

External Review Guidelines

The purpose of external reviews is to systematically and periodically evaluate the processes and functions of the Administrative and Educational Support (AES) units at the College and to recommend strategies for enhancing their effectiveness. Built into the Periodic Unit Review (PUR) is an external review process where the PUR report is submitted to external evaluators. Reviewers from other colleges and universities, which have similar functions or from other units at the College, provide an outsider's perspective on the unit, the PUR, the revised Assessment Plan and future initiatives. The focus of the external review is not the individual staff member, but the unit itself. Reviewers feedback can also include prioritized recommendations based on the PUR report as well as observations, interactions with the staff, and their own experiences. The external reviewer's final report is submitted to the unit after review and internal discussion will integrate the reviewers' comments into the final PUR report.

The Reviewers

- Reviewers can be from other colleges and universities, which have similar functions
- If reviewers from other institutions are not found, they can also be from other units at the College which can provide outsider's perspective on the Unit.
- When the PUR is reviewed by the AES Council member or other LaGuardia personnel, there will be two reviewers. However, because of the difficulty of finding reviewers from outside LaGuardia, there can be one reviewer when reviewers are not from LaGuardia.

Timeline (second PUR year)

- September – December: The unit creates a draft report based on the analysis and reviews in the first PUR year and submits to AES liaison and OIRA for an initial review and feedback.
- January – February: Based on the initial feedback, the PUR report is revised and prepared for submission to the external reviewers.
- March – April: The unit submits the revised PUR report to the external reviewer on March 1st. The external reviewers submit their report by the end of April.
- May – June: The external reviewers' recommendations are discussed within the unit and with senior leadership. A Revised draft based on the external reviewers' feedback is submitted for the division's VP feedback and input.
- July – August: Final draft is submitted.

Process for the external reviewer

Meetings can be done remotely

- Read the PUR draft report
- Meet with the Director
- Meet with the unit staff
- Write a short report providing your feedback and recommendation

Written evaluation report with recommendations

The external reviewers' evaluative component of the review process will culminate in a written report with recommendations. The report is written by the individual or individuals charged with conducting

the evaluation of the unit. The responsible senior administrator (President/Vice President/Executive Director) should review the report, discuss the recommendations with the unit's director and make determinations regarding their implementation. The AES unit will then revise the report accordingly and submit it for a final review.

Below is a table with each of the components and corresponding questions that may be useful to ask of an external entity

Areas	Questions for Evaluating the report
Assessment of results from previous years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the results of the annual assessment data, would you reach the same conclusions that we did? Why or why not? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If not, what would you suggest?
Review and revisions of Mission, goals and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an alignment with the College's and division's Mission and Strategic Plan? • Are the revisions to the Unit's mission or the decision to keep the original appropriate in light of the report and the SWOT analysis? • Do the goals capture your understanding of what the unit wants to accomplish? • Do the objectives provide specific statements describing what needs to be accomplished to achieve the goals?
Review and revisions and measures and targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the measures clearly linked to the objectives and demonstrate that the unit achieves its objective? • Are targets included and do they seem reasonable and attainable?
Review of new initiatives and strategies for improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on past activities, the unit's goals and objectives and the SWOT analysis, do the proposed strategies for improvement seem realistic and practical? • In your opinion, which of proposed initiatives will have the greatest impact?
Conclusion and Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is your overall evaluation of the report? • Are there strategies/activities that were not considered but should?