

28.2 COLLEGIATE REVIEW.

a. Purpose. Systematic collegiate review should assist the faculty, dean, and University administration in 1) evaluating how effectively the college is achieving its educational goals; 2) identifying the college's strengths and weaknesses; and 3) developing strategic plans and priorities for future directions of the college. Pertinent information collected for the purpose of answering specific questions about the college's various components and activities will provide a firm foundation for evaluating the college^[m1].

Review, particularly of a small college, need not be long and complex. It should concentrate on essentials. A collegiate review has two parts -- a self-study of the college and its programs by the collegiate faculty and administration and a peer review by University faculty members from outside the college and at least two reviewers from off campus.

b. Timing. Reviews of colleges shall take place at least once every seven years and ordinarily not more frequently than once every five years. Where possible, reviews should be coordinated with external accreditation evaluations. Reviews may also be scheduled to coordinate with other specific circumstances, e.g., a pending change in collegiate leadership or an impending significant change in resource needs.

In order to assure that the review can benefit evaluation and planning in a timely fashion, the process of review should begin in the last half of the preceding year. Generally, it is anticipated that the collegiate self-study will be completed by the end of the first semester of the review year, that the peer review will be conducted during the second semester and that the final report will be submitted prior to the end of the academic year.

c. Responsibility. Collegiate reviews are initiated by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and that office organizes and directs the process and formulates the final conclusions. The Office of the Vice President for Research and the Dean of the Graduate College also will be involved in those matters germane to their areas of responsibility, e.g., scholarly and creative activities, graduate studies, developing programs.

d. Scope.

(1) In General. The collegiate review should represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the college's function, with recognition of the mutual dependency of programs and activities. An able student body, a faculty engaged in effective teaching and scholarship, effective performance of staff members, effective collegiate administration, and adequate facilities all contribute to the success of a college and must be reviewed as a whole.

Although all collegiate reviews are to be comprehensive, the focus will vary from college to college. It is not intended that collegiate reviews duplicate the specific evaluations of programs provided through departmental or program reviews (see section 28.3). In departmentalized colleges, the results of departmental or program reviews during the preceding seven-year cycle will serve as one source for review of the college. In such cases, the collegiate review will focus primarily on evaluations of college-wide programs, policies, organization, funding, etc. In non-departmentalized colleges, in which departmental/program reviews have not been conducted (with the

possible exception of some graduate programs); the collegiate review will involve a more in-depth evaluation of each specific program in the college.

(2) Areas to Be Considered.

(a) Collegiate Mission and Goals: The overall mission and goals of the college and their contribution to the University mission.

(b) Strategic Plan. The suitability of the collegiate strategic plan and progress toward achieving plan goals.

(c) Students. Projected student enrollment over a seven-year period, admissions policies and procedures, quality, advising, governance, placement services, student perceptions of the college, its program, faculty, and administration.

(d) Educational Programs. Instructional programs of the college should be assessed in regard to [m21](#):

(i) the learning objectives of the program;

(ii) curriculum content in relation to the learning objectives of the program;

(iii) student achievement of learning objectives of the program;

(iv) program changes since last review and success of changes in relation to program learning objectives;

(v) recommendations for program changes based on recent assessments and other pertinent data.

(vi) the relation of the program to the goals of the college;

(vii) the continuing need for the program;

(viii) the overall quality of the program; and

(ix) the interaction of faculty and students with other parts of the University (e.g., development of and participation in interdisciplinary programs).

(e) Scholarly and Creative Activities [m31](#). The scope and excellence of scholarly and creative activities and their contribution to instruction. “Scholarly and creative activities” are meant to include “research” whether or not it is in the laboratory.

(f) Service Programs. The nature of programs or individual efforts that provide services to the college, to the University, to the state, to the nation, and to others; the contribution of service activities to instructional and scholarly and creative activities.

(g) Faculty. A profile of the faculty including educational background, teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative contributions, and service. The assessment of faculty obviously is related closely to evaluation of educational and service programs and scholarly and creative activities.

(h) Facilities and Support Services. The adequacy of space and support facilities such as library, computers, staff assistance, instructional aids, equipment, and supplies. Assessment in this area also is related closely to evaluation of instructional and service programs and scholarly and creative activities.

(i) Functioning of the College.

(i) organizational structure of the college, including committees, communication among faculty, students, and dean; adequacy of the structure for discharging regular collegiate responsibilities.

(ii) role of faculty, students, and administration in collegiate affairs and the nature of their interaction.

(iii) relationship of the college to the University, the alumni, and the field.

(iv) effectiveness of collegiate strategic planning and plan implementation processes.

(j) Financial Resources. The financial structure of the college should be reviewed on a program-by-program basis with regard to source and amount of support and in terms of educational, scholarly and creative activity, and service objectives.

(3) Criteria for Program Evaluation. Specific criteria for program evaluation are determined by the Executive Vice President and Provost^[m4]. The program review should result in assessments based on the primary criteria of quality and centrality, and the secondary criteria of student demand, potential for excellence, external impact, and cost.

e. Self -Study Committee. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall initiate the collegiate self-study by requesting the college to organize a representative self-study committee. The self study committee shall be organized in accordance with procedures adopted by the collegiate faculty at least one (1) year prior to the year in which the self study is to occur. Procedures adopted by the collegiate faculty shall be approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost. These procedures shall set forth the size and qualifications for membership on the self study committee and shall include the method by which members of the self study committee shall be selected. They shall also provide for what role, if any, the dean of the college and the Executive Vice President and Provost shall play in the selection of the self study committee. In the absence of any such procedures, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall appoint faculty of the college to serve on the self study committee.

The self-study committee is charged with developing the collegiate self-study with the cooperation of the dean, collegiate faculty, staff, and other members of the University community, as the committee determines. The self study committee has the responsibility for organizing and conducting the self-study in relation to the review topics listed in this policy. The self study committee will conduct the review so as to ensure broad consultation with the faculty, students, staff, and administration of the college and, if deemed appropriate by the self-study committee, with external constituents of the college.

Copies of the self-study report shall be forwarded to the dean and faculty of the college for their review and comment. Thereafter, and following such other endorsements as may be required by collegiate rule, final copies, revised if appropriate, shall be forwarded to the dean of the college and to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. The final self-study shall be made available to the public.

f. Self-Study.

(1) General. The collegiate self-study is at the heart of a successful review. It assures that the college is reviewing its condition. The college should reexamine its goals, and reflect with as much sound data as possible on how various activities contribute to the achievement of those goals and identify priorities and directions for the future. Thus, a self-study should not be solely a description of current programs and activities; it also must involve evaluation and projection. It should anticipate programmatic changes that may be required by new developments in knowledge or in societal conditions, including enrollment projections based on demographic and other relevant data. It should serve as a stimulus to systematic consideration of current and future directions of the college by the major collegiate constituencies. The self-study will achieve these goals by addressing the major areas described in II 28.2 d. (2).

(2) Data. Much of the data needed for the self-study can be obtained from the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, the collegiate administration, and, often, from recent accreditation materials. The self-study committee should consult with the collegiate administration and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost to determine what types of data are needed for the review. The collegiate administration and the Executive Vice President and Provost shall provide the committee with those data.

(3) Self-Study Reports. The committee will prepare a report ~~that includes~~ that includes information and data on which the self-study was based and the conclusions reached about the strengths, weaknesses, and future directions of the college. Particular attention should be given to ways in which improvements in programs and functions can be achieved within currently available, or if indicated, reduced collegiate resources. Sources of flexibility for resource reallocations should be identified in the self study.

g. Post Self-Study Procedures.

(1). Peer group review of the college will be accomplished by a "review committee" composed of University faculty from outside the college and at least two consultants from off campus appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The chair of the review committee will meet with the Executive Vice President and Provost to plan the specific steps to be taken and to establish a tentative timetable for the review.

The committee shall consider the self-study and related documents and interview faculty, staff, students, and administration of the college under review. It will ascertain the relationships of the college to other academic units in the University, evaluate its programs and come to some conclusions about appropriateness of goals and the degree to which these have been attained. It will help to identify strengths and weaknesses of the college and will make recommendations concerning possible improvements and future directions in the college.

The committee will prepare a report on its findings and conclusions and will submit a preliminary draft of the report to the collegiate dean and the college self-study committee so that errors of fact and problems in wording may be identified and corrected. The review report shall not contain confidential personnel information concerning the collegiate dean or other collegiate personnel. The final report and recommendations of the committee will be submitted to the Executive Vice President and Provost and to the collegiate dean. Copies of the review report will be made available to students and faculty in the college and, upon request, to others.

(2) Consideration and Implementation of the Review Report. After submission of the report of the review committee, further consideration of the review results generally will include the following steps:

- (a) The dean and the self-study committee will be invited to respond in writing to the review findings and recommendations. Such responses, if any, will become part of the total review report.
- (b) The Executive Vice President and Provost will meet with the review committee to discuss the report and the collegiate response in order to clarify the findings and recommendations as needed.
- (c) The Executive Vice President and Provost will submit to the dean a preliminary response to the review which will indicate the steps the college should take in response to the review recommendations^[m5].
- (d) The Executive Vice President and Provost will meet with the dean to discuss the preliminary response^[m6].
- (e) The Executive Vice President and Provost will submit a final closing letter summarizing the review and the steps to be taken by the college and the Provost to address the recommendations in the review. These steps and recommendations will be submitted to the President.
- (f) When the college's strategic plan is next updated, the internal recommendations resulting from the review should be incorporated into the college's strategic plan.

h. Procedural Variation. The Executive Vice President and Provost will consider and may approve departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, where the Executive Vice President and Provost and the faculty agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of collegiate review.

28.3 DEPARTMENTAL AND PROGRAM REVIEW^[m7].

a. Purpose. Systematic departmental review should assist the faculty, dean, and University administration in 1) evaluating how effectively the department is achieving its educational goals; 2) identifying the department's strengths and weaknesses; and 3) developing strategic plans and priorities for future directions of the department. Pertinent information collected for the purpose of answering specific questions about the department's various components and activities will provide a firm foundation for evaluating the department.

Review, particularly of a small department, need not be long and complex. It should concentrate on essentials. A departmental review has two parts^[m8] -- a self-study of the department and its programs by the departmental faculty and administration and a peer review by University faculty members from outside the department and usually two consultants from off campus.

b. Timing. Review of a specific department shall be carried out at least every seven years. The collegiate dean(s) shall establish a schedule for review of departments or programs within the college. Variations from the schedule may be justified for a review to occur before or after the usual period due to specific circumstances, e.g., a pending change in departmental leadership, specific problems that arise or the desirability of coordinating a review with an external accreditation evaluation.

c. Responsibility. The Executive Vice President and Provost has the responsibility for establishing general policy and procedural guidelines for departmental reviews. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall carry out this responsibility in consultation with appropriate faculty and administrative groups.

Within these general guidelines, the faculty of each college has the primary responsibility for establishing specific policies and procedures for departmental reviews. The collegiate dean has the responsibility for such reviews in accord with such policies and procedures. However, when graduate programs are involved, the specific college and the Graduate College share these responsibilities on a joint basis. In such cases, integrated procedures and guidelines for joint review of undergraduate and graduate programs in a unit are to be established.

Note: Throughout this subsection the terms "college(s)" and "collegiate dean(s)" are used to refer to a specific college or dean, to the Graduate College or Dean, or to both functioning on a joint basis as specified in the above policy. Also, in this subsection the term "department" will be used to refer to degree granting academic units (i.e., traditional departments, non-department programs, and interdisciplinary programs^[m9]).

d. Scope^[m10].

(1) In General. Reviews should represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of a department or program with recognition of the mutual dependency of programs and activities. An able student body, a faculty engaged in effective teaching and

scholarship, effective administration, and adequate facilities and support services all contribute to the success of a department and must be reviewed as a whole.

(2) Units Reviewed. The basic units, for purposes of review, are defined as follows:

(a) In departmentalized colleges, the basic review unit is the individual department, school, or division, except as noted in subparagraph (b) below. Each such unit shall be reviewed as a whole with the review covering all undergraduate and graduate instructional programs that are the responsibility of the unit as well as the scholarly and creative activity and service programs of the unit. The term "departmental executive officer" (abbreviated DEO) refers to the academic administrator of any such unit.

(b) In instances where instructional programs do not correspond with departments, schools, or divisions (e.g., interdisciplinary programs), such programs will be reviewed separately, except that undergraduate and graduate programs are to be reviewed jointly whenever feasible.

(c) In non-departmentalized colleges, the undergraduate or professional instructional program of the college shall be reviewed as part of the collegiate review process. Reviews of graduate programs within non-departmentalized colleges also may be incorporated into the overall collegiate review, or the collegiate dean and Dean of the Graduate College may jointly establish a separate schedule of reviews for such programs.

(3) Areas to Be Considered. The college(s) shall define the areas to be considered in reviews. (e.g., mission, goals, and strategic plan, students, faculty, educational programs, scholarly and creative activities, service programs, facilities, support services, departmental administration, and financial resources). Factors to be evaluated and questions to be answered should be specified in each area.

It is intended that reviews be focused on specific areas and questions that are most relevant to the particular department or program. These areas and questions should be specified by the college(s) prior to each review in consultation with the department. As a result, the exact focus of the self-study and review will vary among departments. Listed below are the general areas that are ordinarily subject to a departmental review.

(a) Departmental Mission and Goals: The overall mission and goals of the department and their contribution to the College and University missions.

(b) Strategic Plan. The suitability of the departmental strategic plan and progress toward achieving plan goals.

(c) Students. Projected student enrollment over a seven-year period, admissions policies and procedures, quality, advising, governance, placement services, student perceptions of the ~~college~~ department, its program, faculty, and administration.

(d) Educational Programs. Instructional programs of the department should be assessed in regard to [m11](#):

- (i) the learning objectives of the program;
- (ii) curriculum content in relation to the learning objectives of the program;
- (iii) student achievement of learning objectives of the program;
- (iv) program changes since last review and success of changes in relation to program learning objectives;
- (v) recommendations for program changes based on recent assessments and other pertinent data.
- (vi) the relation of the program to the goals of the college;
- (vii) the continuing need for the program;
- (viii) the overall quality of the program; and
- (ix) the interaction of faculty and students with other parts of the University (e.g., development of and participation in interdisciplinary programs).

(e) Scholarly and Creative Activities. The scope and excellence of scholarly and creative activities and their contribution to instruction. “Scholarly and creative activities” are meant to include “research” whether or not it is in the laboratory^[m12].

(f) Service Programs. The nature of programs or individual efforts that provide services to the college, to the University, to the state, to the nation, and to others; the contribution of service activities to instructional programs and scholarly and creative activities.

(g) Faculty. A profile of the faculty including educational background, teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative contributions, and service. The assessment of faculty obviously is related closely to evaluation of educational, and service programs, and scholarly and creative activities.

(h) Facilities and Support Services. The adequacy of space and support facilities such as library, computers, staff assistance, instructional aids, equipment, and supplies. Assessment in this area also is related closely to evaluation of instructional and service programs and scholarly and creative activities.

(4) Criteria for Program Evaluation. Specific criteria for program evaluation are determined by the Executive Vice President and Provost. Emphasis in the department review should be placed on evaluating the need for various programs based on enrollment projections, their quality, and the way in which they relate to the goals of the program, the college, and the University. The program review should result in

assessments based on the primary criteria of quality and centrality, and the secondary criteria of student demand, potential for excellence, external impact, and cost.

Particular attention should be focused on ways in which improvements in programs and functions can be achieved within currently available departmental resources, or if indicated by enrollment trends and other factors, with appropriately reduced resources. The review should identify areas of flexibility in resources which could allow future allocations.

e. Self-Study Committee. The dean will ask the departmental faculty to determine in consultation with the DEO the process for preparing the self-study report.

f. Self-Study.

(1) General. The first, and most crucial, step in the review process is the self-study to be carried out by the department or program faculty. The college(s) will establish specific guidelines to aid the department or program in preparing the self-study. These guidelines should ensure that the self-study is evaluative, not solely descriptive, and identifies priorities and directions for the future; is carried out with consultation among faculty, students, and other appropriate groups; considers those quantitative data, including future enrollment projections, that are needed to provide an adequate description and evaluation of current and future status of the department; is distributed so as to make it available to all departmental faculty for their input or comment, prior to its being edited in a final form; and in final form shall be available for public dissemination. It will be made available to the department's faculty and to the external review committee members prior to the external review (see II-28.3g (1) below). Ordinarily, the self-study will achieve these goals by address the major areas described in II28.3 d (3).

(2) Data. A standardized data format should be determined by the college(s). The use of data in standard formats already available in departments, colleges, or the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost will reduce the need for special data collection efforts.

g. Post Self-Study Procedures[\[m13\]](#).

(1) External Review. The review process will involve review by an external committee. Collegiate procedures regarding the external review may differ, but the following principles apply to all colleges:

(a) Committee members may not be members of reviewed unit;

(b) There will be at least two reviewers external to the university, unless the provost approves a smaller number for good cause, such as the size of the unit reviewed;

(c) External reviewers will either participate as active members of a single review committee or they will submit their own separate written report;

(d) Procedures for selecting review committees and the description of the role of external reviewers must be approved by the provost;

(e) The Committee will be advised that the review report shall not contain confidential personnel information concerning the DEO or other unit personnel)

(2) Consideration of Report and Administrative Response. The provost's general policy will include procedures for the unit, the collegiate dean(s) and the provost to consider and respond to review reports.

(3) Dissemination of Review Reports and Administrative Response: The external review committee will submit its report to the collegiate dean(s), who will convey it to the Provost and to the unit or program. Any written response from the unit or program will become part of the review report and will be conveyed to the provost.

It is the policy of the University that either the review reports or their substance shall be made available to departmental faculty and students and, upon request, to others.

The dean, in consultation with the provost and with the dean of the Graduate College when the unit offers a graduate degree, prepares a final letter summarizing findings of the review and setting out recommendations and required remedial actions. The dean communicates this final letter to the DEO and the unit's faculty, as well as to the Provost.

h. Procedural Variations. The Dean shall consider and may seek approval from the provost for departures from these procedures in the case of particular reviews, where the dean and the unit or program faculty agree that variations from these procedures are appropriate and would be consistent with the purposes of the review.

[\[top\]](#)

[\[m1\]](#)Review of the dean has been taken out of this section and it is now a part of 28.5.

[\[m2\]](#)Items i – v are new and have been requested specifically by the Regents.

[\[m3\]](#)We have substituted the phrase “scholarly and creative activities” for the term “research” to better characterize the breadth of faculty activities in these areas.

[\[m4\]](#)Previously, there was a statement that these criteria were found on the document “Criteria for Institutional Enhancements and Reductions.” The criteria used by the Provost include the following:

Whether a program is reviewed at the Collegiate level by a review committee appointed by the Provost or at the Departmental level by a review committee appointed by the Dean, the review will focus, at a minimum, on the following criteria:

- ... Faculty quality, including publications, teaching evaluations, awards, etc
- ... Student quality, including scores on standardized tests such as the ACT, GRE, LSAT, entering GPA or class rank, current GPA, and graduation rate.
- ... Diversity of students and faculty participating in the program.
- ... Financial resources committed to the program in the form of overall budget, dollars per student credit hour, faculty/student ratio, and amount of space committed to key functions of the unit (teaching, research, space for graduate assistants)
- ... Program quality, as indicated by national rankings or comparisons to peers

- ... National or competitive benchmark data where available for any of these criteria
- ... Student outcomes, as defined for each program.
- ... Centrality of the program to the University's mission, including the following:
 - ... Strengths of the program
 - ... Weaknesses of the program
 - ... Suggestions for improvement

[m5] The Provost office has indicated that it would like to provide a preliminary response to the review and then follow up with a meeting with the dean (see d.) to discuss it before producing the final response to the review.

[m6] Two sections have been deleted. One having to do with a meeting with faculty to discuss the review findings and recommendations. However, there will continue to be a meeting between the Provost and faculty regarding the separate review of the dean.

The second section that was deleted included a provision that Provost will report to the dean and faculty the steps to be taken in response to the review recommendations and reasons for not implementing recommendations (if that were to occur).

[m7] One of the committee's goals with this section was to make the language as parallel as possible to the section on collegiate review. As a consequence, the language in 282. and 28.3 is very similar.

[m8] The review of the chair has been taken out of this section and is being put into a new section or subsection of the current policy.

[m9] This note is to clarify that the term "department" is a generic one that includes any degree granting academic unit.

[m10] Much of this section was changed to make it consistent with collegiate reviews and provost policy.

[m11] This section is now identical to the same section in collegiate reviews.

[m12] Sections e, f, g, & h are all new and meant to parallel what is in the collegiate review.

[m13] This section is new and basically replaces a similar section in the original policy. The major changes are to be less prescriptive regarding collegiate policy