

Academic Program Review



**Georgia
Tech** 
CREATING THE NEXT

Guidelines updated February 2020

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. Having one periodic comprehensive review is an efficient means for Georgia Tech to review and report on its academic vitality to multiple constituents.

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
- a description of the Institute review process
- key milestones and deadlines
- a list of principal materials and their purpose
- the Academic Program Review schedule
< <https://academiceffectiveness.gatech.edu/resources/program-review/> >
- templates and samples

The Office of Academic Effectiveness

Contact Information

INSTITUTE OVERSIGHT

Dr. Loraine Phillips Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness (OAE)
A. French Bldg. #003 Mail Code 0741
404.385.1419 loraine.phillips@gatech.edu

INSTITUTE RESOURCES

Institutional Research and Academic Data Portfolio

Sandra Kinney Senior Director, Institutional Research and Planning (IRP)
Lyman Hall, #211 Mail Code 0530
404.385.0946 sandra.kinney@irp.gatech.edu

COLLEGE CONTACTS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

<i>College of Computing</i>	Dr. Beki Grinter 404.385.6782	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Interim Assoc. Dean for Faculty beki@cc.gatech.edu
	Mr. David White 404.385.4301	Assistant Dean for Academic Programs drwhite@cc.gatech.edu
<i>College of Design</i>	Dr. Michelle Rinehart 404.385.1449	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Outreach michelle.rinehart@design.gatech.edu
<i>College of Engineering</i>	Dr. Laurence Jacobs 404.894.2344	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs laurence.jacobs@coe.gatech.edu
	Dr. Terri Lee 404.385.3731	Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs & Accreditation terri.lee@gatech.edu
<i>Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts</i>	Dr. David Shook 404.385.3014	Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies drshook@gatech.edu
	Dr. Carol Colatrella 404.894.1241	Associate Dean for Graduate Studies carol.colatrella@lmc.gatech.edu
<i>Scheller College of Business</i>	Dr. Soumen Ghosh 404.894.4927	Senior Associate Dean of Programs soumen.ghosh@scheller.gatech.edu
	Dr. Craig Womack 404.894.2615	Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs Craig.Womack@scheller.gatech.edu
	Dr. Katie Lloyd 404.385.5472	Assistant Dean, MBA Programs katie.lloyd@scheller.gatech.edu
<i>College of Sciences</i>	Dr. David Collard 404.894.7532	Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Professor david.collard@cos.gatech.edu
	Dr. J. Cameron Tyson 404.385.0418	Assistant Dean for Academic Programs cam.tyson@cos.gatech.edu

Table of Contents

Academic Program Review 2020–2021

I. Overview	1
II. The Academic Review Process at Georgia Tech	1
A. Overview	1
B. The Details	2
C. Summary of Milestones	6
III. The Self-study	7
IV. The External Review	9
V. Appendices: Formats and Samples	
A. Self-study Transmittal Sheet Format	A1
B. Invitation Letter Sample	A2
C. Confirmation Letter Sample	A3
D. Pre-visit Letter to Confirmed Reviewer Sample	A4
E. Sample External Reviewer Biosketch	A5
F. Sample External Review Committee Visit Itinerary	A6
G. Sample Process for Feedback Loop	A8
H. Institutional Research & Planning Basic Data Portfolio Content	A9
I. Academic Program Review Five-Year Schedule	A10

Academic Program Review

I. Overview

Through the Academic Program Review (APR) process, Georgia Tech conducts a strategic evaluation of each of our academic programs approximately every five years. The current schedule of reviews may be accessed at < <https://academiceffectiveness.gatech.edu/resources/program-review/> >.

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 Policy Manual 3.6.3) and the University System of Georgia (USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 2.3.6), as well as the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook (4.4). 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:

- self-study prepared 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
- plan developed by the college outlining actions to be taken based on the results of the review
- annual progress reports emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness for three years following the review

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 APAE 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 deans/program chairs/directors are responsible for other aspects of the 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. These elements will be discussed at the initial planning meeting with the college dean and faculty held prior to the start of the review process.

II. The Academic Program Review Process

A. Overview

The APR can be divided into six parts:

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, program chair, 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 units conduct the self-study in the summer and fall, followed by an early spring external visit.

Following the initial planning meeting, associate deans/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. APR process milestones are shown on page six.

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), the associate provost for academic effectiveness, the executive director for institutional research and planning, and others as desired by the dean, to discuss the scope, responsibilities, data needs, 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. Less than four reviewers should be considered only for focused reviews, such as the review of a multi- / interdisciplinary degree program.

The composition of the review team should ensure that a review of all program disciplines and degree levels will occur. 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.

The list of potential external reviewers should be coordinated with the Office of the Provost, 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 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 it will handle this step with the APAE during its 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 through the Office of Academic Effectiveness
- coordinating visit arrangements
- funding the visit and any associated honorariums
- 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 through the Office of Academic Effectiveness is essential.

In advance of the visit, the itinerary, a biosketch of each reviewer (see Appendix E), and the self-study are to be emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness so the provost and vice provosts have ample time to review the documents.

Timely completion of selecting the external reviewers and 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 (Appendix H) compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) 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.

This self-study is a second critical part in the academic program review, and its preparation 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.

The final version of the program self-study and its appendices should be sent electronically to the Office of Academic Effectiveness at least two (2) weeks prior to the external reviewers' visit. This should be in the form of an email or a transmittal memo (Appendix A).

4. *Visit and Written Report by the External Review Committee*

The visit by the external review committee is typically two or three days (arriving on Sunday and leaving Tuesday afternoon). 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 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 written report is essential to the Institute's internal review by faculty committees and subsequent BOR review.

5. *Closure of the Review*

Once the report has been received, the academic unit hosts a faculty meeting with the dean to discuss the review. Then the program chair and dean develop a written response to the external review with an action plan summarizing what actions should be taken. This initial action plan should be emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness.

The Office of Academic Effectiveness then schedules a follow-up meeting where the college/unit representatives meet with the provost and vice provosts to discuss the results from the program review and action plan.

6. *Institute Progress Reporting*

An annual progress report should be emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness by the end of the spring semester each year for three years. 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.

7. *Faculty Executive Board*

The Faculty Executive Board (FEB) APR subcommittee reviews the APRs for the current year, along with the annual progress reports submitted for prior years' reviews. The subcommittee summarizes the findings and identifies common themes to assist the Executive Board with making recommendations as appropriate on conclusions and plans emanating from academic program reviews that have been completed. The provost responds to the subcommittee's report.

C. Summary of Milestones

APR Schedule	Actions	Responsible Parties
January	Schedule of APRs coordinated and updated with colleges' associate deans (AD) or representative.	OAE/ Dean's Office
January–March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning meeting held with dean, program chair, representatives from the Offices of Institutional Effectiveness (OAE) and Institutional Research and Planning (IRP). • A point of contact for the review cycle is identified from the Office of the Dean. 	Dean's Office
No later than end of spring semester	Proposed date for the external review visit forwarded to the OAE.	Dean's Office
August or as requested by the unit	Data portfolio prepared and forwarded to the unit/college, with a final copy to OAE.	IRP/ Unit/Dean's Office
September	List of external reviewers forwarded to OAE for the Provost's approval.	Dean's Office
September–January	An electronic file with <i>confirmed</i> reviewers, biosketches, and visit dates is forwarded to the OAE.	Dean's Office
September to early November	Self-study conducted and report completed.	Unit/Dean's Office
Mid-November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-study emailed to OAE. • OAE notifies the provost and vice provosts that the APR materials are available for review. 	Dean's Office
January to mid-March	Visit by external review committee and exit report by the committee on its findings.	Dean's Office
Three weeks following the external committee visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written report of the external review committee is received by the provost and dean. • Copy of external review committee report is emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness. 	Dean's Office
By end of spring semester	Dean's readout with the chair/program head and program faculty.	Dean's Office
May	Program's response to the external review and action improvement plan emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness.	Dean's Office
By July 30	Follow-up meeting with provost, vice provosts, APAE, dean, associate deans, and school/program chair.	OAE
By August 31	Summary report of all APRs conducted and posted to internal GT site for access by the USG Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Provost.	OAE

III. Self-study

The primary audience for the self-study is the external review committee. The self-study should be a forthright evaluation of each academic program under review. The purpose of the self-study is 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)
- annual program assessments for each program
- 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 in the 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 and in particular, findings as a result of analysis done in Section E. 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 each degree program included in the self-study with regard to its 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 each 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 summarizes 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 each academic program under review is to be addressed and discussed in the self-study and demonstrated by supporting data within the data portfolio and included as appendices in the self-study. Instruction by video, distance learning, and each campus location outside of Atlanta must be addressed and discussed, if applicable.

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

1. a review of each academic degree program and minor as well as each certificate program included in the program;
2. a discussion of the results and improvements from actions taken for each degree program’s annual assessment reports [include copies of the assessment reports in the appendices];
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; and,
4. a review of the unit/college’s diversity goals to include how the 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 the unit’s success in achieving the stated outcomes of the improvements.

Institutional Research and Planning will supply a basic data portfolio for the most recent five-year period for each degree program reviewed, which may be used as supporting data in the discussion of **viability, productivity, and quality**. At the dean’s APR planning meeting, the unit and IRP representatives will have an opportunity to discuss the additional types of data that may be available for program analysis. (Appendix H.)

F. Research and Scholarship

The research activities and accomplishments associated with the unit 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.

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 each 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.

IV. The External Review

A. The Visit

The schedule below is typical for external reviews that are not conducted as part of a professional or specialized accreditation review.¹ 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.

¹ Academic units being reviewed by a professional or specialized accrediting organization should follow the protocols of that organization.

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 reconfirm the schedule. This dinner meeting does not need to include the provost and the vice provosts. 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:

1. An overview of the program(s) by the chair.
2. Faculty introductions and meetings—allow for both individual and group times.
 - Reserved office/meeting space should be made available throughout Day Two to allow a location for faculty wishing to meet individually with reviewers.
3. Discussion time with principals involved with undergraduate and graduate programs, research programs, and outreach efforts.
4. Both morning and afternoon meeting times that will enable undergraduate and graduate students to have the opportunity to interact with the reviewers.
5. A reception at a time conducive for faculty, staff, and students to interact with the reviewers without college/school/program leadership.
 - 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.

1. The exit meeting should be scheduled at a time convenient to the provost/representative, vice provosts, dean, and others as decided by the provost and the dean.
2. An oral report and/or presentation are desired at the exit meeting on campus.
3. A written report is to be submitted to the college dean, and the provost if the college is the unit being reviewed, three weeks following the campus report.
4. 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.

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 emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness (OAE). 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.

NOTES:

V. 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 emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness.

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

[Dean's Letterhead]

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 Day Three, 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

[Visiting Reviewer's Name]



Chair, Department of xxxxxxxxx
Distinguished Professor
[University]
[Address]

Tele: xxx.xxx.xxxx-Office
xxx.xxx.xxxx-Cell

Fax: xxx. xxx.xxxx

E-Mail: xxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx

Biographical Sketch

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Vivamus nulla quam, tincidunt vel sodales quis, feugiat scelerisque metus. Nunc leo dolor, tristique at lectus ut, dictum feugiat sem. Donec tempus magna nunc, interdum facilisis augue pellentesque sit amet. Interdum et malesuada fames ac ante ipsum primis in faucibus. Aenean scelerisque mauris a dolor egestas, et maximus ex efficitur. Nam non finibus orci. Curabitur eros risus, placerat in dolor sit amet, efficitur accumsan mauris. Mauris non odio sed metus tempor lacinia. Duis hendrerit consectetur nisi, ut placerat ligula.

Suspendisse in nisl ligula. Nunc non quam lorem. Praesent fermentum dignissim tincidunt. Aenean id metus bibendum, pulvinar metus id, consectetur ipsum. Aliquam tempus neque in augue molestie interdum. Nulla ultrices et velit nec dapibus. Aenean quis odio non metus porta ornare. Mauris vel ipsum quis mi imperdiet mattis at non nibh. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Cras sollicitudin laoreet ex, venenatis tincidunt orci sagittis in. Nulla fringilla convallis eros at tincidunt. Mauris maximus hendrerit dui sed cursus. Aenean libero eros, convallis nec sagittis in, sollicitudin a dui. In eget ipsum tempor, rhoncus eros eget, consequat ex

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 pm Meet in [location] to travel as a group to dinner
- 7:30 pm 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]
8:15–9:00 a.m.	Overview of the Program [name], Chair, School of _____
9:00–9:30 a.m.	Tour of Instructional Facilities [names, titles]
9:30–10:15 a.m.	Tour of Research [or other educational] Facilities [as appropriate] [names, titles]
10:15–10:30 a.m.	Break

F. Sample Itinerary for External Review Visit [continued]

Day of Week, Date [continued]

10:30–11:00 a.m.	Undergraduate Program(s) [name], Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies (or equivalent)
11:00–11:30 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]
12:15–1:15 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]
1:15–2:15 p.m.	Meet with Assistant Professors [names, titles]
2:15–3:15 p.m.	Meet with Associate Professors [names, titles]
3:15–3:45 p.m.	Break
3:45–4:45 p.m.	Meet with Professors [names, titles]
4:45–5:15 p.m.	Discussion by Review Committee alone
5:15–5:45 p.m.	Wrap-Up Meeting [name], Chair, School of _____
5:45 p.m.	Adjourn – Committee Members Return to Hotel via [Transportation]
6:30 p.m.	External Review Committee working dinner—Location to be determined by Committee

[Day of Week, Date]

Breakfast in [location] and transportation to meeting	
9:30–11:30 a.m.	External Review Committee meeting [location, room number]
11:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.	External Review Committee Lunch [location]
1:00–2:00 p.m. *times as fit schedules of Provost and Dean	External Review Committee Exit Report [location] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 p.m.	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 drivers of the action plan are the unit chair and the dean.

1. The 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 emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness 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.
7. It is then up to the dean and the chair to work out a calendar and schedule to carry out this action plan. The facilitator is available to assist and to provide feedback along the way.
8. A report is emailed to the Office of Academic Effectiveness each spring semester for three years following the review.
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.

H. Institutional Research & Planning Basic Data Portfolio Content

[Indicators of Viability (V); Productivity (P); Quality (Q) Measures]

Student Level Data (Most Recent 5-Yr Period) Bachelor's Degree Level by Program	Student Level Data (Most Recent 5-Yr Period) Master's Degree Level by Program	Student Level Data (Most Recent 5-Yr Period) Doctoral Degree Level by Program
<p>1) Admissions by Academic Year (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Total Number of Applied b) Total Number of Admitted c) Total Number of Enrolled d) Acceptance Rate (% Accepted) e) Yield Rate (% Actually Enrolled) f) Number of FTF (First Time Freshman) g) Average Incoming SAT and ACT Scores <p>2) Fall Census Enrollment by Academic Year (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Total Number of Enrolled ii. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) [FTE = (Total Credit Hours) / 12] iii. Total Credit Hours (Sum of Enrolled Credit Hours) b) Demographics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gender ii. Race <p>3) Persistence Measures (P)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Retention Rates by Cohort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cohort inclusion criteria: Start Summer or Fall and full-time Fall ii. Retention = enrolled or having graduated iii. Retention rates reflect students who entered into program with their cohort but may not have graduated in the same program b) Graduation Rates by Cohort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cohort inclusion criteria: Start Summer or Fall and full-time Fall ii. Graduation rates reflect students who entered into program with their cohort but may not have graduated in the same program iii. Six-year graduation rate is the official rate according to the IPEDS graduation rate survey definition iv. Cohorts without a complete 4-year graduation rate are not included (For example, if currently Spring 2018 is in progress, Fall 2014 cohort is excluded because the full AY2017-2018 is not complete) c) Completion Counts (i.e. # of Degrees Awarded) by Academic Year d) Average Time to Degree in Semesters (excluding summer) 	<p>1) Admissions by Academic Year (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Total Number of Applied b) Total Number of Admitted c) Total Number of Enrolled d) Acceptance Rate (% Accepted) e) Yield Rate (% Actually Enrolled) <p>2) Fall Census Enrollment by Academic Year (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Total Number of Enrolled ii. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) [FTE = (Total Credit Hours) / 9] iii. Total Credit Hours (Sum of Enrolled Credit Hours) b) Demographics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gender ii. Race <p>3) Persistence Measures (P)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Completion Counts (i.e., Degrees Awarded by Academic Year) b) Average Time to Degree in Semesters (excluding summer) 	<p>1) Admissions by Academic Year (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Total Number of Applied b) Total Number of Admitted c) Total Number of Enrolled d) Acceptance Rate (% Accepted) e) Yield Rate (% Actually Enrolled) <p>2) Fall Census Enrollment by Academic Year (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Total Number of Enrolled ii. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) [FTE = (Total Credit Hours) / 9] iii. Total Credit Hours (Sum of Enrolled Credit Hours) b) Demographics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gender ii. Race <p>3) Persistence Measures (P)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Completion Counts (i.e., Degrees Awarded by Academic Year) b) Average Time to Degree in Semesters (excluding summer)
	<p style="text-align: center;">Faculty/Staff Level Data</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Instructional Quality Measures</p>
	<p>1) HR Profile – Only Active employees (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Counts, Average Salary, and Total Salary Outlays <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Faculty by Rank ii. Postdoctoral Scholars iii. Graduate Assistant by Position Type iv. Staff v. Student Assistants <p>2) Faculty Profile – Only Active faculty with Faculty indicator according to the Human Resources Data Mart (HRDM) (V)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Average Annual Salary by Rank (Adjusted to 10-month Equivalent) b) Demographics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gender ii. Race iii. Citizenship c) Characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Total Number by Rank ii. Number of Faculty by Teaching CIPC <p>3) Faculty Academic Portfolio (P, Q)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Academic Analytics b) OK State Salary Survey 	<p>1) Faculty to Student Ratio (Q)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Undergraduate b) Graduate <p>2) Teaching load per faculty (Q)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Credit hrs. per Semester b) Credit hrs. per FTE <p>3) Average Enrollment by Course Level (e.g., 1000, 2000, etc.) (Q)</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">External Data</p>
<p>For additional information, please contact the Office of Institutional Research and Planning:</p> <p>Sandra Kinney Senior Director sandra.kinney@irp.gatech.edu Tele: 404.385.0946</p>	<p>Jason Wang Senior Decision Support Analyst jason.wang@irp.gatech.edu Tele: 404.385.5727</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Space and Financial Data</p> <p>1) Space Data by Usage Type (V)</p> <p>2) Sponsored Awards (P, Q)</p> <p>3) Budget/Encumbrance/Expenditures (V)</p>

I. Academic Program Review Five-Year Schedule

Detailed Academic Program Review Schedule: < <https://academiceffectiveness.gatech.edu/resources/program-review/> >

© Copyright 2020 • Georgia Institute of Technology
An equal education and employment opportunity institution