

*2007-2008 Mid-Year Report on Campus Initiatives  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

*Program Review*

The Provost has charged a small group -- Craig Dutton, David Irwin, Laurie Kramer, John Ory, Ruth Watkins, Stig Lanesskog, Dick Wheeler -- to outline a plan to implement program reviews into our operations. John Ory has assembled materials from universities that appear to do program review well for the group to review. The group met for the first time January 14, 2007, and will meet monthly through the spring semester. The group plans to submit preliminary recommendations to the Provost in March, and bring those recommendations to the Council of Deans shortly after that. The following notes indicate the concerns the group will explore in its deliberations:

History:

- ∞ COPE
- ∞ Failed effort of Graduate Education Task Force
- ∞ Senate approved voluntary review process
- ∞ Renewed interest by Provost and others, partly generated by strategic planning

Purpose: To create a program review process that serves the campus, the colleges, and the units; that drives change and supports excellence; that re-enforces the values and helps to implement the goals of the strategic plan; that addresses the stewardship needs of a constrained budget; and that is not more bother than it is worth.

What is needed to make that happen?

- ∞ Some sort of central oversight body, faculty/administration, with a key administrator for operations
- ∞ Simple, manageable grounds rules
- ∞ A process to determine what units are to be reviewed, and when
- ∞ Use of external reviewers as key component of each review
- ∞ A clear relationship to governance structures
- ∞ Clear statement of scope and level of review
- ∞ Standard (but flexible enough to accommodate different disciplines) templates for determining the content of the review
- ∞ Campus provision of key data for each unit under review

What sort of unit should be reviewed?

- ∞ The review of every department, program, and other academic unit, would create the need for too many reviews, and no comparative vantage point on the unit under review.
- ∞ Reviews conducted at the college level would, in many cases, be too complex to manage effectively, though some colleges are either undifferentiated or tightly integrated, and a college-level review would be appropriate in those instances.
- ∞ Perhaps schools, or clusters of related departments, would be appropriate in many instances
- ∞ Some departments are large enough that it would be appropriate to concentrate a review solely on them, but related departments could be reviewed in the same year

What do we want to find out in these reviews?

- ∞ Faculty productivity and teaching effectiveness
- ∞ Student quality and success – graduate and undergraduate
- ∞ Appropriateness of employee base
- ∞ Effectiveness of governance structure
- ∞ Proportionality – right distribution of faculty, academic professionals, civil service staff, to meet teaching and research responsibilities

How will the reviews be used?

How do we get this process started?

- ∞ One or two prototype reviews in 2008-09, set up by the end of the Spring 08 semester?