

HOBART AND WILLIAM SMITH COLLEGES

Department and Program Review Procedures

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PURPOSE.....	2
II. RESPONSIBILITIES	3
III. PROCESS OVERVIEW.....	4
IV. THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS	5
V. EXTERNAL REVIEW: SELECTION, SITE VISIT, AND REPORT	8
VI. FOLLOW-UP	9
Appendix A: Suggested Format for the Self-Study Report	10
Appendix B: Sample Questions for the External Reviewers	12
Appendix C: Sample Format for the External Reviewers' Report	14
Appendix D: Sample Site Visit Schedules.....	15
Appendix E: Suggested Review Timeline	17
Appendix F: XXX Department/Program Response to External Reviewer's Report.....	18

Updated by the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs: October 2017

Prepared by the Provost's Office, in consultation with COAA and COFAC
October 2, 2008

I. PURPOSE

Department, program, or division reviews have long been conducted at the Colleges, providing valuable information to the divisions, departments/programs, and faculty, the Committee on Academic Affairs, the Committee on the Faculty, and to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs. Periodic reviews at Hobart and William Smith Colleges are a principal means through which we assess and improve the quality of our academic program. They provide a regular mechanism for in-depth evaluation of the effectiveness, progress, and status of a department or program. They create an occasion for departments and programs to highlight their strengths and achievements, to identify areas in need of improvement, to develop long-range plans for meeting these needs, and to plan for emerging changes in the discipline or interdisciplinary field. The primary purpose of the review is to assist the department/program in meeting students' educational needs, supporting faculty scholarship and service, and planning for future opportunities and challenges. In addition, the review assists both the department or program and the Provost in determining resource needs.

To place the review in context is to understand it as one piece of an overall institutional assessment plan that takes place at many levels and in many sites, such as assessment of student learning in individual courses; reviews of academic support services; evaluation of student learning in relation to the curricular Goals; analyses of the writing enriched curriculum; and accreditation reviews for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs will help departments and programs focus their efforts to avoid redundancy and to increase the usefulness of their work.

Regular department and program reviews candidly evaluate:

- the ways in which the mission and goals of the department/program contribute to the Colleges' mission and goals and reflect the norms and expectations of the field;
- the curriculum through which the department/program implements its mission and goals;
- the extent to which student learning fulfills the department/program's aspirations for students and the academic perspectives of majors and minors;
- the contributions of faculty and staff to the department/program and to the Colleges;
- the resources and facilities available to or needed by the department/program.

The following sections describe:

- the review process, its timeline, and responsible agencies;
- the conduct of the self-study that lies at the heart of the process;
- the procedures and guidelines for the selection of external reviewers;
- the guidelines for the site visit and subsequent external report;
- the follow-up and implementation of recommendations arising from the review.

The process is defined generically, and it is understood that modifications may be necessary to allow for the unique circumstances of some departments/programs. *Such modifications must be worked out in advance with the Provost or the Provost's designee.*

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs

As the Colleges' chief academic officer, the Provost has overall responsibility for reviews of departments and programs. The Provost, or the Provost's designee (usually the Senior Dean of Faculty), consults with the department/program, the Committee on the Faculty, and the Committee on Academic Affairs to determine the schedule of reviews. A representative from the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs meets with departments/programs scheduled for review to discuss any features unique to the department/program, to confirm the timetable for the review, and to finalize any costs associated with the review. The Provost, or the Provost's designee, may also meet with the department/program during its preparation of the self-study report.

The Provost, or the Provost's designee, is responsible for assembling and charging the external review team and mailing its members the self-study report materials in advance of their visit. Finally, the Provost, or the Provost's designee, may provide written comments on the self-study report, and meets with the department/program chair to discuss the external reviewers' report and the department/program response to the report.

The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs will cover reasonable expenses associated with the review in consultation with the department or program. Any such expenses must be approved prior to being incurred.

Department/Program Chairs

The chair of the department/program undergoing review is responsible for convening a review committee comprising all, or a subset of, the faculty in the department/program. The department/program chair is ultimately responsible for overseeing the conduct and assembly of the self-study, assisting the Provost or the Provost's designee in the selection of the external reviewers, and scheduling the agenda for the on-campus site visit of the external reviewers. The chair is responsible for ensuring full and appropriate participation by all department/program members in the process. The chair also meets with the Provost or the Provost's designee to discuss the external reviewers' report and the department/program's response to the report. Finally, the department/program chair is responsible for working on the implementation of the action plan. The department/program chair may designate some of these responsibilities to other members of the department/program, but ultimately remains responsible for their completion.

Department/Program Review Committee

The department/program should establish a review committee and select a chair of the review committee, based on its own internal rules and procedures. The department/program chair may serve as the review committee chair. The review committee can be a committee of the whole or a subset of at least three faculty members. The review committee is responsible for conducting the self-study, preparing materials for the external reviewers, scheduling the site visit for the external reviewers, and preparing a written response and action plan to the external reviewers' report. The review committee is responsible for ensuring that deadlines listed below are met and working with the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs to meet those deadlines.

External Reviewers

The external reviewers are responsible for reading the self-study, meeting with students, faculty, and administrators during their site visit, and touring the facilities and other physical resources of the department/program. Based on the self-study report and the visit, the external reviewers submit a written External Reviewer Report to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs by the agreed-upon deadline. The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs will be responsible for submitting the External Reviewer's Report to the department/program chair. The external reviewers are also responsible for presenting an oral preliminary summary to the department/program and to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs before the conclusion of their site visit.

III. PROCESS OVERVIEW

Beginning with academic year 2008-09, departments and programs offering majors will undertake periodic reviews on approximately a six- to eight-year cycle. Review of any minors offered in those departments/programs will take place at the same time. Programs offering only minors may be reviewed at the request of the program, CoAA, and/or the Provost, or possibly in conjunction with closely allied departments or programs that do offer majors. The Provost or the Provost's designee will schedule the cycle of reviews in consultation with the departments, CoAA, and CoFac. In conjunction with the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs, departments and programs with unique or unusual circumstances will tailor a plan for review that meets their particular needs.

In order to accommodate the number of departments and programs at HWS, approximately five departments and programs will be reviewed each year. This schedule will ensure that institutional strategic planning, resource allocation, and accreditation are based on adequate and current information.

It is helpful to think of the review as a process. In the first phase (which normally lasts a semester), the department or program prepares the self-study report and works with the Provost or the Provost's designee to identify and select external reviewers. In the second

phase, the external reviewers undertake their site visit (normally over a two-day period), and submit a report to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs and the department or program chair. In the third phase, the department or program and the Provost respond to the external report and begin to implement appropriate recommendations arising from the process.

In addition to these three stages, *successful reviews are often continual collections and evaluations of information such as syllabi, faculty CVs, enrollment data, data concerning assessment of learning outcomes, budget information, and staffing reports that assists the department/program in understanding its role in the curriculum and impact on the student body.* Some of this information will be collected on the Colleges-wide level, but some will be the responsibility of the department or program. The work of the self-study will be greatly eased and enhanced if, between reviews, the department or program keeps careful records of relevant information and regularly reflects on its work. Building and sustaining processes for direct and indirect assessments of student learning outcomes and departmental/programmatic goals is an especially important to strengthening departments and programs.

At the outset of the review process, departments/programs are encouraged to conduct focused meetings or retreats in order to clarify central issues facing them and to examine any emerging trends within the discipline or interdisciplinary field. Such issues and trends would figure prominently in the self-study. Department and program reviews are primarily concerned with the effectiveness with which they meet the needs of their majors and minors, but should also evaluate the department/program's support of interdisciplinary programs and the general curriculum. Reviews should also address how the department/ program fits into the Colleges' delivery of an HWS education and how the department/program contributes to student learning as articulated in the curricular Goals.

IV. THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

The self-study process is the heart of the review, and should be the culmination of a process in which there is broad and deep participation by members of the department/program. In order to ensure that reviews truly serve the department/program and the Colleges, *it is important to devote substantial effort to the preparation of this document.*

The list below *contains a sample* of the range of topics suitable for inclusion in the self-study. Not all these topics would be appropriate for every department or program, of course, and there may be topics not included below that are especially pressing for particular departments or programs. The self-study document should identify the practices, norms, and habits of the department/program since the last review and address questions of what the department can do over the *next five-seven years* to reach the level of excellence characteristic of the best departments at small liberal arts institutions, given

the resources it has or that it can reasonably expect to receive. Such a document would outline the challenges to the department/program, and the ways of addressing those challenges, as well as the strengths and opportunities faced by the department/program over the years.

In the interest of efficiency, it is recommended that departments/programs concentrate their thinking on the most important challenges. Departments/programs might limit themselves, for example, to the three or four most pressing questions/challenges they anticipate in the near future. Each department/program will know best what would advance its mission, whether the challenges are in the area of curriculum, in shaping the major, in faculty development, in special programs, in facilities and technology, or in other areas.

Mission & History

- Department/program history
- Mission & goals, including goals for student learning at the course and department/program level
- Actions attempted, under way, or planned to reach major goals
- Review of recommendations from any previous review and progress since then

Academic Program:

- Description of curricular offerings, including syllabi
- Analysis of major & minor; any proposed changes in structure
- Role in general education, first-year programs, service courses for other departments, off-campus programs
- Analysis of enrollment trends

Assessment of the quality & currency of the curriculum

- Identification of program needs, curricular lacunae and opportunities
- Pedagogical approaches and strengths (e.g., use of instructional technology, service learning, undergraduate research, internships)
- Special program offerings and opportunities
- Assessment of the quality of student advising

Student Outcomes

- Profile of majors & minors
- Measures of student success (e.g., numbers of students pursuing graduate work and/or employment and review of placements, surveys of alumni/ae, national fellowships/scholarships, scores on standardized tests for admission to graduate work)
- Assessment of student learning in relation to the Curricular Goals and department/program goals
- Adequacy of the department/program's assessment plan

- Description of alumni/ae connections (e.g., contacts between faculty and alumni/ae, opportunities for internships)

Diversity, Gender & Climate Issues

- Student and faculty profile with regard to diversity & gender
- Opportunities for contributions to diversity at the Colleges and assessment of contributions
- Classroom climate issues

Staffing & Personnel

- Staffing array & needs, including projections of retirements, sabbaticals, leaves
- Use of part-time and/or visiting faculty
- Collegial interactions (e.g., departmental dynamics, mentoring relationships, faculty development opportunities within the department/program)
- Support staff, including administrative assistants, technicians, etc.

Facilities and Space, Equipment, Budget

- Adequacy of facilities & space
- Equipment projections & needs, including technology
- Description and evaluation of library holdings relevant to the department/program
- Budget profile (e.g., patterns of expenditure, availability of special restricted funds)
- Evaluation of budget adequacy

Activities and Publications

- Description and evaluation of curricular and co-curricular events and other sponsored programs
- Evaluation of department/program web site, handbook, and other publications

At the beginning of the review, the exact form and scope of the self-study report will be determined by the department/program in conjunction with the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs. (See Appendix A for a suggested format that can serve as a guide.)

Except where indicated, responsibility for collecting the data, and writing and assembling the report rests with the department/program review committee. The statistical data and, in general, the focus of the review usually spans the time since the last review, or about six years. Departments and programs are encouraged to work closely with the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs for assistance in identifying and acquiring appropriate information. Review committees in general should coordinate with the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs about the format of the self-study report and their progress towards completion prior to the final submission.

The department/program submits copies of the self-study report (with all accompanying appendices and materials) to the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs a minimum of six weeks prior to the scheduled visit of the external reviewers. The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs is responsible for submitting copies of the self-study report to the external reviewers along with a letter, detailing the external review committee's charge.

V. EXTERNAL REVIEW: SELECTION, SITE VISIT, AND REPORT

The process of selecting external reviewers begins with the department and program, which provides the Provost or the Provost's designee with the names of at least six colleagues in the discipline or interdisciplinary field whom they deem most qualified. Potential reviewers should come from institutions that are known to have strong programs in the discipline or interdisciplinary area under review. Reviewers typically come from primarily undergraduate institutions considered to be peers of HWS or to represent a model to which the department or program aspires.

The list of potential reviewers should include the names, titles, addresses, and contact information of all six nominees along with a description of their expertise and standing within the discipline/interdisciplinary field, and a statement of any potential conflicts of interest with department and program members. The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs selects and invites usually at least two external reviewers to participate in the review. Understanding that some fields are particularly small and that overlap in some cases may be unavoidable, the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs and the department/program should make every effort to minimize the potential of influencing the external reviewers outside of the formal review process.

Before the site visit, ideally at least a month prior to the visit, the external reviewers should receive the self-study report and the charge letter to frame their work. It is important that the reviewers feel free to arrive at an independent assessment of the department/program, but suggested questions and formats for the report are included as an appendix. In addition to describing the responsibilities of the external reviewers, the charge letter, sent by the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs, will also detail focal points that the department/program and/or Provost agree warrant particular emphasis.

As part of their site visit, the external reviewers will have the opportunity to:

- have entry and exit meetings with the Provost or the Provost's designee,
- meet with all available department and program faculty and with students, including majors and minors,
- discuss the self-study report,
- observe classes,
- meet with faculty members in related departments/programs,

- and meet with the department and program and with the Provost or the Provost's designee prior to departure to discuss their preliminary findings.

Site visits normally last two full days and are conducted during a regular academic semester while classes are in session. The review committee chair is normally tasked with finalizing the schedule for the two days. Travel, meals, lodging, and honoraria are covered by the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs and should be coordinated with the Office before expenses are incurred.

The external reviewers are responsible for writing one report, which should be submitted within a month of the site visit. For ease of distribution, the report should include an executive summary of its findings and recommendations. If there is no consensus on a particular issue, all the differing opinions should be stated. The report should respond to the charge letter and the self-study report, identifying strengths, making concrete and constructive suggestions for improvement, and finally, addressing any other issues the reviewers consider important that might have been overlooked in the self-study. The text of the report should preserve the anonymity of individuals within the department/program.

When completed, the report is submitted to the Provost or the Provost's designee, who shares the final report with the department/program chair.

VI. FOLLOW-UP

After the completion of the site visit and receipt of the written report, the department/program is required to provide a written reaction to the report and action plan to the Provost or the Provost's designee no later than September 15 for Spring visits and January 15 for Fall visits. This action plan should follow the guidelines listed in Appendix F. The department or program chair and the Provost meet to discuss the external review report and the department/program's response and to prioritize any agreed-upon action steps. The report and the department/program response may subsequently be shared with the Committee on the Faculty and the Committee on Academic Affairs.

Appendix A: Suggested Format for the Self-Study Report

1. Campus Overview [provided by the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs]
 - a. College's mission statement and goals
 - b. Organization charts
 - c. Campus statistical profile
 - d. Undergraduate degree requirements
 - e. Department and program review procedures
2. Departmental Profile
 - a. Historical overview of department
 - b. Department's mission and goals
 - c. Information on current faculty, including current CVs
 - d. Department/program assessment plan, updated if necessary since submission in 2006
 - e. Department/program Standards and Criteria document
3. Summary Self-Assessment
 - a. Description of department's strengths and weaknesses
 - i. Teaching/curriculum/pedagogy
 - ii. Scholarship
 - iii. Community Service
 - iv. Resources
 - v. Overall functioning
 - b. Department/program review history
 - i. Progress made since last review on review recommendations
 - ii. Major goals the department and program has for itself
 - iii. Actions underway or planned to reach major goals
4. Undergraduate Student Data
 - a. Enrollment trends for majors and minors
 - b. Gender and ethnicity of majors
 - c. Student-faculty research participation and opportunities
 - d. Placement data for graduates (jobs, graduate or professional schools) and any information from alumni/ae surveys
 - e. Assessment of student learning outcomes: process and data
5. Department and Program Curriculum
 - a. Catalog description of department, major and minor requirements, course offerings, and declaration/audit sheets
 - b. Contributions to campus-wide curriculum (e.g., HWS Goals, FSEM, non-major service courses, etc.)
 - c. Contributions to global education and service learning
 - d. Frequency of course offerings
 - e. Syllabi for all courses offered in the last four years
 - f. List of courses withdrawn in the last four years

- g. Class sizes and student- and major-faculty ratios
- h. List of honors theses and independent study titles
- i. Description and assessment of department's print and web presence
- j. Position of department and program with respect to trends in the discipline/interdisciplinary area

6. Resources: Staffing, Space, Facilities, and Budget

- a. Staffing needs and rationale
- b. Retirement, sabbatical, leave projections
- c. Use of visiting faculty
- d. Intradepartmental mentoring
- e. Non-faculty support staff
- f. Facilities and space overview, including technology and instrumentation
- g. Evaluation of library holdings
- h. Most recent department/program budget and assessment of budget and instructional funding adequacy

7. Appendices

Appendix B: Sample Questions for the External Reviewers

1. OVERALL PROGRAM

- a. What is your evaluation of the overall quality of this department/program, in the context of liberal arts institutions of comparable quality and type?
- b. What attributes of the program would you recommend to undergraduate students? What factors distinguish the HWS program from programs at other institutions?
- c. To what extent does the program/department effectively address its mission and goals? Are the mission and goals reflective of the hallmarks of the field and realistic to the Colleges? Are there changes that could or should be made to the programming that would make achieving that mission and goals more effective?

2. FACULTY

- a. What was your perceived reputation for the stature of the faculty at HWS prior to reading the report? In what ways did this review enhance that perception?
- b. How do the department/program's teaching and research specialties compare with trends in the discipline or interdisciplinary area? Is the balance among subspecialties in the department/program appropriate?
- c. Is the current faculty adequately qualified, experienced, and staffed to provide for the curricular and administrative needs of the program? In what areas, if any, would additional training, resources, and other types of support be of utility to strengthening the Program?
- d. Do you have suggestions for improving the diversity of the faculty?

3. CURRICULUM

- a. Does the department/program effectively meet the expectations of a modern 21st century curriculum? In what ways does it surpass those expectations? In what areas does it need improvement?
- b. What is your assessment of the content and organization of the curriculum? Is it rigorous, contemporary, and coherent? Do course offerings adequately reflect current trends in the discipline or interdisciplinary area? Are they appropriate to the needs and aspirations of a diverse student population?
- c. Does the curriculum as described reflect the teaching norms and expectations of contemporary academic programs in the field? Has the Program struck the right balance between theory and practice in its course offerings and designs?
- d. In what ways/areas might the program enhance the structure, offerings, and contributions of its curriculum to students for future academic challenges and opportunities?

4. THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

- a. How would you assess the overall quality of student learning outcomes? What measures of excellence did you see in your review? What indicators of concern did you notice?
- b. Is the number of majors typical given the size of the faculty and the campus? In general how does the curriculum, faculty teaching, and faculty scholarship compare to programs with which you are familiar at institutions similar to HWS or more prestigious ones you might consider in its aspirational group?
- c. Do students receive sufficient exposure to the aims of the discipline, including the awareness of the core literature; essential writing, reading, and comprehension skills; and cultural and academic competencies? Are graduates adequately prepared for professional careers and/or graduate studies in the field?
- d. Are there ways/ideas for engaging students more in the undergraduate research with faculty members—or directly with faculty research projects?
- e. Are students adequately supported in their educational experiences in the program? What signs of excellence in teaching and student engagement did you notice in your review?

5. DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM RESOURCES

- a. Does the department/program receive adequate support? Is the budget sufficient to support department/program curricular objectives? Could the budget be restructured without additional expenditures?
- b. Given the department's support needs, are staff responsibilities allocated reasonably across positions?
- c. In examining the proposed five-year plan, the use of resources and opportunities within the program/department, and the availability of funds and other supports, where is the department in line with your own institution (or institutions that you know of)? In what areas might greater support be needed to sustain a strong program?
- d. Given the current budget cycle, what are the realistic fiscal, personnel, and physical needs of the department/program? How might those needs be best prioritized? Has the department/program planned wisely and made good use of the resources and opportunities available to it?

6. DIRECTION OF THE FIELD AND THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM

- a. In what direction(s) do you believe the discipline/interdisciplinary field will evolve over the course of the next ten years? Is HWS well positioned to respond to those trends?
- b. Where does this department/program fit into the field nationally? Does it have a particular niche?
- c. Can existing resources be deployed more effectively to increase the department/program's quality and reputation or are additional resources required?

Appendix C: Sample Format for the External Reviewers' Report

Title Page	Name of department and program or program Hobart and William Smith Colleges Members of external review committee Date of external review committee visit Date of report
Table of Contents	
Executive Summary	Summary of key findings Summary of key recommendations
Introduction	Background and context of department/program and of review
Organizational structure, management, planning, and improvement	Findings Recommendations
Human and physical resources and infrastructure, including IT	Findings Recommendations
Courses and curriculum	Findings Recommendations
Teaching, learning and assessment	Findings Recommendations
Engagement in and support for scholarship	Findings Recommendations
Professional and community activities and service	Findings Recommendations
Appendices	Including but not limited to: List of external review committee members with credentials and affiliations Schedule of site visit Any additional documents

Appendix D: Sample Site Visit Schedules

_____ Department/Program External Review Tuesday – [Date]	
8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	DeWayne Lucas (Provost) – Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs, Coxe Hall
9:00 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	[Name] (_____ Professor of _____ and Chair, Department/Program) [building and office location]
9:45 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.	Meeting with faculty member [building and office location]
10:20 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	Observe Class [building and office location]
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch – Scandling Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students and external reviewers OR 2-3 faculty and external reviewers
1:00 p.m. – 1:25 p.m.	Meeting with faculty member [building and office location]
1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Observe class OR meet with faculty members OR meet with students
4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Reception with department members and majors
5:30 pm	Dinner with 2-3 faculty members and external reviewers

**_____ Department/Program External Review
Wednesday – [Date]**

8:00 a.m. – 8:55 a.m.	Breakfast with faculty member(s)- Scandling Center
9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	Meeting with faculty member [building and office location]
9:30 a.m. - 10:05 a.m.	Meeting with faculty member [building and office location]
10:10 a.m. – 11:05 a.m.	Observe class
11:15 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	Meeting with faculty member [building and office location]
11:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.	Meeting with faculty member [building and office location]
12:20 p.m. – 1:20 p.m.	Lunch with 2-3 faculty members at Scandling Center
1:25 p.m. – 2:50 p.m.	Discretionary time for external reviewers to meet to discuss report
3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Department/Program Faculty Meeting to Discuss Initial Report – [room]
4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	DeWayne Lucas (Provost) Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs, Coxe Hall
5:30 p.m.	External reviewer dinner (if they stay overnight)

Appendix E: Suggested Review Timeline

Semester	Provost	Department/Program Review Committee	External Reviewers
Pre-Review Year			
Spring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provost meets with CoFac and CoAA to determine dept/programs to review -Provost notifies dept/program chairs -Provost meets with chairs to discuss any special circumstances and to finalize review budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Construction of Review Committee -Dept/program forwards list of nominees for external reviewers to Provost 	
Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provost provides data on major counts, advisees, section summaries, course offerings, and FSEMS to dept/programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Dept/program collects information for self-study report 	
Review Year			
Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -provides comments on self-study report when completed -contacts external reviewers after report is completed -creates a formal charge -arranges a site visit date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Dept/program drafts Self-study report and forwards draft to Provost (discuss in early fall with Associate Provost) -Responds to any comments from Provost about Self-study report -Submits final copies of self-study report to Provost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -membership finalized (after report completed) -receive charge letter from Provost -site visit date set
Spring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sends external reviewers the self-study report 3-4 weeks prior to site visit -Approves site visit agenda -Meets with external reviewers during site visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Creates a detailed site visit agenda -Organizes the site visit meetings -Meets with external reviewers -Prepares written response to external reviewers' report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Site visit -Meets with Provost/designee and Dept/Program Review Committee prior to departure -Prepares and sends copies of final review report to Provost and chair of dept/program
Post-Review Year			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Meets with dept/program to review recommendations -Works to support implementation of recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Prepares written response to external reviewers' report -Meets with Provost to review recommendations -Begins implementation of recommendations 	

Appendix F: XXX Department/Program Response to External Review Report:

Action Plan

<i>Need to be Addressed</i>	<i>Strategies and Actions</i>	<i>Responsible Person(s)</i>	<i>Start Date</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>
I.				
II.				
III.				