

GUIDELINES FOR DECENNIAL SCHOOL REVIEWS

I. PURPOSE

The principal purpose of decennial reviews is to serve the CGU faculty and administration in specific and overall school and resource planning.

II. REVIEW PROCEDURE

1. Each school or freestanding program will be reviewed every 10 years.
2. For schools subject in whole or in part to external accreditation reviews, the CGU decennial review will be scheduled to coincide with the accreditation review; however, in no event will the time period between reviews exceed ten years.
3. For schools with accreditation reviews, the external review committee will be selected in accordance with the processes of the accrediting body. For the other schools, in the semester prior to review, the school to be reviewed will provide the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) with a slate of possible members of an outside Review Committee. The format will remain flexible in terms of the number and scholarly expertise of reviewers. The Committee should also include persons familiar with issues related to diversity. A summary of qualifications should be provided for each potential reviewer, along with a detailed account of any relationship between the potential reviewer and faculty in the school. The ASC will prepare for the Provost a slate of possible members of the outside Review Committee. The Provost will select a three-person Review Committee including at least two from the slate.
4. Also in the semester prior to review, the ASC will ask the faculty of the school to prepare a brief statement of its mission, resources and needs, and its predictions and plans for the next ten years. During this semester the ASC will gather school evaluations from students and alumni in each degree track.
5. During the review semester, the school faculty, in consultation with the ASC, will prepare a self-evaluation which, at minimum, must respond to the objectives detailed in the attached statement of Information needed for the Decennial School Review. This self-evaluation will be provided to the visiting Review Committee, in addition to other information collected by the ASC and the school.
6. During the review semester, the ASC will prepare the charge for the Review Committee, specify the documents to be made available to the Review Committee, and arrange the details of the review.
7. For units with accreditation reviews, the external accreditation reviews shall be supplemented as necessary to meet the full requirements of CGU's decennial review process.

III. DISPOSITION OF THE REVIEW REPORT

1. When the review is completed, the Review Committee will submit a preliminary report to the school faculty for its comments. Taking account of the comments by the school faculty, the Review Committee will then submit a final review report to the ASC. The ASC will invite a formal response to the review report by the school faculty.
2. The ASC will forward the review report, the school faculty response, and its own comments to the Provost, the faculty governing committee for the school, and the Faculty Executive Committee, inviting their comments. These comments must be received by the ASC within three weeks (normal semester time) of its request, or they will not be incorporated in the wrap-up meeting. Failure to submit comments within three weeks will be interpreted as having no comments to make, and the ASC will proceed to hold a wrap-up meeting without further ado.

The comments of the ASC will include: (1) A summary of the major observations and recommendations of the Review Team's Report and the faculty's response; (2) An assessment of each of the Review Team's recommendations and of the faculty's response to them; and (3) a list of actions that the ASC would recommend that should be taken by the school under review and other units of CGU given its assessment of the Review Team's Report and the Faculty Response.

3. A wrap-up meeting will be held under the auspices of the ASC to develop a strategy for responding to the Decennial review recommendations consonant with the school's strategic plan and vision. A Memorandum Of Understanding between the program reviewed and the administration will be developed. It will take the following form:

(1) The meeting will be chaired by the chair of the Academic Standards Committee and consist of the Provost, the Associate Provost, the chairs of the relevant departments under review, and the dean of the School. Before either writing his/her own comments on ASC's comments or coming to the wrap-up meeting, the dean of the school will share copies of the ASC's comments with members of the reviewed school and solicit comments from them to share either in the writing of his/her own comments or in the wrap-up meeting.

(2) The focus of the discussion will be the implications of the school's self-study, the reviewers' report, the school response, and the ASC's comments. The question that the discussions will seek to answer is: "Given the information provided by the review, what are the desired programmatic outcomes and how will they be achieved?" The goal is a set of specific agreements about actions on the part of the school or center and the central administration.

(3) The Associate Provost will draft a Memorandum of Understanding on the basis of the agreements worked out in the wrap-up meeting. These specific agreements will indicate what actions are to be taken, when and by whom to achieve each of the desired outcomes. The draft Memorandum is circulated among those who attended the wrap-up meeting for substantive and editorial changes. It is then signed by the Provost and Associate Provost, the Dean and the Chairs.

4. The Memorandum will be presented to the Committee on Academic Affairs of the Board of Trustees. The program will report actions taken in response to the Memorandum to the ASC and the Provost at the end of each of the two academic years following the year in which the review was undertaken.

5. The ASC will prepare a final report following the adoption of the Memorandum of Understanding that it will submit to the CGU faculty. The Chair of the Faculty shall distribute to the members of the faculty copies of the Academic Standards Committee's Comments and the Memorandum of Understanding. Access to these and other decennial review materials may be restricted in case the Provost, the Chair of the Faculty, and the Chair of the ASC agree such restriction is advisable for the sake of necessary confidentiality.

IV. DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR DECENNIAL SCHOOL REVIEWS

1. The ASC has the primary responsibility for the review. It directs the school under review to prepare its self-study; it provides to the Provost a slate of names of people who might serve on the review team, usually informed by a list from the Program under review from which she/he picks the team; it directs the Provost's office to survey current students and alumni in accord with the guidelines for Decennial Reviews. It prepares a charge to the review team; it meets the review team during the team's visit; it directs the school under review to respond to the review team's report; it prepares a draft and a final report on the Program review; and, it chairs the wrap-up session at which responsibility for school action in response to the review is placed in the hands of the Provost's Office.

2. The school being reviewed is responsible for preparing the self-study, recommending to the ASC a set of possible reviewers and dates for the site visit, and, preparing a schedule for the visit of the review team. It must present the self-study to the ASC three weeks before the scheduled visit. It is responsible for taking the review team from event to event during its visit; for making technical changes in the draft report of the review team; and for responding to the report of the review team. It is responsible for responding to the draft ASC report on the review, for attending the wrap-up meeting, and working out a final Memorandum of Understanding with the Provost and Associate Provost.

3. The Associate Provost is responsible for sending out the survey to alumni and current students, for tabulating the results of the survey, for inviting the review team, for sending the review team the self-study two weeks before the team's arrival, for making travel and accommodation arrangements for the review team, and for arranging the payments associated with the visit. The Associate Provost attends the wrap-up meeting, drafts the Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) with the program, and signs the MOU.

V. INFORMATION NEEDED FOR THE DECENNIAL SCHOOL REVIEW

1. Information to be provided by the school

(1) Mission Statement

In the semester prior to review, the school will prepare an introductory statement describing the mission and strategy of the school, governance, and a definition of scholarship within the school. Please give examples, especially those that demonstrate elements of scholarship unique to your school or disciplines.

(2) Description of School

1. How are the dean and the chairs of the departments chosen? Are faculty members outside of core faculty consulted on selection of the dean or chair?
2. How is work and administration of the school allocated among individual faculty members? Who makes decisions about planning, curriculum, hiring, admissions, and financial aid? What principles guide financial aid decisions?
3. How are decisions about major changes in the school made? Include examples of large changes in recent years.
4. What is the role of students in school decision-making?

(3) Evaluation of Curriculum

A description of the program of instruction, in concept and in practice, and an evaluation of that program in light of available resources and the standards of the field. The following materials should be included in the evaluation, and should be assessed and analyzed within the body of the evaluatory comments.

1. Narrative description of the curriculum structure.
2. Course descriptions and current syllabi.
3. Description of the extent to which a range of approaches and subject matter, particularly those of relevance to an engaging, increasingly diverse society and student body, are addressed.
4. Description of advising/mentoring efforts and the other student support programs.
5. Description of the role and implementation of qualifying examinations.
6. Description of role of research tools in the curriculum.

(4) Evaluation of Scholarship

1. Vitae/resumes of regular faculty
2. National reputation surveys, if available.
3. Samples of scholarly work by faculty.
4. Brief statement of faculty work in progress.
5. Citations in professional literature to scholarly work of faculty, if available. Include a description of how the citation search was conducted.

6. How is scholarship encouraged and supported? What are impediments?
7. Service and/or research related to underrepresented communities.
8. Specific efforts to support research related to diversity.
9. Teacher/course evaluations aggregated to the program level, or to type of course where appropriate.

(5) Evaluation of Student Body

1. Statement of how students are evaluated for admission including factors other than test scores
2. Recruitment and retention efforts directed at U.S. minorities, foreign students, and women students.
3. Summary of patterns of student recruitment (including special efforts to recruit minorities).
4. Summary of steps taken by the program to obtain information from alumni regarding the program, and a summary of relevant information.

(6) Evaluation of External Relations

1. Description of relations with graduate faculty outside of the core.
2. Summary of contributions of graduate faculty outside of the core for the past four years by faculty member:
 - i. service on committees for completed dissertations and M.A. theses, including number of committees chaired
 - ii. research supervision
 - iii. enrollment of graduate students in courses

(7) Looking Forward

1. A discussion of the adequacy of current and projected financial resources for maintaining the quality of the unit. This study should be accompanied by relevant documentation such as trends in certain funding categories and comparison with student-teacher ratios in other programs.
2. Statement of program direction and plans, with a discussion of key factors needed for success. Include a statement of the program mission, anticipated changes in student recruiting and placement, expected changes in the level of scholarship attained by faculty and students, resources and needs in the program, diversity of faculty and students, assessment of strengths and weaknesses, and a description of internal or external opportunities or threats that may impact on the program's efforts.

2. Information to be provided by the Institutional Research Office

1. List of students by first year of enrollment, current status for all students enrolled in the past ten years (current enrollment status, degrees attained, attrition rates).
2. List of official graduate faculty in program.
3. Student enrollment by course for the past three years.
4. CGU transcripts showing courses taken by recent graduates.
5. Qualifying examinations: a) data on success rates for students who attempt examinations, and b) time between admission and completion of qualifying examinations.
6. Languages or research tools completed by recent graduates.
7. Summary of standardized test scores by year for the past ten years, separately for students who applied, who were admitted, and who enrolled.
8. Number of students who applied, who were admitted, and who enrolled by year for the past ten years.

9. Proportion of U.S. minorities, foreign students, and women students enrolled by year for the past ten years. Information on students with disabilities.
10. Number of degrees conferred each year for the past eight years (including by race, gender, international).
11. Program concentration and time in the program for all currently enrolled students (by race, ethnicity, gender, international).
12. For current students by year in program, summary of how students finance their graduate education, including data on financial aid, loans, units taken, and employment.
13. List of dissertations with name of student, date of completion, supervising committee, title of dissertation, and abstract. Dissertations will be available for the outside Review Committee.
14. List of MA. projects approved, with name of student, date of completion, supervising committee, and title of paper. Projects will be available for the outside Review committee.
15. Survey of student satisfaction with the overall program of instruction, including course offerings, integration of classroom instruction, amount learned in courses, research supervision, faculty availability, mentoring and advising, quality and promptness of feedback on work, program resources, contribution of program to life and work, and program overall.
16. For the 15 most recent graduates from each degree track (from exit survey and current resumes where available):
 - i. time to complete degree requirements
 - ii. conference presentations while a CGU student
 - iii. published work completed at CGU
 - iv. position when entering CGU, initial placement following graduation, and current position
 - v. scholarly and professional contributions subsequent to graduation
 - vi. perceived contribution of program to life and work
 - vii. overall satisfaction with the program

Adopted ASC, 1/95; amended by FEC, 4/19/99; amended by FEC 11/29/99; amended by FEC 2/4/02; amended by FEC 3/4/02; reorganized and edited for clarification by ASC, May and November 2003; Amended and reorganized by FEC 5/4/09: Change from departmental reviews to school or freestanding program reviews every 10 years.