College Area Review – Academic Program Review
EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES
2017-2018

1. By the end of **November 2017**, each program should submit the names of at least two potential reviewers to their dean. The dean along with faculty in conjunction with the vice president and provost for that program will decide who should be invited to conduct the external pee r review. Invitation and selection of the peer reviewer should be made prior to the end for fall semester. Peer reviewer visits should occur in **February 2018** after the dean has reviewed and made comments on the report and recommendations and prior to the vice president's review of the academic area.

2. When selecting potential reviewers, refrain from nominating individuals who have been (or are):
   a. An employee, candidate, or consultant with the College over the last five years.
   b. In familial or close relationships with individuals at MC or may be biased in regards to MC.

3. The program is responsible to cover the cost of the reviewer (honorarium and travel). The Assessment Office will assist, where necessary. The dean's office will be responsible for the scheduling of meetings and all other logistics within his/her program area. The CAR Coordinator should be informed of the details o f t h e reviewer's schedule. Prior to the College exit, the peer reviewer will meet with dean and vice president and provost for discussions and debriefing.

4. Prior to the on-site visit, the program should send to the peer reviewer details about the program, directions to campus, accommodations information, CAR package with reports, data, recommendations, and any other pertinent background materials needed for the peer reviewer to conduct the review.

5. Key questions that the program wishes to be addressed should be provided to the peer reviewer with the expectation that these questions will be addressed in the report.

6. The peer reviewer will conduct a one-day visit with one overnight stay, when warranted. The peer reviewer will conduct on-site interviews/meetings with chairs, coordinators, faculty designates from the program, related staff, and students representing all three campuses.

7. Peer Reviewer will provide a written report based on the program review and recommendations, interviews conducted by the reviewer, and observations during the visit to Montgomery College. The reviewer should answer the specific questions that have been provided in order to achieve an overall evaluation of the academic area. The reviewer should submit the report in electronic and paper format within 10 days of the visit, along with his or her resume. Summary written reports should be five to eight pages in length.

8. Peer reviewer written report should be sent to:
   Dr. Clevette Ridguard, College Area Review Coordinator Montgomery College
   15400 Calhoun Drive, Suite 310
   Rockville, Maryland 20855

9. Electronic copies should be sent to: *CollegeAreaReview@montgomerycollege.edu.* If there are any questions, please contact Dr. Clevette Ridguard at (240) 567-5343.

College Area Review

Expectations of the Peer Reviewer Report
Template Guidelines

Each peer review report should address the following items. However, other specific questions can be asked of the external peer reviewer at the discretion of the program department. The report should not exceed ten pages.

- Discuss how relevant and aligned the program's mission, goals, and objectives are to the College's mission and vision.
- Discuss the overall quality of the curriculum, does it appropriately prepare our students to address the needs of industry and or transfer institutions? How does this curriculum compare with other two-year programs?
- Specifically, address the student learning outcomes and available program assessment results. Are they appropriate? Do program learning outcomes adequately address skills needed for transfer students and students entering the work profession? Are there any suggested modifications?
- Discuss advisory boards and articulations agreements? Are there articulation agreements that this program should investigate?
- Discuss any observations related to meetings and interactions with the faculty, students, deans or chairs.
- Discuss the strengths and weakness of the program. Identify program characteristics that should be kept and ones that might be changed.
- Review program and industry data and suggest any ways this program might improve student retention, completion, and success.
- Discuss any observations related to the program's facilities, technologies, support materials, student support, advising, resources for students, and faculty.
- Make at least two or three program recommendations and explain the rationale for making the recommendations that will benefit and promote student success.

Note: Peer Reviewer's recommendations should suggest ways to meet the benchmarks of the Academic Master Plan (AMP). These benchmarks are:
- Increase graduation
- Increase transfer
- Reduce cost
- Reduce time to completion
- Enhance partnerships with 4-year institutions
- Enhance partnerships with business and industry