

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Division of Academic Affairs

PROGRAM REVIEW
Research & Academic Service Entities

2000-2011

last updated: 30 January 2004

**Program Review
Centers, Institutes, and Laboratories
2000-2011**

[For a general discussion of the definition, purpose, philosophy, types, goals, and assumptions of program review at Eastern Michigan University, please refer to the most recent version of the Program Review Department Manual.]

The Division of Academic Affairs will maintain a calendar scheduling organized research units (centers, institutes, and laboratories) and academic service units for program review. Centers that are subunits of institutes or laboratories will be reviewed as part of the larger unit.

Except for the year in which a full program review is scheduled, less comprehensive annual reports will continue to be required of all organized research units.

The Program Review Schedule Cycle

Reviews of research and academic service entities are scheduled in four-year cycles, with a self-study and site visit for the Higher Education Commission of the North Central Association (NCA) of Colleges and Schools anchoring the schedule during the ninth and tenth years.

When circumstances warrant, the Provost and Assistant Provost, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, or the Dean or senior administrator of the unit may request more frequent reviews of a unit.

The Provost's Office is responsible for the program review schedule. The Associate Provost, in consultation with the administrators supervising the units, will propose a schedule for the Provost's approval. All requests for variance from the master schedule shall be addressed to the Associate Provost, with final approval coming from the Provost. A master schedule of reviews will be maintained at all times, with copies distributed to the supervising administrators, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, and unit directors at the beginning of each fiscal year.

Components of the Program Review Process

Directors or other administrative personnel are responsible for conducting the review of their own unit and all subunits under it. All reviews should be conducted with the full participation of faculty and staff involved in the unit's programs and services during the period under review.

The director or other administrative personnel will write the report and make recommendations. The program review document should follow the outline below. The document should conclude with specific recommendations regarding the future of the unit and any subunits:

- (1) Continuation.
- (2) Continuation with Specific Changes.
- (3) Probation.
- (4) Phase Out.

It is essential that the main text of the program review document be succinct; not more than 25 pages excluding appendices. However, units may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or other evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the unit.

The director is responsible for forwarding the program review materials, supporting documents and final recommendations to the unit's senior administrator (Department Head, Dean, Associate Vice President for Extended Programs, as appropriate), who will review and rate the unit in one of the four categories. The review document and ratings will then be forwarded to the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research who, in cooperation with the unit's administrators, will review and evaluate all materials and rate each program according to the same scale.

The Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research's rating will reflect the program's viability, value, quality, effectiveness, and efficient use of resources. It will include not only a narrative justifying the rating of the program but also a recommendation to the Provost's Office for any follow-up actions required.

The documents will be distributed to interested parties across campus for comment. The unit will then participate in an open discussion, to include the unit's staff, the Associate Provost, the Provost, and any other interested parties. The Provost will review the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research's rating for each program, along with all materials that formed the basis of the recommendation, and notes from the open discussions. The Provost and the Associate Provost will then meet with the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, the director, and other appropriate administrators to discuss the results of the program review.

If the Provost recommends a program review rating of (1) Continuation, then the unit will continue to be reviewed in a four-year cycle, and no follow-up action will be required. If the Provost recommends (2) Continuation with Specific Changes, the unit will remain on the four-year program review cycle, but the Director will supervise the writing of a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan within three months of receiving the program rating. The purpose of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan will be to respond to the concerns raised in the Program

Review ratings, propose improvements, and develop a timeline for implementing the recommended improvements.

When the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is completed, the director will send the report to the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research and other appropriate administrators, who will then determine that recommendations adopted in the report are consistent with the program goals described in the Program Review.

Once a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is adopted, the director will report to the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research annually, in writing, on progress made in the implementation of recommendations proposed in the report. After receiving progress reports from the director, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research will summarize these reports in discussion with the Provost. This information will be integrated into the report to the Board of Regents on the previous year's program reviews.

For programs that are placed on (3) Probation, the director will supervise the writing, within 3 months of a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan that will include a detailed timeline, not to exceed three years, to eliminate the deficiencies noted in the program review. The unit will then undergo an abbreviated form of Program Review annually until noted deficiencies are rectified.

If a program is recommended for "Phase Out," the director will be given 30 days to respond in writing to the recommendation. After receiving this report, the Provost will determine whether the program should be phased out. If, at that time, the Provost determines that the program will be phased out, the director will supervise the writing and implementation of a detailed transition, due to the Provost no later than 30 days after a final decision is made.

This plan should address the following:

- An appropriate method for dispersing, reallocating, or transferring current funds or other resources that may be specifically tied to the program.
- An outline of outstanding projects/commitments and how/when they will be completed.
- An outline and a timeline for the administrative tasks that must be undertaken to officially end a unit.

If phase out is implemented, faculty will be reassigned, retrained, or terminated based on stipulations in the Eastern Michigan University AAUP contract. Once a Phase Out plan is adopted, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research will report to the Provost, in writing, on progress made on the progress of the Phase Out action.

While under development, program reviews, post-review program improvement reports, external reviews if any, and related reports will be regarded as confidential; essentially, this means that they should be distributed within defined communities and not made generally accessible.

Guidelines for Program Review Reports

The following guidelines should be used in conducting program reviews. They should help (1) reduce the amount of documentation required in the program review process and (2) focus the review on unit goals, how well the unit has done in meeting these goals, and the future actions needed to meet the goals.

- A. The report will be goal oriented. Specific goals should be stated for the unit and the attainment of those goals should be the focus of the report. The goals should reflect the university's mission and any relevant departmental, college, divisional, or crosscutting strategic plans.
- B. The report will look at the unit as a whole. The focus will be on the unit, not on individual activities of the unit to the exclusion of others.
- C. The report will be forward-looking. It will focus not only on where the unit has been but also on where it wishes to go (its goals). Using data provided to or generated by the unit, it will analyze and assess whether the goals are appropriate to the needs of stakeholders and sponsors and the University's mission.
- D. The focus of the report will be on assessment rather than on description. The report will evaluate progress toward unit goals rather than merely document the status of the unit. It will analyze available data, both quantitative and qualitative, that have been provided to or generated by the unit, to assess progress in meeting its goals.
- E. Recommendations will be expressed in terms of action. Recommendations for action will indicate who will do what specific tasks, and when.
- F. The program review process will be continuous. With appropriate input from unit staff, the director, related administrators, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, and the Division of Academic Affairs will continuously monitor the health of the unit.

Special Program Funding as a Result of Program Review

Program review results will have budgetary implications. According to the following guidelines, resources may be allocated, where appropriate and justified, for the improvement or enhancement of organized research units. The Associate Provost may determine, subject to the approval of the Provost, the recipients of these allocations.

1. The Provost's office may provide funding for improving institutes and laboratories that have been recommended for Continuation with Specific Changes or for Probation.

(Centers are not eligible for base funding.) The decision to provide funding will be based on the unit's viability, effectiveness, and relation to the University's mission.

2. Additional resources may be available for making good units better. Decisions to award additional funding will be based on the unit's quality, effectiveness, efficient use of resources, and potential for added value to the university.

Conclusion

Strong academic programs are augmented by various research entities that include the centers, institutes, and laboratories at Eastern Michigan University. They are the fundamental building blocks of a progressive, vibrant, and responsive learning environment. The purpose of Program Review is to enhance the learning environment of Eastern Michigan University, thereby maximizing each student and faculty member's opportunity for success.

Appendix A

Structure of the Program Review Report

Program Name

Unit

Year of Report

I. MISSION

State the mission of the unit.

II. GOALS

- A. Describe the goals of the unit. How and by whom were these goals determined? Have they changed since the last unit review? If so, why and how? If not, why? What is the relationship of the goals to the University's mission and strategic directions, and strategic initiatives of the division, college, and/or related units and crosscutting committees? What is the relationship of the goals to the needs of the unit's constituencies (people served by the unit's activities, including sponsors).
- B. How do you measure attainment of the above goals? Describe the measures used to evaluate whether or not the program is meeting its goals. A fuller description of evidence from these measures will appear on the following pages.

III. OBJECTIVES

- A. List specific objectives for the unit during the period under review. How does each objective support the unit's goals? Who was responsible for achieving each objective, and by what date?
- B. To what extent was each objective achieved or not achieved by the due date? What remains to be done? If the objective was not achieved, explain why.
- C. Report evidence showing how the objectives respond to emerging issues for the unit, e.g., developments in the discipline, new knowledge, changes in the labor force, changes in employer needs, changes in the funding priorities of sponsors, and so on.

IV. INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE

A. Instruction

If appropriate to the mission and goals, describe and assess any training and instructional activities sponsored by the unit, if applicable. For credit programs, indicate the amount of credit (SCH) by year produced by each program. For noncredit programs, indicate per year the number of persons served and hours of

training provided. Describe the delivery system for each program (type and location, clientele, extent of online instruction, subcontracts to vendors, etc.).

B. Research

If appropriate to the mission and goals, describe and assess the research and scholarly (or, where appropriate, creative) activity (publications, presentations) of the unit since the last review. How many and which grants or contracts specifically required research? Indicate whether the level of scholarly activity is satisfactory and, if not, describe plans to increase the level of activity.

List any peer-reviewed publications, presentations, or other disseminated scholarly product that resulted directly from research performed by the unit.

C. Service

If appropriate to the mission and goals, describe and assess any service the unit has provided to the university, local community, region, state, nation, and world.

Provide evidence that the unit has served the needs of its sponsors and beneficiaries. State how you plan to assess the unit's services during the next evaluation period.

D. Support of Academic Units

With which academic units did the unit collaborate during the review period. Describe and assess the nature of the collaboration. Was it mutually beneficial? What conflicts arose, if any, and how were they resolved? To what extent did the unit share with collaborating departments the benefits of sponsored projects and other unit activity (e.g., credit, indirect cost recovery, recognition)?

Briefly summarize efforts made by the unit to support the instructional, research, and service obligations of faculty who worked for the unit, and their progress toward tenure and promotion.

V. INFRASTRUCTURE

A. Organization

Describe and assess the organizational structure and current staffing of the unit. List all faculty and staff who provided work for the unit during the review period, and their roles, compensation, and contribution. If applicable, describe and list members of advisory committees (function, frequency of meetings, etc.). Is the organizational structure adequate to fulfill the unit's mission and accomplish its goals?

B. Location

Describe and assess the unit's physical location and work environment (if space is rented, include square footage and rental cost). Is it convenient and accessible to stakeholders? Is it attractive? Functional? Efficient?

C. Equipment

Describe and assess any major equipment items controlled by the unit. What are the unit's most pressing equipment needs (include an itemized budget and acquisition plan)?

D. Marketing

Describe efforts to publicize the services and accomplishments of the unit among stakeholders and potential clients.

Describe efforts to cultivate sponsor support and positive relations with actual and potential sponsors.

Attach as an appendix any marketing materials (brochures, posters, displays, event programs, etc.) that were used during the review period. Describe number of copies, distribution, audience, etc.

Assess the marketing efforts made during the review period. What was effective and what was not? What new approaches are needed, if any?

VI. COST EFFECTIVENESS

A. Unit Cost

Provide the unit budget for each year under review, including internal and external funding sources in separate columns.

Describe how funds were used for each year by budget category (personnel, SSM, travel, equipment, other). Note and explain any significant year-end deficits or surpluses.

State by year the amount of indirect-cost recovery distributed to unit accounts. Describe how indirect-cost revenues are used to advance the goals of the unit.

Describe unit goals to offload administrative costs onto non-federal grants or contracts, and onto federal grants where costs are project related in a direct way. How successful has the unit been in meeting these goals?

B. List of Proposals Submitted

Provide a complete list of proposals submitted for external funding during the period under review. Include only those proposals submitted directly by the unit through ORD. Include proposal title, ORD transmittal number, sponsor, amount requested, name of principal investigator, project period, date submitted, and outcome (Funded, Not Funded, Pending).

C. List of Awards

Provide a complete list of external grants/contracts awarded during the period under review. Include only those proposals submitted through ORD. Include proposal title, ORD transmittal number, sponsor, amount awarded, indirect cost recovery, institutional matching funds, name of principal investigator, and date of award. Include total figures by year for awards, indirect cost, and matching funds.

D. Other Income

Describe any other income generated by the unit during the evaluation period (e.g., gifts, fees, tuition from short courses, training, etc.).

E. Fundraising and Friend-Raising

What efforts has the unit made to cultivate philanthropic support of the unit? What has been the result of these efforts? Describe efforts to cultivate donors and partners. What new relationships and opportunities for the University has the unit identified during the evaluation period?

F. Cost-Benefit Analysis

Assess the cost-effectiveness of the unit. Evaluate the benefits and value provided by the unit (to the University and to its stakeholders) in relation to unit cost. Include here any benefits unrelated to grants and gifts (e.g., awards, recognition, community service, support of students and student learning, patents, licenses, and copyrights, public relations, and so on).

VII. RESOLUTION OF ISSUES

A. Internal Review

Describe any recommendations that were made as a result of the last internal program review. Describe how the unit has responded to each recommendation.

B. Impact of Response to Issues/Concerns

Assess the outcomes of the unit's responses to these recommendations.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

- A. What steps should be taken to strengthen the unit? How can quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency, and resource value be improved?
- B. Should the unit be expanded, maintained at the current level, downsized, eliminated, restructured, or merged with another unit? Provide a brief rationale for the recommendation.

IX. APPENDIX

Units may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the program.

Appendix B

The Structure of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan

Unit Name

Year of Report

I. SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REVIEW RATING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Describe the unit that was reviewed.
- B. State the recommendations that were made for the unit.
- C. State any difference in recommendations made by the Dean, the Associate Provost, or the Provost.

II. ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROGRAM REVIEW

- A. Which recommendations from the program review are to be adopted? If different, which recommendations from the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, the Associate Provost, or the Provost, will be adopted? State the rationale for not adopting any recommendation.
- B. Indicate which planned changes in the unit derive all or in part from the program review, a prior departmental review, or an external review. When possible, reference document cited by page and line number.
- C. Describe the corrective actions that unit staff want to take. Is there a consensus concerning the corrective changes that need to be taken? Include the views from those who could not reach a consensus in a supporting addendum.

III. STEPS TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Provide a timeline of changes that will occur in the unit.
- B. Describe the steps that can be implemented immediately to improve the unit. Explain each of these steps in detail and identify the individual/committee that will oversee each step.
- C. Outline the steps that can be completed by the end of one year, and after years two and three. Describe each step and identify the person/committee that will be responsible for each step.

- D. Express the long-term outcomes expected in five years if the program improvement plan is successful. What long-term outcomes are expected in 10 years?

IV. RESOURCE REALLOCATION

- A. Describe any internal unit resources that will need to be reallocated in order to implement the adopted recommendations.
- B. Describe any external resources that will be needed in order to implement the adopted recommendations.

V. ASSESSMENT OF THE POST-REVIEW PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- A. The program improvement plan will need to specify unit outcomes to evaluate whether the plan successfully corrects the problem(s) identified in the Program Review. State the outcomes that define a successful or unsuccessful outcome, in addition to the expected outcome. Describe how the outcome of the adopted unit changes will be evaluated.
- B. Describe how incorporation of the improvement will strengthen the unit. Explain how unit quality, productivity, satisfaction, and resource value will be improved.
- C. Describe how the unit will implement more effective outcome assessment measures to improve unit quality and enhance the educational experience of those involved with the unit.