Butler University
Academic Program Review Guide

Updated October 1, 2019

Table of Contents

Academic Program Review Personnel and Units of Review 2
The Academic Program Review Process 3
Program Review Timeline at a Glance 7
The Self-Study Report 8
Outline and Format of the Self-Study Report 10
The External Reviewer and Site Visit 13
Sample Invitation Letter to Reviewer 15
Sample External Reviewer Visit Itinerary 16

Academic Program Review Personnel and Units of Review

The academic program review (APR) process is overseen by the provost, with individual reviews being overseen by the college deans. The associate deans and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment provide support.

Unit of Review

The typical unit of review is the department. Normally, all programs within an academic department are reviewed simultaneously. In some instances, particularly if a unit has both externally accredited academic plans and non-accredited plans, APR may be done separately for different academic programs within the unit. Programs that do not reside within a department are reviewed independently of academic departments.

Accredited Programs

Externally accredited programs are reviewed in compliance with the standards and procedures established by the accrediting organization and following the calendar of review established by the accrediting organization. The review conducted by the accrediting body will usually substitute for the majority of the APR process. The provost may require a supplement to the accrediting review in cases where the review does not fully address University expectations (e.g., scholarly activity is not covered). When an accreditation review does not apply to all of a unit's programs, the regular APR process is required for the programs not covered by the accreditation.

The Academic Program Review Process

Academic Program Review (APR) serves as an essential, cyclical component of ongoing collaboration to assure that Butler is providing the highest quality educational programs and scholarship. To that end, every academic program offered by the University is typically be reviewed once every seven years.[1] The dean or provost may choose to adjust the schedule depending upon specific circumstances with the program. Programs that undergo external accreditation are exempt from the University's program review cycle because they complete accreditation reviews. However, if these external accreditation cycles are longer than seven years, an interim report is required.

Following initial orientation meetings for program leadership, the process begins with a comprehensive yet succinct self-study conducted by the full-time faculty and leadership responsible for the program(s). The self-study generally involves a multifaceted assessment of program goals, infrastructures, operations, strengths, and challenges in relation to the missions and strategic plans of the unit, college, and University.

A site visit by an external reviewer occurs following the self-study report. In certain cases, such as with multi-disciplinary or blended departments, two or more reviewers may be desired. Following the site visit, the consultant provides a report, which conveys their impressions of the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for the unit, as well as specific recommendations. Based on the self-study and consultant's report, and in the context of the University strategic plan, the unit faculty and academic leadership develop an action plan for the unit and its programs. The action plan is discussed with the college dean and provost before finalization.

Program Review Goals

The primary goals for program review at Butler University are to:

- Enhance the quality of academic programs by clarifying program goals, assessing goal achievement, reviewing program resources, identifying concerns, and introducing needed changes

- Stimulate the review of policies, practices, procedures, and records, thereby helping improve program operations

- Provide an effective orientation to the program and its activities for new faculty, administrators, and external entities

- Identify areas for resource needs and growth, as well as justify requests for program enhancements

- Help the University develop a better sense of college programs, and make informed decisions on curricular proposals, budget requests, and long-term planning

[1] The term "programs" includes traditional departments, as well as interdisciplinary programs. If a department houses more than one academic program, the decision whether to assess the programs individually or collectively will be made by the dean, in consultation with departmental faculty.

- Align academic program needs and campus priorities in ways that are consistent with college and University missions and strategic directions, and with program and institutional Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

Academic Program Review Cycle and Sequence

The program review cycle consists of the following steps:

1. Notification of the Review: During the year prior to scheduled review the dean's office notifies the department chair/program director that a program review is scheduled. The college dean, in consultation with department chair or program director, will either confirm the review or request an alternative timeframe, and will inform the provost of the decision. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment office maintains the standard University schedule of reviews.

2. Orientation Meeting: Following notification, the department chair or program director will attend an orientation session conducted by the college dean or designee to assure that all parties understand the expected process, and to provide appropriate guidance for the academic unit under review.

3. Identification of External Reviewer(s): During the semester prior to the review, the department/program faculty identifies a short list of possible external reviewers and their credentials (see guidelines for this process within this document). The list is provided to the respective college dean for consideration. The dean's office will select the reviewer(s) and select dates for the review in consultation with the department chair or program director and external reviewer(s).

4. Formation of the Self-Study Committee: During the semester prior to review, the department chair or program director should consult with the college dean regarding an appropriate composition for the self-study committee. The department chair or program director will convene the self-study committee, or can select a designee to lead the committee. At the request of the department chair or program director, the associate dean can conduct an orientation session for the unit faculty or self-study committee. In certain cases, the entire faculty body of a program can constitute the self-study committee, given permission from the dean.

5. Standard Data Reports: It is the responsibility of departments to contact the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to gather standard data for their reports. Examples of standard data which can be provided are individualized department statistical overviews, and 10-year statistical trends. More specific data needs for individual departments may be requested through the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Please allow the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at least four weeks for processing standard or specialized data requests.

6. The Self-Study: The self-study will typically proceed during the fall term of the review year, though in some cases a spring review may occur. A draft of the self-study report should be delivered to the dean's office for review, a minimum of two months prior to the on-site review visit. Following any necessary revisions to the draft self-study report, a final version of the self-

study report should be sent by the dean to the reviewer(s) no later than three weeks prior to the visit.

7. Site Visit Preparation: The schedule for the site visit should be developed in consultation with the college dean's office. The department chair or program director develops the site visit itinerary and coordinates with the external reviewer (see sample itinerary, Appendix).

8. External Reviewer Travel, Reimbursement and Honoraria: The external reviewer's travel arrangements (flight, hotel, etc.) should be made by the reviewer with assistance from the unit if needed. All expenses will be paid by the dean's office. The dean's office will also pay the consultant's honorarium, upon receipt of their written report.

9. External Reviewer's Report: Within one month following the site visit, the reviewer submits a report to the college dean, who will distribute it to the department chair or program director. The department chair or program director should in turn distribute the report to the unit faculty and discuss the evaluation and recommendations made by the reviewer.

10. Action Plan Development: After facilitating discussion of the self-study and reviewer's report among the unit's stakeholders, the department chair or program director will collaborate with the college dean to develop a draft action plan. The department chair or program director is typically responsible for drafting the action plan, which is then reviewed by the college dean. The action plan should synthesize the results of the self-study and reviewer's report within the context of the strategic plans for the college and/or University. It will describe the actions the unit will take over the next 1-6 years to achieve its goals and address key strategic issues that surfaced through the program-review process. The plan can be organized as a series of objectives that are prioritized based on the synthesis from above. The plan can also focus on two distinct realms: 1) What actions can occur with existing human and financial resources, and 2) Which actions will likely require an infusion of human and/or financial resources, and why? The draft action plan must be completed within six weeks of the receipt of the external reviewer report, not including summer months.

11. Action Plan Meeting: Following the college dean's review of the action plan and any desired collaboration with the department chair or program director, the dean will send the draft action plan to the provost for review. An action plan meeting will be scheduled including the department chair or program director, college dean, associate dean, and provost. By the conclusion of the meeting, all participants should agree upon the actions to be taken and any revisions needed to the draft action plan. Within 30 days of the meeting, the department chair or program director will submit a revised action plan for final approval of the dean and provost.

12. Permanent Record of the Program Review Materials: The department is to forward the electronic program review materials, including the self-study, reviewer report, and action plan, to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for permanent archiving within 30 days post review.

13. Progress Report: The dean's office will request a progress report three years after completion of the program review year. (e.g. a program review undertaken in 2016-17 will require a completed progress report by the end of the academic year 2019-20). This report should include a brief summary of progress relative to the action plan and any updates that have impacted the

implementation of the plan. The progress report should be submitted for review by the dean, and to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for archiving.

Note: This step constitutes the “closing of the loop” of the program-review process at Butler, providing specific instances of how both the University leadership and the department/program have implemented the agreed upon action plan.

Program Review Timeline at a Glance

YEAR PRIOR TO APR	TIMEFRAME
Dean's office notifies departments of upcoming APRs	One year prior to site visit.
Associate dean and a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment meet with department chair or program director for APR orientation	One year prior to site visit.
Department chair or program director forms self-study committee	One year prior to site visit.
YEAR OF APR	
External reviewers proposed, decided by college dean	Semester prior to site visit
Develop timeline and site-visit schedule	Semester prior to site visit
Complete self-study report draft; submit rough draft to dean	Three months prior to site visit
Finalize self-study report; send to internal offices and reviewer	Three weeks prior to site visit
Site visit (two days)	Site visit
Receive external reviewer report	Within one month following site visit
Department/college processes reimbursements and honorarium for external reviewer	Within one month following receipt of reviewer report
YEAR AFTER APR	
Draft action plan for review by dean	Six weeks following receipt of reviewer report
Schedule action plan meeting with provost	Semester following receipt of reviewer report
Finalize action plan; provost approval and filing	Semester following receipt of reviewer report
THREE YEARS AFTER ACTION PLAN	
Mid-term progress report submitted to college dean and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment	End of 3rd year following review year

The Self-Study Report

Introduction to the Self-Study Report

The program review process begins with a departmental self-study that culminates in a report that is comprehensive, but not encyclopedic. The self-study should be written as an interpretive document that evidences the outcomes and impacts of degree programs, as well as scholarly and other endeavors, relevant to the unit's distinctive goals.

The purpose of the self-study report is to identify strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction, student learning outcomes, scholarly activities, operations and infrastructure, service and engagement, and special features or services provided by the unit.

Standard data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (to be obtained per consultation with their office), assessment findings, and other pertinent sources should be referenced in making evaluative and proscriptive conclusions. Supporting evidence collected from the unit's staff, enrolled students, alumni, and advisory boards (where relevant) should be solicited and utilized to support standard data.

Resource allocation is an important matter to all academic units. However, the self-study report should not be used as a budget request. The subsequent action plan will serve as the primary vehicle for communicating improvements, which can be accomplished both with and without an additional infusion of resources.

The self-study is intended to assist the program(s) and its reviewers in evaluating the following dimensions:

1. Program goals and directions
2. Faculty
3. Curriculum and its impact on students
4. Extra programmatic curricular contributions
5. Student experience
6. Resource management
7. Strengths and weaknesses of the program

The self-study should be grounded in, and organized around, quantitative and qualitative data collected by the institution and the program itself. Much of the quantitative data about the program will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in the form of **the Program Review**

Statistical Overview[2], and/or other data as requested by the department. This standard report provides data on faculty, students, enrollments, major counts, graduation rates, etc. since the department's last program review.

Other sources of data include student learning outcome (SLO) assessment reports, external evaluations, recommendations from accreditation reports, and data from post-collegiate surveys administered by the program or by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Each department, program, or college may develop additional information relating to these criteria that are meaningful and appropriate for the program. The program review process should strive for an appropriate balance of quantitative and qualitative information about the program under review.

Characteristics of Effective Self-Study Reports

- Focus: The report should adhere to the basic outline provided in this document, be thorough, succinct, and readable. It should not dwell excessively on problems, but rather focus on successes, challenges and potential solutions, aspirations, and goals. A thorough, accurate, and neutral self-study focused on the unit will provide the best guarantee that University leadership will understand and appreciate the needs of the unit.

- Audience: The primary audience considered for the program review should be the external reviewer, who likely knows little about the department and programs. The secondary audience is the academic leadership of the University. It is recommended that the self-study report be written with these audiences in mind.

- Holistic: The report should cover all facets of a unit's operations, unless the department chair or program director and college dean agree upon exclusions.

- Evidence: The report should be based on quality data. Out-of-date and out-of-context data should be avoided. Valid internal and external peer comparisons are helpful.

- Tone: The report should be constructive and realistic in tone and approach. The report is not an opportunity to lament the past, nor should it be an unconstrained "wish list."

- Objectivity: The report should be appropriately candid, evaluative, and analytical. It should present a credible assessment of strengths and weaknesses that will provide a foundation for plans for the future.

- Brevity: The self-study should be concise. The authors should keep in mind that their colleagues will be asked to read the document carefully.

[2] Data from the Program Review Statistical Overview is considered authoritative. If in the course of the self-study, the program faculty discover discrepancies, they should work with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to resolve them as soon as possible.

Outline and Format of the Self-Study Report

Major Sections of the Self-Study Report

The outline below provides a suggested approach for organizing the self-study report. Absent compelling reasons, the self-study should contain the major sections listed below; however, units have wide latitude to organize content within the sections.

The bullet points under each section represent items that should typically be discussed in the section, but they need not be addressed in any particular order, and not all points will be relevant to every unit. It will often be the case that an issue (e.g., student research) will be relevant to more than one section. Feel free to organize the material and use links to maximize coherence and minimize repetition.

1. *Executive Summary* (1-2 pages)
   - A brief overview of the academic unit and the program(s) to be reviewed.
   - A brief summary of quantitative data on teaching: e.g., departmental TCH and SCH, number of majors and/or minors, etc.
   - Overview of significant strengths, opportunities, and areas for improvement.
2. *Unit Overview*
   - Helpful information about the history of the unit.
   - A brief description of how the unit and/or programs are aligned with the college and University mission.
   - Overview/table of faculty and general characteristics: tenure status and titles, areas of specialization, date started, highest degree attained, ethnicity. CVs should be hyperlinked.
   - Overview of teaching load and research/service expectations within department.
   - Overview of unit organization and governance – addressing issues such as the relation to the college and other units (e.g. if a program resides within a department with multiple programs), committees, the role of the head of the unit, of support and academic staff, and other administrative posts within the unit.
   - A brief description of processes for selection, annual evaluation, and promotion and tenure review for faculty.
   - Resource issues and constraints within the unit.
   - Brief summary of the previous action plan and developments resulting from the last APR.
3. *The Curriculum and Its Delivery*
   - Describe major and minor degree requirements for programs. Hyperlink requirement lists or catalog.
   - Discuss course schedules and rotations. Hyperlink catalog as well as tables showing historical schedules with courses and enrollments.
   - Discuss contributions to Core curriculum and honors program. Hyperlink to data.
   - Discuss service to other majors or interdisciplinary programs. Hyperlink to data.
   - Hyperlink assessment reports from last few years. If department has not been archiving reports, contact the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for copies.
   - Discuss opportunities for development and/or weaknesses in program delivery (e.g. staffing problems, curricular bottlenecks).
   - Discuss the quality of support from the library, facilities, IT, and other support external to the unit.

4. *Student Learning and Assessment*
    - List departmental SLOs and discuss relation to University SLOs.
    - Discuss how learning outcomes are mapped to curriculum.
    - Discuss the unit's approach to managing assessment (link assessment reports). What is the assessment cycle? Who manages it? What methods are used to measure SLOs?
    - Discuss assessment results and trends since the last program review.
    - Discuss any changes to the curriculum or pedagogical practices since the last program review, and how they have been linked to assessment results.
    - Discuss any other activities of the unit or its faculty that have been directed at improving teaching and learning within the unit.
    - Discuss any resource constraints that limit efforts to address issues discovered in assessment.
5. *The Student Experience*
    - Student profile(s) – what draws students to the program? How and when do they enter? What are their typical academic and vocational interests and goals?
    - Research, internship, practicums, and service-learning opportunities (if not already addressed in discussions of curricula).
    - Quantitative data, including trends on recruiting, enrollment, number of majors, graduation, retention, etc., if not already covered elsewhere. Consider hyperlinks to detailed data.
    - Approaches used to recruit and retain students, including underrepresented groups.
    - Strengths and challenges related to student advising.
    - Record of alumni outcomes, including graduate, professional school and job placement.
    - Approaches to maintaining contact with alumni.
6. *Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities*
    - Discuss highlights of faculty research, scholarship and/or creative activities, including:
        - publications, presentations and performances
        - grants
        - Research collaborations
        - Disciplinary recognition of department or its faculty
    - Describe highlights and/or provide quantitative summaries of faculty activities. Link to CVs for further detail.
    - Discuss departmental, college and University initiatives to support research.
    - Discuss appropriateness and/or challenges of libraries, facilities, staffing, funding, etc. that support or limit research.
    - Discuss collaborations in which students participate in faculty research.
7. *Service to the University, the Profession and the Public*
    - Engagement in any service and/or collaborative initiatives across the college or University.
    - Service to, or engagement with, the local and global community, and results of that service.
    - Service to the profession, such as editing journals and holding leadership positions in regional, national or international professional organizations.
    - Documentation of any regional, national, or international awards/recognitions.
8. *Summary of strengths, weaknesses/challenges, and opportunities identified through the self-study process.*

Format

The self-study report will be submitted and stored in the form of an online portfolio. That portfolio will consist of the main self-study narrative, plus a variety of materials (e.g., CVs, course catalog sections, enrollment data, assessment reports, syllabi) that provide information and evidence to support the narrative. Hyperlinks from the text will point readers directly to various supporting materials.

The External Reviewer and Site Visit

Central to the program review is a visit and report by an external reviewer (or reviewers). The reviewer is to provide an unbiased review of the program and to provide ideas and insights based upon their professional experience. External reviewers will be chosen by the college dean, in consultation with the department chair or program director and program faculty (see detailed process above). The reviewer will receive a copy of the departmental self-study in advance of the visit.

The reviewer's site visit will typically begin and end with a meeting with the college dean and associate dean. Other meetings will typically include the program faculty, program students, alumni, faculty and staff members contributing to programs outside the department, and other stakeholders as necessary.

The external reviewer's final report should address the following:

- Evidence of student learning in the program.
- Evidence of quality in students' work (such as portfolios or other projects).
- Report from meetings with the dean, groups of students, faculty, and other stakeholders as deemed necessary.
- Strengths and "promising practices" evidenced in the program.
- Weaknesses/challenges identified in the program, and strategies to address them.
- Other issues raised by program faculty in its review.

Selection of the External Reviewer and Planning the Site Visit

The department chair or program director should consult with the faculty, as outlined in this document, to propose a short list of potential reviewers. Sources of potential reviewers may include national and/or regional associations or professional networks may be willing to provide the names of individuals who are qualified to serve as external consultants. Desirable qualifications of the consultants include:

- Prior program review service or training for a consultant's role
- Expertise in the academic and professional area(s) fitting with the department
- Experience with similar institutional/departmental context
- No close relationships with personnel in the unit undergoing review, or other potential conflicts of interest
- Sufficient time to devote to the task

The department chair or program director should submit to the college dean a ranked list of three to five potential reviewers, including contact information, biographical overview and/or abridged CV, and any other rationale for the choices. The dean will review the list and consult with the department chair or program director to determine a preferred ranking. The dean or associate dean will make initial contact with those on the list to determine their availability and willingness to participate as a reviewer. Initial discussion should result in a determination of the dates and duration of the visit (typically 1.5 to 2.5 days), and any other critical arrangements. Following initial contacts, the dean or associate dean will send formal letters of invitation to the selected external reviewer. A sample letter of invitation is found in this document.

The department chair or program director, in cooperation with the dean's office, and other offices as needed, will formulate an itinerary for the site visit to include:

- An entrance interview during the first morning of the visit between the reviewer and the college dean and associate dean.

- Interview with the department chair or program director.
- Interviews with unit faculty, staff, and students and possibly with department chair or program directors of supporting academic departments and unit advisory committees (if pertinent).
- Meetings between the reviewer and individual faculty members are encouraged where possible (or with small groups of faculty in larger units).
- An open forum to allow students, faculty, and staff to ask further questions of the reviewer and/or to provide input.
- The reviewer may request tours of facilities.
- An exit interview, toward the end of the visit, between the reviewer and the college dean and associate dean.
- An exit interview or wrap-up meeting with the department chair or program director.

A sample itinerary is available later in this document.

Guidelines for the Reviewer's Report

There are no specific format requirements for the reviewer's report. The length and content will vary depending on the nature and scope of the program being reviewed and on personal preferences. Typically, the report begins with an overview of the program's strengths and areas identified for improvement, and concludes with a summary and specific recommendations.

The external reviewer is encouraged to give specific attention to:

- The quality and suitability of all undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered by the department
- Whether the degree program curricula is/are current and sufficient in terms of the discipline
- Effectiveness of each degree program as evidenced by student learning outcomes
- Whether the unit has implemented an adequate process for assessing the learning outcomes of its students, and if the unit has utilized the assessment findings to improve their degree programs
- Whether the qualifications of the faculty fit the programs offered
- Opportunities for development, and weaknesses/deficiencies in the program
- What major factors could limit the unit's future development or increased effectiveness
- Evaluation of the quality and quantity of research, scholarly and/or creative activities considering the unit's context
- Quality of the support from the library and other support external to the unit
- Appropriateness of the unit's short- and long-term goals
- Prospects for the unit to achieve its stated objectives

The best means of assisting the unit under review is to make recommendations that are useful within the confines of the current budget. If the current level of support is inadequate for the current program, indicate what could be eliminated from the program to correct the imbalance, as well as what additional resources would be needed to adequately support the current program. Recommendations that will increase a unit's efficiency and effectiveness are especially helpful.

The particular issues that need to be addressed in a report will depend upon the unit, and the dean should make clear in the initial meeting their expectations for the review.

Sample Invitation Letter to Reviewer

It is important for the chosen external reviewer(s) to understand the terms and expectations of an Academic Program Review at Butler. These should be spelled out in a letter from the dean/associate dean confirming the dates and other terms of the review. The following letter is a sample, which should be modified, as needed, by the dean.

Dear Dr. [Reviewer Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for the [discipline] department at Butler University. Academic Program Review (APR) is conducted every seven years for degree programs not affiliated with professional accreditation. The most important purpose is to assure the quality of educational programs and to identify opportunities for future development. As an external reviewer you have a critical role in this review process. Your objective input will assist the unit and university to evaluate its programs and develop strategic plans for program development.

We have scheduled your visit for [add dates]. You will have initial and terminal meetings with the dean and associate dean, and will have opportunities to meet with the chair/director, the faculty and staff and students of the department, you will have the chance to visit a class, and you will have opportunities to meet with selected faculty and administrators in related programs. If you have questions about the schedule, or particular activities you would like us to schedule, please contact the chair/director.

We will be sending you a comprehensive self-study at least two weeks prior to your visit. The self-study will provide you an overview of the unit's faculty, staff, students, and facilities. It describes the curriculum and its delivery. It will also describe student learning outcomes and their assessment, as well as the post-graduate trajectories of the department's alumni. It will also discuss the research and service activities of the faculty. We ask the department to use the results of their self-study to identify the major strengths of, challenges to, and opportunities for their programs.

Within one month after your visit, we will expect you to deliver us a written report on your findings. We do not specify a fixed format for the report, but will generally seek your assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses and your views on how the program can improve over the course of the seven year assessment cycle. Your report, together with the self-study, will serve as the basis of an action plan developed by the department and dean, and approved by the provost. The dean will provide you further information on the questions we would like addressed in your report at our initial meeting.

The department chair/program director and their administrative support will be in touch with you to make travel arrangements and finalize your itinerary. If you need further information in advance of your visit or if you have any special requests, do not hesitate to contact them. We will pay all travel and expenses for your visit. Upon receipt of your report, we will process your honorarium.

We are grateful for your agreeing to assist us, and look forward to your visit.

Best wishes,

[Name]
Associate Dean, College of [Insert]

Sample External Reviewer Visit Itinerary

This itinerary represents a typical yet adjustable schedule for a site visit. The academic unit leadership, faculty and staff should adapt this default approach for their own circumstances. The itinerary should still include entrance and exit meetings with the college dean and associate dean(s), and department chair or program director. Likewise, meetings should be arranged with the unit staff personnel, and a sample of current students representing the programs under review. Finally, the external reviewer may desire to meet with other role players not listed below in order to provide a fuller context.

DAY 1

8:00a – 9:00a	Breakfast with department chair or program director
9:30a – 10:15a	Entrance interview with the dean and associate dean(s)
10:30a – 11:15a	Meet with self-study committee
11:15a – 11:45a	Departmental/campus tour (as desired) (break)
12:00p – 1:00p	Luncheon with select faculty
1:00p – 1:30p	Professor #1 (1:1 meeting)
1:30p – 2:00p	Professor #2 (1:1 meeting) (break)
2:15p – 2:45p	Professor #3 (1:1 meeting)
2:45p – 3:15p	Professor #4 (1:1 meeting) (break)
3:45p – 5:00p	Meet with department chair or program directors/directors of associated programs/Core (if relevant)
6:00p – 7:30p	Dinner with select faculty

DAY 2

8:00a – 9:15a	Breakfast, professors #5, 6, etc.
9:30a – 10:30a	Open forum for faculty, staff and students
10:30a – 11:30a	Meet with department administrative staff
11:30a – 1:15p	Pizza luncheon with current students, and break
1:15p – 1:45p	Professor #7 (1:1 meeting)
1:45p – 2:15p	Wrap up with department chair or program director
2:30p – 3:30p	Exit meeting with the college dean, and associate dean(s)