reviewer conducts the onsite visit.
8. The external reviewer submits a copy of the site visit report to the Office of the Provost within two weeks of the visit (as per their engagement letter). The report of the external reviewer is distributed to: Vice President for Planning and Programs, Chair of the Graduate Policy Committee, Chair of the Undergraduate Policy Committee, Faculty Development and Advancement Office, Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and other administrative and faculty representatives monitoring the process.

9. Both the UPC and the GPC Subcommittees conduct reviews (which include meetings of the subcommittees with faculty and graduate students). These reviews may coincide with that of the external reviewer. The UPC and GPC review its subcommittee’s reports and make final recommendations.

10. The academic dean analyzes the reports and synthesizes them into an action plan, then submits an electronic copy to the Office of Planning and Programs. The action plan addresses issues raised in the self-assessment and by the external reviewer and makes actionable recommendations for improvement. The recommendations should include actions that extend beyond the allocation of additional funds. The Office of Planning and Programs distributes the plan to Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Dean of the Graduate School, Associate Vice President for Research, Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, and key administrative and faculty representatives. The academic dean also completes the Florida Board of Governors summary template for each program reviewed and submits the summaries to the Office of Planning and Programs.

11. The dean reviews and discusses the action plan with the Vice President for Planning and Programs, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Dean of the Graduate School, Associate Vice President for Research, Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement, and key administrative representatives.

12. The Provost evaluates the dean’s action plans and makes budgetary, planning, and performance assessments against these plans.

13. The Office of Planning and Programs submits summary reports for each reviewed program to the Florida Board of Governors.

14. The GPC reviews progress on its recommendations two years following full committee action. The UPC may request written follow-up on recommendations two years after the initial review.
Quality Enhancement Reviews: Seven-Year Cycle Schedule

2014-2015 (subject to modification)

Fall 2014

1. Economics
2. Political Science
3. Sociology and Demography (one binder, 1 reviewer)
4. Public Administration
5. Public Health
6. African American Studies (moved from 2015-16)

Spring 2015

7. Business Administration (add to 2014-15), including undergraduate program at PC, FL
8. Management Information Sciences, Entrepreneurship, Strategy and Information Systems
9. Management
10. Accounting
11. Finance
12. Risk Management and Insurance, Real Estate
13. Marketing
14. Hospitality Administration
2015-2016 (subject to modification)

1. Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Science
   - Meteorology
   - Geology
   - Oceanography
   - GFDI

2. Computer Science

3. Law

4. Physics

5. Psychology

6. Communication

7. Communication Disorders

8. Nursing

9. Music

10. Dramatic Arts

2016-2017 (subject to modification)

1. Clothing, Textiles & Merchandising

2. Food & Nutrition

3. Movement Science

4. Family, Child & Consumer Sciences


6. Human Sciences

7. Criminology & Criminal Justice

8. Social Work

9. Art Education
10. Art History
11. Studio Art
12. Arts Administration
13. Interior Design
14. Dance
15. Chemistry
16. Biology
17. Molecular Biophysics
18. Neuroscience

2017-2018 (subject to modification)
1. Educational Psychology
2. Measurement & Statistics
3. Instructional Systems
4. Counseling and Human Systems
5. Counseling Psychology and Human Systems
6. Rehabilitation Counseling
7. Sport Management
8. Recreation and Leisure Services Admin
9. Physical Education
10. Social Science Education
11. Math Education
12. Science Education
13. Multilingual/Multicultural Education
14. English Education
15. Health Education
16. Early Childhood Education
17. Elementary Education
18. Reading Education
19. Special Education
20. Visual Disabilities
21. Mental Disabilities
22. Educational Leadership and Policy
23. Foundations of Education
24. Higher Education
25. Research & Evaluation Methods
26. FSU Teach
27. Secondary Science & Math Teaching

**2018-2019 (subject to modification)**

1. Civil Engineering
2. Mechanical Engineering
3. Chemical and Biomedical Engineering
4. Industrial Engineering
5. Electrical and Computer Engineering
6. History (including Middle Eastern Studies)
7. English (including Creative Writing)
8. Philosophy
9. Religion
10. Classics (including Greek and Latin)
11. History & Philosophy of Science
12. Biomedical Sciences
13. Medicine

2019-2020 (subject to modification)
1. Spanish
2. French
3. Italian & Italian Studies
4. German
5. Russian, Slavic Language & Literature
6. East Asian Studies
7. Mathematics
8. Actuarial Science
9. Statistics
10. Computational Science
11. Biostatistics

2020-2021 (subject to modification)
1. Geography
2. Urban & Regional Planning
3. International Affairs
4. Interdisciplinary Social Science
5. Motion Picture, Television & Recording Arts
6. Recreation, Tourism, and Events
7. Humanities
8. Library & Information Studies
9. Latin American and Caribbean Studies
10. Anthropology
11. Russian and East European Studies
12. Asian Studies
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Quality Enhancement Review: The Role and Qualifications of the External Reviewer

Role
The role of the external reviewer is to review and analyze the self-study as well as conduct interviews during the site visit in order to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the degree programs and identify strategies for quality improvement. The reviewer is asked to consider national trends in the discipline in determining how the program fares in comparison to aspirational and comparable programs. The external reviewer synthesizes findings into a final report that forms the basis for later stages of the QER process.

Qualifications
External reviewers should have national and/or international standing in their respective academic discipline. They should also have broad enough experience in higher education to understand the dynamics of public research-extensive universities and should represent high-quality degree programs. In addition, external reviewers should be independent of the University in order to ensure the objectivity of the report and the credibility of the process. Ideally, reviewers will be senior faculty from a public Association of American Universities (AAU) institution and have significant administrative, curricular, and program-review experience.

In the submission of candidates to be considered for external reviewers, the program chair should disclose all known affiliations between the proposed reviewer, Florida State University, and any of the program faculty (i.e., nature of the relationship, any potential conflicts of interest). It is expected that individuals within the same academic discipline will know one another and may have possibly worked together; nonetheless, the program chair must disclose this information at the time of the submission of names for consideration.
Due Dates:  
July 7, 2014 for fall 2014 reviewers  
October 15, 2014 for spring 2015 reviewers

1. The department (or program) identifies at least three candidates for external reviewer (in priority order), based on the role and qualifications described in “The External Reviewer” and discloses any affiliations between each candidate, Florida State University, and any member of the program faculty.

2. The department may contact their first-choice reviewer informally to determine his/her interest and availability to serve.

3. The department submits curriculum vitae (or website addresses where vitae can be found), along with information regarding all known affiliations with the department, of three candidates to the Faculty Development and Advancement Office in priority order.

4. The Faculty Development and Advancement Office reviews the candidates and coordinates communication with the potential reviewer(s).

5. After an informal agreement is reached, the Faculty Development and Advancement Office sends a formal offer letter to the external reviewer on behalf of the Provost to ensure standard formats, fees, and conditions. Each external reviewer is offered an honorarium of $1500 and reimbursement of travel expenses at State of Florida rates. The letter also describes the expectations of the review and conditions of the agreement, including the requirement that a formal written and electronic report of the site visit be submitted to the Office of the Provost within two weeks following the site visit. When signed by the external reviewer, this letter serves as the contract for services.

6. After this contract is signed, the office of the dean whose department or program is under review (or department office) becomes the primary contact for the external reviewer throughout the rest of the review process in regard to visit logistics (travel arrangements, hosting responsibilities, and visit schedule). Each academic dean or department chair identifies a staff member who will contact the external reviewer regarding travel arrangements. It is the responsibility of the department chair to prepare a schedule for the reviewer’s visit (using the sample schedule as an example). The Vice President for Planning and Programs is the contact regarding substantive issues.

7. The academic dean’s office is responsible for making the reviewer’s travel reservations, for reimbursing the reviewer directly for travel expenses, and for paying the $1,500 honorarium. If this task is delegated to the department, the dean will notify the department chair, the Provost’s Office, and the department fiscal administrator. Thus, the staff member identified in (6) prepares all paperwork involved in making these payments (travel authorization, expense report, purchase order), making sure that the external reviewer is paid and reimbursed promptly following the site visit.
8. The Office of the Provost will reimburse the department/dean via budget transfer for these external reviewer honoraria and travel expenses in accordance with State of Florida guidelines. There are no special provisions or exceptions for the honoraria and expenses incurred by external reviewers; departments should inform reviewers of all per diem restrictions or be prepared to cover any expenses that exceed state per diem. Each dean/department should send a copy of all relevant documentation (receipts, travel authorization, expense report, purchase order) to the Office of the Provost, Attn. Accounting, Mail Code 1310, to effect the reimbursement. (Refer to contact list, Appendix A, if you have questions.)

Please let Jennifer Buchanan know if you have any questions regarding these procedures.
Quality Enhancement Review: Sample External Reviewer Engagement Letter

July 7, 2014 for Fall
October 15, 2014 for Spring

Professor I. M. Distinguished
Aspirational Department
Reputable University

Dear Professor Distinguished:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate our ____________ program(s). Your assessment of our accomplishments, challenges, and aspirations will be invaluable to us in our effort to improve the quality of our program offerings.

As the external reviewer for the program(s) in ____________ at Florida State University, you will be asked to perform the following tasks:

1) Review the program’s self-study documents prepared for the program review;

2) Conduct an in-depth review of the _______ degree program(s), on site, from ____ to _____, 201_. A standard sample schedule, which includes topics of discussion, is attached. The specific schedule for your visit will be set by the department chair; and

3) Develop a report assessing the quality of the program, including recommendations that will be used by the program as benchmarks for improvement over the next five years. You will submit your report to the Office of the Provost (rsfeiock@fsu.edu) within two weeks after the date of your site visit to Florida State University. A sample format for your report is attached.

Your role as external reviewer is critically important to our review of the _______ program(s) and will be used in all subsequent phases of the Quality Enhancement Review process.

We are able to offer you a consultant honorarium of $1,500 for your services plus reimbursement of travel expenses at State of Florida rates. (See http://www.vpfa.fsu.edu/policies/controller/2d-2.html for more information.) Ms/r. ________ at the college/department office (phone and email of your staff) will contact you about travel arrangements and will handle your payment and reimbursement. If these arrangements are satisfactory to you, please sign below and return the original to my office as soon as possible. Upon receipt of the signed agreement, the University will create a purchase order, which will serve as the contract for your services.

We appreciate the time and effort you are investing in improving the _______ program(s) at Florida State University. We trust that your visit will be professionally gratifying to you.

We look forward to working with you.
Sincerely,

Jennifer Buchanan  
Assistant Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement

___________________________________ ___________________________  
Signature of Reviewer Date

cc:   Vice President for Planning and Programs  
      Dean of College  
      Department Chair  
      Ms/r. College Administrative Assistant  
      Provost’s Office, Accounting Representative  
      Provost’s Office, Staff Assistant

Enclosures (included only for the addressee and department chair):  
External Reviewer Sample Schedule  
External Reviewer Suggested Report Format

Note: Please return a signed copy of this agreement to the Provost’s Office as soon as possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Scheduler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:30</td>
<td>• Relationship of programs to goals and mission of university</td>
<td>Vice President for Planning and Programs</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Availability of resources to discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State and national issues affecting discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>(return to college)</td>
<td>Dean of the College</td>
<td>Department rep in conjunction with the Dean’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Goals and objectives of discipline and programs within the college(s) and departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State and national issues affecting discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aspirations for programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Break and go to Departmental Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-1:00</td>
<td>• Goals and objectives of discipline and programs within the college(s) and departments</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>Department rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State and national issues affecting discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aspirations for programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-4:00</td>
<td>• Curriculum evaluation</td>
<td>Department or program chairs</td>
<td>Department rep in conjunction with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4:00-5:00 | Program relationships within university  
Program relationships to individual and societal needs  
Adequacy of resources  
Effectiveness of Eminent Scholars Program  
Indicators of excellence and key faculty including Eminent Scholars (simultaneous, separate meetings may be scheduled with individual faculty) | Alumni, employees and other constituents | Department rep in conjunction with attendees |
| Day Two  | 7:30-8:15 | Breakfast with Chair at hotel |       | Department rep |
| 8:30-9:30 | Program relationships within university | Chairs of related disciplines | Department rep in conjunction with other chairs/departments |
| 9:30-11:30 | Student characteristics  
Demand for program and availability to students  
Admissions, retention, completion  
Articulation of program with community colleges and public schools (undergraduate only)  
Follow-up on program graduates (undergraduate and graduate) | Department or program chairs and key faculty (simultaneous or separate meetings may be scheduled to accommodate topics) | Department rep in conjunction with attendees |
<p>| 11:30-12:30 | Discussion of the quality of the program | External reviewer and GPC rep | Department rep in conjunction with attendees |
| 12:30-1:30 | Lunch | TBA |       |
| 1:30-2:30 | Interview students | A cross-section selection of students by level, ethnicity, gender, and background | Department rep |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2:30-3:00 | • Review specialized facilities supporting program  
• Tour of library, laboratories, specialized teaching classrooms, research facilities, etc. | Key faculty in conjunction with attendees | Department rep in conjunction with attendees |
| 3:00-4:00 | • Outline report                                                                 | External reviewer only                                  |                                   |
| 4:00-5:00 | • Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations  
• Comparison of program with national rankings | Vice President for Planning and Programs, Academic Dean, Department Chair, GPC Chair, GPC Representative, University Libraries Representative, Dean of the Graduate School, Faculty Development and Advancement Office Representative | Office of Planning and Programs |
I. Analysis of Undergraduate Program:

A. **Curriculum.** Is the curriculum appropriate, given the numbers and qualifications of the faculty? Are there too many required courses, or degree tracks, or too few? Does the curriculum provide the basis for a good core education in the discipline? Given the background of the faculty, are there opportunities for curricular development with other disciplines that might be pursued? To what extent are there seminars and workgroups offered by the program?

B. **Student Learning Outcomes.** Are the outcomes appropriate? Are the measurements measurable and specific? Are results stated clearly and analyzed? Have appropriate improvements been identified and implemented, and how?

C. **Procedures.** Do you see problems with departmental procedures such as advisement of undergraduates? What improvements might be made?

D. **Student Body.** Are the numbers of undergraduate students majoring in the department appropriate given the faculty size? Is the diversity of the undergraduate body appropriate?

E. **Student Accomplishments.** Are student accomplishments—such as papers presented, awards won, quality of graduate and professional programs in which students subsequently enroll, position of first employment, etc.—indicative of a quality undergraduate program?

F. **Strategic Plan.** Are the unit’s plans for its undergraduate program appropriate? Are there some alternatives that should be considered?

III. Analysis of Graduate Program:

A. **Curriculum:** Is the curriculum appropriate, given the numbers and qualifications of the faculty? Are there too many required courses, or degree tracks, or too few? Does the curriculum provide the basis for a good core education in the discipline? Given the background of the faculty, are there opportunities for curricular development with other disciplines that might be pursued? To what extent are there seminars and workgroups offered by the program?

B. **Procedures:** Are the procedures for selection and support of graduate assistants appropriate? Are the general examination procedures appropriate? Does the department provide sufficient levels of advisement, mentoring, and professional development for its students? What improvements might be made?
C. **Student Body.** Is the mix of masters and doctoral students indicative of a quality graduate program? Is the program attracting quality graduate students? Are enrollment levels in the graduate program(s) sufficient? Is the graduation rate appropriate? Is the diversity of the student body appropriate?

D. **Student Accomplishments.** Do student accomplishments, such as papers presented and published and positions obtained after degree completion, indicate a quality program? Do the dissertation titles and topics indicate scholarship that addresses subjects considered important?

E. **Strategic Plan.** Are the unit’s plans for the graduate program appropriate? Are there some alternatives that should be pursued?

IV. **Analysis of Faculty Accomplishments:**

A. **Scholarship/Creative Activity.** Are each of the faculty member’s publication record and/or other indicators of creative activity indicative of high quality? Please comment on the status of the journals and other outlets in which the faculty publish articles, the publishers of their books, and the prestige of their outlets for creative activity.

B. **Grants/Contracts.**

1. Are the external awards for faculty research and creative activity indicative of a quality unit?
2. Are there opportunities for external funding that should be pursued?

C. **Reputation.**

1. Is this a unit that is recognized within its professional community for the quality of its contributions? If there are some specific noteworthy scholarly contributions of faculty in the unit, please cite them.
2. Are the national and international professional service contributions of faculty significant? Please cite contributions you believe to be especially noteworthy.

V. **Overall Analysis and Recommendations:**

A. **Analysis.** What is your overall evaluation of the unit? Is it among the top 25 percent of similar units at comprehensive state research universities? In the middle 50 percent? In the bottom 25 percent? Are there areas of strength that should be promoted? Are there weak areas that should be phased out? Does the unit have a good strategic plan for the future? Do you have changes in direction to suggest? Are there funding opportunities that are not being pursued? Would you advise a high school student to major in this department? Would you advise an
undergraduate to attend graduate school in the department?

B. Recommendations. With the recognition that there are likely to be, at most, very modest levels of new funds available in the near future for program improvement, please recommend steps that the University and unit might take to improve the unit’s program.
Self-Study Questions

*Please be sure that your responses and documentation are consistent with federal laws relating to privacy of students’ educational records. For more information about the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, please refer to http://registrar.fsu.edu/ferpa/apdefault.htm.
Overview

1. Describe the academic program, including the program's history, academic offerings (degree and certificate programs), curricular focus, and organizational structure. In addition, comment briefly on the program's accomplishments, faculty, and research.

2. Analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

3. What are the program's academic and organizational short and long-term goals and what plans are in place for reaching them? Evaluate the program's progress towards the stated goals. Cite the program's strategic plan, if applicable.

Undergraduate Students

4. Analyze the undergraduate headcount enrollment and identify any significant trends and issues which the program must address. What is the total number of students enrolled in and graduating from the degree(s) program(s)? Is the ethnic and gender diversity of the program(s) consistent with the field? Does the program meet BOG thresholds for undergraduate degree production (at least 30 graduates in the past five years)? Additionally, is the program(s) enrollment increasing or decreasing? How effective is the program in meeting enrollment demands (include information about faculty course loads, course scheduling and course availability)?

5. What efforts are made by the program to recruit, enroll, and retain high-quality students? What is the average GPA for formally admitted students? What is the time to complete a degree? What does this say about the program’s efforts to recruit, enroll and retain high-quality students? To what extent do GPA data suggest any changes about the academic strengths or weaknesses of the students within the program(s)?

6. Describe the mechanisms and structure in place to provide academic advising to undergraduate students. How are students advised once they have been enrolled in the program? What is the process for advising prospective majors in limited-access programs? Are improvements needed?

7. How do students fulfill the general education competencies (upper-division writing, oral communication, computer competency, and scholarship in practice)?

8. Do the courses offered by the program benefit the university (general education)? If so, how does the program meet the demand and assure the quality of those courses and their relevance to the liberal studies curriculum?
9. Please share a summary of strengths of the undergraduate program(s), including data from the self-study and other assessments.

**Graduate Students**

**Graduate Policy Committee (GPC) Self-Study Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure/Topic</th>
<th>Narrative and Analysis</th>
<th>Tables and Supporting Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Recruitment/ Enrollment/ Retention/ Graduation data for all graduate degrees</td>
<td>1. Comment on the size of the graduate program and any trends in the graduate program statistics. Does the program's size create problems, is program growth (or shrinkage) a goal? Is retention a problem? 2. Comment on the diversity of the student body (gender and ethnicity). 3. Describe how recruiting is done. Include recruitment documents (brochures, etc.) and/or address for materials posted on the web. 4. If the department operates graduate certificate programs or offers large graduate service courses these should be described.</td>
<td>1. Provide chart of numbers of students applying, admitted, enrolled, graduated, numbers who drop out, time to degree (use table format on website), and GRE and GPA scores (or other appropriate metrics) and gender and ethnicity of enrolled students over the last five years. Data should be separated by degree (but may be combined if most appropriate). 2. Provide a list of doctoral graduates for the last 5 years with dissertation title and name of major professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Placement data, and other quality indicators of the graduate programs</td>
<td>1. Report on placement of masters and doctoral graduates for the past five years. 2. Comment on the data on graduate student publications/creative works, presentations, awards, fellowships and other quality indicators. 3. Comment on any contact with or outreach efforts to alumni.</td>
<td>1. Provide a chart of masters and doctoral recipients for the last five years, numbers of publications and presentations or other quality indicators (awards and fellowships, etc) for each student, and information on student placement. 2. For the doctoral graduates list their dissertation titles and major professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Curriculum</td>
<td>1. Comment on the currency and adequacy of the curriculum. Are there difficulties in course scheduling and availability, enrollments. Describe the faculty teaching loads. 2. Will distance learning play a role in your enrollment planning at either the undergraduate or graduate level?</td>
<td>1. For each degree and majors within the degree, provide a chart or table showing elements of the curriculum, include a plan of study and indicate what are core courses and commonly chosen electives. 2. Provide a list of all the courses offered in the last five years, when they were offered, name of the instructor, and enrollment in each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Advising and professional preparation of graduate students</td>
<td>1. Explain how student advising is done. 2. Describe the &quot;milestone steps&quot; in the degree program (diagnostic exams,</td>
<td>Include a copy of the departmental handbook for graduate students or a web link to the handbook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preliminary exams, prospectus, etc) and how these are administered. What are the success rates on these exams? 3. Provide statement on professional preparation of students for academic or non-academic roles including teaching and research.

| 14. Resources for graduate training. | 1. Explain how students are supported. Comment on the fraction of students supported on personal funds, teaching assistantships and grants and fellowships. Give stipend levels and comment on how they compare with national averages and how student funding impacts the program's quality indicators. Are there trends in the support data over the last five years? 2. Provide statements on space facilities, equipment, library and other resources available to graduate students. Are there facilities and resources needed for students in the program that are not currently available or are difficult to access? If so, are their plans for obtaining these resources? | Provide a table showing how the student's were funded (TAs, grants, fellowship, personal funds, etc.) for each of the five years covered by the review. |

| 15. Faculty Research/Creative Activity | Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty's research/creative activities. Provide CVs using the Faculty Expertise and Advancement System. | 16. Summary of the program’s strengths and weaknesses Comment on data specific to graduate education. What particular strengths, weaknesses, concerns do the data indicate? (For example, what do admission rates, and the demographics and stated goals of the admitted students indicate about the strength of the program)? |

17. Describe the teaching expectations and requirements for graduate students. How are teaching assistants supervised, evaluated, and provided training?

**Faculty**

18. To what extent is the program concerned about having adequate faculty to teach its degrees, majors, and certificates? Why? What is the nature of the program’s mentoring program for new faculty members?
19. Analyze faculty research and scholarship productivity. What steps are taken to ensure doctoral supervision loads are equitable and sustainable?

20. Have any adjuncts not been evaluated?

21. How is teaching effectiveness assessed by the program and what program efforts have been shown to improve the quality of instruction? Are there any instances where faculty members have had poor evaluations of teaching and what efforts were made to improve his/her teaching?

22. Identify the undergraduate academic degree program director and/or coordinator. How was the person selected and what are her/his academic qualifications in relation to her/his position?

Curriculum

23. When was the last time the undergraduate curriculum was reviewed comprehensively? Review lower level prerequisite courses to ensure that the program is in compliance with state-approved common prerequisites (reference the most recent annual review of the program guide found at http://www.academic-guide.fsu.edu/ and conducted by the Division of Undergraduate Studies). If appropriate, review the limited access status of a departmental program(s) and determine if it is still warranted (reference the most current annual report compiled by the Office of the VP for Faculty Development and Advancement and submitted to the Florida Board of Governors). Are there difficulties in course scheduling and availability? Are course offerings reviewed for relevancy to the learning outcomes of the major/academic degree program/certificate as well as to the general field? Please describe the review process and who was involved. Also, how are undergraduate students engaged in research?

24. To what extent is distance learning used to deliver courses? Is there an online academic degree program and how does it function in relation to the main campus?

25. How does the program relate to other teaching and research units on campus? Consider units that the program currently interacts with as well as other units with which there may be potential for interaction. Are program offerings spread too broadly over different majors, certificates, or other activities? Overall, how does offering these courses impact the academic degree program(s)?

26. If applicable, how does the program monitor and assess the performance of the program's instructional efforts at any off-campus instructional site(s) (e.g., Panama City, Florida; Republic of Panama)? How do these function in relation to the main campus?
27. Analyze the adequacy of the physical facilities utilized by the program.

28. Identify any programmatic concerns with information technology.

29. How adequate are the library resources to support the program? Identify "gaps" in holdings and/or databases.

30. How does the program support (stipend, health insurance supplements, travel to meetings, etc.) provided to graduate teaching and research assistants compare to other comparable programs? To what extent are contract and grant and private dollars available to supplement state support? Analyze and identify any issues that the program must address.

31. To what extent is the program(s) involved with delivery of courses at study abroad centers, international exchange agreements, or the delivery of programs at the Republic of Panama branch campus?

32. How has the program compiled and used feedback from students, alumni, and employers? How are student perceptions/satisfaction assessed and are graduate survey results from the Career Center or Institutional Research used? To what extent does the program use this information to make curricular and programmatic changes?

33. Consider the findings and recommendations from the previous self-study. How did the program address previous findings and recommendations? What are the significant changes in the program since the previous review?

34. Report the findings and recommendations from the previous discipline-specific accreditation. Indicate whether the program is currently undergoing accreditation or when the next one is scheduled.

35. What process does the program use to formulate student learning outcomes and assess student learning? How are key concepts and other knowledge the faculty want the students to learn explicitly mapped into the curriculum? How well are students achieving the expected learning outcomes established by the program faculty members?

36. What specific changes or improvements has the program made in response to assessment of student performance on learning outcomes?

37. How do the program's curricula compare to the best efforts nationally? How often are the curricula reviewed and by whom? Describe any changes that were made based on the most
recent comprehensive review of the degrees, majors, and certificates offered by the
department or program and discuss their implementation. How is the program monitoring the
effects of curricular changes? What new degree programs and at which levels does the unit
plan to propose in the next five years?

Supporting Materials

Appendix A. QER Vitae (build the CVs through the Faculty Expertise and Advancement System available through the Faculty Development and Advancement Office website and include hard copies in the binder)

Appendix B. Budgeted and actual faculty FTE for the last 5 years

Appendix C. Teaching Evaluations (for faculty, teaching assistants, and adjuncts); be sure to provide an explanation regarding the scale used on the course evaluations (see sample form)

Appendix D. Organizational Chart

Appendix E. Enrollment and Completion Tables (GPC Question 10)

Appendix F. Student Learning/Program Outcomes, Assessments, Actions, and Results from IE Portal (most current full year available), including those associated with college-credit certificates

Appendix G. URL/Weblink to Student Handbooks

Appendix H. Surveys of current students, graduates, alumni

Appendix I. Undergraduate and graduate placements
Quality Enhancement Review: Supporting Documentation for the Self-Study Questions

To assist departments/programs in preparing the self-study, various administrative offices across campus serve as resource to facilitate the gathering of data/information from centralized databases.

- Each academic program is provided a data booklet from the Office of Institutional Research (http://www.ir.fsu.edu/links.cfm?ID=qer). The data booklet includes information about undergraduate and graduate enrollment, degrees awarded, student credit hours by instructor type, program expenditures, and instructional workload.

- The Office of Sponsored Research (http://www.research.fsu.edu/sras/index.html) provides information regarding faculty research activities, including the number of proposals submitted and funded and award amounts.

- As part of the Quality Enhancement Review, student evaluations of faculty teaching scores are analyzed for the last five years. Prior to spring 2013, the median score for #8 from each faculty member’s SUSSAI/SPOT evaluation (for each course) is reported using a template provided by the Office of the Provost. Due to a change in survey instrument, starting spring 2013, the median score for SPCI item #13 is reported. The ODL Assessment & Testing unit serves as a resource to assist programs with obtaining this data (nguidry@campus.fsu.edu).

- Questions about program and student learning outcomes should be directed to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (kmorton@fsu.edu).
# Faculty SUSSAI/SPT/SPCI Scores for the Last Five Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY MEMBER’S NAME</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FALL</td>
<td>SPRING</td>
<td>FALL</td>
<td>SPRING</td>
<td>FALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE, JOHN</td>
<td>ABC 123-01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABC 123-03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEF 345-01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGG, GOODIE</td>
<td>AAA 111-03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BBB 222-01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCC 333-01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON, ONE</td>
<td>CBA 321-01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Use Median score for #8 from the individual’s SUSSAI printout through Fall 2012. Use Median score for #13 from Spring 2013 - present. These can be obtained from Nancy Guidry (nguidry@fsu.edu, 4-3541).
Quality Enhancement Review: Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC) Review Process

Purpose of the Undergraduate Policy Reviews

The purpose of the UPC program reviews is to:
1. ensure that FSU’s undergraduate academic degree and certificate programs are academically sound.
2. assist the program faculty and administration in improving programs through timely review.
3. provide an independent forum in which program students can bring issues to the attention of the faculty, and program faculty can bring issues to the attention of the University administration.

The programs considered for review will be taken from the official degree program inventory maintained by the Office of Institutional Research. Related programs and majors may be reviewed in clusters or combinations as determined by the Chair of the UPC.

The Review Process:

The UPC will evaluate the program based (at a minimum) on the following materials:
1. binder of material provided by the program for the Quality Enhancement Review (QER) process, which provides a 5-year snapshot of the program’s activities.
2. email survey of undergraduate students in the program by the UPC
3. Comments and recommendations made by external reviewers as part of the QER.

A three-person subcommittee within the UPC, which will consist of at least one individual from the college within which the degree program is housed and of at least one from a college outside of the degree program, will prepare a report summarizing their observations of the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate program based on the self-study. The report will conclude with recommendations for how the program could be improved. The degree program is welcome to appoint a member to the subcommittee; however, it is not required.

If, in preparing the report, the subcommittee feels that it needs more information, it may set up a meeting(s) with:
   a. the faculty member responsible for coordinating undergraduate curriculum
   b. the program’s administrators (department chair, director of program, etc.)

Upon completion, the subcommittee will present the report to the full UPC for discussion. The UPC will invite the program’s administrators to be present at this meeting. Following the UPC meeting, the UPC will report their findings to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

Relationship to the Quality Enhancement Review

The UPC review is conducted as part of the Quality Enhancement Review (QER). The QER focuses on the entire department – undergraduate and graduate programs plus any associated institutes or centers – and has the goals of: determining whether the unit’s productivity (educational, research, and service) justify its resources in achieving the related program goals and objectives; how well relevant program goals and objectives are being met; how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes; and
how continuous program improvements can be fostered. While the QER includes the graduate programs in the unit, the academics of the undergraduate programs are the sole focus of the UPC review. The QER concludes with a meeting of the department faculty, the academic dean, and the Provost’s representative. It is helpful if at least one of the UPC subcommittee members can attend this final unit review meeting.

The recommendations in the UPC Subcommittee’s report
The UPC may make any findings and recommendations that it thinks appropriate. The recommendations are to be directed to the program (or department), Faculty Senate, and other appropriate entities. The recommendations should be drafted in such a way that a program has flexibility in addressing the recommendations. If there are areas for program improvement that can be handled only by the upper administration (more faculty lines, more money, etc), it is best to write these findings or recommendations in a form in which the program is directed to work with the administration in addressing their need for more faculty (or money or whatever). Another way to bring certain issues to the attention of the administration is to include a section in the report directed specifically at the administration. It is useful to differentiate findings and recommendations that require additional resources from those that may not. The UPC member on the committee and the UPC chair will assist the committee with this aspect of writing their recommendations. The UPC may ask for a written follow-up on recommendations two years after the initial review to learn about progress made towards improving those areas identified in the report.

All recommendations will be sent to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee for consideration and, where appropriate, the full Faculty Senate. If the UPC concludes that the program is deficient in providing undergraduates with an academically sound degree, the UPC may recommend to the Faculty Senate and other appropriate entities that the program be placed on probation, suspended, or terminated.
Quality Enhancement Review: Graduate Policy Committee (GPC) Review Process

Purpose of the Reviews

The purpose of the GPC program reviews is to:
1. ensure that FSU’s graduate programs are academically sound and are producing graduates who are adequately trained in their field,
2. assist the program faculty and administration in improving the academic quality of their graduate program,
3. provide an independent forum in which program students can voice their concerns to the faculty, and program faculty can voice concerns to the administration.

The Review Process

The program review subcommittees are responsible for making recommendations to the GPC. Their report is presented to a meeting of the full GPC for discussion and final approval. Recommendations are made on (1) whether the program should be continued; and (2) any other recommendations aimed at improving the academic quality of the program deemed appropriate by the review subcommittee. Once approved by the GPC, the recommendations are forwarded to the unit being reviewed, the dean of that unit, the Faculty Development and Advancement Office, and the Provost’s office.

In summary, review of the program by both the GPC Review Subcommittee and the GPC is based (at a minimum) on the following materials and meetings:
1. binder of material provided by the program (QER self-study), which provides a 5-year snapshot of the program’s activity
2. discussions with the external reviewer and reading that person’s report when it becomes available
3. discussion with graduate students in the program
4. reading a sample of recent doctoral dissertations
4. discussions with program faculty
5. discussion with program administrators (department chair)
6. reading a sample of annual graduate student evaluations
7. reading a sample of recent doctoral dissertations

What the Chair of the GPC Needs from Chairs/Directors

Each review subcommittee consists of 5 faculty plus one graduate student – a subcommittee chair, two faculty drawn from the University at large, a faculty member who is also a member of the GPC, and a faculty member and graduate student from the program under review. Program directors/chairs are responsible for appointing the latter two subcommittee members and the chair of the GPC appoints the rest. However, he/she makes these appointments with the advice and guidance of the department chair/program director of the program under review. So Program directors/chairs are requested to provide suggestions and advice about people whom they think would make useful and effective members on the review committee for their program - especially ideas about who should chair your review committee.
Chairs/Program Directors should send the chair of the GPC the names of 6 to 12 faculty whom they think would make a good chair and/or member for their program's review committee. The people suggested must be FSU faculty from outside of their program/department, they must have tenure, and they should, of course, be senior faculty whose judgment they trust and respect. It is preferable, though not always practicable, not to include administrators (Associate or Assistant Deans) on this list or, if possible, department chairs. The faculty suggested can be from within the program’s college or from other colleges (in fact a mix of people from inside and outside of the college is preferable) and they should be people who are familiar with the program’s field but are distant enough from the department/program that they can make independent judgments during the review. Frequently the GPC subcommittee chairs are faculty from an allied field; they may also have served on some committees of students in the program or may have had a research collaboration with one of the program faculty.

**Follow-up Process**

Six months after the semester in which the review was completed, the program submits a written plan for how the GPC recommendations will be met. The plan is submitted to the Graduate School and reviewed by both the Dean of the Graduate School and the Chair of the GPC. Two years after the semester in which the review was completed, the program submits a written report on how the GPC recommendations were met. This report is submitted to the Graduate School and reviewed by both the Dean of the Graduate School and the Chair of the GPC. If deemed necessary, further follow-up is initiated by the Dean of the Graduate School.
Template for the Dean’s Action Plan

Summary Title: [name of the program]

Applicable programs: [Provide list with 6-digit codes, program names and degree levels]

Accreditation: [Is the QER associated with an accreditation review?]

Last Review Year: [Indicate year of last previous academic program review]

Major changes since the previous review:

Program Strengths:

Program Weaknesses:

Recommendations:

A. Improvement possible without the need for significant infusions of new financial resources
   a. Improvements
      i. xxx
      ii. xxx
   b. Recommendation, individual responsible for and timeline of changes
      i. Xxx
      ii. Xxx

B. Improvements that are possible with additional financial resources
   a. Improvements
      i. Xxx
      ii. Xxx
   b. Recommendations, costs, individual responsible for and timeline of changes
      i. Xxx
      ii. Xxx

C. External Reviewer: [Name of the external reviewer, his/her institution, dates of onsite visit]

D. Was there a Review by the Undergraduate or Graduate Policy Committees: [Yes/No]
Quality Enhancement Review: Florida Board of Governors Review Process

The Florida Legislature requires that all academic programs in state universities are reviewed on a seven-year cycle (section 1001.03, Florida Statutes). The Board of Governors prescribes the procedures for these reviews, and requires that each institution prepare and submit summary reports to the Board of Governors (6C-8.015, Florida Administrative Code).

The components of the program review process prescribed by the Florida Board of Governors include the following:

1. Articulate the mission(s) and purpose(s) of the program(s) within the context of the institutional mission and the State Board of Education’s and Florida Board of Governors’ strategic plans.
2. Identify program goals/objectives, including expected outputs and outcomes. Specifically, identify and publicize expected student learning outcomes.
3. Develop assessment systems to determine how well students are achieving those learning outcomes.
4. Implement and/or modify the program(s) to achieve the articulated goals/objectives.
5. Collect data and information on actual outputs and outcomes.
6. Analyze—and have external expert(s) in the discipline analyze—the data and information to determine how well articulated goals/objectives have been accomplished within the context of the mission.
7. Specifically, analyze—and have external expert(s) in the discipline analyze—how well students are meeting expected learning outcomes, both as articulated by program personnel and as deemed appropriate in the discipline within the context of the individual institution’s mission.
8. Assess—and have external expert(s) in the discipline assess—the sufficiency of resources and support services to achieve the goals/objectives.
9. Identify—and have external expert(s) in the discipline identify—strengths, opportunities, and barriers that support or impede achievement of goals.
10. Review—and have external expert(s) in the discipline review—responses to recommendations from previous reviews.
11. Generate—and have external expert(s) in the discipline generate—recommendations based on review findings.
12. Plan for continuous program improvement based on the results of the review.

The Florida Board of Governors also requires each institution to prepare and submit a program review summary report for each academic program under review.

The academic dean will use the data and the information found in the program’s self-study binder, external reviewer’s report, and GPC report to prepare the program review summary report for each academic program under review. Each summary report should consist of the following components:

a. The Classification of Instructional Program (CIP)/degree combinations for the program that is reviewed.
b. An indicator identifying whether or not the program review was conducted in conjunction with any external reviews (e.g., accreditation reviews).
c. The date of the last review of the program.
d. A brief description of major changes made since the previous program review.
e. A summary of the current strengths of the program.
f. A summary of the current weaknesses of the program.
g. A summary of the recommendations and/or proposed action plans made as a result of the review.

The academic dean should forward completed summary reports for each program reviewed to the Office of Planning and Programs using Word. The Vice President for Planning and Programs will review the summary reports and submit the reports to the Florida Board of Governors. In addition, the Vice President for Planning and Programs will verify that the program review included all of the processes outlined in the BOG regulation and was conducted according to approved university policies and procedures.
EXAMPLE FORMAT

Florida Board of Governors
Program Summary

Summary Title: [Name of the Program]

Applicable Programs: [Provide 6-digit CIP code(s), program name, and degree level]
   Example: 42.0101 Psychology, General : Research Doctorate
   42.0101 Psychology, General : Bachelors
   42.0101 Psychology, General : Masters

Person Completing Summary: [provide name and email address]

Accreditation: [Is the QER associated with an accreditation review? Yes/No]

Last Review Year: [Indicate year of previous academic program review]

Major Changes since the Previous Review: [see example below]
1. Twenty-three faculty members have left the psychology department; 19 faculty members have been hired.
2. The Florida Center for Reading Research was established by Governor Jeb Bush in January 2002. It is jointly administered at Florida State University by the Learning Systems Institute and the College of Arts and Sciences.
3. The department is involved with two interdisciplinary cluster initiatives: neuroscience and the psychology and neurobiology of dysregulated behavior.
4. The department has added two doctoral programs: social (2003) and developmental (2004).
5. Graduate enrollment has increased by 35%.
6. The program has increased the BA/BS degrees awarded by 50%.
7. In 2008, the program has moved into the new Psychology Building.

Program Strengths: [see example below]
1. The master’s program in Applied Behavioral Analysis delivered at Panama City is effectively serving a community in need of trained professionals in dealing with autism.
2. The average GRE and GPA scores of the graduate enrollees have increased from 1210 and 3.47 in 2003 to 1290 and 3.79 in 2007. Several of these students have been recognized with university and college fellowships.
3. The faculty have an outstanding publication rate with 13.7 publications and 63.1 citations per faculty member over the period 2003-2007.
4. The department ranks fourth among all private and public universities in external research support.
5. The external reviewer noted that the “graduate students are of exceptional quality and are uniformly complimentary of the preparation they receive for their professions.” Current doctoral students average 7 publications and 10 conference presentations. Recent Ph.D.s average 12 publications and 20 presentations.
6. The psychology program has outstanding physical facilities.
7. The program has fostered collaborative relationships with several units on campus (e.g., Florida Center for Reading Research, College of Medicine, Neuroscience, and several other units).

**Program Weaknesses:** [see example below]
1. The faculty size is small relative to its research and teaching mission. The external reviewer notes that "the present complement of 35 is smaller than one would predict for an institution of FSU's size and research reputation. Psychology departments with similar numbers of majors and level of scholarship have 40 faculty."
2. Graduate student stipends are low and uncompetitive.
3. Graduate students are required to take a zero-credit teaching practicum to be eligible for a teaching position. The external reviewer recommends that the students receive elective academic credit for the practicum.
4. Faculty salaries are inadequate and not competitive (lack of merit increases, salary compression and inversion).
5. Undergraduate advising needs to be improved.

**Recommendations:** [see examples below]
1. Given the current financial situation in the state, it seems unlikely that the university will be able to address the low numbers of faculty, low faculty salaries, and the uncompetitive graduate stipend amounts. All remain a priority for the institution.
2. The department will explore the feasibility of the teaching practicum being offered for academic credit.
3. The department's undergraduate program supervisors will meet with the dean of undergraduate studies to discuss advising and to make recommendations to improve the process.

**Additional Comments** [fill in the blanks]

This review was conducted by the Office of the Vice President for Planning and Programs and coordinated with the Graduate Policy Committee and Undergraduate Policy Committee (committees of the Faculty Senate). The external reviewers were Dr. ______________, ____________title, ______________university. S/He conducted his on campus review on ______________month, dates, year.
## APPENDIX A

### Quality Enhancement Review: Contact List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT PERSON</th>
<th>SUBJECT MATTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert B. Bradley</strong></td>
<td>• Unit Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>• Self Study Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Westcott Building (Mail Code 1310)</td>
<td>• Two-Year Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644-5196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rbradley@admin.fsu.edu">rbradley@admin.fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unit Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruth Feiock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Planning and Programs</td>
<td>• Self Study Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Westcott Building (Mail Code 1310)</td>
<td>• Two-Year Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644-5122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rsfeiock@fsu.edu">rsfeiock@fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• External Reviewer-nominations, contracting,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jennifer Buchanan</strong></td>
<td>scheduling visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Westcott Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644-6876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jbuchanan@admin.fsu.edu">jbuchanan@admin.fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty Expertise and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tiffany Lawver</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Westcott (Mail Code 1481)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645-8203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:tlawver@fsu.edu">tlawver@fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Keith Bernstein or Rick</td>
<td>• Institutional Research Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnette**</td>
<td>• Departmental Profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Institutional</td>
<td>• Data needed for reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 Westcott Building (Mail Code 1360)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644-4203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kbernstein@fsu.edu">kbernstein@fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rburnette@fsu.edu">rburnette@fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jen Koslow</strong></td>
<td>• UPC Self-Study Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Undergraduate Policy</td>
<td>• UPC Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>• UPC Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 Bellamy Building (Mail Code 2200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644-5888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jkoslow@fsu.edu">jkoslow@fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lee Stepina</strong></td>
<td>• Graduate Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Graduate Policy</td>
<td>• Self-Study Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>• GPC Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 RBB (Mail Code 1110)</td>
<td>• GPC Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644-7847</td>
<td>• GPC Two-Year Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lstepina@fsu.edu">lstepina@fsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Office/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| James Beck                  | The Graduate School                      | 314 Westcott Building (Mail Code 1410) 644-3501 jpbeck@admin.fsu.edu | • GPC Reviews  
• GPC Action Plans  
• GPC Two-Year Follow-up |
| Diana Key                   | Sponsored Research Services               | 874 Traditions Way (Mail Code 4166) 644-8648 dkey@admin.fsu.edu | • Contract and Grant Awards and Proposal Data |
| Roberta McManus or Helen McCann | Sponsored Research Accounting Services | 874 Traditions Way (Mail Code 4166) 645-2485 (Roberta) or 644-8947 (Helen) rmcmanus@fsu.edu hmcann@admin.fsu.edu | • C&G Expenditure Data |
| Susan Alexander             | Office of the Provost                     | 116C Westcott Building (Mail Code 1310) 644-0087 slemery@admin.fsu.edu | • Reimbursement for External Reviewer |
| Nancy Guidry                | Office of Distance Learning               | 3500 University Center, Building C (Mail Code: 2550) 644-3541 nguidry@campus.fsu.edu | • Student Evaluation of Teaching |
| Kayce Morton                | Office of Institutional Effectiveness     | 208 Longmire Building (Mail Code 1310) 645-2740 kmorton@fsu.edu | • Program and Student Learning Outcomes |

*If you have any questions/concerns that are not listed, please direct these questions to Ms. Ruth Feiock or Dr. Robert B. Bradley.*
APPENDIX B

Quality Enhancement Review: 2014-15 Due Dates and Deadlines

Fall 2014

Spring 2014  Informational Meeting for Fall and Spring Reviews

  Department chair/program director identifies potential reviewers and forwards names to
  Jennifer Buchanan

  QER guidelines distributed and posted on the website for the Provost's Office

  Department chair/program director begins preparation of self-study material

  All chairs of programs under review in the coming year will be contacted by the GPC
  chair for recommendations concerning faculty to serve on the GPC subcommittee.

Late-June 2014  Institutional Research and Contract and Grant Information Available

  July 7, 2014  Deadline for submitting the names of potential reviewers to Jennifer Buchanan

  August 2014  Department makes travel arrangements for external reviewer’s onsite visit and
  following the visit makes arrangements for external reviewer’s travel reimbursement.

  August 15, 2014  Department chairs submit written self-study material to the Office of Planning and
  Programs (212 Westcott Building) and an electronic copy in PDF format should be sent
  to James Beck (jpbeck@fsu.edu) for the Graduate Policy Committee and Jen Koslow
  (jkoslow@fsu.edu) for the Undergraduate Policy Committee

  September 2014  External reviewer evaluates the program and submits recommendations to the Vice
  President for Planning and Programs.

  Fall 2014  Undergraduate and Graduate Policy Committees conduct reviews and make
  recommendations.

  Late Fall 2014  Academic dean completes executive summary, action plan, and Florida Board of
  Governors’ summary templates for review by Academic Affairs.

  Vice President for Planning and Programs submits QER Summary to the Florida Board
  of Governors for review.
Spring 2014  Informational Meeting for Fall and Spring Reviews

Department chair/program director identifies potential reviewers and forwards names to Jennifer Buchanan

Department chair/program director begins preparation of self-study material using the QER guidelines available on the Provost’s website

October 15, 2014  Deadline for submitting the names of potential reviewers to Jennifer Buchanan

Late October 2014  Institutional Research and Contract and Grant Information Available

December 2014  Department makes travel arrangements for external reviewer’s onsite visit and following the visit makes arrangements for external reviewer’s travel reimbursement.

Dec. 8, 2014  Department chairs submit written self-study material to the Office of Planning and Programs (212 Westcott Building) and an electronic copy in PDF format should be sent to James Beck (jpbeck@admin.fsu.edu) for the Graduate Policy Committee and Jen Koslow (jkoslow@fsu.edu) for the Undergraduate Policy Committee

January 2015  External reviewer evaluates the program and submits recommendations to the Vice President for Planning and Programs.

Spring 2015  Undergraduate and Graduate Policy Committees conduct reviews and make recommendations.

Late Spring 2015  Academic dean completes executive summary, action plan, and Florida Board of Governors’ summary templates for review by Academic Affairs.

Vice President for Planning and Programs submits QER Summary to the Florida Board of Governors for review.