

The internal reviewers ^{will} ~~then~~ meet with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs for an orientation, ^{prior to the} ~~then make arrangements to visit with the department faculty, students, Chair/Director, and academic Dean~~ ^{site visit} before meeting with the external reviewers during their site visit.

At least two external reviewers, as appropriate, will assume the leading role in writing the review report in close consultation with the internal reviewers. The faculty whose programs are undergoing review should select a minimum of five individuals who are respected members of their disciplines. In selecting these nominees, the faculty should make every effort to ensure that there are no potential biases or conflicts of interest. Current or former collaborators, colleagues, mentors, and students of unit faculty and staff are inappropriate, as are past reviewers of the unit. These names should be submitted to the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, who in consultation with the collegiate Dean and the Provost will make the final decision on the selection of the consultants. When two individuals have agreed to serve as reviewers, the Associate Provost for Academic Programs will submit their names to the Faculty Senate's UEPC for approval.

^{meet with the internal reviewers and}

The consultants are brought to the campus for a two-day visit where they will ^{tour} supporting facilities (such as offices, classrooms, laboratories and the library), and interview the faculty, staff, students, and administrators. They will also collaborate directly with the internal reviewers to draft a single review report. Initial communication with the consultants is handled by the program. The Associate Provost for Academic Programs will follow up with an official invitation that includes matters such as payment for travel and honoraria.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The principal information sources are the annual assessment reports and the dashboards of performance indicators, the mid-cycle assessment and strategic plans, the self-study document, Academic Analytic datasets on research productivity (whenever available), and personal interviews with university personnel. After the orientation meeting with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, the internal reviewers will set up meetings with the appropriate administrators, collegiate Dean/Graduate Dean, department Chairs, faculty, staff, and undergraduate/graduate students from the department's programs. The programs will arrange meetings with departmental representatives for the external reviewers during their site visit.

THE REVIEW REPORT

~~The internal review team will provide a brief summary of its findings to the program Chair/Director, the appropriate Deans, and the external review team within two weeks of the external consultants' visit, paying particular attention to the assessment reports, the performance indicators, and the assessment and strategic plans. At the conclusion of the site visit, in consultation with the internal reviewers, the external consultants will share an oral summary of their findings with the Provost office. After the site visit, the external consultants will prepare, jointly or individually, a written report reflecting their judgment regarding the status of the degree programs, including its administration, faculty, funding, and quality (based in part on assessment data). The reports may include specific recommendations for changes in any aspect of the unit's structure, operation, or programs. This report is sent to the Associate Provost for Academic Programs for distribution to the Provost, the collegiate Dean, the Graduate Dean, the internal reviewers, the unit/program Chair/Director, and the Program Review Committee of the Graduate Council.~~

The external consultants are strongly encouraged to submit their report within two weeks of the visit to campus. The Associate Provost for Academic Programs will assist the consultants in any way possible to meet the deadline.

Deans' Reports: The collegiate Dean reviews the review team's report and other pertinent information, and discusses the findings with the chair/director to express their mutual concerns and interests. The Dean then develops a report that summarizes the review findings for submission to the Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Research/Graduate Dean, if a graduate program is under review. If the Dean and the program faculty differ on the reports, the department may send its own response to the Provost.