Different deans may want to institute somewhat different procedures for conducting academic program reviews. However, in all cases a Self-Study responsive to the University’s Academic Program Review Guidelines must be prepared by the department or program, and the department/program must be evaluated by GW colleagues external to that department. Those programs that must meet external accreditation requirements on a regular basis may make arrangements to overlap both reviews cycles and to substitute material required for the professional accreditation to meet the relevant APR requirements. However, all elements of the APR must be covered, regardless of whether or not it is required for professional accreditation. Contact the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment for additional information.

Please note that the Doctoral Program Review Criteria has been revised and has been incorporated into the APR Guidelines. Departments with doctoral programs need to include only the information requested in the APR Guidelines.

Once the self-study is completed, the Dean appoints a GW Internal Review Committee (IRC). This IRC reads the Self-Study, raises questions with the department, and ideally meets with selected faculty and students. A written report called the GW Internal Review is submitted to the dean and the department/program, and the department/program has the opportunity to respond to it.

At least one reviewer external to the University must be commissioned to review the Self-Study and the GW Internal Review, to talk to or meet with relevant individuals inside and outside the department/program, and to file an independent report called the External Review.

Finally, the dean of the school or college must provide his/her own assessment of the department/program.

It is recommended that the following timetable be followed in conducting academic program reviews:

First Eight Months

- **Preparation of Self-Study:** Organization of Self-Study, compilation of data, drafting of sections of the report. (GW has leased a data management software, TaskStream, to assist with the storing, managing, and archiving of APR documents and report and the yearly program assessment update. More information about TaskStream can be found at [www.gwu.edu/~assess/taskstream.html](http://www.gwu.edu/~assess/taskstream.html).
• **Analysis of Data:** Strategic planning, and completion and submission of Self-Study.

• **Dean appoints and charges a GW IRC:** This committee consists of three colleagues from other departments within the University, and the dean provides the committee with the Self-Study. (This committee may in some cases benefit from inclusion of an individual from outside the University such as a practitioner in the field for which the program prepares students.)

### Next Six Months

- **GW Internal Review:** The GW IRC convenes, reviews the Self-Study, meets with chair and ideally with selected faculty and students, deliberates, and submits its report called the Internal Review to the dean.

- **Department Response:** The department/program has an opportunity to respond to the report in writing.

- **External Review:** An academic reviewer external to the University (e.g., a colleague at a nearby university) is commissioned by the dean. In the typical case, he/she reads the Self-Study and Internal Review; meets with as many as feasible of the following: dean, chair/director, review committee, faculty, students, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Planning; and files his/her report called the External Review. At the discretion of the dean, this External Review step may occur during the Self-Study phase or during the GW IRC phase, but most often it would occur after the GW IRC has completed the Internal Review. Again at the discretion of the dean, and based on the needs of the department/unit being reviewed, this phase could range from a largely document-based review in which a reviewer reads the Self-Study and Internal Review and, if desired, asks questions of the chair and dean by email or phone, to a committee of two or more scholars brought to campus for 2-3 days.

- Review is undertaken at dean’s level—e.g., through review by the dean’s council and then the dean, or simply through review by the dean(s).

- The Dean submits a memo summarizing his/her own assessment and recommendations to the Provost.

### Final Four Months

- **Review by the AP-APA:** The Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment reviews the entire portfolio and prepares a memo for the Provost.

- **Meeting with the Provost:** The Provost, Senior Vice Provost, Associate Provost, dean, chair of the department/program, and a faculty member selected by chair meet to discuss results.

- **Final Memo from the Provost:** The Provost writes a summary memo with conclusions to the chair and dean and brings the review to a close.

### Thereafter

- If requested, a progress report is submitted two years after the conclusion of the review.
The next academic program review is scheduled for 5 years after the conclusion of the review.