Academic Program Review

Updated: August 10, 2017

The Georgia Institute of Technology is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges to award baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees. Contact the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges at 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, GA 30033-4097, telephone, 404.679.4500, http://www.sacscoc.org for questions about the accreditation of the Georgia Institute of Technology.

In addition, many Institute programs are specifically accredited by appropriate professional certifying agencies.

College of Design

In the United States, most state registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted a 6-year, 3-year, or 2-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.

The Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may consist of a pre-professional undergraduate degree and a professional graduate degree that, when earned sequentially, constitute an accredited professional education. However, the pre-professional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree.

The Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Architecture, offers the following NAAB-accredited degree programs:

- Master of Architecture, Two-year track (pre-professional degree in Architecture + 60 credits required)
- Master of Architecture, Three-year track (non-pre-professional degree + 108 credits required)

The Master of Science in Building Construction and Facility Management is accredited by the International Facility Management Association (IFMA) Foundation. The School of Building Construction has also received international recognition by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS).

The Master of City and Regional Planning program is fully accredited by the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB), www.planningaccreditationboard.org.

The Bachelor of Science in Industrial Design and the Master of Industrial Design degree programs have been accredited by the National Association of Schools in Art and Design (NASAD) and are recognized by the Industrial Designers Society of America.

College of Computing

The following undergraduate computing programs are accredited by the Computing Accreditation Commission of ABET, www.abet.org.

- Bachelor of Science in Computer Science
- Bachelor of Science in Computational Media

College of Engineering

The following undergraduate engineering programs are accredited by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET, www.abet.org.

- Bachelor of Science in Aerospace Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Environmental Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Materials Science and Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering
- Bachelor of Science in Nuclear and Radiological Engineering

The Master of Science in Medical Physics and the PhD in Nuclear and Radiological Engineering - Medical Physics Option programs are accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Medical Physics Educational Programs, CAMPEP, www.campep.org/campeplstgrad.asp.

Scheller College of Business

The College of Business and all of its degrees are accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) International.

College of Sciences

The American Chemical Society has certified the curriculum leading to the Bachelor of Science in Chemistry.

The Human Factors and Ergonomics Society has accredited the curriculum leading to the PhD with a Major in Psychology, concentration in Engineering Psychology.

Division of Student Affairs

The Counseling Center is accredited by the International Association of Counseling Services (IACS). IACS is the accrediting body for counseling services provided by college and university counseling centers. The Counseling Center sponsors a predoctoral internship training program in psychology for doctoral students in counseling and clinical psychology programs. The internship training program is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA).

Georgia Tech Language Institute

The Language Institute's Intensive English Program is accredited by the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA) and thus meets the CEA Standards for English Programs and Institutions.

Introduction

Dear Colleagues,

The Georgia Tech Academic Program Review (APR) process is designed to be responsive to both internal needs and external requirements, such as the Institute and Board of Regents policies, and criteria for program improvement required by regional and specialized accreditations. Having one periodic, comprehensive review, is an efficient means for Georgia Tech to review and report on its academic vitality to multiple constituents. While it is not the only means by which units periodically evaluate their academic programs, it is considered to be among the principal processes by which the Institute systematically assures it is fulfilling its academic mission.

These APR Guidelines provide a model that addresses internal and external requirements, and may be enhanced to address discipline or unit needs. Within this guide you will find

- an overview of the purpose for academic program reviews

- regional accreditation standards and Board of Regents policy

- a description of the Institute review process

- key milestones and deadlines

- a list of principal materials and their purpose

- an Academic Program Review schedule

—essentially all you need to conduct your academic program review. Also included are templates and samples to assist you and those in your organization with planning for and implementing the academic program review process.

Should questions arise at any time during the planning or implementation of a program review, contact your Dean's representative for academic affairs shown on the next page or the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness.

Georgia Tech's APR process provides an opportunity to examine its academic programs periodically and holistically, and to benefit from the recommendations and observations provided by external reviewers as well as our own students, staff, faculty, and administrators on how we are meeting the goals of our educational mission.

Please feel free to offer your suggestions for improving Georgia Tech's APR process. We would welcome them at any time.

The Office of Academic Effectiveness

Contact Information

INSTITUTE OVERSIGHT

Loraine Phillips, Associate Provost for
Academic Effectiveness
[Primary]
404-385-1419   Mail Code 0741
loraine.phillips@gatech.edu

Sandi Bramblett, Assistant Vice President of
Institutional Research and Enterprise Data Management
[Secondary]
404-894-8874   Mail Code 0530
sandi@gatech.edu

INSTITUTE RESOURCE OFFICES FOR ACADEMIC UNITS

Assessment, Learning Outcomes, ADORS, and Online Assessment Tracking System

Franz Reneau, Director of Assessment
Office of Academic Effectiveness
[Primary]
A. French Building   Mail Code 0741
404-385-2552   franz.reneau@gatech.edu

Loraine Phillips, Associate Provost for
Academic Effectiveness
[Secondary]
404-385-1419   Mail Code 0741
loraine.phillips@gatech.edu

Sue Woolard,   Program Review and Planning Manager, Office of Academic Effectiveness
A. French Building   Mail Code 0741
404-385-1420   sue.woolard@oars.gatech.edu

Institutional Research and Academic Data Portfolio

Sandra Kinney   Senior Director, Institutional Research and Planning
Lyman Hall   Mail Code 0530
404-385-0946   sandra.kinney@irp.gatech.edu

Sandi Bramblett   Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research and Enterprise Data Management
Lyman Hall   Mail Code 0530
404-894-8874   sandi@gatech.edu

COLLEGE CONTACTS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Computing   Dr. Charles Isbell, Jr., Senior Associate Dean and Professor
                       404-895-6491   isbell@cc.gatech.edu

                       Mr. David White, Assistant Dean for Academic Programs
                       404-385-4301   drwhite@cc.gatech.edu

Design   Dr. Michelle Rinehart, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Outreach
                       404-385-1449   michelle.rinehart@design.gatech.edu

Engineering   Dr. Laurence J. Jacobs, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor
                       404-894-2344   laurence.jacobs@coe.gatech.edu

                       Dr. Terri Lee, Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs & Accreditation
                       404-385-3731   terri.lee@gatech.edu

Ivan Allen College   Dr. John Tone, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Professor
of Liberal Arts   404-790-0644   john.tone@iac.gatech.edu

                       Dr. Carol Colatrella, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Professor
                       404-894-1241   carol.colatrella@lmc.gatech.edu

Scheller College   Dr. Saby Mitra, Senior Associate Dean of Programs and Professor
of Business   404-894-4365   saby.mitra@scheller.gatech.edu

                       Mr. Brian Jennings, Associate Dean of MBA Programs and Executive Education
                       404-894-0038   brian.jennings@scheller.gatech.edu

                       Dr. Craig Womack, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs and Associate Professor
                       404-894-2615   craig.womack@scheller.gatech.edu

Sciences   Dr. J. Cameron Tyson, Assistant Dean for Academic Programs
                       404-385-0418   cam.tyson@cos.gatech.edu

Academic Program Review
2019–2020

Table of Contents

Inside Front Cover:
Accreditation Statements (Source: GT Catalog 2016–2017)

End Notes:
GT Academic Program Review Schedule

I. Overview

The purpose of Georgia Tech's Academic Program Review (APR) process is to conduct a strategic evaluation of each academic program approximately every five years. The current schedule of reviews is located at the end of this document.

Academic program reviews also fulfill other internal and external requirements. Among them is the periodic review of undergraduate and graduate programs required by the Board of Regents (BOR)[1] of the University System of Georgia as well as Georgia Tech statutes,[2] and the periodic review of institutional effectiveness required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.[3] Further, for some programs the review may be conducted in conjunction with a specialized or professional accreditation review. Programs accredited by external entities may optimize the external review process to cover that for institutional program review also, provided the external review meets the BOR and institutional requirements for program review.

Academic Program Review involves the following materials and activities:

- preparation of a self-study by the faculty and approved through the college Dean
- visit and review by an external review committee and a written report of the review
- commentary by the Dean of the academic unit in review of the external review committee's report
- review and comment of the APR self-study and associated materials by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development
- a plan developed by the college outlining actions to be taken based on the results of the review
- annual progress report uploaded to the secure www.apr.gatech.edu website

The Office of the Provost, through the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness (APAE) is responsible for assuring a comprehensive program review is scheduled and conducted for each academic program, and that results of the review are reported to internal and external governing offices as required. The Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness serves as the manager for Georgia Tech's APR process, a resource to academic units, and the liaison for reporting results to internal and external offices. The Associate Deans serve as the primary contact within each college for the APR process, and program chairs/directors are responsible for other aspects of the review.

At Georgia Tech, an "academic degree program" may refer to the college itself (e.g., Scheller College of Business), a school within a college (e.g., School of Economics, School of Mechanical Engineering), or a program within a college (e.g., Walter H. Coulter Department of Biomedical

---

[1] The BOR requires a "Comprehensive Program Review" of every undergraduate program at least every seven years and every graduate program at least every ten years. **All newly established programs are to be reviewed no later than seven years following launch.** The review requires: (a) a program self-study that focuses on indicators of program "viability, productivity, and quality;" (b) external review by qualified peers; (c) evaluation of the program review by peers at the institution; and (d) compliance with the institutional effectiveness criteria of SACSCOC.

[2] Georgia Tech statutes (see Faculty Handbook) require a review of all undergraduate and graduate curricula on a periodic basis by the Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Institute Graduate Curriculum Committee.

[3] SACSCOC criteria require that institutions demonstrate adherence to accepted standards of institutional effectiveness in all its operations. Stated simply, SACSCOC requires that reviews such as these be broad-based, focused on assessing student learning, and offer evidence that the program is engaged in a systematic, documented cycle of continuous improvement of all its activities, programs, and services.

Engineering) and all its associated operations at each location. Additionally, it may also be only a single degree program, such as a multi-/interdisciplinary degree program (e.g., Human-Computer Interaction or Algorithms, Combinatorics, and Optimization), a joint degree (e.g., School of Mechanical Engineering's Master of Science degree program with the University of Stuttgart in southern Germany), and a dual-degree (Dual Master's Degree Program in Electrical and Computer Engineering at the School of Information Technologies at the Politecnico di Torino located in Torino, Italy). (Note that in all cases, however, an academic program refers to a degree—not a minor or a certificate program.) Thus, references to "program chair" may mean a School Chair, Program Director, or similar "program" head—essentially, the primary faculty responsible for the oversight of the academic program under review.

These guidelines are intended to provide a framework for completing the program review. Given the diversity of academic programs at Georgia Tech, some elements may need modification to accommodate individual programs. This will be discussed at the initial planning meeting with the college Dean and faculty held prior to the start of the review process.

II. Regional Accreditation Standards and Board of Regents Policy

A. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission of Colleges (SACSCOC) accredits the Georgia Institute of Technology. SACSCOC accreditation <u>applies to the institution as a whole</u>, not just its educational programs. Our most recent decennial accreditation review was completed in 2015. Since 2015, Institute changes that have occurred in our educational program offerings to include distance learning and off campus instructional operations are reported to SACSCOC and the BOR as they occur. As a result, all off-campus instructional sites, academic programs, external offering of existing degree programs or coursework, and distance learning programs (for credit) that have been approved by the Institute governing bodies, the BOR, and SACSCOC since 2015 should be included in each academic unit's program review.

SACSCOC **Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1., Institutional Effectiveness** addresses effectiveness in five (5) institutional areas, four of which are connected directly to educational programs. <u>These should be included in the self-study</u>.

> 3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)
> *3.3.1.1 <u>educational programs</u>, to include student learning outcomes*
> *3.3.1.2 <u>administrative support services</u>*
> *3.3.1.3 <u>academic and student support services</u>*
> *3.3.1.4 <u>research within its educational mission</u>, if appropriate*
> *3.3.1.5 <u>community/public service within its educational mission</u>, if appropriate*

B. In October 2008, the BOR's Office of Academic Affairs released a report titled "Program Review Task Force Report" outlining changes to two policies—BOR Policy 3.6.3 Comprehensive Program Review and the Academic Affairs Handbook 2.3.6, Comprehensive Program Review. The implementation of these changes affected the conduct of program reviews beginning April 2010.

> **The policy changes require institutions to include the following elements as part of the program self-study**:
> 1. Review of USG <u>general education</u> requirements *offered by the academic unit*.
> 2. Establishment and evaluation of <u>goals for the diversity</u> of students, faculty, and staff to include an analysis of meeting the program goals.
> 3. Establish a <u>culture of evidence</u> in that program self-studies include indicators or outcomes are collected, tracked, and analyzed to help determine how to improve the quality of a program.
> 4. <u>On-line programs</u> are to be reviewed by the same review guidelines and criteria.

Additionally, while BOR policy states that specialized or professional accreditation reports may not be substituted in whole for academic program reviews, these reviews may supplement the unit's program review materials. As a matter of practice, a comparative review should be made of the reporting requirements of the specialized or professional accreditation and those of the BOR and SACSCOC *Principles of Accreditation* standard 3.3.1 to ensure that <u>all areas are covered in the self-study</u>. BOR and SACSCOC standards not covered in the review by the professional or specialized program accrediting organization must be included in the unit processes and added to the self-study materials submitted for Institute review. In some cases, the specialized or professional accrediting organization will assist the unit by including these in the review when requested in advance notification.

APR materials are required to be posted to a secured Georgia Tech site in order for designated members of the BOR and USG Office of Academic Affairs to conduct their review of our process and resulting artifacts. The Office of the Provost will receive feedback from the USG office upon the completion of its review.

III. The Academic Program Review Process

A. Overview

The APR can be divided into six parts as described below. An important goal is to finish the complete review process in either the fall or spring semester of the review year so that the Vice Provosts can complete their internal reviews during an academic year and not have the process carry over into the summer months.

1. Planning Meeting by the College Dean and relevant Academic Unit(s)
2. Selection and Approval of the External Reviewers and Confirmation of the Visit Dates
3. Preparation of the Program Self-Study
4. Visit and Written Report by the External Review Committee
5. Closure of the Review with the College Dean and the Office of the Provost
6. Progress Reporting within the Academic Unit, College, and to the Office of the Provost

While academic units are free to choose their own schedule, it is recommended that the self-study is conducted in the summer and fall followed by an external visit in early spring. **Following the Initial Planning Meeting, Program Chairs should decide and then advise the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness of the chosen APR schedule and the name of the person who will serve as the unit point of contact for the APR. Milestones of the APR process are shown on page 9.**

B. The Details

1. *Planning Meeting*
   Each spring semester the schedule of academic programs for review in the coming academic year are reconfirmed with the Associate Deans. Planning meetings with the academic units are subsequently scheduled to include the Dean, Associate Dean(s), program chair(s), Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness, and others as desired by the Dean, to discuss the scope, responsibilities, and schedule of the review. **Each year our goal is to complete this meeting before the end of the spring semester of the preceding year.**

2. *External Reviewers and Visit Dates*
   Among the first actions to be undertaken by the unit is to develop a list of proposed external reviewers and confirm the dates of the review committee's visit.

   The Provost expects program faculty to be actively involved in the selection of the external reviewers. The Dean must approve the list of external reviewers. It is recommended that the initial suggested list have more reviewers than will be needed so that replacements can be invited quickly if needed. The number of reviewers for the visit is to be decided by the College Dean or program chair—four to six reviewers is standard and the recommended minimum for a visit is three. The composition of the review team should ensure that a review of all program disciplines and degree levels will occur. Less than four reviewers should be considered only for focused reviews, such as the review of a multi-/interdisciplinary degree program, otherwise the unit might ultimately find itself in jeopardy of having too few reviewers should some reviewers cancel on short notice. Given the caliber of individuals sought, past experience has shown that at least one reviewer may need to cancel on short notice.

   Other factors to be considered in identifying a list of reviewers are: capability to evaluate undergraduate and graduate curricula and their assessment procedures and practices,

technical expertise in light of the program's research and outreach activities, familiarity with large research universities, administrative experience, diversity, and organizational representation (i.e., industry, government, and academia). While it is expected that many individuals within the program will likely know the reviewers, it is also expected that conflicts of interest should be avoided.

It is strongly preferred that the list of potential external reviewers should be coordinated with the Office of the Provost—if possible providing a brief statement of how faculty were involved in the selection of the reviewers and how the invited reviewers satisfy the various diversity issues related to the unit. To facilitate this request, the Office of the Dean should forward this material to the APAE who will secure the approval of the Vice Provosts and Provost. It is understood that this list is often dynamic and that this coordinating step can be difficult to implement. Therefore, each College should discuss how they will handle this step with the APAE during their planning meeting.

The Dean is responsible for extending invitations to those on the list (see Appendices B and C for suggested letter templates).

In order to ensure the availability of the Provost and Vice Provosts to meet with the external reviewers, the dates of the visit should also be coordinated in advance with their administrative offices. **The College or program is responsible for determining the visit dates of the external review committee, coordinating those dates with the Office of the Provost (and if needed, with the President's Office), coordinating visit arrangements, funding the visit and any associated honorariums, and hosting the reviewers during their visit.**

For professional or specialized accreditation review visits that require an entrance/exit meeting with the president of Georgia Tech or a regent, advance notification to the Office of the President is essential.

In advance of the visit, the itinerary, a biosketch of each reviewer [4] (see Appendix E), and the self-study are to be provided to the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness and uploaded to the www.apr.gatech.edu protected website so that an APR package can be prepared for the Provost and Vice Provosts.

Timely completion of this part, especially setting the external review visit dates, is critical. It largely determines the remainder of the APR schedule. Thus, it is imperative that action on this begin as soon as possible following the planning meeting. Coordinating the calendars of the Provost, Vice Provosts, Dean, program chair, and external reviewers is among the most challenging aspects of the program review process.

3. *Preparation of the Program Self-Study*
   The self-study and its associated support materials are the primary artifacts for the members of your external review committee to prepare for their visit. It is highly recommended that the conduct of the self-study be inclusive of the unit as a whole.

   A copy of the previous self-study will be available to the program chair in addition to a current data portfolio compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP)

---

[4] The full names, titles, and institution/organization are reported to the USG Office of Academic Affairs in an annual report.

at the onset of the program review to aid in the preparation of the self-study. More details for the preparation of the self-study are given in the next section of these guidelines.

The final version of program self-study and its appendices should be uploaded to the APR website (www.apr.gatech.edu) at least two (2) weeks prior to the visit of the external reviewers. There must be evidence that the Dean has reviewed and approved the self-study before it is uploaded. This should be in the form of an email or a transmittal memo (Appendix A).

This is a second critical part in the academic program review. Preparation of the self-study should also begin shortly after the planning meeting. A considerable amount of the self-study can be started while the program chair is waiting for the data profile, or gathering and examining other program data. Ideally, the self-study should be mailed to the external review committee about one month before the visit, but no less than two weeks. A hardcopy and an electronic copy should be provided to the reviewers.

4. *Visit and Written Report by the External Review Committee*
   The visit by the external review committee is typically two or three days. It is recommended that the Dean identify one member of the external review committee to serve as the chair of the committee. The visit schedule is determined by the Dean, program chair, and chair of the external review committee. During the visit, external reviewers should have time to meet with faculty without the unit leadership present. This would allow the reviewers to interact with the faculty in a social and/or informal manner. (A suggested schedule for consideration is outlined in Appendix F.)

   The Provost and Vice Provosts have indicated that they do not need to be included in the welcome/entrance meeting with the dean and external review committee. However, the Provost and the Vice Provosts *will* attend the exit meeting conducted by the external review committee scheduled at the end of their campus visit.

   At the exit meeting, the external review committee will deliver its advisory report orally, which includes findings and recommendations and which may include a PowerPoint presentation. Three weeks following the campus exit meeting, the chair of the external review committee is responsible for the delivery of the committee's written report to the Provost with a copy to the Dean. Delivery of this report is essential to the Institute's internal review by faculty committees and subsequent BOR and accreditation review.

5. *Closure of the Review*
   It is recommended that once the report has been received, the academic unit host a faculty meeting with the Dean to discuss the review. Then, the program chair and Dean, with input from the Provost and the Vice Provosts, should decide what actions are to be taken based on the results from the program review. A written plan summarizing the actions should be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness for review and comment. If desired, the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness can schedule and facilitate a meeting to start the process of defining the action plan. This will be discussed at the initial planning meeting. This initial action plan should be uploaded to the APR secure web site (www.apr.gatech.edu). This will be used by the Office of the Provost—both for accountability of the process as well as a heads up about the need for resource allocation in the future years.

6. *Institute Progress Reporting*

An annual progress report should be uploaded to the APR secure website (www.apr.gatech.edu) by the end of the spring semester each year. It is expected that this will be the result of a discussion between the program chair and the College Dean. The Office of the Provost will use this report to be kept informed about the action plan.

C. Summary of Milestones

APR Schedule	Actions	Responsible Parties
April	Schedule of APRs coordinated and updated with colleges' Associate Deans	APAE
No later than end of Spring	Planning meeting held with Dean, Program Chair, and representative from the Office of the Provost	APAE
Late Summer/ Early Fall	APR schedule provided to GT Executive Board for approval; then note sent to Deans and Vice Provosts with this schedule	APAE
August or as requested by the unit	Data portfolio prepared for and forwarded to unit/college	IRP
September	List of external reviewers forwarded to the APAE	Dean's Office
September	Electronic file with *confirmed* reviewers, biosketches, and visit dates forwarded to the APAE and uploaded	Dean's Office
September to early November	Self-study conducted and report signed off by College Dean	Program Chair, Dean
Mid-November	• Self-study forwarded to APAE and uploaded • The APAE notifies the Provost and Vice Provosts that the APR materials are available on the APR website for review	Dean's Office
December	College advises APAE of the proposed date for external review visit, and unit point of contact for review cycle	Dean's Office
January to mid-March	Visit by external review committee and report by committee of program	Dean's Office
Three weeks following the external committee visit	• The written report of the external review committee received by Provost and Dean • Dean's office to upload copy to APR website	Dean's Office
May	Response to the External Review and Program improvement plan uploaded	Dean's Office
By August	• Follow-up meeting with Provost, Vice-Provosts, APAE, Dean, Associate Deans, and Chair • Summary report of all APRs conducted and posted to internal GT site for access by USG Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Provost	APAE

IV. Self-Study

The primary audience for the self-study is the external review committee. The self-study should be a forthright evaluation of the academic program under review. The purpose of the self-study is not to bias the external review committee in any one direction but rather to present an honest appraisal of the current state of the program and the plans for the future. The school/program chair is encouraged to review the following materials prior to starting the self-study:

- previous academic program self-study, external review committee report, and action plans
- specialized accreditation review reports (if applicable)
- On-line Assessment Tracking System (OATS)
- data portfolio forwarded by Institutional Research and Planning

The self-study should be organized into the following sections and divided into subsections as appropriate. Additional sections may be added as decided by the school/program chair. The bulk of the report should be in sections A-E and I. The other sections should primarily report highlights of a few points that support section I, with details left for the appendices. The data should primarily be presented in the data portfolio appendix with only pertinent information being repeated in the body of the report.

A. Executive Summary

The executive summary is presented by the academic unit's leadership to note significant and noteworthy results that have occurred since the last program review as well as to add thoughts on the outcomes of the self-study. The executive summary provides the opportunity for the unit leadership to communicate information to the external reviewers that will help establish the goals for and focus of the upcoming on-site review of the academic unit.

B. Overview of the Program

This section describes the programs in terms of their role and placement within the Institute, connection to the institutional mission, and stature within its peer community. Major recent events that may have a significant bearing on the future direction of the programs should be considered for inclusion here.

C. Vision and Strategic Direction

A summary of the vision and strategic direction for the unit's programs should be presented in this section. Explicit reference should be made to the unit's and/or Institute's strategic plan as it has guided departmental planning and decision-making. The unit's strategic plan could be made available to the external review committee by including it as an appendix to this self-study.

D. Actions in Response to Recommendations of the Previous Self-study and External Review Committee Report

This section includes each of the recommendations of the previous self-study and external review committee report along with the unit's follow-up actions, any resulting program improvements, and documented student academic achievements as a result of those improvements.

E. Programs, General Education Curriculum, and Institutional Effectiveness

The "viability, productivity, and quality" of the academic program under review is to be addressed and discussed in the self-study—this includes instruction by video, distance learning technologies, and at each campus location or site outside of GT Atlanta.

A key portion of the preparation of the self-study process is the examination of multiple years of internally collected data for the academic program. That examination may include review and analysis of information provided in the data portfolio. Some of it may come from program assessment data stored in OATS. Regardless, the preparation of the self-study of educational programs should include:

1) a review of each relevant major program and minor as well as each certificate program included in the program;
2) an overview of each undergraduate and graduate assessment plans,[5] findings reported as a part of annual assessment updates, discernable trends, and improvements implemented based on assessment results are key elements of the review;
3) a description and assessment of all courses offered by the unit that are approved by the BOR as Georgia Tech's General Education requirements;[6] and,
4) a review of the unit's/college's diversity goals to include how goals were met and/or are being addressed by the unit.

Underlying the idea of conducting a successful program review is to identify areas for improvement (to include those within academic support and service areas), describe the actions necessary to make those improvements, and then review and assess our success in achieving the stated outcomes of the improvements.

F. Research and Scholarship

The research activities and accomplishments associated with the unit's program should be presented in this section to include evidence to support the impact of research and scholarship. Among the areas to consider are the research areas and directions, distribution and nature of research support, facilities, support personnel, quality of research, and faculty and student scholarship and leadership in their fields. Include examples that would serve as evidence to support the impact of research and scholarship in the materials.

G. Economic Development and Community/Public Service

The program's contributions to economic development as well as its outreach, such as to pre-college students, non-traditional students, and practicing professionals should be discussed in this section to include evidence to support the impact of economic development and service. Among the areas to consider are contributions to patents, invention disclosures, new products and services, start-up companies, and consulting and technical advisement, as well as pre-college recruitment or awareness programs, off-campus degree programs, and continuing education and short courses. With regard to community/public service, include activities that relate to the educational experience and involve the unit's faculty, undergraduates, and graduate students. Include examples that would serve as evidence of efforts in these areas.

H. Organization and Facilities

A description and state of each program's leadership and administrative organization should be presented in this section. Include findings that affect the success of the program as related to the unit's organization.

Program facilities include assigned and allocated space of all instructional facilities both on and off the GT Atlanta campus at which educational programs of the unit are offered and/or delivered.

---

[5] SACSCOC, Standard 3.3.1, Institutional Effectiveness

[6] SACSCOC Standard 3.5.1, College-level competencies and BOR Policy Manual 3.3.1, Core Curriculum

This area may include overarching issues that do not neatly fall into the educational and research missions of the program. Consideration may be given to address the adequacy of Institute facilities as well as academic support and service offices essential to the academic unit fulfilling its educational mission as it relates to the program in review; however, this should not be seen simply as an opportunity to get outside groups to lobby the administration for more resources for facilities.

I. Future Opportunities

This section should summarize future opportunities in education, research, and outreach as a result of this self-study, and how the academic unit presently plans to address them. This section should state the goals and vision of where the academic program expects to be going between the present and the next program review. This is a key section of the report as it sets the tone of the future movement of the program.

J. Additional Supporting Materials/Appendices

Additional materials in support of the self-study should be included in this section. The data portfolio should be the first appendix. Other appendices could include the program strategic plan, annual reports, advisory committee studies or reports, recruitment material, development reports, related program web material, and student, faculty, and staff handbooks. If some of the material is too lengthy to include, then it is suggested that it be listed here with the web links.

V. The External Review

A. The Visit

The schedule below is typical for external reviews that are <u>not</u> conducted as part of a professional or specialized accreditation review.[7] Day One is typically a travel day for the reviewers and a business dinner meeting to outline and start the review. Day Two is a full day of meetings with the college leadership, program leadership, faculty, students, and administrators that includes a tour of the program/Institute facilities. See Appendix F for a detailed sample itinerary plan for the visit.

Day One

Arrival and hotel check-in.

Business dinner meeting hosted by the Dean to welcome the reviewers, provide the charge to the committee, discuss the review and deliverables, and re-confirm the schedule. This dinner meeting does not need to include the Provost and the Vice Provost. This is a time for the review committee to meet with the Dean and program faculty.

Day Two

Program review(s) begins. Among the meetings and events to plan are:
   a. An overview of the program(s) by the chair.
   b. Faculty introduction and meetings—allow for both individual and group times.
      1) Reserved office/meeting space should be made available throughout Day Two to allow a location for faculty wishing to meet individually with reviewers.
   c. Discussion time with principals involved with undergraduate and graduate programs, research programs, and outreach efforts.
   d. Both morning and afternoon meeting times will enable undergraduate and graduate students to have the opportunity to interact with the reviewers.
   e. A reception at a time conducive for faculty, staff, and students to interact with the reviewers without college/school/program leadership.
      1) Advanced and broadcasted announcement of the date, time, and location will help to ensure strong attendance at this event.

In the evening, time should be allowed for the review committee to draft its recommendations and prepare for the next day's exit meeting.

Day Three

Review concludes with morning time for the committee to revisit its comments and recommendations.
   a. The exit meeting should be scheduled at a time convenient to the Provost/representative, Vice Provost, Dean, and others as decided by the Provost and the Dean.
   b. An oral report and/or presentation are desired at the exit meeting on campus.
   c. A written report is to be submitted to the college dean or the Provost if the college is the unit being reviewed, three weeks following the campus report.
   d. If there is time on Day Two for the review committee to draft its written report, then adjournment can be by noon on the third day. Other schedules include freeing up the morning of Day Three for this task and then closing by mid-afternoon.

---

[7] Academic units being reviewed by a professional or specialized accrediting organization should follow the protocols of that organization.

B. The Written Report

When possible, the external review committee should draft its written report on the evening of Day Two along with its oral presentation for the next day's exit meeting with the Provost, Dean, and selected leaders. Day Three concludes with two morning sessions: time for the committee to finalize its recommendations and possibly meet with the Dean; and then a meeting to present the recommendations to the Provost, Vice Provosts, Dean, and others as determined by the Office of the Provost and the Dean. If additional review time is needed to complete the review by the external committee, the afternoon of Day Three could be scheduled for the exit meeting.

Three weeks following the visit, the chair of the external review committee is to provide the committee's written report to the Provost with a copy to the Dean (or as decided at the exit meeting) containing comments on and recommendations for the reviewed academic programs.

C. Closing the Loop: The Action Plan

The Dean should provide a written response to the report and forward that to the Provost with a copy to APAE, and upload it to the secure www.apr.gatech.edu website. Each College should determine a process that involves the faculty of the Unit to determine and work on an action plan based on the Academic Program Review and External Review report. One potential process is outlined in Appendix G. If a College chooses to develop an alternative process, it should alert the APAE with documentation of that process. This will be discussed at the initial planning meeting.

Any such alternative process should include, at a minimum, the following components:
- Leadership by the School Chair
- Involvement of the Faculty of the School
- Oversight by and Accountability to the College Dean
- Initial and annual Communication to the Office of the Provost

The Office of the Provost is available to assist the Dean in this important work.

VI. Appendices

A. Self-study Transmittal Sheet

A Word file of the completed APR self-study and its appendices, and a .PDF of the signature Sheet should be sent to the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness and uploaded at http://www.apr.gatech.edu.

The Dean's Office will compile all APR materials and provide to the Office of the Provost.
.

<div align="center">[Dean's Letterhead]</div>

MEMORANDUM

To: Rafael L. Bras
        Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: [Dean's Name]
        [Office]

Re: APR Self-study for [Program Name]

Date: [Date]

cc: [Program Chair/Director]
        [Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness]

The attached self-study is submitted for your review and comment. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me [or name of program contact, if appropriate].

Reviewed and approved:

_____
[Name, Title—School Chair or Program Director]

_____
[Name, Title—College Dean]

Note: Include as many signature lines as appropriate, particularly for programs involving more than one school and/or college.

B. Sample Invitation Letter

[Dean's Letterhead]

Dear [Name]:

Greetings from the College/School of [as appropriate]. The [College/School] is conducting its five-year academic program review for the [name(s) of program(s)] this fall. The primary purpose of our program review is to conduct a strategic evaluation of the [College/School] and its programs by evaluating our overall effectiveness.

My purpose in writing to you is to invite you to serve on the [School/Program] External Review Committee. The external review committee plays a valuable role by providing insight that is useful in developing future strategies.

As a member of the review committee, we would ask you to visit the campus beginning with an evening dinner, followed by a day of meetings with the Dean/Chair, faculty, staff, students, research directors, and others. That evening and the following morning would be time for the committee to draft its written report and prepare an oral presentation of your findings and recommendations. Following the oral presentation at the exit meeting in the morning will be scheduled departures by noon of the third day. Within a couple of weeks of your visit, you would send the committee's written report to me. In addition, you would receive an honorarium of $[as determined] in appreciation for your time and service.

The School is scheduled to complete its self-study in [month/year] and that along with other pertinent materials would be sent to you in advance of your visit for preparation. We would like to schedule your visit in [month/year], ideally beginning [day of week and date], and concluding [day of week and date]. I greatly value your insights and opinions, and hope you can serve on the review committee at that time.

I have enclosed a [brochure/materials] to provide some background information on the [College/School]. Thank you for considering this invitation, and please give me a call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Dean's Signature Block]

C. Sample Confirmation Letter
Note: The letter assumes a schedule that begins with business dinner on Day One.

[Dean's Letterhead]

Dear [Name]:

We are very pleased that you will be able to serve on the External Visiting Review Committee for [School/Program] on [dates] at Georgia Tech. Your advice and insight will have a great impact in guiding our [School's] future path. The members of the committee include [provide names, titles, and institution].

The review visit will begin on [date] with [highlight of Day One]. Day Two of the review visit, the committee will meet with our faculty and staff as well as undergraduate and graduate students. At the end of the day, you will have a group dinner so that you may compare notes and draft your written report. On [date] the committee will present its findings in an oral presentation for the exit meeting on [date] which will include [names or titles: Dean, Provost, and Vice Provost] at [time]. The committee's final written report should be sent to the Provost with a copy to me by [date].

[Person's name and contact information] will assist you in making travel plans, reserve your hotel room, and help you with arrangements for your visit to Georgia Tech. In addition, we will reimburse you for travel expenses related to this review visit. Also, we will provide you with an honorarium of [amount, if wish to include] in appreciation for your service.

The program(s) self-study and associated materials will be sent to you no later than [date]. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to call me [phone] or send e-mail [e-mail address] should you have questions concerning the review.

Thank you again for your willingness to serve on this committee.

Sincerely,

[Signature/Block of the Dean]

D. Sample Pre-visit Letter to External Reviewer

[Dean's Letterhead]

Dear [Name]:

Thank you again for participating in the evaluation of [School, Program] at Georgia Tech. Enclosed is the itinerary and self-study for your visit as well as contact information for [person's name] who will assist with your travel plans, hotel room, and other arrangements regarding your visit. A copy is also available electronically from our secure Web site at [link]. If you have questions about the self-study, difficulties accessing it, or wish to receive any other materials, please contact [name of contact, title, number, e-mail address].

Allow me to summarize again the context for the visit and some important questions we would like you to consider. The APR is an Institute process in which we conduct a strategic evaluation of each academic program every five years. In addition to helping the Institute assess its strategic progress, the reviews are also used to satisfy several internal and external requirements. Among them are the periodic review of the program chair, the periodic review of the undergraduate and graduate programs required by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and Georgia Tech statutes, and the periodic review of institutional effectiveness required by our regional accreditation organization, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. [Note: Delete chair review if not applicable] As you can see, you will be helping us address a number of areas, and, most importantly, providing your insight on how to ensure that [School, Program name(s)] is moving in the right direction.

We would like for you to provide an oral exit report of your observations and comments on [date], and also send your [committee's, if the Chair] written report [date that is three weeks after the campus review]. I ask that in your report to cover each area as outlined in the self-study materials as well as any additional findings you wish to include. In addition, we would like you to consider three overarching sets of questions. The questions [tailor these questions to your program] are:

1) Is the program pursuing appropriate strategic directions and, if so, how well are they achieving them? Are there unique opportunities the program should be exploring more fully? Are there areas being pursued that are not contributing substantially to the overall objectives of the program and the college?

2) Does the program have effective administrative structures, staffing, and leadership? Are fiscal and physical resources well aligned with and being fully utilized toward the program's strategic directions?

3) Does the program have high quality undergraduate and graduate programs, and effective assessment processes to assure their continued effectiveness?

Sincerely,

[Signature/Block of Dean]

Enclosures:
1. Visit Itinerary
2. Self-Study
3. [Title of Other Materials]

E. Sample External Reviewer Biosketch – provide for each reviewer

MICHAEL A. MARLETTA

Chair, Department of Chemistry
Aldo DeBendictis Distinguished Professor
Joel Hildebrand Distinguished Professor
University of California, Berkeley
570 Stanley Hall
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-1460
Voice: (510) 666-2763-Office
(510) 666-2766
Fax: (510) 666-2765
E-Mail: marletta@berkeley.edu

Biographical Sketch

Dr. Marletta, Distinguished Professor, received his A.B. (1973) at the State University College, Fredonia, New York and Ph.D. (1978) at the University of California, San Francisco. Dr. Marletta has been a Professor of Chemistry and Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at the University of California, Berkeley since 2001. Dr. Marletta received the Outstanding Achievement Award at the State University of New York College at Fredonia in 1993, is a Fellow with the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and received the American Chemical Society's Repligen Award in Chemistry of Biological Processes in 2007.

Research in Professor Marletta's research group is focused on structure/function relationships in proteins with a particular emphasis on the catalytic and biological properties of redox enzymes. Research questions are being answered using both the tools of chemistry and molecular and structural biology.

F. Sample Itinerary for External Review Visit

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SCHOOL OF _____
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

SUMMARY SCHEDULE for [dates of visit]

College Point of Contact: [name, title, phone number, email]

OBJECTIVES OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

1) *[Insert objective of the review]*
2) *[Insert objective of the review]*
3) *[Insert objective of the review]*

Day of Week, Date
6:30 p.m.   Meet in [location] to travel as a group to dinner

7:30 p.m.   Dinner: Overview of Visit and Charge to the Visiting Review Committee
                 [Restaurant Information and Transportation Arrangements]

                 Visiting Committee
                 - *[name, title, affiliation] – Committee Chair*
                 - *[name, title, affiliation]*
                 - *[name, title, affiliation]*
                 - *[name, title, affiliation]*

                 Georgia Tech
                 - *[name], Dean, College*
                 - *[name], Chair, School*
                 - *[name], Associate Dean, College*

Day of Week, Date

7:45 a.m.	Meet [location] for Transportation to Campus
8:00 a.m.	Breakfast [during overview]
8:15 a.m.– 9:00 a.m.	Overview of the Program [name], Chair, School of ___
9:00 a.m.– 9:30 a.m.	Tour of Instructional Facilities [names, titles]
9:30 a.m.–10:15 a.m.	Tour of Research [or other educational] Facilities [as appropriate] [names, titles]
10:15 a.m.–10:30 a.m.	Break
10:30 a.m.–11:00 a.m.	Undergraduate Program(s) [name], Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies (or equivalent)

F. Sample Itinerary for External Review Visit – continued

11:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.	Graduate Program(s) [name], Associate Chair for Graduate Studies (or equivalent)
11:30 a.m.–12:15 p.m.	Meet with Undergraduate and Graduate Students [Recommend these be two separate meetings to allow for better discussion]
12:15 p.m.– 1:15 p.m.	Lunch [may be committee-only or with a small number of school faculty, key staff, or students and not include the school chair or college leadership]
1:15 p.m.– 2:15 p.m.	Meet with Assistant Professors [names, titles]
2:15 p.m.– 3:15 p,m.	Meet with Associate Professors [names, titles]
3:15 p.m.– 3:45 p.m.	Break
3:45 p.m.– 4:45 p.m.	Meet with Professors [names, titles]
4:45 p.m.– 5:15 p.m.	Discussion by Review Committee alone
5:15 p.m.– 5:45 p.m.	Wrap-Up Meeting [name[, Chair, School of _____
5:45 pm	Adjourn – Committee Members Return to Hotel via [Transportation]
6:30 pm	External Review Committee Working Dinner Location to be determined by Committee

Day of Week, Date

	Breakfast in [location] and transportation to meeting
9:30 a.m.–11:30 a.m.	External Review Committee meeting [location, room number]
11:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.	External Review Committee Lunch [location]
1:00 p.m.– 2:00 p.m. *times as fits schedules of Provost and Dean	External Review Committee Exit Report [location] • Rafael L. Bras, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs • [name], Dean, College • [name], Associate Dean, College • Colin Potts, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education • Bonnie Ferri, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development • Loraine Phillips, Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness • *[name], Chair, School of _____ [optional]*
2:30 pm	Adjournment and Departure Transportation arranged as needed for each reviewer

G. Sample Process for Feedback Loop Following Receipt of the External Review Report

The default facilitator of this process is the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness. Where appropriate (see Step 3 below), this will be handed off to a different Vice Provost (or delegate). The facilitator's job is to ensure that the process is followed, that feedback is given and action is taken as deemed appropriate by the reviewed unit—the driver of the action plan is the unit Chair and their Dean.

1. External report is received by the unit.

2. The report is reviewed by the Provost, Dean of the appropriate College, and Chair of the reviewed unit.

3. The Dean meets with the Chair to discuss responses.

4. The Dean visits a faculty meeting for a "read out" discussion of the report and responds to questions.

5. An initial plan of action is uploaded to the secure website and shared with the APAE.

6. The APAE calls a meeting of the Dean, Program Chair, Provost, Vice Provosts, and others as requested by the Dean and Program Chair. At this meeting, the Chair and Dean will propose what actions they expect to take in response to the report. It is at this point that it might be suggested that a different facilitator be appointed (if most of the action plan is around the undergraduate curriculum then it makes sense that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education shepherd the rest of the process, for example).

7. It is then up to the Dean and the Chair to work out a calendar and schedule of carrying out this action plan. The facilitator is available to assist and to provide feedback along the way.

8. A report is uploaded to the secure website each spring semester.

9. The facilitator keeps the Provost and other Vice Provosts informed at appropriate intervals.

10. The outcomes of the action plan are submitted as part of the next self-study.

Notes:

H. Academic Program Review Schedule

2019-2020 Academic Program Review

College of Design (COD)

2019-2020	City & Regional Planning	MSGIST	Master of Science	Master of Science in Geographic Information Science and Technology

College of Sciences (COS)

2019-2020		BSAPHY	Bachelors	Bachelor of Science in Applied Physics
2019-2020		BSPHYS	Bachelors	Bachelor of Science in Physics
2019-2020	Physics	MSPHYS	Master of Science	Master of Science in Physics
2019-2020		DR	Doctorate	Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Physics
2019-2020		BSBIO	Bachelors	Bachelor of Science in Biology
2019-2020		MSBIO	Master of Science	Master of Science in Biology
2019-2020	Biological Sciences	DR	Doctorate	Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Applied Physiology
2019-2020		DR	Doctorate	Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Biology

Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts (IAC)

2019-2020		BSHTS	Bachelors	Bachelor of Science in History, Technology, and Society
2019-2020	History and Sociology	MSHSTS	Master of Science	Master of Science in History and Sociology of Technology and Science
2019-2020		DR	Doctorate	Doctor of Philosophy with a major in History and Sociology of Technology and Science

Interdisciplinary

2019-2020	**COE**;* COB; COC	MSANLT	Master of Science	Master of Science in Analytics

* taking lead in APR

Academic Program Review Schedule (as of February 2019)

Note: Unless otherwise noted, all certificate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs no matter the instructional delivery method or location are to be included in the unit's academic program review.

Review Year	College of Computing	College of Design	College of Engineering	Ivan Allen College	Scheller College of Business	College of Sciences	Interdisciplinary
2018–2019	• Computer Science (MS, PhD)	• City & Regional Planning (MCRP) [PAB]	• Electrical and Computer Engineering [all] [include PMSEE] • Materials Science and Engineering [all] • PMASE [COE; PE]	• History and Sociology (all) [postponed to 2019–2020]		• Biological Sciences [postponed to 2019–2020]	• Robotics (PhD) [**COC**; COE]
2019–2020		• CRP—Geographic Information Science and Technology (MS)		• History and Sociology (all)		• Biological Sciences: - Biology (BS, MS, PhD) - Applied Physiology (PhD) • Physics (all)	• Analytics (MS) [**COE**; COC; SCoB]
2020–2021 ABET-COE		• Building Construction (MSBCFM, PhD)	• Biomedical Engineering (all) • Civil & Environmental Engineering (all)	• Literature, Media, & Communication (all)	• Business [AACSB] [All programs]	• Earth & Atmospheric Sciences (all)	• Bioengineering (MS; PhD) [**COE**; COD; COC; COS; Emory] • Bioinformatics (MS) [**COS**; COC; COE • Cybersecurity (MS) [**COC**; COE; IAC] • Quantitative Computational Finance (MS) [**SCB**; COE; COS]
2021–2022 ABET CS,CM	• Computer Science (BS) [ABET]	• M-ARCH (NAAB) • Industrial Design [all] • Music [all] [BS 1st Review]	• Aerospace Engineering [all] • Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering [all]	• Modern Languages [BSALIS, BSGEML, BSIAML]		• Quantitative Biosciences (PhD) [BIOS;CHEM;EAS; MATH;PHYS;PSYC]	• Computational Media (BS) [ABET] [**COC**; IAC] • Statistics (MS) [**COE**; COS] • Professional Masters in Manufacturing Leadership (MS) [**COE**; COB; PE] [1st Review-tentative]
2022–2023	• Human-Centered Computing [PhD]	• Architecture (MS, PhD) • Building Construction (MRED; PMOSH — 1st Review-tentative) • City & Regional Planning (PhD) • Urban Design (MS) [**ARCH**, CRP]	• Industrial & Systems Engineering [all] • Mechanical Engineering [all]	• Economics [all]		• Chemistry & Biochemistry [all] • Mathematics [all] • Psychology [all]	• Algorithms, Combinatorics & Optimization (PhD) [**COS**; COC; COE] • Computational Science & Engineering [MS, PhD] [**CoC**, CoE, CoS] • Human-Computer Interaction (MS) [**COC**;COD;COS;IAC] • Neuroscience (BS) [**COS**; COE; COC] • Ocean Science & Engineering (PhD) [**COS**; COE] [1st Review- tentative]
2023–2024	• Computer Science (MS, PhD)	• Architecture (BS)	• Electrical and Computer Engineering [all] [include PMSEE] • Materials Science and Engineering [all] • PMASE [COE; PE]	• International Affairs [all]			• Machine Learning (PhD [**COC**; COE; COS] [1st Review-tentative]

† To be decided: **Lead** College responsible for the completion of the APR self-study and external review.