

# UIC Program Evaluation Guidebook

Office of Academic Affairs (m/c 103)

The University of Illinois At Chicago

2731 University Hall

601 South Morgan Street

Chicago Illinois 60607

Please direct comments to Brenda Russell, Office of Academic Affairs at the address above or to [Russell@uic.edu](mailto:Russell@uic.edu).

## **INTENT OF PROGRAM REVIEW**

UIC is committed to the goal of becoming a leader in its academic niche -- combining exemplary research and a land-grant mission within an urban setting. It is essential to this goal that UIC be a university of first rank, measured by traditional academic criteria. It is equally important to be an institution that takes full advantage of its urban setting. UIC's urban environment must be reflected in its academic and research programming. The university must participate appropriately with other institutions in attempts to deal with pressing problems facing contemporary urban life. It is this combination of academic excellence and urban relevance that is central to the development of a distinctive institution.

## **THE SCOPE OF PROGRAM REVIEW**

UIC's system for conducting program reviews is not an attempt to dictate routines or activities. Rather, it is a mechanism through which performance is evaluated given the central question, "How is this program contributing to the university mission and goal(s)?"

All activities of academic programs and academic support programs are subject to review; however, some activities warrant closer scrutiny than others. For example, the university faculty, through their senate, have identified certain areas which are central to accomplishing our mission. These are presented below as UIC Strategic Initiatives. It is important to note that, surrounding this small subset of initiatives, is a broader array of activities which are equally important in the sense that they are necessary for the very survival, sustenance, and legitimation of UIC as a university. This broader array of activities will not go unrecognized under UIC program evaluation. Ultimately, the question of which activities will receive more or less attention depends, not only on university needs and priorities, but also on a given program's mission, strengths and/or expertise.

The following UIC Strategic Initiatives come from *Preparing UIC for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, a report written by the Standing Campus Priorities Committee. The initiatives are the driving force behind UIC's effort to become the nation's leading public research university striving to accomplish the land-grant mission in an urban setting.

## **THE UIC STRATEGIC INITIATIVES**

**Initiative 1. Research: UIC will become a first-rank university, judged by traditional academic criteria.**

**Initiative 2. Undergraduate Education: UIC will be known as a university that offers a superior undergraduate education.**

**Initiative 3. Contributor to knowledge of Urban Issues: The university will optimize its existence in Chicago, and the state of Illinois. It will become an acknowledged participant in the educational, cultural, and economic life of the community and be recognized as a focal point for the study of urban issues nationally and internationally.**

**Initiative 4. UIC will be a well-administered university, with minimal centralization of administration, improved physical structure, and integrated technological resources.**

**Research** The university seeks to be ranked at the top half of all Research I institutions. It must increase the number of nationally-ranked academic programs. Faculty and graduate programs are the force behind research productivity. Therefore, one area of careful evaluation will be (1) research activities of UIC academic programs; and, (2) resources and support for research. Activities which fall under this initiative include, but are not limited to, research agenda and accomplishments of existing faculty; research resulting in scholarly recognition and/or recognition for applying new knowledge to societal problems; efforts to hire new faculty with demonstrated achievement or potential for significant achievement in research; and activities which lead to further developing the research potential of existing faculty.

The availability of talented, well-trained graduate students is essential to the progress that UIC makes as a Research I institution. Graduate education and institutional research enterprises are an essential focus of program review. The quality of training within programs, placement of students; demand for graduates in the program area, evidence of continued productivity in research on the part of graduates, and other evidence of excellence in graduate education is included under Initiative 1.

**Undergraduate Education** Initiative 2 reinforces the notion that teaching is a central role for the faculty. As part of this initiative, special attention will be given to excellence in teaching, learning, and to UIC as a social environment. Efforts to enhance the teaching effectiveness of the faculty and teaching assistants will also receive attention as part of this initiative.

Teaching effectiveness depends on the quality of the students and their degree of preparation for learning at the college level. Initiative 2 highlights efforts to recruit students with a high potential for learning and the establishment of programs to address the needs of academically under-prepared students. The university as a whole, individual academic programs, and academic support programs share responsibility for recruitment and retention efforts.

Finally, the social environment at UIC must be conducive to learning and teaching. Social environments go beyond buildings and safety. UIC is committed to creating and maintaining an educational environment that significantly improves retention and graduation rates. Also, efforts

to create a social climate which attracts students to the campus and efforts which assist in creating a warm, friendly atmosphere are encouraged and rewarded under this initiative.

**Urban Relevance** Initiative 3 should be perceived as an opportunity rather than as a mandate. For the UIC academic community, it opens up new vistas for research and application of research with added assurance that these activities will be recognized and rewarded. It should not be the perception of faculty that they will be penalized if they do not engage in activity that is not urban-relevant; but rather that, in addition to traditionally valued activity, UIC is presenting new opportunities where faculty and others can contribute. Initiative 3 should not be construed as a license to do anything that is community-oriented; but rather, should be regarded as being limited to activities that will utilize the products of traditional university activity (the generating of cutting-edge knowledge and expertise) to address significant social issues.

**Optimizing The Structure of UIC** The concept of taking an organization to "prime" was coined by Ichak Adizes, a prominent management consultant. It refers to balancing an organization's need for control with an organization's need to allow flexibility for change. In operational terms, it pits bureaucracy against looser organizational structures. For the purpose of conducting program reviews, "prime" is measured in terms of a program's ability to respond to technological and societal change while still maintaining control for effectiveness and efficiency. Questions that might arise are the following, meant to serve only as examples. **As** the program structure too rigid for responding to pedagogical or technological innovation? Is the structure top or bottom-heavy? Does the program structure allow quick response to challenges and change?

## **CRITERIA USED IN EVALUATING PROGRAMS**

Whereas the foregoing discussion has centered on the issue of *which* activities will be assessed, this section discusses the question of *how* activities will be evaluated. The criteria used in UIC program review are Quality, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Diversity, and Compelling Need, or QEEDC (QUID-SEE). Each of the elements of QEEDC is discussed below.

**Quality** Quality is synonymous with "best." It is not the intent of program review to specify concretely what "best" is in each case of program review -- such wisdom resides with those who are most familiar with each program's critical environment. Program reviews seek evidence of quality in the resources that are used to fulfill each program's mission as well as in the processes tied to delivery of instruction, service and research. In other words, programs must strive to employ state-of-the-art technology, equipment, and pedagogical devices in order to maximize optimal potential returns in teaching, research, and service. They must also pursue excellence in the *processes* tied to the delivery of teaching, research and service.

Effectiveness As opposed to quality, which focuses on attributes that are tied to process and product, effectiveness refers to the extent to which a stated goal or mission has been accomplished. The definition of effectiveness is further stretched to accommodate *perceptions of excellence associated with the final product or service*. While the university can make tremendous strides in the enhancement of quality, until such efforts result in positive recognition from relevant audiences, these efforts cannot be regarded as being completely fruitful. Thus, effectiveness refers not only the completion of a task or goal, but also to perceptions of quality associated with the final product. While it is somewhat difficult to articulate what effectiveness is, one can recognize it when one sees it. For example, the following would be evidence of effective performance:

- UIC colleges of nursing, pharmacy and allied health professions and department of philosophy rank among the top ten nationally.
- Departments of economics, English, history, psychology, and sociology rank above several Big Ten departments.
- UIC and UIUC are the only Illinois public universities ranked in Barron's Best Buys in College Education.
- UIC personnel have been recognized in local and national literature for achievements that contribute to the betterment of the university and/or society.

As further examples of effectiveness-oriented *goals*, undergraduate academic programs at UIC should seek to be *recognized* as programs that keep the academic needs of the undergraduate student as a central concern and provide an excellent academic experience to its undergraduate student body. Every graduate program at UIC should be *recognized* as a program that offers superior and nationally recognized graduate and professional educational opportunities to advanced students. Further, every program should strive to become a nationally ranked academic program or to better its academic ranking. Each of these examples, taken from the Standing Campus Priorities Report, "Preparing for the 21st Century," makes reference to important audiences who must be moved to perceive the special quality known as "excellence" and attach that label to UIC programs. Each academic and/or support unit must seek to identify its relevant academic and urban audiences and must strategically pursue results that will impress these audiences. The most relevant audience of university activity, the student body, must always be kept prominently in mind.

Efficiency Efficiency is tied to the delivery of products or services in a cost-effective manner. Closely associated with efficiency are productivity and accountability. Accountability focuses on proper oversight and responsibility, both of which are necessary for generating cost-effectiveness and social economies of scale. Productivity is tied to efficiency because of its link to economies

of scale and/or economies of technology. The overall standard for assessing productivity is whether outcomes for the betterment of UIC and society are garnered through the most frugal use of resources.

Efficiency is integrally connected to the life cycles of programs. Liabilities of newness work against efficiency; liabilities of smallness diminish its overall impact. Reviews on the basis of efficiencies will therefore be conducted with an eye to long-term performance. As well, efficiency-oriented assessments should utilize proper scope.

Diversity Wide representation from urban, national, and international constituencies is a valuable asset to all institutions of higher education. Exposure to value systems, normative conduct, histories, and situations from around the world are imperative to achieving a well-rounded education and for preparing UIC students to become citizens of the World. Discourse, a valued commodity at all universities, is enriched by diversity. At UIC, diversity takes on greater prominence because of UIC's urban-relevant vision. Especially compelling is the need to ensure that the population of the United States, of Illinois, and of Chicago be reflected among UIC students, faculty, and staff. UIC has chosen to make diversity one of its defining characteristics. Therefore, it must be especially vigilant in its efforts to make it a prominent part of its strategic planning and program review.

Compelling Need Adherence to the UIC vision requires that program reviews hold, as a central question, "How is this program contributing to making UIC (1) a great academic institution and/or (2) a leader among academic universities with an urban mission?" Compelling need is not to be confused with *a unit's need for survival*. The latter focuses on existence versus nonexistence while the former explicitly addresses the question of (1) why a unit exists and (2) how and to what extent it contributes to the mission of the university and to the state and nation. Academic programs should show evidence that the knowledge instilled in their students will help them acquire skills and be competent in performing tasks as defined by demand. Research should include among its objectives, where feasible, outcomes that have meaningful applications in society.

A rule of reason and professional discretion must be used to establish compelling need, especially as it relates to teaching and research. "Meaningful use in society" does not mean immediate use or use that is recognizable to everyone. Many are the products of research which, finding little intended use at the outset, found honorable and significant use at a later time or in other spheres. Similarly, "use" here does not exclude usefulness in the world of academia. Ultimately, the criterion of compelling need seeks to ensure that the activities of every program contribute to society in some meaningful fashion, whether it be enhancing culture, furthering human life, buttressing the economy, or some other activity that is recognized as being a contribution *among prominent stakeholders, including the world of academia*.

Weighing of QEEDC criteria Evaluations made on the basis of the above criteria should be holistic in nature. As general criteria, each has equal weight; however, when applied to specific

programs, there is usually cause for unequal weighting. New programs will almost always be weighed more heavily on the basis of **C**ompelling demand or **D**iversity, since, in their early stages, they cannot be expected to excel in terms of **Q**uality, **E**fficiency or **E**ffectiveness. In more mature programs, certain criteria may be more critical than others because of recognized strengths or weaknesses, or because of the special nature of the program. In each cases, it is not the administrators of the program who should make weighting assessments, but rather, it should be a consensual determination that is made by those involved in the program review process.

### QEEDC's Global Purpose

Administrative, Service, and Academic units are subject to review according to QEEDC. Later sections of this guidebook present a more detailed description of questions and measurements to be considered in program reviews. In general, the following basic questions should be answered:

- (1) Is the unit striving to accomplish its mission with the best possible resources at its disposal? For academic units, this includes the utilization of faculty, staff and technology. For administrative units, this includes staff, equipment, and other resources.
- (2) Is the unit recognized for its achievement(s) by relevant audiences?
- (3) Is the unit operating efficiently?
- (4) Is the unit optimizing its opportunities to serve society's diverse populations? Is it optimizing its opportunities to procure the talents of a diverse workforce?
- (5) Is the unit responding to the needs of that part of the population that it was intended to serve?

These questions reflect the core of the program evaluation model. To the extent that units can show that they are engaged in activities, reflective of QEEDC standards, that are aimed at fulfilling traditional university functions, the outcome of program evaluation can be expected to be positive -- the more QEEDC-oriented, the higher the evaluation. To the extent that units can show that they are engaged in activities, reflecting QEEDC standards, that show that they are engaged in some or all *university strategic initiatives*, the outcome of program evaluation can be expected to be even more positive.

Both administrators and line personnel are responsible for the program evaluation process. Accordingly, both must be engaged in the gathering of data. Some measures, namely those dealing with efficiency, diversity, and in some cases, compelling need, are best gathered centrally. The Office of Academic Affairs, working with other units on campus, will be responsible for gathering core data and for making these data available to units under review.

## **THE OUTCOME OF PROGRAM REVIEWS**

Program reviews are conducted for three main purposes. First, the Illinois Board of Higher Education requires that academic programs be reviewed on an eight-year cycle. UIC program reviews coincide with these cyclical reviews. Some of the data generated from UIC program reviews will be used for IBHE reporting purposes. Over and beyond the IBHE mandate, the review process serves the additional purposes of generating data for internal strategic decision-making.

UIC program reviews are used as a tool for making decisions associated with resource allocation and reallocation. It cannot be assumed that all programs currently in operation at UIC will be continued or continued at the current level of support. Decisions about the viability of academic programs must be made on the basis of careful, systematic review. Second, programs review data are used to make recommendations for self-improvement. Recommendations emanating from the various committees involved in program review are expected to be followed. The UIC Strategic Oversight Committee, comprising the Office of Academic Affairs, the Senate's Standing Campus Priorities Committee and the Graduate College, will make periodic checks on progress made in addressing recommendations. Subsequent program reviews of given units will place special emphasis on previous recommendations.

## **THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS**

<b>Initial Planning</b>
-------------------------

The academic program review process is initiated each year by the Office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In the Spring semester of the preceding academic year in which the review is to be conducted, letters are sent to the appropriate deans notifying them of the programs under their administration scheduled for review and inviting them to participate in an informational workshop to launch the academic program review process. Unit heads and appropriate staff members are also encouraged to attend the workshop which serves as an introduction to academic program review, its purposes and guidelines. The schedule for review is for the most part tied to the review schedule of the IBHE, which is an eight-year cycle. Programs which, for some reason or another, have not been included in the review process, will be fitted into the cycle according to functional to with other programs. Some flexibility in scheduling will be maintained. Under some circumstances, a pending accreditation review for example, it may be desirable to shift a scheduled review so as to maximize the usefulness of information gathered and/or minimize the burden of the program under review.

The review of programs which are functionally similar is a common element of both the IBHE and proposed UIC program review. For internal purposes, this practice allows more meaningful comparisons to be made across programs. For example, the "cost" of educating a student across the social sciences differs greatly from the "cost" of educating a student in medicine or engineering. By clustering strategically, one can control for important variables, thereby producing more meaningful assessments of performance. An added advantage of using strategic groupings is that data generated from program review can be complemented with industry, occupational, and economic information procured from external sources. From this, projections of demand, effectiveness of past efforts, and opportunities for the future, are made possible along with more traditional products of program evaluation. Even when not reviewed in the same year, functionally similar programs will be compared as a group, cross-sectionally as well as longitudinally.

Following the workshop, the dean and the head of the academic unit should set a planning meeting with the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, which acts on behalf of the provost, to determine the procedures to be followed in the review. The meeting is also used to discuss unique needs in the individual unit's review process and the anticipated time frame for the review. It is helpful for the dean and the unit head to have given some thought to the membership of the self-study committee as well as the areas to be covered by that group. Suggested members of the university review (and external review at a later date) will be requested of the dean by the office of the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs as the self-study phase draws to a close, although they may be submitted at any time.

<b>Self-Study</b>
-------------------

A thorough and thoughtful self-study will candidly assess a program's past and present efforts and will sketch out a realistic course for the program's future enhancement. The self-study provides the basis for the entire review process. Therefore, it is critical that the study cover all aspects of the academic program. If a self-study has been done within the previous year for accreditation or other purposes, it may be possible to use it for academic program review purposes with appropriate modifications and updating.

At a general level, all academic units are *expected* to contribute to the areas of research, teaching and service. It is understood that the contributions in each area may vary. The self-study provides an excellent opportunity to explain why one area receives more or less concentrated effort than another. In some cases, as in the case of research institutes for example, the answer might appear to be relatively straightforward. Even here, however, the question of effort and effectiveness in the three areas is relevant. Some research units are more effective at

disseminating knowledge than others. Some research units are effective at finding compelling need for their discoveries while others are not. The self-study affords the opportunity to defend what might appear to others as a deficiency in performance as well as the opportunity to validate achievements in all three areas. In short, research, teaching and service are to be interpreted broadly. In most cases, the traditional interpretations will suffice. In other cases, especially given UIC's initiative for urban relevance, broader interpretations are possible.

The areas and issues to be covered by the review are reflected in the academic program review guidelines described in the following section. In addition, the provost and dean may specify particular areas to be examined in the self-study. Because of the variety of academic programs, it is assumed that the self-study may need to go beyond the issues and questions raised in the guidelines. The guidelines are intended to provide the skeleton of the review and should be augmented by whatever supplemental information is deemed necessary to create an illustrative self-assessment. This additional information may be presented through an extension of the guideline questions or through appendices.

Membership of the self-study committee generally is recommended by the program head; final decisions and appointments are made by the dean. The self-study committee usually consists of three or more faculty from the department or program being reviewed. It is recommended that committee members be selected from among those faculty with a good understanding of the department as well as of the profession. When possible, this group should include both junior and senior faculty. The committee may also include student representatives. Alternatively, it may be beneficial to have all faculty participate in the self-study process through the use of subcommittees to examine each of the various aspects of the review. This is particularly useful in larger departments.

The self-study should be started immediately following the information workshop and the initial planning meeting so that it can be completed by the middle of December. The self-study is the most time-consuming part of the academic program review procedure.

It is recommended that the committee make a special effort to gather all relevant data and present it clearly in ways that will facilitate review at higher levels; to interview all faculty and selected representative students and alumni; and to gain input from other campus and non-campus resources, as appropriate. The Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs can be of assistance in framing questions to gather data relating to the undergraduate component of the program.

The self-study committee is encouraged to suggest to the program head or dean possible members for the University Review Committee (and later the External Review Committee). These recommendations should be considered by the dean in making his/her suggestions to the provost.

<b>University Review Committee</b>
------------------------------------

Prior to the completion of the self-study, names of potential committee members are submitted to the provost (via the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) by the dean, after consultation with the program head. The dean may offer the recommendation in a prioritized order. Any preference for a committee chair, from the members of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, should be indicated. The final membership is appointed by the provost, after consultation with the dean of the graduate college, senate committee on education policy, and the office of academic affairs. Two members, including the chair, are generally from closely related departments (within the same faculty or college) and one is from a totally unrelated discipline (usually outside the faculty or college). One of the committee members is a member of the Graduate College and acts as a liaison with that group.

The University Review Committee should review the department or program within the context and mission of the institution. Among the features of the unit that should be examined are the undergraduate and graduate programs, academic outreach efforts, resources, and administrative organization. In addition, opportunities for inter- or cross-disciplinary development and cooperation should be explored. To the degree that, as non-specialists, university review committee members can evaluate faculty research -- productivity, extramural support, etc. -- they should do so. (This is a main task of the external review committee.) These suggestions are not exhaustive. The university review committee is encouraged to be responsive to other issues which come to the fore in the course of the review. It is expected that the university review committee will make specific recommendations for improvement of the quality of the program.

The university review should be done in the Spring semester following the completion of the self-study. The assistant vice chancellor for academic affairs, and representative(s) from the office of associate vice chancellor for academic affairs, join the committee at its first meeting to discuss procedure, scope, and issues unique to this review.

The procedure followed by the committee is flexible and, at least to some extent, is determined by the nature of the department and the inclinations of the committee. Copies of the self-study are provided to the university review committee by the department or appropriate college. Additional data may be gathered as deemed necessary or appropriate.

The completed report is submitted to the provost, via the office of assistant vice chancellor for academic affairs, who distributes it to the program head, the dean, the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs, and dean of the graduate college. When the report is released, it is considered to be a public document and should be shared with both faculty and students as requested. The department and dean are free, but not obligated, to respond to the university review.

## **Strategic Oversight**

Following the provost's receipt and subsequent distribution of the university committee's report, a concluding conference between the provost and the dean is scheduled. The assistant vice chancellor for academic affairs, representative from the office of associate vice chancellor for academic affairs, dean of the graduate college, and SCEP liaison also normally attend the meeting. The conference is scheduled by the assistant vice chancellor for academic affairs.

The purpose of the meeting is to consider the findings of the various levels of review. It is generally preceded by a meeting of the dean and program head at which appropriate responses to the findings and recommendations of the university review committee are discussed. At the strategic oversight conference, recommendations of the dean will be considered with possible outcomes, including, but not limited to, prioritization and implementation of the reports' recommendations; decisions regarding resource allocation; and planning authorization. After discussion, findings and agreed upon actions will be summarized in a letter of understanding from the provost to the dean with copies to the unit head and others present at the concluding conference.

Table 1. Proposed Program Evaluation Schedule, Roles, and Responsibilities: Academic Units

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES AND TIMETABLE**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Activity</u>
Jan. 10-31	Deans and unit heads, OAVCAA OAVCAA, Deans, unit heads	<b>Initial Planning</b> Academic Affairs informational workshop Planning meeting (optional)
Feb. 01- Nov. 1	Unit Head with Dean Committee Committee Committee Unit Head Dean	<b>Self-Study</b> Appoints Committee Collects and Analyzes Data Prepares report following guidelines Submits report to Unit Head Submits report to Dean with Dept. response/input Sends Report to OAVCAA for distribution With college response/input
Jan. 15-April 15	Provost with Dean, Grad. College, and SCEP  Committee  Committee OAVCAA  Dean or Unit Head (optional)	<b>University Review</b> Appoints committee (at minimum, 2 members from related units and 1 from unrelated unit). For graduate-related programs, at least one member from Graduate College Executive Committee plus one member of Graduate College Reviews self-study report; collects additional data; interviews faculty, students, staff Prepares evaluation and sends to OAVCAA Transmits report to Dean, Unit Head, and University Program Review Council May provide written response to review to UPRC, OAVCAA
April 15 - May 31	Unit Head Dean OAVCAA Provost  OAVCAA	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b> Submits unit response to the Dean Submits college response to OAVCAA Submits summary of above to Provost, SCEP Discusses Results with UPRC, OAVCAA, Dean of Graduate College, College Dean Summarizes recommendations and sends to Deans, SCEP, Graduate College, Unit Head
<b>Deadline: October 15</b>		
<b>Deadline: November 1</b>		
<b>Deadline: December 1</b>		
<b>Deadline: April 15</b>		
<b>Deadline: May 31</b>		

OAVCAA - Office of Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs SCPC - Standing Campus Priorities Committee  
 USEC - University Senate Executive Committee UPRC-University Program Review Council

Table 2. Proposed Program Evaluation Schedule, Roles, and Responsibilities: Academic Support Units

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO**

**ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES AND TIMETABLE**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Activity</u>
Jan 10-31	Unit directors, immediate supervisor, OAVCAA OAVCAA, unit directors, supervisor	<b>Initial Planning</b> Academic Affairs informational workshop Planning meeting (optional)
Aug. 15 - Dec. 1	Unit Director with immediate supervisor Committee Committee <b>Deadline: November 1</b> <b>Deadline: December 1</b> Unit Director	<b>Self-Study</b> Appoints Committee Collects and Analyzes Data Prepares report following guidelines Submits report to Unit Director Sends Report to Immediate Supervisor plus OAVCAA with response/comment
Jan. 15-April 15	OAVCAA, Unit director and designated member of SCEP  Committee  Committee OAVCAA  Unit Director (optional)	<b>University Review</b> Appoints committee (may include faculty, academic professionals, or others).  Reviews self-study report; collects additional data; interviews students, staff Prepares evaluation and sends to OAVCAA Transmits report to Unit Director, immediate supervisor, University Program Review Council May provide written response to review to OAVCAA
April 15 - May 31	Unit Director Immediate Supervisor OAVCAA Provost	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b> Submits unit response to the OAVCAA, Submits response to the OAVCAA Submits summary of above to Provost, SCEP, UPRC Discusses results with UPRC, SCEP, OAVCAA Immediate Supervisor
<b>Deadline: May 31</b>	OAVCAA	Summarizes recommendations and sends to SCEP, Unit Director, Immediate Supervisor

OAVCAA - Office of Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs SCPC - Standing Campus Priorities Committee  
 USEC - University Senate Executive Committee UPRC - University Program Review Council

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY GUIDELINES**

Program Description and Background Information

Much of the following information is provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. In some instances, we ask that you provide more detailed information from your departmental records. These data are intended to serve as background material for addressing the questions raised later in this section. If other information is desired, program directors should contact the Office of Academic Affairs at the earliest possible date. OAA will make every effort to assist in the self-study.

Student Credit Hours (Previous Semester plus last five years C please give off campus as well as on-campus data if applicable)  
Lower Division  
Upper Division  
Graduate

Percent of Departmental SCH by Majors  
Lower Division  
Upper Division  
Graduate

Headcount (Majors)  
Undergraduate  
Graduate  
Total

Profile of Majors (percent)  
a. Undergraduate  
Female  
Male  
Minority Status  
International  
Transfer (+ 12 hours)  
Part-time (< 6 hours)  
Class level breakdown  
Freshman  
Sophomore  
Junior  
Senior

**Please provide data for the following:  
Tracks, subsection or specialty areas within majors if applicable**

- b. Graduate
  - Female
  - Male
  - Minority Status
  - International
  - Transfer
  - Part-time

Number of Graduates

- Baccalaureate
- Masters
- Doctoral

Budgeted Personnel

- Faculty FTE
- TA and RA FTE
- Staff FTE

**Please provide the following:**

**Classify staff according to function (e.g. administrative assistant, clerical, bookkeeping, etc.)**

Faculty Profile

- Female
- Male
- Minority
- Tenured
- Faculty by tracks, specialties, areas or other subsections if applicable

Comparative Ratios

- Faculty FTE/Staff FTE
- Student FTE/Faculty FTE
- Operating Budget/Faculty FTE

Responsibility Centered Management and Budgeting Data

Please refer to Appendix B. for description and purpose of these data

Other Productivity and Quality Measures

(Provided by the unit) These are additional measures of productivity and quality of the program in terms appropriate to the academic field represented by the major(s). Measures could include amounts of funded research, of publication and other creative activity, of professional service, and so on.)

A. Mission statement and Goals

Prepare a concise statement of the mission of your program as you see it, and the approach and means used to reach your objectives. Please indicate your goals and obligations and the primary constituencies (undergraduate, masters, doctoral students, post-doctoral students, specific patient populations, etc.). Indicate how the program goals and obligations relate to the overall mission of the University.

B. Overview of the Program

1. Faculty -- a summary list of faculty by rank, tenure status, and major sub-areas of academic interest. Curricula vitae should also be attached in an appendix. Where department is large, vitae should be available for review on site for university review committee and others.
2. Facilities
  - Offices, conference areas, computer areas, libraries
  - Classrooms
  - Laboratories
  - Shops, etc.
3. Programs
  - Major areas of concentration within the department/unit and how these compare to the discipline at large
  - Faculty participation in areas of concentration
  - Funded faculty research
  - Level and areas of clinical care and other major service activities
  - Specific department activities
  - Cross-school or cross-departmental-boundary groups and activities
  - Courses offered, Degrees offered
4. Historical pattern of program development
  - Directions of faculty, student, and program development over last 10 years
  - Development of departmental objectives
5. For Graduate Programs:
  - a. Information on student recruitment and selection/admission
  - b. graduation requirements and progress review process
  - c. listing of students entering program five years prior to the review and information on their present status (to the extent possible including those who left the program)
  - d. listing of graduates of the program during the period under review with information on length of time to degree, first placement, current position
  - e. listings of dissertations and publication generated by graduate students during the review period

C. Self-Evaluation -- the evaluation should assess your present position from two perspectives: your position within your field in general, looking outward; and the status of each of your programs, considering

internal strengths and weaknesses. The following questions are meant to serve as pointers to the types of substantive information that are requested as part of this review. Feel free to modify or add questions if it leads to a more accurate or concise review.

1. Program Quality

The quality of a program can be assessed in many ways. In general, reviewers should focus on (a) resource criteria (e.g. student selectivity or demand; faculty prestige, training, library, equipment, support staff) and (b) outcome criteria (e.g. teaching performance, faculty scholarly productivity, pedagogical innovation).

- a. In the view of faculty, what is the overall quality of this program?
  1. resource criteria
  2. outcome or delivery of product or service
  
- b. Quality of the Faculty Summarize the faculty's overall strengths and weaknesses. What information has been used in identifying these strengths and weaknesses and what conclusions have been drawn from the information?
  1. Describe the overall nature and breadth of the faculty's research and other scholarly contributions made through active participation in the generation of knowledge and exemplary practice or creative performance. If there is a means for doing so, provide an appraisal of the significance of these contributions in this field or to society in general.
  2. Considering the academic unit's faculty as a whole, describe the faculty's potential for response to the future -- to urgent discoveries, changing directions or new external demands. For example, can this faculty be proactive and risk-taking? What is the balance of scholarly depth and breadth in the faculty, and what is the balance of traditional views with work taking place at the field's frontiers?
  3. What is the faculty's collective view of the program's future, its desired directions, and its means for reaching those objectives? How do incentives and planning direct the program to these ends?
  
- c. Quality of Undergraduate Programs (For Undergraduate Program Review)
  1. If this unit offers courses taken by substantial numbers of students with other majors, the items below should be addressed. Otherwise, continue to question 2.
    - a. What has been the planning process for these courses? How are such offerings coordinated with other courses taken by these students, and with courses offered for students majoring in this field?
    - b. Who teaches these courses, and what is the evidence of instructional quality for these courses? How is their quality assessed? What plans are underway to strengthen these offerings?

2. The undergraduate major(s) curriculum and courses:
  - a. How are the courses in the undergraduate major(s) coordinated? What evidence is there of sufficient offerings and balance among the various specialties to meet student needs and interests -- is there sufficient breadth of course offerings as well as sufficient depth for specializations?
  - b. What specific efforts are made to incorporate new knowledge and perspectives into the curriculum, and to consolidate or eliminate outdated views? What efforts are made to involve students actively in their learning through such opportunities as internships, practica, work-study, seminars?
  - c. How is the assessment of student learning used to improve courses and programs of courses?
  - d. What is the quality of advising for undergraduate majors . How has the advising process been evaluated?
  - e. In general, what plans are underway to change or strengthen the undergraduate major(s).
3. Undergraduate Students:
  - a. How does the quality of students selecting this major compare with the quality of students in other fields at UIC. In what manner, and how well, do students demonstrate their overall command of the field. How does the quality of students graduating in this field compare with student quality in this field nationwide?
  - b. What efforts are underway to attract and retain well qualified undergraduate students?
  - c. Describe graduation rates for this program. Do you see room for improvement? If so, what courses of action need to be taken?
  - d. What efforts are underway to attract and retain well qualified transfer students from community colleges?
4. Are there accreditation requirements for this program? If so, what were the major outcomes from your last assessment? If any deficiencies were noted, what efforts have been made to remove them?

- d. Graduate Program(s) (For graduate program review)
  - 1. What evidence is there of sufficient offerings and balance among the various specialties -- is there sufficient breadth of course offerings and sufficient depth for specialization? How are the courses in the graduate program coordinated? What plans are underway to modify the graduate program(s) in the light of available information?
  - 2. What evidence is there of whether the courses meet student needs? Are a sufficient number of courses offered at the appropriate level (400, 500) for timely graduation? Do the courses offer the breadth and depth of knowledge necessary for mastery of the field? In what ways besides individual thesis or dissertation research are students involved actively in their learning -- for example, through internships, practica, teaching internships or assistantships?
  - 3. Do students have adequate resources to carry out their studies? What additional resources would be required to substantially improve the quality of the graduate program(s)?
  - 4. Graduate Students:
    - a. What mechanisms are used to recruit students? Is the program competing well for top students? What help is needed in recruiting? How does the quality of students in this graduate program compare with student quality in other similar programs? Has the quality of students improved over the last 5 to 10 years (based on GREs, GPAs, or other admission criteria)?
    - b. Are stipend levels and availability adequate? (In answering this question, consider how many of the total number of graduate students have a teaching or research assistantship; what financial support is provided for students presenting scholarly papers; additional program, college, or university-level support, etc.)
    - c. What is the nature and quality of the advising for graduate students, and how has advising been assessed? What is the average ratio of student/faculty thesis supervision? By what means, and how well, do students demonstrate command of the field?

2. Program Efficiency

a. Administration

- 1. How is this unit organized? Describe the unit's governance structure and give an overview of the more important policies and procedures.

2. Describe the classified staff and professional staff in this academic unit. What has been the turnover rate in these positions during each of the previous five years? What changes are underway or contemplated to strengthen the staff support for the academic program's activities?
- b. Resource Efficiency
  1. Describe your ICR procurement. Were the funds procured for conducting basic research, service, or technical assistance? Are there plans to change the make-up of ICR procurement?
  2. Using RCMB data and other data provided, assess your program in terms of costs and revenues. What are the strengths of the program in terms of generating revenues? What are its weaknesses? Are there plans to change the make-up of cost/revenues? If so, what are these plans?
  3. Using data provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and any other data at your disposal, assess your program's strengths and weaknesses related to resource allocation in teaching. Has there been a significant increase or decrease in the unit costs of the program? Do the costs of the program deviate significantly from statewide or nationwide (if available) average costs in the discipline? Can the deviation be corrected with existing resources?
3. Program Effectiveness
  - a. General Effectiveness
    1. Among similar departments/programs at similar institutions, what are the five best? What is the key to their success? What evidence supports this conclusion? What are your distinctive areas of strength with regard to this analysis? How do they weigh against the evidence above?
      - a. Describe and appraise support services for the program's (1) teaching program, (2) research, creative production, or other scholarly activities, (3) professional and community service, and (4) administration.
      - b. What are the programs's specific resource needs (e.g. library, laboratory, classrooms, classroom support, office personnel, research assistants, other)?
  - b. Teaching Effectiveness
    1. Are faculty and staff making significant contributions to teaching, curriculum development or pedagogy? To what extent are these recognized as being major contributions by important constituencies (e.g. the scholarly community, industry, professional groups, parents, students)?

2. How do the alumni of the program view their educational experience? What method is used to solicit their views?
3. What are the retention rates in this program?  
Do they differ by class level (freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior)?  
Are the rates improving?
4. Do the credit hours, enrollment, or degree production of this program differ significantly from statewide or institutional averages? Has there been a significant increase or decline in credit hours, enrollments, or degree production of this program?
5. Is the program central to the instructional mission of the university? To what extent does the program provide instructional support to students and faculty in other programs?
6. Is there sufficient student interest and demand for all courses, specializations, options, and minors offered as part of the program?

c. Research/Service Effectiveness

Are faculty and staff making significant contributions to the development and/or application of knowledge or to the delivery of services? To what extent are these recognized as being major contributions by important constituencies (e.g. the scholarly community, industry, professional groups, public sector, etc.)?

4. Program Diversity

- a. What is the current gender and race/ethnicity composition of students in this field? How do these figures compare with figures for this program? With similar programs at other schools?
- b. What efforts are underway to attract and retain well qualified students? What particular efforts are made to attract and retain students who are not in the majority group for this field?
- c. What is the gender and race/ethnicity composition of the faculty? Describe the major features of the program's plans for introducing and maintaining diversity.

5. Compelling Demand

- a. Academic Outreach -- This term refers to educational efforts, leadership, and sharing of knowledge off campus, for example, in the local community and throughout the state. (Service to UIC and to the academy is addressed elsewhere.)
  1. Describe the nature of academic outreach activities in this program.
  2. How do these activities reflect the goal(s) of your program as described in Section A (Mission and Goals), and the particular needs of the state of Illinois?

3. What evidence is available to document the quality and effects of these activities?
- b. Collaboration with other units or programs
  1. What are the other departments, schools, or colleges to which this program contributes and/or with which it collaborates most frequently? Describe the nature of those efforts and give an assessment of their successes and disappointments.
  2. What is contemplated for the future of these collaborative efforts?
- c. Meeting the Demands of the Academy and UIC
  1. Given your program's contributions to the generating of new knowledge in their fields, describe the overall impact of these contributions, especially as they relate to the needs of the field or profession.
  2. Describe the faculty's participation, leadership, and influence in the academic profession through such avenues as professional associations, review panels, and advisory groups.
  3. Describe the faculty's participation, leadership, and influence at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Include such activities as committee work, administrative contributions to UIC, leadership roles in the university faculty senate, etc.
- d. Occupational Demand
  1. What are the occupational objectives of students enrolled in the program?
  2. Do state employment projections in occupations related to the program show adequate job openings for graduates?
- e. Student Demand

Is there a need for the program based on student demand?

C. Summary Observations and Plans for Action

1. Based on your self-assessment, do you have specific recommendations to improve the quality and strategic positioning of your program?
2. Plans for Implementation

Specific steps the unit can take on its own (e.g. substantive areas you plan to concentrate on ; areas in which you would seek faculty replacements, changes in student recruitment or

programming, differential shifts in faculty workload, specific efforts to relate to or cooperate with other cognate units at or associated with the university, etc. That is, how might you re-marshal your existing resources to achieve the changes you advocate?

3. If you had additional resources, to what priorities would you allocate them?

D. Any other issues deemed appropriate.

**Non-Academic Program Review Self-Study Guidelines**

A. Mission statement for the department or unit

Prepare a concise statement of the mission of your unit as you see it, and the approach and means used to reach your objectives. Please indicate your goals and obligations and the primary constituencies (faculty, staff, students, alumni, and others) to which your efforts are directed.

B. Overview of the department/unit

1. Staff -- a summary listing of staff by category; Resumes for principal staff should also be attached in an appendix.

Facilities

Offices, conferences areas, computer areas, libraries

Laboratories

Shops, etc.

3. Major program initiatives  
Major programs underway  
Staff involvement in major programs  
Cross-unit boundary groups and activities.

4. Historical pattern of unit development  
Directions of staff and program development over past 10 years  
Development of unit objectives over past 10 years.

C. Self -Evaluation

Your self-study review should assess your present position from two perspectives: Your position within your area in general, looking outward; and the status of each of your functions, considering internal strengths and weaknesses. The following specific questions should be answered, but feel free to include any other topics unique to your unit or to modify the questions so that they fit your particular situation more closely.

1. Relative status within your area  
Are there similar programs in existence at other universities?  
If so, how does your program compare to these?  
For your program, what is the key to success?  
With regard to the question above, what are your distinctive areas of strength? Weaknesses?
2. Specific status of your unit  
The quality of various components of the unit.  
The quality and strength of staff.  
The quality of unit leadership.  
The quality of administrative support and leadership at various levels in the university.  
The adequacy of resources available to the unit.  
The nature of interactions with other cognate units in or associated with the university.  
The nature of opportunities for future development. This should be discussed in the context of where you see your area of endeavor moving in the next decade. Do you plan

to move in these directions? Have you plans to grow in some way? Give your reasoning.  
The record of the past decade. Looking back, what actions would you have taken differently ;  
are you satisfied with your progress?

3. Major accomplishments -- List your major accomplishment over the last five years? How do these contribute to your overall mission or goals? To the goals of UIC? What is the status of these activities at present?

D. Major recommendations - develop a strategic plan for the next five years. Please include the following:

1. How would you define the goals of the unit for the next five years in light of your self-evaluation? What are going to be your priorities, etc.?
2. Specific recommendations to improve the quality and strategic positioning of your unit for the future. An indication of the specific changes you advocate to improve your unit.
3. Plans for implementation.

Specific steps the unit can take on its own (e.g. functional areas you plan to concentrate on; areas in which you would seek personnel replacements, changes in programming, differential shifts in workload, specific efforts to relate to or cooperate with other units at or associated with the university, etc. That is, how might you re-marshal your existing resources to achieve the changes you advocate?

If you had additional resources, to what priorities would you allocate them?

E. Any other issues deemed appropriate.