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**I. Purpose**

SUNY Oswego has developed a process for academic program review to encourage academic excellence that enhances the learning climate for our students. This system reflects and is consistent with SUNY academic policy. This academic program review is designed to evaluate all academic programs not already subject to review by an established accrediting body. Its goals are to assess and enhance department or program quality, and to assist the institution in planning, setting priorities, and allocating resources.

A rolling schedule of reviews has been established by the Provost, Vice President of Academic Affairs. Each departmental major or interdisciplinary program will be reviewed at five-year intervals although, under certain circumstances, this interval may vary. The departments or programs scheduled for completion in a given academic year will be notified no later than the spring semester prior to the academic year in which the review is to be completed. The program self-study should be completed by the end of the semester prior to the planned visit of the external review team.

The program review process is composed of six parts: (1) preparation of a self-study by the department or program; (2) preparation of an Executive Summary of the self-study; (3) site visit by a panel of external reviewers and submission of their report; (4) preparation of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the next 5 years based on the self-study and the external reviewers’ report; (5) approval and archiving of the MOU by the Provost; and (6) annual review of progress on the MOU.

It is important to focus the review of the academic unit on critical questions affecting the academic stature of the unit *since the last self-study* and its future prospects.

A description of the review process, outlining general questions and requirements follows. The Dean will discuss any special issues to be addressed with the department Chair or program Director. The Chair or Director will be invited to propose additional topics to be included in the review.

**II. Self-Study**

The self-study has the dual purpose of involving the faculty in a critical analysis of all aspects of the department—undergraduate and graduate (if relevant) programs, especially assessment of student learning outcomes, scholarship, service, student learning environment, recruiting and retention of students, continuing faculty development—and of informing the reviewers about the department.

To ensure broad departmental involvement, the Chair will inform the department of the review and solicit input from the faculty on questions and issues to be addressed in the self-study. The Chair (or designee) will be responsible for:

* completion of the self-study
* providing copies for binding by the deans’ office
* soliciting and scheduling the external review team
* preparing the Executive Summary for the Provost and Dean by the end of the semester prior to the planned visit of the external review team
* preparing the MOU

Members of the department will be given at least one week to read the completed document before it is submitted to the Dean. Although it is expected that the self-study will represent a diversity of views, anyone wishing to provide alternative views on material or conclusions may add them as a signed statement at the end of the appendices.

A copy of the self-study draft will be supplied to the Dean by January before spring of the completion year for review. The Dean may require revision before releasing the self-study to the reviewers. The self-study should analyze several discrete areas including: faculty profile, student demographics, success in meeting student learning outcomes as indicated by assessment data, effectiveness in teaching, scholarly ability, effectiveness in university service, and continuing growth. The relative space allotted to these and other topics will vary by department but each should appear in the narrative and/or be developed in an appendix as set forth in the "Guide for the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs” (2012) developed by University Faculty Senate.

The narrative section should provide an overview of the *current state* of the department and its *current and prospective opportunities and challenges*. It should be limited to twenty-five pages, excluding attachments.

Raw data and other evidence (to be included as appendices) should include the following (some of this data will be made available by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment):

1. Faculty curriculum vitae, including rank and tenure status, educational and employment background, professional affiliations and activities, awards and honors, publications, presentations or performances at professional meetings and at other institutions, brief description of current scholarly projects;
2. Summary of faculty activity for the past five years; brief appraisal of the most significant projects;
3. List of other professional and support staff;
4. Summary of personnel changes for past five years;
5. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course descriptions from the current college catalog, noting the department’s courses oriented towards majors, non-majors, service to other majors; and towards participation in the General Education Program, Service Learning, Internships, support of teacher preparation, interdisciplinary programs, Honors Program, and other college-wide programs;
6. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course offerings over the past five years, including addition and deletion of course offerings (with rationale for such additions and deletions, if available);
7. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course enrollments, numbers of majors and minors, number of degrees awarded, for each of past five years;
8. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) faculty/student workload (headcount and FTE), past five years;
9. Assessment of student learning outcomes including: assessment plan(s), annual assessment reports from the previous five years, relevant assessment data, etc.;
10. Summaries of student course evaluation data, past five years;
11. Data reflecting undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) student profile and quality:
* Academic profile of majors: average cumulative GPA and major GPA of majors; number of full-time and part-time student majors; and retention rates for majors.
* Composition/distribution of student majors with respect to age, gender, race and ethnicity.
* List of positions and places of employment of department/program’s students who received degrees in the past five years, and earlier graduates who have gained positions of significance within or without the academic discipline of the program.
1. List of major professional activities sponsored by the department in the last five years, e.g. special colloquia, conferences, seminars, workshops;
2. Comparative data for relative departments at peer institutions with a selection from other SUNY comprehensives and non-SUNY institutions.

**III. Site Visit: Review Team**

The *charge of the external review team* is to evaluate the overall state of the department/program and to assess its future needs. Where appropriate, the review team will make suggestions for improvement.

As part of the site visit, the team will assess the accuracy of the self-study; interview faculty and students, both to understand their perspectives on the department and assess the state of their morale; examine facilities; review student work; discuss with administrators the unit’s role in fulfilling the overall mission of the institution, and ascertain the institution’s commitment to the department’s programs and its financial, physical, and personnel resources. The key questions posed for the self-study will provide the basis for the evaluation team’s review. The deans’ office will ensure access to a college catalog as well as other material the reviewers may require in order to evaluate the program.

The unit being reviewed will send the external reviewers in electronic format: (1) the self-study, (2) vitae of the program’s full-time faculty, (3) syllabi (core courses; others as requested), (4) assessment reports; (5) Appendix B Guide for Reviewers; and other items as requested.

**Electronic copies of vitae for the external reviewers, self-studies and executive summaries should also be sent to the Dean’s secretary.**

**Selection and Composition of the Evaluation Team**

The Chair will solicit possible external reviewers (i.e., ask for availability and vitae) from people in the discipline.

"...[E]xternal review teams should consist of not less than two (2) persons who have no academic, professional or other significant relationship to full-time faculty in the program/department, no previous significant or formal affiliation with the institution, AND WHO COME FROM ACADEMIC OR PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS BELONGING TO A PEER OR ASPIRATIONAL PEER GROUP (EQUIVALENT TO BEING IN THE SAME CARNEGIE CLASS AND HAVING SIMILAR PROGRAM SIZE, SCOPE AND STATISTICAL, OR PERCEIVED REPUTATIONAL, RANKING).   Emphasis (capitalization) added. "Item IV. External Review Team Report" of the SUNY "Guidelines for the Implementation of Campus-Based Assessment of the Major (Revision: August 12, 2003)."

To ensure the fairness and impartiality of the review, persons with close professional relationships to members of the department—including current research collaborations, current and prior co-author relationships, and previous teacher-student relationships—will normally be excluded from the team.

After review by program faculty, and agreement on possible evaluators, vitae of those preferred, at least two, ideally three, will be forwarded electronically to the Dean for review no later than January 31. After review of the vitae and consultation with the department, the Dean will either concur with the choices or make suggestions to the chair.

Once agreement on the evaluators is reached, the Chair will contact evaluators to confirm, discuss what generally is expected of them, share the program review guidelines, and secure at least two sets of dates for the campus visit. Both evaluators must be on campus at the same time and the days of visit must be any two days Monday through Friday. (Because of travel issues, evaluators may arrive/leave on a weekend if needed.)

*Formal invitations to the external review team will be extended by the Dean’s office once the dates of the visit have been confirmed by the chair/director. The Dean’s secretary also includes the W9 or BU8, Institutional Strategic Plan, Mission, and Goals, CLAS Mission and Goals, and link to the undergraduate (and graduate, as applicable) catalog(s).*

**IV. Site Visit: Arrangements**

The dates and arrangements for the site visit will be handled by the office of the relevant Chair, in consultation with the Dean’s and Provost’s secretaries. The schedule for the visit will be determined by the host department after checking on availability of Dean and Provost. In general the department will plan the visitors’ schedule with provost, dean, faculty, students, non-teaching professionals, and will submit a proposed schedule to the dean at least one week prior to the official invitation being sent. The schedule should include at least one focus group with students.

Department secretaries are responsible for setting up the itinerary for the review team, arranging lodging, informing reviewers of reimbursement procedures for their travel costs, and processing travel reimbursement forms. The Dean’s Office pays for lodging and will requisition $500 honorariums.

The external reviewers will have an initial meeting with both the Provost and Dean. This meeting may be joint or separate, according to the schedules and wishes of the Provost and Dean. (As stated above, an Executive Summary must be delivered to the Provost and Dean at the end of the semester prior to the planned visit by the external review team.)

The site visit will end with an exit interview with the Provost and/or the Dean. This meeting may be joint or separate. *Toward the end of the second day and prior to the exit interview, the evaluation team will be given several hours to prepare an initial draft or outline of their report.* This draft could be used as the basis for the team’s initial evaluation to be given at the exit interview. The final written report will normally be submitted within ***four weeks*** of the team’s visit.

**Site Visit Report**

The site visit report is a crucial element of the College’s evaluation of the department/program and must be objective, complete, accurate, and specific. Using the self-study, the Guide for Reviewers (appendix B), and any specific items in the directions to the team, the report should evaluate the unit’s effectiveness in defining and fulfilling its mission, evaluate its strengths and challenges, and assess, in detail, the state of all important components and functions. The evaluation team must identify whether they will write the report jointly or assign a single member with this responsibility. The report should be a single document, and should be submitted electronically to the Provost and Dean within three-to-six weeks after the site visit.

**Follow-up Procedure**

Upon receiving the report, the Chair will acknowledge the receipt of the report and send letters of appreciation to the review team.

The department chair or program director will share the report with all faculty of the department/program. Any glaring errors should be reported to the evaluators and if necessary the evaluators will make a revision of their report.

Once a final report of the evaluators is accepted by the department/program, evaluators should send a copy to the dean (this will be communicated to them in their invitation letter). The Dean may also identify errors or omissions and ask for them to be corrected, directly to the external reviewers or via the Chair, and will assure that a final and corrected copy of the report is forwarded to the Provost.

As an important component of the campus assessment program, findings from the report should be incorporated into planning within the academic department (course and curriculum improvement) and within the School and/or College (administrative support and campus-wide planning).

The Dean and Department Chair should meet within two weeks of the receipt of the report to discuss issues and priorities, and discuss the process for drafting the MOU. ***A Memorandum of Understanding focusing on the next five to six years will be prepared by the department based on the self-study, the evaluators’ report, the assessment data, and the discussion with the Dean. The MOU will be submitted to the Dean and the Provost by November 1 following the spring evaluator’s visit.*** The Dean and chair will discuss the MOU and the Dean will either approve or ask for modification, before forwarding to the Provost for final approval.

Periodic review of progress will occur annually by the Department Chair and the Dean.

Copies of the Self-Study, External Reviewers’ Report, and MOU will be housed in the department, Dean’s Office, and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, will be reviewed annually with the Dean, and will inform discussions of resource allocation in ensuing years.

**Appendix A: Common Questions Addressed in the Self-Study**

These questions are provided as a guide for the narrative sections of the self-study.

***Overview***

What are the major strengths of the unit? What are its major concerns? What challenges does it face in the immediate future and over the next five to ten years? How do the activities of the department contribute to the larger mission of the institution?

***Faculty***

* What changes are anticipated in the faculty for the next several years? What new positions or replacement positions have been authorized? What reductions, if any, are foreseen? How do these changes affect the department’s direction and its ability to fulfill its mission?
* How does the faculty’s range of interests compare with the breadth covered in typical peer departments? If disciplinary groupings of faculty in the department are identifiable, what working relationships exist among them and what procedures ensure communication? Are there major research/scholarly foci within the department or program?
* How effective is the faculty’s teaching? What procedures are there for evaluating the quality of instruction? What consideration is given to the quality of teaching in the granting of tenure, promotions, or discretionary salary increases?
* How well does the department distribute responsibility for teaching, scholarship, service, advising and other activities that contribute to the health of the College across faculty?
* What role, if any, do faculty, other than the Chair or program Director, have in determining departmental objectives or policies? How do they participate in departmental governance, including deciding intra-departmental budget allocations and assignment of new or replacement faculty lines?
* What is the state of faculty morale? What factors have promoted it and what have tended to lower it; what efforts are being made to foster the former and reduce the latter?
* What efforts are made to support and sustain new faculty as they advance toward continuing appointment?

* If necessary, what effort is the department making to address the diversity of its faculty?

***Undergraduate Program***

* How do the activities of the department contribute to the formation of the successful Oswego College Graduate?
* What is the focus of the undergraduate program?
* What innovations has the department initiated to enhance undergraduate education? How well has the department kept up with external changes in the discipline (e.g., new areas of research, technology).
* What efforts has the department made to contribute to an integrated undergraduate curriculum across departments? To encourage, when possible, interdisciplinarity?
* How do the offerings of the department contribute to the college’s General Education program, College Honors Program, or other interdisciplinary programs? Does the department participate in learning communities?
* What opportunities exist for undergraduates to engage in research and/or scholarly activities? What proportion of undergraduate majors are involved in research, creative, or scholarly activity?
* How do the activities of the department contribute toward a more integrated undergraduate student experience at the college? Describe any collaboration with student/ residence life.
* What are the department’s procedures for academic advising of undergraduates? How many faculty advise undergraduate students? Are non-tenured or non-faculty involved in undergraduate advising?
* How effective is academic advising in the department? How is academic advisement assessed in the department?
* By what procedures are first-year courses designed, and faculty assigned to them?
* How satisfied is the department with the quality of its current undergraduate students? How has the quality of undergraduate student preparation affected the content and method of undergraduate instruction?

* What are the special needs of transfer students in the department? How has the department met those needs?
* Does the department utilize graduate assistants or undergraduate TAs? If so, what are their specific responsibilities, and how are they trained, supervised and compensated?
* Describe any special student recruiting, retention and completion efforts the department is involved in and describe the results of these efforts.

***Graduate Program (if relevant)***

* What is the focus of the graduate program? How is the graduate curriculum designed? To what extent does it overlap with the undergraduate curriculum? To what extent do undergraduates participate in graduate courses?
* What is the quality of graduate students attracted to this program? What recruitment efforts are in place? What type of student body is served by the graduate program?
* What are the responsibilities of the graduate program director? How is the role of the graduate program director defined in the department?
* What plans are there for graduate program development or change in the immediate future, and what are the reasons for the change?
* What opportunities exist for graduate students to engage in scholarship and professional related activities?
* What are the procedures for academic advising, for supervision and evaluation of student progress through degree completion, and for assisting graduates in job placement? Does the department monitor and assess graduate student outcomes?

***Assessment***

* What is the department trying to accomplish with the major program? What student learning outcomes do you expect in program graduates? These should be made explicit in the self-study report. At least two measures of student performance, one direct and one indirect, are recommended.[[1]](#footnote-1)
* How does the department monitor and assess student outcomes? What mix of direct and indirect assessments of learning outcomes does the department utilize?

a. Direct assessments include: standardized tests, capstone experiences, performance assessments, portfolios, job placements, performance in admission and licensing tests, and placement in graduate school programs.

b. Indirect assessments include: surveys, exit interviews, and focus groups.

* Describe how the department uses program assessment data/review to make programmatic, curricular, and pedagogical enhancements in the program [how the department “closes the loop” of assessment]. Three questions should inform faculty discussions regarding actions to be taken after assessment: (1) “What is most important?” (2) “Which areas show the greatest problems with learning?” (3) “What is feasible?”[[2]](#footnote-2) Remember, whatever plan a department creates must be sustainable.
* Are part-time faculty involved in departmental assessment? If so, how?

***Scholarship/Research***

* What provisions are made in the department or program to support faculty to engage in scholarship/research and/or creative activities?
* What level of external (to the department/program) support exists to assist faculty in their scholarship/research? Does the department have plans to try to increase this level of support? If so, describe how.

S***ervice***

* Describe how the department contributes in service to the college, faculty governance and the wider community.

C***ollege Libraries***

* Information Literacy

Are students introduced to the creation, communication, and dissemination of knowledge in the discipline? Do students have opportunity to practice identification, retrieval, and evaluation of information resources in all formats using print and electronic tools? Do students practice ethical use of information?

* Resources

Do departmental and library faculty collaborate effectively in selecting appropriate resources?

Do faculty and students have adequate access to resources that support the curriculum and faculty research?

Are students encouraged/required to use information resources?

* Services

Are students encouraged to use key library services that enhance access? (e.g. reference, interlibrary loan)

***Extended Learning and Other Activities (where applicable)***

* Describe the program’s extended learning efforts: online courses, hybrid courses, summer session offerings, winter session offerings, off-campus courses (including the Metro Center and Watertown/Fort Drum), evening and part-time programs, and lectures, symposia, or workshops available to the college community.
* Describe special collaborations with other departments of the college.
* Describe any development-related activities (i.e., fundraising and alumni outreach initiatives) conducted by the department.

***Resources and Facilities***

How satisfactory are the following provisions for the department’s needs and how might they be improved?

* General and disciplinary library holdings and acquisitions
* Research and laboratory facilities and equipment
* Computer facilities and services
* Technical and secretarial services for faculty and students
* Office, classroom, and study space
* Any special resources or support facilities
* Funds for other than personnel services (OTPS)

**Appendix B**: **Guide for Reviewers**

***Overview***

* What are the major strengths of the unit? What are the primary concerns? What challenges does it face in the immediate future and over the next five to ten years? How do the activities of the department contribute to the overall mission of the institution?
* How does the program’s teaching and research outcomes compare with similar units at comparable institutions? Does it have a distinctive identity?

***Faculty***

* What is the overall assessment of the faculty? What is the quality of their teaching and scholarship? What is the scope and impact of other current professional activities? Which faculty members are outstanding in their specific scholarly areas? In what areas is the department weak? Are significant areas of specialization inadequately represented for the instructional needs of the department or the college? Are there areas of available faculty expertise that might be more fully exploited? Do the department’s requirements for teaching and administrative responsibilities leave sufficient time for scholarship?
* Is the department anticipating its future needs? How effective has it been in recruiting promising junior faculty to replace retiring faculty? How are its character and function likely to be affected by retirements in the next few years? Is there a healthy balance of tenured and non-tenured faculty? Is the gender and ethnic distribution of the faculty appropriate?
* How effective is undergraduate and graduate (if relevant) instruction? How do students rate the teaching in the department?
* How successful is the faculty in generating funding for research, facilities, and equipment? How does funding compare with that of other comparable departments in this field? Discuss the mix of funding—federal agencies, corporate, private, special campus sources.
* What are the credentials of adjunct or part-time faculty? Is the department’s use of such faculty appropriate?
* What is the current state of faculty morale? Is there consensus within the department about its goals and policies? Is departmental leadership effective? Are burdens and responsibilities, rewards and privileges equitably distributed? Are junior faculty’s interests respected?
* Are compensation, teaching loads, and working conditions commensurate with the quality of the faculty? Is the department likely to have difficulty retaining faculty?
* Are junior faculty mentored adequately on the development of their careers? Is their academic progress reviewed periodically?

U***ndergraduate Program***

* How does the character and quality of the undergraduate major program compare with those at comparable institutions? What, if anything, is distinctive about it? How well does it prepare students for occupations related to the field? For graduate study? For teaching in the schools? Does the department adequately monitor and assess student outcomes?
* How extensively are undergraduate course offerings elected by non-majors? How appropriate are they for the general or liberal education of such students?
* How large is the department’s instructional responsibility in the form of service courses to the College? How effective are they?
* How do undergraduates, particularly majors, feel about the department and its courses? How accessible are faculty outside the classroom? How adequate is undergraduate advising? Are there opportunities for undergraduates to become involved in research, creative, or scholarly activity?
* Is there evidence that the department engages in systematic assessment of student learning outcomes? Does the department use an appropriate mix of direct and indirect assessment procedures? Is there evidence that the department has used program assessment review to make programmatic, curricular, and pedagogical enhancements in the program?

***Graduate Program (if relevant)***

* How does the character and quality of the graduate program, its curriculum and degree requirements, compare with those at peer institutions? What, if anything, is distinctive about it? How well does it prepare students for research and teaching? For non-academic careers?
* How does the quality of graduate students compare with those at other institutions? How rigorous are admissions standards? How effective are recruiting methods? How might they be improved?

* How effective is the advising system? How helpful are faculty in directing student research? What, if anything, is done to foster a scholarly community of faculty and graduate students within the department? What is the state of graduate student morale?
* What are the procedures for aiding the placement of graduates in appropriate academic or professional positions?

***Resources and Facilities***

* How adequate are the classrooms, laboratories, faculty offices, technical support, computer and audio-visual facilities, and their maintenance? Are conditions in these areas improving or deteriorating?
* Are the library holdings and facilities and other research resources in this field adequate to the needs of faculty and students? Are conditions in these areas improving or deteriorating?
* Is the secretarial, clerical, and technical support staff adequate to the needs of the programs and faculty? Is the allocation of funds for expenses other than salaries adequate?
* Are interdepartmental research facilities utilized by the faculty? Identify whether there are specific areas where increased investment in such facilities might be particularly effective in increasing research or scholarly activity.
* How does college support for research and scholarship compare to support for peer departments at other universities?

G***eneral Conclusions***

* How well does the department distribute its time and resources among undergraduate and graduate (if relevant) education and advising, individual and collaborative research, and college service and governance? Are its efforts skewed disproportionately in one direction? Is the department making the best possible use of its resources?
* How does the department or program fare in comparison with its counterparts in comparable institutions? What is unique about the department/program?
* Are there important steps that should be taken to maintain and/or to improve the program’s quality?

**Appendix C**: **Information Sources**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Information** | **Source** |
| Vitae | Faculty |
| Faculty Activity (past 5 years) | Departmental Annual Reports/Faculty Information Forms |
| Staffing Roster | Department Chair |
| Summary of Personnel Changes (past 5 years)  | Human Resources/Department Chair |
| Current Course Descriptions & supporting information (e.g. Gen. Ed., Honors, etc.) | College Catalog (online), Program Directors/Coordinators |
| Course Offerings – Past Five Years (additions/deletions, rationale) | Banner data, Dept. Chair |
| Faculty Workload Data & Department Profile Trends | Faculty Workload Reports, Department Chair |
| Course Enrollment Trends (5 yr) | Faculty Workload Reports, Course Enrollment Trends Report (contact IRA x2345) |
| Number of Majors/Minors | [Student Fact Book](https://www.oswego.edu/institutional-research/ira-fact-book-contents) |
| Degrees Awarded | [Student Fact Book](https://www.oswego.edu/institutional-research/ira-fact-book-contents) |
| Course Evaluation Summaries | Department Files/Faculty |
| Grade Distribution Reports | IRA x2345 |
| Student Profile Data (SPD) | [Student Fact Book](https://www.oswego.edu/institutional-research/ira-fact-book-contents) |
| SPD- Average SAT Scores, HS average, Average Class Rank Percentile | [Student Fact Book](https://www.oswego.edu/institutional-research/ira-fact-book-contents) |
| SPD - Retention/Persistence rates by major | [Student Fact Book](https://www.oswego.edu/institutional-research/ira-fact-book-contents) |
| SPD - Gender and Ethnicity | [Student Fact Book](https://www.oswego.edu/institutional-research/ira-fact-book-contents) |
| SPD - Age | [Student Fact Book](https://www.oswego.edu/institutional-research/ira-fact-book-contents) |
| Alumni Employment/Placement | Alumni Office (Annual Alumni Directory), Academic Departments, Career Services Data |
| Departmental Sponsored (Service) Activities | Faculty, Department Chair |
| Department Mission Statement (if available) | Department Files, Department Chair |
| Department Bylaws  | Department Files, Department Chair |
| Department Personnel Policies | Department Files, Department Chair |
| Peer Department Data | Peer Department Chairs |

**Appendix D: Program Review Timeline (spanning two academic years)**

 **Spring semester (academic year prior to program review)**

**March-April** Spring semester before self-study is written, attend kick-off meeting with

 Associate Dean and Assessment Coordinator to discuss process and

 resources.

 **Fall semester (program review)**

**August-December** Compile materials and write self-study.

 **Spring semester (program review)**

**January 31 Electronic** draft of the self-study and vitae of possible external reviewers

 to the Dean for review.

**February** Self-study finalized after Dean’s review, and external reviewers approved after Provost and Dean’s review.

 Department contacts the approved reviewers to get two sets of possible dates the reviewers are available for their visit (to occur in Feb/March/April). Department notifies the Dean’s and Provost’s offices of the dates reviewers are available. Dean and Provost’s secretaries confirm dates, and notify department of final dates for site visit.

 Department calls reviewers to confirm dates.

 Dean sends invitation letter to reviewers, including W9 or BU8; Strategic Plan of institution; mission and goals of CLAS; link to catalog(s).

 Department sets up itinerary (see Appendix E), arranges lodging, which will be direct billed to Dean’s office. Dean’s Office also pays for meals.

 Reviewers book their own flights and will be reimbursed.

**February-March** A complete copy of the self-study and copy of the **Memorandum of Understanding** from last self-study must be made available to evaluators no less than two weeks before their visit to campus (electronically). A final copy of the self-study must be sent to the Dean (electronically) and copied to Dean’s secretary.

An **executive summary** of self-study of 2-4 pages (bullet points) must be delivered to the Provost and Dean (and secretaries) at least one week before evaluators’ arrival on campus.

 Site visits take place during February, March, and April. Department

 secretary completes all travel reimbursement forms (leaving account

 numbers blank) while reviewers are on campus, and forwards to Dean’s

 Office.

**April 30 LATEST** date for site visits (late February and March are preferred).

**March-May** Evaluators submit their reports electronically 3-to-6 weeks after their site visits. Each reviewer receives $500 honorarium (when report is submitted). Dean’s office will requisition honorariums.

 **Fall semester (after academic year of program review)**

**August-October** Departments discuss self-study and evaluators’ report, draft MOU, and schedule a meeting with Dean in order to be able to submit the final version by November 1.

**November 1** Final version of a Memorandum of Understanding (plans for next 5 years) based on the self-study, evaluators’ report, and conversations with the Dean and Provost. Submit electronically to Dean and Provost and copy to secretaries.

**Appendix E: Sample Itinerary for External Reviewers**

Department sets up itinerary.

Tuesday, April xx

* Arrive

Wednesday, April xx

* Breakfast with \_\_\_
* (.5 hr) Opening meeting w/ Provost
* (.5 hr) Opening meeting with Dean
* (1.5 hr) Meet with Department Faculty
* Lunch with \_\_\_\_\_\_
* (1 hr) Meet with students
* (1.5-2 hr) Reviewers’ conference
* (1 hr) Exit meeting with Provost & Dean
* Dinner with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
1. Barbara E. Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 2010), 59-60. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple*, 69. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)