

College of Public Health Departmental Review Guidelines

Purpose of the Review

The departmental review should assist the faculty, Dean and University administration in (1) evaluating how effectively the department is achieving its educational goals; (2) identifying the department's strengths and weaknesses; and (3) developing strategic plans and priorities for future directions of the department. The review recommends what steps need to be taken to ensure that the department's mission is fulfilled, to improve the department's quality, and increase its centrality to the missions of the College and the University. [See the University document, "Criteria for Institutional Enhancements and Reductions."]

Scope of the Review

At the time the review is initiated, the Dean consults the DEO on the scope of the review, including the issues below on which the review should focus and what additional questions specific to the department the review should address. The Review Committee may be included in this consultation, at the request of the department. This stage in the review process is intended to ensure that the review reflects the current situation of the department and anticipates changes in the relatively near term, creates an opportunity for departmental self-examination and initiative, and promotes productive conversation on the review issues with the Review Committee and ultimately with the College.

The scope of the review must include the questions below on the *Quality and Focus* of the department and on progress made since the previous review. The scope will also include those questions below which, in the view of the College and the department, are particularly relevant to the future of the department. In some reviews, circumstances such as shifts in faculty composition may necessitate an especially comprehensive treatment of all the questions below.

1. *Quality and Focus.* What are the strengths of the department? Which areas should be emphasized and how does (or should) the department's current hiring plan and its academic programs reflect this focusing?
2. *Results of Previous Review.* How have the recommendations of the previous review been implemented? What other important events or changes have occurred since the last review? What new issues seem likely to emerge before the next review?
3. *Mission and Objectives.* How does the department define its mission? What actions has the department taken to achieve its strategic planning objectives? to

achieve the planning objectives of the College of Public Health, the Graduate College and the University?

4. *Connections within the University.* What relationships currently exist with academic programs in other departments or with interdisciplinary efforts on campus? Should anything be done to enhance and augment these interactions?
5. *Teaching and Advising.* What are the department's contributions to the College's education programs? Is the department's curriculum current and appropriate? How does the department evaluate its curriculum and programs? How is the department using the results of its assessment of student achievement to improve its instructional programs? How are the department's advising responsibilities met? How does the department involve students in its research, scholarly, and/or creative missions?
6. *Graduate Programs.* How does the department select its graduate students and assess their achievement? What does that assessment indicate about the quality of graduate programs in the department? What are the procedures by which graduate students' programs of study and research are developed? How does the department promote graduate students' professional development?
7. *Research Activities.* What types of research activities has the department been involved with over the last 5 years? Indicate the source and amount of support for research.
8. *Service Functions.* What types of service functions has the department been involved with over the last 5 years? What types of activities has the department been involved in at the community, state, and national level?
9. *Physical Assessment.* Are there problems with the space assigned to the department? Are there pressing equipment needs that should be resolved?
10. *Special Review Questions.* At the start of the review, the DEO and the Dean of the College of Public Health will consult on a set of questions tailored to the specific situation of the department.

Departmental Self-Study

The point of departure for the review is a departmental self-study prepared in consultation with, and approved by, the faculty of the department. The self-study narrative should be no longer than 15 pages; it should address the principal issues within the scope of the review in sequence. The department adds appendices containing tabular data and other supporting information, including, at a minimum, the appendices listed below.

Checklist of Appendices to the Self-Study:

- An updated curriculum vitae for each departmental faculty member
- A copy of the department's strategic plan;
- The department's hiring plan (including its plan to diversify its faculty);
- A copy of materials distributed to students who request information;
- Data on student enrollments and degrees awarded since the previous review;
- Data assessing the achievements of graduate students completing the department's programs each year since the previous review;
- The current departmental budget from all sources, including state funds, UI Foundation accounts, and external funds;
- Where applicable, a summary record of external research support since the previous review;
- Other materials appropriate for the description of the department's mission.

Work of the Review Committee

Appointment of the Review Committee and External Reviewer(s). The Dean appoints the Review Committee members in consultation with the Executive Committee. This committee shall include persons whose administrative, research, teaching, and service activities give them a broad and informed perspective of the department being reviewed. The Dean appoints the external reviewer(s) after soliciting nominations from the department and other appropriate sources and consulting the Executive Committee.

Guidelines for Nominating External Reviewer(s)

The department may recommend to the Dean possible outside external reviewer(s). They should be individuals from within the discipline(s) represented in the department. The department should provide a brief background of each proposed reviewer. The information should include:

- Areas of scholarly and teaching expertise
- Administrative experience
- Significant service to/leadership in professional organizations
- Contact information (email, mail address, phone)

External reviewer(s) must be members of the faculty at peer institutions and may not be individuals who have a close professional relationship (e.g., as co-author, former student, or mentor) of any member of the department. Individuals who have served in a previous review of the department will not be invited to serve again.

The Dean will consult with the Executive Committee on the qualifications of those nominated as external reviewer(s) before extending an invitation to serve.

Review Committee

The Review Committee should proceed with judgment appropriate to the situation and among other things, should receive the materials collected by the Department, including the self-study, and other relevant background information, and should interview the Head, administrator(s), faculty, and students of the department.

The Review Committee should assess and evaluate all aspects of the department, including:

- The composition and balance of the faculty, including the extent to which diversity has been achieved.
- The department's process for faculty development and evaluation.
- The teaching goals of the department, its methods of determining curricular content, and its methods of evaluating the success of its teaching effort.
- The department's graduate and postgraduate programs.
- The research activities of the department, including quality, source, and amount of support for research.
- The service responsibilities of the department and how well they are being met.
- The relationship of the department to other departments in the College, and to other colleges when appropriate.
- The amount of space allotted to the department and its adequacy.
- The department's activities at the community, state, and national level.
- The support of the department by the College and University administration
- The strengths and weaknesses of the department and the foreseeable future problems

The Review Committee should proceed in an open, yet discrete and confidential, manner to assure the success of the review process.

Review Committee Report

A preliminary draft of the review and its recommendations shall be prepared by the Review Committee and submitted to the Dean, who will forward it to the Executive Committee for review and comment. The Executive Committee will scrutinize the report for factual errors, but not to change its thrust, and will recommend amendments to be considered by the Review Committee. The final Review document is to contain only the Committee opinions and recommendations. The Review need not include material prepared by the Department, except as necessary to support specific recommendations, such as budgetary information or tables from the self-study.

The report will not include items such as correspondence from outside reviewer(s), direct quotations of dialogue from Review Committee meetings, or direct quotations from Departmental members or others interviewed. The final Review must be in a form and of a substance suitable for transmission to the faculty of the Department under review, as well as other recipients of the report in the Central Administration.

Specifically, comments that might be construed as pertaining to confidential personnel matters should not be included in the body of the report. These comments may be submitted to the Dean under separate cover for inclusion in the relevant personnel file. The final Review shall be submitted by the Review Committee to the Dean. Background materials collected by the Committee, including the self-study, should be transmitted to the Dean and the originals kept in confidence in the Dean's office; all other copies will be destroyed by the Dean.

College's Response to the Review Materials

The Dean shall discuss the Review with the DEO. The DEO will then discuss it with the Departmental faculty. If the DEO, or any member of the Departmental faculty, object to any portion of the review or the recommendations arising from it, they may so indicate in a letter to the Dean. These letters shall become a part of the review file in the Dean's Office. The Dean may refer the contested matter back to the Review Committee for further consideration. The additional or amended findings of the latter shall then be presented to the Executive Committee for discussion and action. Upon approval, they shall be added to the review file in the Dean's Office.

Access to the Review Documents

When the Dean's response to the Review has been transmitted to the department, all the review materials are treated as public documents, except those (such as the assessment of the DEO or other individuals) that are prepared with an explicit expectation of confidentiality. The department has the responsibility of making the review materials available to faculty, staff, and students of the department upon request. The College will make the Review documents available to others upon request.

The Review shall be forwarded to the appropriate Central Academic Officers and Regents in compliance with the current University procedure.

External Reviewer(s) Visit. The external reviewer(s) will interview faculty, staff, and students in the department. They may also interview other faculty and administrators suggested by the department, the College, or the reviewer(s) themselves. The reviewer(s) may exchange information and recommendations with the Review Committee, and will prepare a written report to the Dean.

The department will prepare the schedule of the reviewer(s) interviews and transmit the schedule to the reviewer(s) and the Dean the week before the review visit. The reviewer(s) may meet with departmental faculty individually or in groups, as determined by the DEO in consultation with the faculty. The department should encourage as many students as possible to participate in the review.

The review begins with an orientation meeting with the Dean and ends with an exit interview with the Dean.

Consistent with the practices governing site visits of professional accrediting teams, the College asks that the external reviewer(s) not receive or accept social invitations, including invitations to meals, from individual faculty members or subgroups in the department being reviewed, to ensure that the review process is fair and neutral and that it is perceived as fair and neutral.

External Reviewer(s) Report. The external reviewer(s) will make a written report to the Dean. The Dean then transmits the report to the department. This will officially conclude the review of the department.

Any evaluative comments about identified or identifiable persons (including the DEO) must be separately reported to the Dean, who will notify the persons commented on and provide them access to the comments. The Dean shall maintain the confidentiality of these comments as needed.

Review of the DEO

University policy requires that long-term administrators undergo periodic reviews. For department heads, these reviews are conducted as part of the departmental review when possible, to avoid duplicative effort. The Review Committee submits to the Dean a confidential report on the performance of the DEO, separate from the Review report on the department.

The confidential assessment of the DEO focuses on issues related to the improvement of the department's programs and the well-being of its faculty. The committee's information-gathering procedures should provide for all departmental faculty to participate in evaluating the DEO. The Dean will share the evaluation with the DEO, maintaining confidentiality as necessary, and will transmit the substance of the report to the department's faculty. The review of the DEO, like other materials evaluating individuals, does not become part of the review file that is available to members of the University community or general public.

Search for Head of the Department (if applicable)

If a new Head is to be chosen and the Dean with the advice of the Executive Committee considers the latest review of the Department to be out of date, a Committee will be appointed to prepare a review of the Department and to conduct a search for a new head. In the initial stages of its function, the Committee will prepare a review of the department as outlined above and will also identify potential candidates for the headship. When, in the opinion of the Executive Committee and the Dean, the review process has been completed, the Dean, in consultation with the Executive Committee, may expand the Review Committee to include students or others. From this point on the Committee will function as a search committee as defined in the Manual of Procedure.

Timetable

The review process will normally be completed in a year from the time the department begin the self-study.

- The Dean will notify each department of the schedule of its review.
- The Dean will arrange the timing of the self-study.
- The Review Committee and External Reviewer(s) will be scheduled to conduct their interviews following the completion of the self-study.
- When the Review Committee submits its report, the department may convey its response within a reasonable amount of time.