

## GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE REPORT BY THE EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FOR PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The report of the external reviewers should be modest in length (approximately 15 pages, including an executive summary) and should provide a realistic and unbiased view of how the program compares to other regional and national programs with similar missions and resource constraints.

The report should address the strengths and weaknesses of the program and how quality programs can be maintained and strengthened. In addition to reviewing the quality of program, the scope or currency of the curriculum and the performance of faculty and students, the external reviewers should include recommendations that can constitute the core of the academic unit's Plan for Improvement. These recommendations shall include a clear statement of priorities for any investments that will be required from all sources.

As outlined in the Policy, the recommendations shall be identified within the following categories:

- Recommendations for program improvement
  - Without new resources (including more creative use of existing resources)
  - With new resources to be generated by the unit
  - With one-time allocation of University resources
  - With additional steps to generate external funding
  - With additional allocations from the University
- Recommendations for ways to increase its resource base
- Recommendations for ways for unit to strengthen its curriculum, teaching, scholarship/creative work and service

Under each of the above conditions, the external reviewers should identify the outcomes expected and specify the criteria for determining the realization of improvement. It is important that the external reviewers make their recommendations with the understanding that there needs to be a balanced emphasis on quality, productivity and self-support improvements, and not simply a request for new resources for the program under review. The external reviewers' report needs to emphasize that much enhancement funding must come from private sources, given the State's modest level of support and the University's responsibility to maintain tuition at reasonable rates.

The chair of the external review team shall send a draft copy of the team's report to the Deputy Provost no later than two weeks following the final day of the team's site visit. In consultation with the Dean, the Deputy Provost shall ensure a review of the draft only in terms of accuracy of data and information and in terms of conformity with the University's policy and administrative guidelines for periodic program review. The Deputy Provost shall confer with the chair of the external reviewers regarding any potential changes in data or information. Thereafter, the chair of the external reviewers shall send the final report of the review team to the Provost.