

# Organizational Review

---

## 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 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.

### Scope of the Review

The scope of the review includes the following topics:

1. Overview and Goals (including departmental Vision and Mission, and responses to previous recommendations).
2. Strengths and Opportunities (including faculty, staff, students, and alumni, as well as physical facilities and important collaborations).
3. Teaching (academic programs and other teaching).
4. Research (publications, research funding, faculty offset).
5. Service (to the institution, profession, and community).
6. Interplay Among Teaching, Research, and Service.
7. Conclusion (summary and future plans).

Additionally the Dean may advise the DEO to focus on specific areas of the above, or to address additional questions specific to that department.

### Outline of Process

The Review process has four main components:

1. The department first completes a Self-Study.

2. A Review Committee\*, consisting of a combination of external reviewers from outside the university and at least one UI faculty member outside of the department, does an assessment based on the Self-Study and interviews of members of the department, and then submits recommendations.
3. The Dean assimilates the Self-Study, the Internal Review Committee's Report, and the External Reviewer's report, and makes final recommendations for the department.

*\*Note: University policy labels the Self-Study as an "internal review", and uses the term "external" to include non-departmental reviewers inside and outside of the university. We simply say, "Review Committee", for the latter.*

## 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 document should be no longer than 15 pages plus one page per academic program, plus appendices. The following is a template for the Self-Study, which may be modified in consultation with the Dean's Office in order to be more relevant to a particular department. (Self-Study Template available in "Helpful Documents" section of the CPH Faculty Handbook)

## The Review Committee

**Nomination and Selection of Reviewers.** The department may recommend to the Dean possible outside external reviewers to be part of the committee. They should be individuals who have expertise in the core discipline(s) represented in the department. The department should provide a brief background of each proposed reviewer. The information should include contact information and resumes, biosketches, or CV's to demonstrate their qualifications to be reviewers. External reviewers should be members of the faculty at peer institutions and should not be individuals who have a close professional relationship (e.g., former advisee/advisor or recent co-author) of any member of the department. The Dean appoints and invites external reviews in consultation with the Executive Committee.

**Reviewers' Charge.** Reviewers will interview faculty, key staff, and select students in the department. They may also interview other faculty and administrators suggested by the department or the College. The college will schedule these interviews and send the schedule and the Self-Study to the reviewers and the Dean at least one week before the site visit. Reviewers may meet with faculty individually or in groups, as determined by the department and college. The department should encourage broad student and staff participation. The visit typically includes at least one meeting with the Dean.

To maintain fairness and neutrality, reviewers should not accept social invitations, including meals, from individual faculty or departmental subgroups, in line with professional accrediting site visit practices.

**Review Committee Report.** The Committee's report is to contain its member's perspective, observations, and recommendations. The report need not include material from the Self Study or other materials prepared by the Department, except as necessary to support specific recommendations. The report should not include items such as direct quotations of dialogue from Review Committee meetings or direct quotations from departmental members or others interviewed. It 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.

The final report is to be submitted by the Review Committee to the Dean. Any additional materials collected by the Committee that were not in the Self-Study should also be transmitted to the Dean. Any notes taken by Committee members during the interviews should be destroyed once the entire Review process has been completed.

**Department's Response to the Internal Review Committee Report.** The Dean shall discuss the Review Committee Report with the DEO, who then discusses it with the Departmental faculty. If the DEO, or any member of the Departmental faculty, objects to any portion of the review or the recommendations arising from it, they may so indicate in a letter to the Dean. These letters 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.

## **Final Recommendations**

**Recommendations from the Dean.** The Dean drafts recommendations, based on the Self Study, the Review Committee Report, and any responses from the department. These draft recommendations are shared with the DEO for formal or informal feedback. The Dean then finalizes the recommendations and shares them with the DEO and the departmental faculty, and then reports them to the Central Academic Officers and Regents in compliance with the University procedures. Based on the review, the department should create or update their strategic plan to address the recommendations. After approximately two years, the Provost Office asks for a progress report from the department.

**Access to the Review Documents.** The department has the responsibility of making the review materials available to faculty, staff, and students of the department upon request. The College should make the review materials available to others upon request.

**Overview of Timetable.** The review process will normally be completed in 12-18 months from the time the department begins the Self-Study, depending on scheduling issues with the Review Committee.

- The Dean notifies each department of the schedule of its review.
- The DEO works with departmental members to conduct the Self-Study.
- The Review Committee is scheduled to conduct their interviews following the completion of the Self-Study, with the intent of completing the report in the subsequent month.
- When the department is given a chance to respond, it should do so (or decline) in a timely manner (e.g., within 2-3 weeks).
- Following receipt of the Dean's recommendations, the Department updates its strategic plan, as necessary, to address the recommendations.
- Approximately two years after the review is finalized, the department prepares a progress report for the Provost office.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA  
 Schedule of Academic Program Reviews (2017-18 to 2030-31)

**COLLEGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

A=Accreditation; C=Collegiate Review; D=Departmental Review; L=Licensure (State); P=Program; O=Other

Collegiate, Department or Program Review															Normal Accreditation Review Cycle	Accreditation Organization or Other External Agency
	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	29-30	30-31		
Collegiate Review	A	C							A, C						7 years (note that the accreditation review will include the review of the collegiate-based degree programs: BA, BS, and MPH)	Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)
Biostatistics (MS, PhD)						D								D	review moved from 21-22 to 22-23	
Community and Behavioral Health (PhD)									D						scheduled 23-24 review will now take place in 25-26	
Epidemiology (MS, PhD)								D						D		
Health Management and Policy (MHA, MS, PhD)					D								D		7 years	
Master of Health Administration (MHA) (HMP)		A								A					CAHME has approved a one-year extension for this program to 26-27	Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME)
Occupational and Environmental Health (MS, PhD, and MS in Industrial Hygiene)		D								D						
Industrial Hygiene (MS) (OEH)		A						A						A	6 years	Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)

# Accreditation Information

The University of Iowa College of Public Health (UI CPH) is accredited by the Council on Education for Public Health ([CEPH](#)) which is an independent agency recognized by the US Department of Education to accredit schools and programs of public health. These schools and programs prepare students for entry into careers in public health. The UI CPH has been accredited since 2000.

<http://www.public-health.uiowa.edu/accreditation-information/>