UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
FACULTY SENATE

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 2006

During the 2003-04 academic year, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee urged the JSPC and the President to develop a procedure for reviewing academic programs that would include both qualitative and quantitative measures. (See http://www.uri.edu/facsen/JSPC_MIN_12_18_03.html). In January 2004, President Carothers hired Mr. Thomas Murphy to adapt his model to the University of Rhode Island (See http://www.uri.edu/facsen/JSPC_Min_1_22.html). In February of that year the JSPC agreed to replace the Program Contribution Analysis (PCA) with an instrument that would include qualitative as well as quantitative measures (See http://www.uri.edu/facsen/JSPC_Min_2_5.html). Shortly thereafter, a small group comprising members of the JSPC began working with Mr. Murphy to refine and revise his model. This work continued through the 2004-2005 academic year and in the summer of 2005 under the auspices of a Faculty Senate Executive Committee-Administration working group (2004-05 Senate Chair Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Senators Michael Rice and Celest Martin, Assistant Provost Cliff Katz and Ms. Ann Morrissey, Co-Director of Planning Services and Professional Development and Executive Assistant to the President). This group continued to revise, refine, and test the model originally developed by Mr. Murphy, and eventually renamed the AIIM Model (See http://www.uri.edu/facsen/AIIM_Home.html for details on the process and the development of the model) In the fall 2005, faculty members from all academic departments were asked to complete the AIIM Survey. At that time, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee asked the Constitution, By-Laws and University Manual Committee to review the existing sections of the University Manual on Program Quality Review and to revise them to accommodate a combined quality-cost process (such as the AIIM) and to establish a standing joint committee to oversee the process and the development of any future instrument. After some discussion between members of the working group and the Constitution, By Laws and University Manual Committee, it was agreed that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee should develop a proposal in consultation with the CBUM Committee.

It is clear to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that the Program Contribution Analysis (PCA) and the Program Quality Review (PQR) process as outlined in the UNIVERSITY MANUAL are no longer viable. Therefore, after consulting with the Constitution, By-Laws and University Manual Committee, the FSEC now proposes revisions to sections of the University Manual on Program Quality Review and the establishment of a Joint Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Administration which would be responsible for maintaining faculty oversight and review of an academic assessment process, including developing and revising an appropriate instrument as the University's needs evolve.

The Executive Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the following legislation as the University' official procedure for academic program review.

Recommendations

I. DELETE EXISTING SECTIONS 8.86.12, 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, 33 34, 41 and 50, which refer to the detailed Program Quality Review Process:

8.86.12 ~~The Chair of the Graduate Council, the Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee, and the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate shall have general responsibility for determining a program review cycle conforming to the guidelines specified for carrying out other oversight functions of the University's program quality review process. This includes notifying affected parties and publishing schedules of reviews to allow effective planning and workload assignment for the review. This group shall meet at least once each year, early in the fall semester, and as often as necessary to accomplish their assigned responsibilities.~~

8.86.13 ~~In general, programs should be reviewed at least every seventh year, that is, reviews should be scheduled so that the completion date of successive reviews for a given program should be no more than seven years apart. Programs may be reviewed after an interval of less than this at the mutual agreement of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the chair or person responsible for the program.~~

8.86.14 ~~In consultation with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the group specified in 8.86.12 may schedule a number of related programs to be reviewed simultaneously and may make special arrangements to this end.~~

8.86.20 ~~Program Review Steering Committees. Each program identified for review shall have its own three member Program Review Steering Committee appointed to oversee and coordinate the review of that specific program. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint one person to the committee, the program being reviewed shall appoint one person to the committee, and the third person shall be an individual agreed upon by both the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the program. The Provost's appointee shall chair the committee.~~

8.86.21 ~~A basic responsibility of a Program Review Steering Committee for a particular program shall be to meet with the members of that program in order to design and determine the specific procedures and formats that will be followed in the current review. General guidelines for reviews are given below, but adjustments or modifications to them can be recommended by a Program Review Steering Committee. For example, the Program Review Steering Committee may decide that outside reviewer should be consulted in a particular review or that a recent accreditation review document prepared by the program can serve as the primary component of the current review.~~

8.86.22 ~~Each Program Review Steering Committee shall prepare a brief program review plan in consultation with members of the program and submit it to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval. If the program review plan contains a recommendation to use outside reviewers in a program review, a mechanism for selecting them shall also be included as part of the plan. An approved plan shall~~

be the basis for a specific program review. This plan should normally be submitted and approved in the semester prior to the beginning of the review. The review process itself normally shall extend over the two semesters of an academic year, with a report being submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in the spring semester.

8.86.31 Description. The descriptive section may be comprised largely of departmental material produced on an annual basis such as past annual reports, supplemented by curricular proposals submitted since the last review, updated vitae of all tenure-track faculty members and other personnel, other than graduate assistants teaching on a part-time and/or non-continuing basis, the latest accreditation report, if applicable, and such other documentation as the department considers pertinent. The Program Review Steering Committee shall determine what specific information may be used or must be included in the descriptive section. (See 8.86.21).

8.86.32 Evaluation. The members of the program, in cooperation with their Program Review Steering Committee, shall use the information contained in the descriptive section to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the program including a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the teaching, research, service, and/or other creative accomplishments of the faculty.

8.86.33 Recommendations. On the basis of the assessments made in the evaluative section, the members of the program, in cooperation with their Program Review Steering Committee and the Dean or academic administrator to whom the program director or chair reports shall develop a plan to help direct the future efforts of the program. The plan should include: goals, steps to be taken to achieve those goals, and a timetable.

8.86.34 Summary. The Steering Committee shall prepare a short summary of the most important points in the report and any observations or thoughts on the evaluation and recommendations contained in the report. These observations shall serve as a peer assessment of the process and its outcome and shall be conveyed with the report as described in 8.86.40-41.

8.86.41 In general, the written report submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as a result of the program review process shall be made available upon request to any interested parties. Any individual or group of standing in a particular program review may request that some portions of the report, especially those relating to specific personnel issues, not be made public. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall have the final authority to decide whether or not to withhold any portions of the report from public distribution.

8.86.50 Follow-Up. Each Steering Committee, in consultation with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean or academic administrator to whom the program director or chair reports and the program director or chair, shall determine the length of a follow-up period. This period, usually two years, should allow for implementation of at least some of the recommendations made in the report or subsequently agreed to as a result of discussions with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. At the end of the follow-up period, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the program director or chair, the Dean or academic administrator to whom the program director or chair reports and such members of

the Program Review Steering Committee as are available, will review the
recommendations and assess progress. Further recommendations, including
recommendations to schedule subsequent follow-up meeting(s) may be negotiated at
this time.

II. REVISE the following sections (Changes in **boldface**):

8.86.10 **Academic** Program ~~Quality~~ Review. In this section the term "program" shall
be understood to include **academic departments, as well as** any curriculum or
University sponsored activity requiring the assignment of one or more faculty to serve
in a teaching, research, or service capacity and intended to result in the conferral of
an undergraduate or graduate degree or of a certificate or other credential.

8.86.11 The primary purpose of the **academic** program ~~quality~~ review shall be to
assess **both** the academic quality ~~of~~ **and the financial aspects of** a program. **The
academic program review shall be used to inform decision-makers with regard to
resources in academic departments and programs and to provide the University with
information that will lead to improved program focus and quality. In addition, it is
intended to help the University gain greater degrees of efficiency and effectiveness
in the delivery of the academic curriculum.**

8.86.12 (~~8.86.23~~) During the course of the **academic program** review and during the
formulation of **the review instrument,** an **Academic** Program Review ~~Steering~~
Committee shall help coordinate the steps of the review, shall **lead** in the formulation
of the evaluation **instrument,** and shall **continue to modify previous instrument
versions or develop new instruments to accommodate the changing needs of the
faculty and administration. (See sections 5.86.10-11 on the Academic Program Review
Committee.)**

8.86.13 (~~8.86.30~~) ~~Report. In general terms,~~ The report, prepared as a result of an
academic program ~~quality~~ review, **shall be available to the University Community;**
however, responses to the evaluation instrument submitted by individual participants
shall remain confidential.

8.86.14 (~~8.86.40) Presentation of the Report.~~ The ~~Steering Committee for each
review, the~~ program director or chair and the Dean or academic administrator to
whom the program director or chair reports shall meet with the Provost and Vice
President for Academic Affairs to **examine and discuss the results of the review**
~~present and explain the report, and to discuss the recommendations made in the
report.~~ as soon as feasible, but no longer than **one hundred and eighty** calendar days
following the **dissemination of the results. The Academic Program Review Committee
shall serve in an advisory capacity during this process.** ~~the Provost and Vice
President for Academic Affairs shall provide the program director or chair and the
Dean or academic administrator to whom the program director or chair reports with a
written response to the report and the meeting including what support can be
expected to help implement recommendations made in the report or subsequently
agreed to.~~

III.   ADD NEW SECTIONS 5.86.10 and 5.86 11 as follows:

5.86.10 The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) shall develop and maintain the academic program review instrument. The committee shall coordinate the administration of the review, oversee the collection of data, and compile and disseminate information resulting from the review as outlined in sections 8.86.10-14. When academic program reviews are conducted, the committee shall serve as a resource to departments and programs being reviewed. The committee shall receive and respond to comments regarding the program review process, including, but not limited to, the academic program review instrument.

5.86.11 The committee shall be comprised of at least four faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate, two representatives   of the Provost and a representative of the President. Faculty members shall serve three-year terms, shall be appointed on a staggered basis and may succeed themselves for one additional three-year term.