PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW
The departmental review focuses on the quality and centrality of the department’s educational programs and teaching; the quality of the faculty’s research, scholarship, or artistic activities; and the department’s service to the University, the state, and the disciplines represented in it. 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 to increase its centrality to the missions of the College and the University.

SCOPE OF THE REVIEW
At the time the review is initiated, the Dean consults the DEO on the scope of the review, including which areas of question (below) the review should focus on and what additional questions specific to the department the review should address. The departmental executive committee (or other advisory committee to the DEO) or the departmental self-study committee is also invited to this consultation. 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 within the department, with the review committee, and ultimately with the College.

The scope of the review must include at least questions # 1 and 2 below, on the quality and focus of the department and on progress made since the previous review. The scope will also include those additional questions listed 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, change in student demand for the major, change in national rank of the department, or shifts in the discipline nationwide may necessitate an especially comprehensive treatment of all the questions below.

1. **Quality and Focus.** What are the strengths of the department? What is its national standing within the discipline or disciplines in which its faculty teach and engage in scholarly or creative work? Which areas should be emphasized and how does (or should) the department’s current hiring plan and its academic programs reflect this focusing? What actions has the department taken to diversify its faculty and students with respect to gender and ethnicity?

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 planning objectives? to achieve the planning objectives of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 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. **Undergraduate Teaching and Advising Programs.** What are the department’s contributions to the General Education Program? Is the department’s undergraduate curriculum current and appropriate? How does the department evaluate its undergraduate curriculum and major programs? How is the department using the results of its assessment of student achievement in the undergraduate major to improve its instructional programs? How are the department’s advising responsibilities met? How does the department involve undergraduates in its research, scholarly, and/or creative missions? How does the department prepare its graduate students to teach and supervise their teaching in its undergraduate programs?

6. **Departmental and University Honors Programs.** How do the department’s faculty and students participate in the University Honors Program? What if anything should be done to increase this participation or improve its quality? How is the departmental honors program structured? What proportion of the department’s majors participate in its honors courses or receive honors degrees? How effective is the departmental honors program in improving academic opportunities for highly motivated students?

7. **Graduate Programs.** What does the department’s “Strategic Assessment of Graduate Programs” (see the list of appendices to the self-study) indicate about the quality and sustainability of the graduate program(s) in the department? In light of this assessment (and the most recent Graduate College data), what changes are indicated in graduate recruitment and admission practices; in curriculum, degree requirements, or student financial support; and/or in graduate student mentoring and professional development within the department?

8. **Physical Plant.** Are there problems with the space assigned to the department? Are there pressing equipment needs that should be resolved?

9. **Special Review Questions.** At the start of the review, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the Graduate College consult the department 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, submitted by the DEO and prepared in consultation with the faculty of the department. The self-study narrative is 15 pages or fewer, and addresses the principal issues within the scope of the review in sequence. The department adds appendices in the sequence listed below.

**Table of Contents for Appendices to the Self-Study:**

A. an abbreviated, current *curriculum vitae* for each departmental faculty member (no more than 2 pages will be included in the self-study for any faculty member);

B. data reflecting the national standing of the department and its programs;

C. a two-page summary of the department’s hiring plan;

D. the off-print of the University’s *General Catalog* describing the department’s programs and/or other information distributed to majors and graduate students;

E. data on student enrollments, departmental majors, and degrees awarded since the previous review (provided by the College and reviewed by the department);

F. departmental plan for assessing outcomes of the undergraduate major program(s), with data from each year since the plan was submitted;

G. the department’s “Strategic Assessment of Graduate Programs,” updated with the most recent data from the Graduate College;

H. where applicable, a summary record of external research support since the previous review;
I. the report of the internal and external reviewers from the last review of the department;
J. other materials appropriate for the description of the department’s mission.

WORK OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Appointment of Committee Members. The Dean appoints the internal members of the review committee in consultation with the CLAS Executive Committee and the Associate Deans. The Dean appoints the external members after soliciting nominations from the department and other appropriate sources and consulting the CLAS Executive Committee and the Associate Deans.

Review Visit. The review committee spends one to two days interviewing faculty, staff, and students in the department. The committee may also interview other faculty and administrators suggested by the department, the College, or the reviewers themselves.

The department and the Office of the Dean cooperate in preparing the schedule of the reviewers’ interviews. The Dean’s Office transmits the schedule to the reviewers the week before the review visit. The reviewers ordinarily meet with departmental faculty in groups. The department includes in the review schedule meetings with graduate students, and if at all possible with undergraduate students, and encourages as many students as possible to attend.

The review begins with an orientation meeting with the Dean and Associate Deans and ends with an exit interview with the Dean, the Dean of the Graduate College, and the Vice Provost or other representative of the Provost’s office.

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

Review Report. The review committee submits its report to the Dean. The Dean then transmits the report to the DEO, who shares the report with faculty, staff, and students.

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.

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW REPORT

The Dean, in transmitting the review committee report, will solicit a written response, including the correction of any factual errors, from the department.

COLLEGIATE RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW MATERIALS

The Deans of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the Graduate College discuss the self-study, the review report, and the response of the department with the CLAS Executive Committee and with the Provost and Associate Provost for Academic Review before transmitting to the DEO a joint written response to the review. The DEO shares the Colleges’ response with the faculty, staff, and students.

The review process officially concludes with the transmission to the department of the Deans’ response.

ACCESS TO THE REVIEW DOCUMENTS

After the Deans’ 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 DEO has the responsibility of making the review materials available to faculty, staff, and students of the department. The College will make the review documents available to others upon request.

**Timetable**

The review process will normally be completed in slightly more than a year from the time the department begins the self-study.

- The Dean will notify each department of the schedule of its review.
- The Dean will arrange that some self-studies begin in August and some in January; the self-study is due at the end of the semester in which it is started.
- The internal and external members of the review committee will be scheduled to conduct their interviews in the semester following the preparation of the self-study.
- When the review committee submits its report at the end of the spring semester or during the summer session, the department may convey its response early in the fall semester.