April 4, 2006

TO: Executive Committee of the Academic Council (ECAC)
FROM: Christina DeJong, Richard Groop, Harold Hughes, Michael Moch, James Potchen, and Allen Weich
RE: Final Report of Faculty Voice Taskforce III: Program Review

Attached find the final report of Faculty Voice Taskforce III: Program Review. We anticipate that you will forward our report to members of the Faculty Council in time for them to review it prior to the Faculty Council meeting on April 11. Those of us in attendance will provide a very brief overview of the report. We had anticipated that two of us who are members of Faculty Council would move and second the following resolution:

The Faculty Council, having received and considered the Taskforce III report on Program Review, supports the proposal in concept and overall design and offers it to the Provost and the President as a template for implementing a university-wide system of periodic program review at Michigan State University.

With the ECAC’s April 4 decision to offer our report only as an information item, however, we understand that we cannot offer this resolution. Nevertheless, we will provide an overview of our report.

In our overview, we will express our gratitude for the cooperation of and consultation with administrators across the university. We were impressed by their energy, commitment, and vision. Many college deans are already implementing comprehensive programs of unit assessment and review. Our recommendations therefore should be considered as resting on a solid base of currently operating unit review procedures. We essentially are recommending that the best practices already in place be extended throughout the university.

Had the Faculty Council endorsed our proposal, we had planned to urge the ECAC to take responsibility for coordinating our recommendations with those of the other faculty voice taskforces and for culling, collating and processing the changes in governance procedures and bylaws proposed by all of them. We understand that now the ECAC will endeavor to do this without a Faculty Council vote on our proposal. To aid them in this effort, we advise them that, in our opinion, there are few, if any, points at which the recommendations of Taskforce III need to be coordinated with those being considered by other taskforces. Our recommendations have very little to do with academic governance per se. We focused our attention on faculty participation in program review, an essentially administrative function. The only direct implications of our report for academic governance are 1) a significant role for college advisory committees (CACs) and 2) the establishment of a University Faculty Program Advisory Committee (UFPAC) to advise the Provost on program review.
CACs already play a significant role in academic governance at MSU. Resources permitting, the system of program review we are recommending could be implemented and managed by the Office of the Provost, with or without UFPAC. Our recommendations, including the UFPAC, therefore are advisory to the administration and can be implemented regardless of changes that might be under consideration for the governance structure, administrator evaluation, communication systems, or the roles and privileges of tenure-system and fixed-term faculty. They could, in fact, be implemented administratively with or without the endorsement of the Faculty Council.

Should the Faculty Council eventually endorse our recommendations, we advise ECAC to route the proposal through the Council of Deans. Now that consideration of endorsement has been postponed, perhaps the ECAC might consult with the Council of Deans as they coordinate across taskforce recommendations. The deans have been instrumental in the development of our report. They have not, however, seen the final version. Nor are they all of the same mind. As they will play a central role in program implementation, the deans should be consulted on the program features under consideration. Should they identify shortcomings or ways to strengthen the proposed program, their recommendations should be taken seriously by Faculty Council.

The program review procedure we are recommending will be implemented, if at all, by the administration. It will not be administered through governance. We therefore also advise the ECAC to route the proposal through Academic Council and to put it up for support or rejection in that venue.

In developing the proposal we heard a great deal about cost in terms of both money and time. The taskforce members are not in a position to engage the appropriate costing methodologies to accurately project costs and associated staffing needs. Our proposal, however, is lean and requires no additional evaluation activities where existing procedures are already in place. We believe it can be administered incrementally by existing unit and college staff and within current budgetary constraints. If our expectations prove to be too optimistic, we expect the administration will make the needed resources available or scale down the evaluation program to accommodate the resources that are available.

We want to express our appreciation for the opportunity to serve the faculty and our administration. We also have enjoyed getting to know each other. It has been a privilege to serve on Taskforce III, and we offer our recommendations in the spirit of service and continuing dialog. We will be available to help ECAC, should it seek our advice and counsel as it moves forward to integrate the various taskforce recommendations. With this report, however, we consider our task accomplished and the taskforce disbanded.
The purpose of the MSU Academic Review Program (ARP) proposed herein is to establish a process whereby faculty members will initiate program planning and be directly involved in follow-up activities in the area most germane to their core responsibilities: the determination and assessment of the direction and performance of their primary administrative unit, the academic department. At the college and university levels, the ARP will generate actionable information that will support and guide MSU’s process of continuous regeneration and renewal to meet the needs of its ever changing multiple constituencies.

It is essential that MSU respond to the increasing pace of change in its environment. In telecommunications, for example, significant technological change occurs faster than the tenure-review cycle. In Engineering, MSU must move rapidly to develop specialties for the future, as commodity engineering is increasingly outsourced to developing economies. MSU is facing increasing competition from private providers who are nimble and capable of employing new delivery systems for educational materials. When implemented, the proposed ARP will guide the faculty in identifying future directions for the university and provide support to the administration as it manages the changes that will be required to advance MSU’s distinctive capabilities and unique potential into the 21st Century.
Programs are taken to be academic departments hereinafter called units.¹ The ARP will provide units with self- and externally-generated assessments that will provide them and college and university administrators with the performance criteria and feedback required for the effective management of change. By improving its programs and by identifying its many successful accomplishments, academic units at MSU will be able to stimulate excellence internally and document their contributions externally. By facilitating communication between students, faculty, support services such as the library, administrators, and external reviewers, the ARP will function to provide faculty initiated broad-based constructive reviews and align all interests in the common goal of achieving and maintaining university-wide excellence.

The primary responsibility for the conduct of ARPs, as currently proposed, will reside with the faculty at the unit level. There will be two deliverables: a unit self-study and an external reviewer report. Responsibility for initiating reviews and assisting units in their timely completion will reside at the college level, in the office of the college dean with the advice of the College Advisory Council (CAC).² Where appropriate, APRs for centers, institutes and other groupings may, at the discretion of the dean and with unit concurrence, be folded into reviews of academic departments. Self-study and external reviews along with dean’s and, where appropriate, CAC commentaries will be provided to the Provost, advised by a University Faculty Program Advisory Committee (UFPAC), selected annually by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. All academic

---

¹ A unit is any administrative department existing in a college and supervised by a dean. This definition captures the 215 units listed within each of the 14 colleges listed on pp 27-33 of the MSU 2005-2006 Faculty/Staff Directory and the MSU College of Law. In the case of small colleges such as James Madison, the MSU College of Law, and the College of Nursing, the unit may be taken to be the college itself.
² In the case of units with multiple deans, the lead dean will assume the dean’s APR functions.
units at MSU, unless granted a waiver by the Provost at the request of the college dean, will go through the APR process at least once during any given seven year window.\(^3\)

**Features of the ARP**

Different types of program review are required to address different problems and prospects facing units at MSU. Some units might be making significant progress with the resources at hand and require additional resources and greater national or international visibility. Other units may be making significant contributions to MSU in teaching, research or service but require conscious self-assessment and external guidance to realize their potential within the resource-constrained environment that must be anticipated for MSU for the foreseeable future. The proposed ARP therefore is designed to provide the flexibility called for by the diversity of unit needs, strategic options, and resource requirements. The overall process is depicted in Figure 1.

A unit APR will be initiated by the college dean on his/her initiative or upon the request of a unit chairperson. The dean will meet with unit personnel to outline procedures, expectations, and a schedule of milestones. Performance metrics will be negotiated and agreed to by the unit, the dean and the provost. The first stage in the APR process, a unit self-study, will generally take between 9-12 months to complete, but events may require extensions or respecifications. In such cases, the burden for justifying an extension or review respecification to both the college dean and the provost will rest

---

\(^3\) Many units at MSU are reviewed by external accrediting organizations. Others are reviewed by licensing or other external agencies. In many cases, therefore, aspects of the APR process may be redundant with requirements already in place. In these cases, a dean, with approval of the Provost, may exempt a unit from APR or restrict the APR process to those aspects not already covered by other requirements. For example, accreditation reviews often may be directed toward undergraduate or masters education but be relatively unconcerned with Ph.D. education and research. In such cases, the APR process may be restricted to a review of graduate education and research.
with the unit. The self-study, once completed, will document the unit’s accomplishments and its shortcomings and generate an agreed-upon course of action for the future. Self-studies should provide answers to the following questions:

1. What do you do?
2. Why do you do it?
3. How well do you do it, and who thinks so?
4. What difference does it make whether you do it or not?
5. How do you intend to change to reach your (evolving) future given where you are now?
6. How will you evaluate your progress and ultimate success?

The self-study will be reviewed by the college dean, who, with the advice of the college CAC, will select and solicit the participation of appropriate external reviewers. It is anticipated that the unit will recommend reviewers. The responsibility for selecting reviewers, however, will reside with the dean, and the dean may select reviewers other than those on the unit’s list. The external reviewers will consult with unit faculty and staff, students and appropriate unit constituencies within and external to MSU, evaluate the unit and its self-study, and report directly to the unit and to the college dean. The unit

---

4 Unit emeritus faculty might play an important role, both in the self-study and its subsequent review at both the college and university levels.
5 Reviews of units that represent a discipline will need review committees composed, at least in part, of experts in the discipline who are not affiliated with MSU. Other units have little of their foundation in a discipline but link or offer service to other MSU units. These units will need reviewers from outside the unit or even the college who understand the unit’s interdependencies with other units at MSU. The preferred combination of external reviewers from outside or inside MSU will vary by college and by unit and therefore should be left to the discretion of the dean, advised by the CAC.
6 Some have expressed concern that external reviewers who know their evaluations will be given to unit personnel may be less than candid. It is difficult to see, however, how a unit can generate and adhere to a realistic development plan unless it is informed about both its strengths and weaknesses by those it deems
will respond to the external review, forwarding its response to the dean. The dean and the unit chair then will review the self-study and the external review with the CAC.\(^7\) Upon college-level receipt of the unit self study, the external review, the unit’s response to the external review, and a review of the report to the college CAC, the review materials will be forwarded, along with the dean’s comments, and, where appropriate, CAC reaction, to the Provost.

The APR, as currently proposed, includes a process for unit and college-level feedback and follow-up. The Provost will provide feedback to the unit, either directly or through the college dean, outlining the administrative options he/she has chosen either to support or redirect the unit’s assessments and future plans. Guided by the schedule of milestones identified by the unit or respecified by the Provost through the college dean, the unit will, within 24 months of the completion of its self-study and action plan, submit a report documenting and explaining its successes and failures, recommending support and, where appropriate, changes in its action plan. These changes and requests for support will be reviewed by the college dean with the advice of the CAC and forwarded, with the dean’s comments and recommendations, to the provost.

**Implementation**

It will take time to ramp up the APR process. A significant number of units, however, notably all those in the colleges of Social Science and Arts and Letters, are worthy to provide this information. There also may be benefit to advice tempered by the knowledge that it will be disseminated to those who will be most directly affected.

\(^7\) Recognizing that securing candid external reviews may require pledges of some confidentiality, the unit and the dean may choose to provide the CAC with an overview of the APR but restrict the CAC’s access to either the external review, the self-study, or both.
already on a review rotation. APR also has been accomplished in whole or in part through accreditation reviews in the colleges of Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine, Nursing, Veterinary Medicine, Communication, Education, Engineering, Law and Business. Some units in the College of Natural Science fall within the accreditation domains of other colleges and have participated in reviews in that capacity. In the past six years, the Graduate School has facilitated program reviews in a variety of units in Engineering, Natural Science, Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, Arts and Letters, Education, Social Science, and Communication. The Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies is continuing a systematic process of reviewing research centers, institutes, and laboratories that was initiated in the Spring of 2002. These have involved the Colleges of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Arts and Letters, Business, Communication, Education, Engineering, Human Medicine, Natural Science, Nursing, Osteopathic Medicine, Social Science, and Veterinary Medicine. The proposed APR should leverage these efforts and avoid redundancy. APRs therefore should be prioritized in proportion to the amount of time that has passed since the most recent previous review and priority be given to those aspects of an APR that have received less attention from accreditation procedures, licensing, the Graduate School, the Vice President for Research, or other forms of review. Discretion for how to ramp up the APR process, however, should reside with the unit faculty by initiating a review and the college deans, advised by their college advisory councils, based on college and unit level priorities and concerns. When fully implemented, approximately 30 units will participate in or be excused from an APR during any given
academic year, a number that should not be overly burdensome, given the potential benefits to the unit, the college, and the university.

Costs and Costing

In developing the proposal we heard a great deal about cost in terms of both money and time. The taskforce members are not in a position to engage the appropriate costing methodologies to accurately project costs and associated staffing needs. Our proposal, however, is lean and has been designed so that it will require no additional evaluation activities where existing procedures are already in place. We anticipate that it will be administered incrementally by existing staff in units and colleges and within current budgetary constraints. We have been advised by some quite knowledgeable people, however, that additional resources will be needed, including assigning overall responsibility for program reviews to the Senior Associate Provost. If our expectations concerning program costs prove to be too optimistic, we expect the administration will make the needed resources available or scale down the evaluation program to accommodate the resources that are available.

---

8 Several commentators have raised the issue of funding for the APR process. Proposals have ranged from having the process supported entirely by unit resources, complemented in some cases by deans and the Graduate School, to the establishment of an Academic Program Review Office administered by the provost. We view this feature of the APR as essentially an administrative issue and therefore outside the purview of the mandate of the taskforce. Support sufficient to implement APR is essential. How that support is administered, however, should be determined administratively rather than specified through academic governance.
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