

From: Daleke, David L
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2005 10:36 AM
To: Gonzalez, Gerardo M.
Cc: Kintgen, Eugene R.
Subject: Program review

Dear Gerardo,

Thank you for meeting with me Friday to discuss academic program review and some of the ramifications of the mission differentiation process for graduate education. As we discussed, before Dean Slattery left I was asked to assess the status of academic program reviews, at all levels, across the university and to develop a common set of guidelines for program review. This responsibility for program reviews was included in the revised portfolio of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, a title jointly held by the Dean of the Graduate School.

Almost all of our academic programs undergo some sort of periodic review. The goal of this effort will be to create guidelines for program review, assist units that have not previously performed regular reviews, and establish connections with review processes that are established.

It is important to stress at the outset that this process is not intended to interfere with or duplicate existing reviews, including the accreditation of professional programs by disciplinary bodies, nor is it desired to impose a structure for review on any academic unit. Rather, the diversity of our academic programs requires that we consider the unique requirements of each program and develop a review process that will be appropriate and informative for each unit. It is also important that reviews not be viewed as a punitive measure, but rather are an assessment and reassertion of program quality that can help guide strategic planning for our departments, schools and campuses.

Several core principles underly periodic program review and the structure of these reviews typically follows a common format. This format includes the performance of an internal self-study, the generation of questions to be addressed, and the recruitment of external peer reviewers. Input is collected from all aspects of the academic program, including an evaluation of the curriculum, collection of student performance data, interviews with faculty and students and an assessment of quality. However, the data collected and the process followed should be flexible and reflect the norms and culture of the discipline. The time and effort put into a review can be substantial, but the rewards in terms of resource allocation and a renewed sense of direction can be great.

My goal is to create a set of guidelines for program reviews from a distillation of the review processes of IU academic units, comparisons with the structure of program reviews at peer institutions, and consideration of the unique requirements of diverse schools operating in a multi-campus university. This report will be submitted to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and will be vetted by the appropriate constituencies (school and campus faculty governance bodies, ALC, Deans, Chancellors).

To begin this process, I am surveying the current state of program reviews at IU. Could you provide the following information for the School of Education?

1. Which of your academic programs currently undergo periodic reviews (including professional accreditation)?
2. What is the schedule for these reviews?
3. Are any of your academic programs considering the implementation of, or revision to, their process of program review?
4. Which, if any, of your academic programs are currently not scheduled for review or have not been reviewed recently?

I view this as a collaborative process and hope to have many conversations with academic units during the course of the project. This information will enable me to begin these efforts, help identify units that desire the implementation of program reviews, and to encourage those units that are not performing academic reviews to consider developing a process. I would also like to offer whatever assistance I can provide to those programs that are creating a new review process.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Cheers,

David Daleke

Associate Dean

University Graduate School

Kirkwood 111

Indiana University

Bloomington, IN 47405

812-855-8852

Still searching

Indiana University President Adam Herbert announced Monday that the university will continue the search for the next Bloomington ch and academic vice president. He had hoped to make the choice this week, but said none of the finalists identified by a search committee the right fit for the job. Ken Gros Louis will continue to serve as interim chancellor and vice president.

Ken's to-do list

IU President Adam Herbert said Monday he has given this to-do list to Ken Gros Louis, the interim Bloomington chancellor:

- Appoint a vice chancellor for enrollment services.
 - Appoint a graduate school dean.
 - Appoint a director of the Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching.
 - Explore providing raises for faculty promotions.
 - Submit mission-differentiation policy recommendations to the trustees.
 - Implement campus program review procedures.
 - Evaluate the impact of the School of Informatics.
 - Ensure smooth development of Student Enrollment Systems.
 - Analyze library needs.
 - Enhance Bloomington-campus admission requirements.
 - Initiate more aggressive student recruiting.
 - Continue to improve relations with Ivy Tech Community College.
 - Explore dental insurance for graduate and professional student employees.
-

- resolution of conflicts in graduate education across campuses and units
- coordination of regular reviews of graduate programs
- organization of formal reviews of proposed new graduate programs and degrees
- collection and analysis of data on graduate education
- development of funding for graduate education
- coordination of the acquisition, oversight, and distribution of university-wide graduate and post-doctoral fellowships
- representation of Indiana University's interests in graduate education at the local, state, national, and international levels;

(5) that such issues as curriculum and program development be determined at the campus or school level; and
(6) that graduate faculty membership be determined at the campus or school level in accord with procedures and standards adopted by the Graduate School Council.

In addition to the above recommendations, the UFC further recommends:

- (1) that the mission of the Graduate School and its Dean include the responsibility of ensuring graduate and professional student welfare, including consultation with elected representatives of the graduate and professional student organization (GPSO in Bloomington or similar organization on other campuses);
- (2) that student association with academic schools be formally recognized in the commencement ceremonies.

Finally, the University Faculty Council requests of the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School, a report in the fall of 2005 outlining the portfolios of these two separate positions—the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean of the Graduate School.

And, lastly, we recognize that there remain complex issues regarding the financial impacts of assessments to and distribution of fellowship and other resources to affected campuses and units. We therefore recommend that each campus faculty council undertake a formal review of financial issues associated with assessments and distribution of graduate fellowships. We further recommend that an initial review of the Graduate School be conducted in three years and every five years thereafter. The results of these reviews should be reported to the University Faculty Council.

Approved by Action of the University Faculty Council: February 8, 2005