I. INTRODUCTION

Since merger, the University of Wisconsin has been moving toward a policy of requiring systematic reviews of all academic programs. Central Administration has been spurred in this direction by the repeated requests of the State Department of Administration that such procedures be established, and by the demand of significant publics that the University justify its academic programs and account for its use of fiscal resources. The initial steps were taken in 1973 with the audit of graduate programs. More recently, December 1974, Central Administration has promulgated guidelines to extend the review process to undergraduate programs.

Each campus in the University of Wisconsin System has been requested to formulate policies and procedures for evaluating academic programs. While review procedures may vary to reflect local initiatives and particular conditions, each unit is expected to provide for a continuous and systematic process of critical self-appraisal that goes beyond the kind of analysis made for the biennial budget. It is further expected that the process would involve extensive

1. Memorandum from Mr. Joseph Nusbaum, Secretary of the Department of Administration, State of Wisconsin, dated June 7, 1974, to President Weaver requesting criteria for the review of undergraduate and doctoral programs in the University of Wisconsin System.

2. Memorandum from Donald K. Smith, Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs, received by Board of Regents at December, 1974 meeting on "UW System Policy on Academic Program Review: Guidelines for Audit and Review of Existing Academic Programs."
faculty participation. Central Administration's involvement in the review process would be limited to:

(a) the distribution of the general guidelines; (b) the verification of the fact that the processes and procedures undertaken by the institutions meet the expectation of the guidelines; and (c) the receiving of campus reports to the end that consequences of the process can be made known to the Regents, and that effective practice developed by one institution can be communicated to others.\(^3\)

With its on-going program of graduate reviews, UWM has taken a major step in meeting the general requirement. Now the faculty and administration need to consider what review process should be established for undergraduate programs.

The options appear to range from a purely administrative audit to a systematic program of academic reviews.\(^4\) The minimum response would be the administrative audit, with little or no faculty involvement, where readily available and largely quantitative data would constitute the basis of the evaluation. However, it is believed that this type of assessment would be inadequate. In the first place, faculty should be involved in any decision related to status of the curriculum; and secondly, while quantitative data are very useful, there are non-quantifiable values and subjective considerations that must be taken into account in making judgments on the soundness and merit of academic programs.\(^5\)

II. RECOMMENDATION

With the basic objective of enabling the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to provide students with the most effective range of academic offerings possible within its available resources, the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee recommends adoption of the policies and procedures for the review of under-

3. Ibid, p. 2

4. See definition of terms, Section III, infra.

5. Basically the faculty is invited to extend to the programmatic and departmental level the kind of critical judgments that it has traditionally made on individual personnel and curriculum questions.
graduate programs, set-forth-below.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

A review unit is any academic department or non-departmentalized school, or regularly organized interdisciplinary committee offering an undergraduate major or work leading to the Bachelor's degree. There are 48 academic departments, 4 non-departmentalized schools, and 7 interdisciplinary programs for a total of 59 review units.

A statistical profile is a compilation of data by the Office of Institutional Studies on such items as enrollments, cost of instruction, the ratio of student credit hours to FTE faculty, etc. The statistical profile presents data on the past four years.

An audit is an examination of a review unit in terms of the quantitative data in the statistical profile.

A review is a broader survey of a given department or program. It includes the data from the audit, but extends to non-quantifiable information and comprehends the involvement of faculty in a judgmental process on the merits of academic program(s) of the review units.

IV. AUDIT AND REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS AT UWM

The Academic Program and Curriculum Committee proposes to initiate a three stage audit and review process that will utilize quantitative data, assembled largely by the administration, and qualitative judgments of faculty. Briefly summarized, stage one would involve the collection of data, an audit, and the selection of departments or programs to be reviewed in a given academic year. At stage two, those units selected for review would prepare the departmental or unit self-evaluation reports. Stage three would call for the appointment of an ad hoc review committee for each unit to be reviewed and for the evaluation of the committee's report and recommendation, with feedback to all interested parties.
Consistent with the requirements for a sound program, the audit and review process should be as simple as possible. Except for the members of the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee, the annual audits will require little faculty time or energy. For those units selected for review, the department self-analysis report will require serious attention; however, it should be considerably less onerous than the one associated with graduate review because the administration will provide a greater portion of the basic data and the report will call for more generalized evaluations from the reporting units. Departments or programs that have recently undergone graduate or accreditation reviews may use relevant portions of those evaluations in their self-analysis reports. In the third stage, the greatest burden will fall on the sixteen to twenty members of the UWM faculty appointed to ad hoc review committees and on the membership of the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee.

A. Stage One: Audit and Initial Screening Process

The Office of Institutional Studies prepares an annual statistical profile on each review unit and from that data will generate the following critical indicators: cost per student credit, ratio of student credit hours to full time equivalent faculty, the trend in student credit hours delivered, and the ratio of student credit hours delivered in the first semester of each year to the number of student credit hours reported in the second week of the semester. In addition, the above Office will undertake to provide appropriate bench marks for interpreting the reported data; i.e., figures from comparable departments, affinity groups, or statistical means or averages. The statistical profile along with the critical indicators will provide the data base for an audit conducted by the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in cooperation with the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee.

6. Before using statistical profiles for annual audits, the Office of Institutional Studies will forward copies of the profiles to departments to permit a check on the accuracy of the data.
The specific purpose of establishing an audit procedure is to make use of a few accessible and objective indicators to single out review units that may need special attention. Obviously, caution must be used in the interpretation of these indicators. For example, a sharp increase in cost per student credit might be caused by any number of things, ranging from acquisition of high salaried senior staff or the purchase of sophisticated equipment, to a stable staff with a rapidly declining enrollment. Nonetheless, it is believed that these indicators, taken together, provide the most reliable measure for identifying units that should be accorded high priority for full academic review.

The Academic Program and Curriculum Committee will select the eight to ten units that will be reviewed in a given academic year. The selection will proceed on the following priorities: 1) units that have been singled out for special attention by the annual audits, 2) units whose programs have not undergone graduate reviews nor the scrutiny of professional accreditation agencies or associations, 3) units whose programs have undergone either graduate review or professional accreditation, and 4) units whose programs have been subject to both graduate review and professional accreditation. Where a specialized program has been reviewed by an accreditation agency, the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee shall determine whether that evaluation, or any part of it, may be accepted in lieu of stages two and three of the UWM review process. Since there are approximately sixty (60) review units, each one could expect to receive a full academic review once in every seven to eight year cycle, with the possibility of more frequent evaluations where the need is suggested by the annual audits.

The Vice Chancellor will notify the units selected for review and forward to them, and to their deans, copies of the statistical profile, including the critical indicators and any benchmarks generated by the Office of Institutional Studies. The units so notified will be requested to start preparing the self-evaluation reports.
B. Stage Two: Self-Evaluation Reports

A standard three part format will be provided for the self-evaluation reports. Part I will be a basic data sheet which can be filled out, in large measure, from information readily available from the statistical profile; however, there are some data that only the reporting unit can supply. For example, each department will be asked to prepare a chart showing in the left-hand column the total number of faculty, by name and rank, including graduate teaching assistants and part-time instructors, and in the appropriate rows, to give the undergraduate courses, identified by course numbers, that were taught by each member of the faculty in the past six (6) regular semesters, excluding summer sessions. If the curriculum of the undergraduate program is divided into different options or subfields, reporting units will be asked to: (a) give those subdivisions, and list the faculty, by teaching and research interest, under the appropriate heading, and (b) give the number of undergraduate courses taught in each subdivision for the past six (6) regular semesters.

Departments will also be asked to submit the names and addresses of ten (10) people in their discipline or professional association that would be qualified to act as an outside consultant, and to indicate three (3) related departments or academic areas at UWM from which faculty might be chosen to review their undergraduate programs.

Part II of the format will request each department or reporting unit to provide an interpretation of the statistical profile. In instances where there is little change in the data, the report may be very brief. If there is significant change in the profile, especially in the critical indicators, the chairman of the review unit may welcome the opportunity to make a more extended report.

Part III of the self-evaluation format will request review units: (a) to set forth, in narrative form, the goals and objectives of their units in relation to the UWM Mission Statement; (b) to describe the major strength and
particular characteristics of their program; c) to indicate any weaknesses or deficiencies; d) to suggest the resources that would be needed to eliminate the deficiencies; and e) to briefly describe plans for future development.

The departmental report will be sent to the dean of the reporting unit, who may attach additional information or interpretative comments before forwarding copies to the Secretary of the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee and to the Office of Vice Chancellor.

C. Stage Three: Evaluation and Feedback

For each department, program or unit selected for evaluation, the Vice Chancellor shall appoint, in consultation with the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee, an ad hoc review committee consisting of at least three persons, two of whom shall be UWM Faculty from related disciplines and at least one outside consultant from the discipline or academic area under review. The Vice Chancellor shall appoint the UWM members from the departments or academic areas designated as related disciplines by the units under review, and employ an appropriate number of outside consultants from those designated by the departments or from a list of nominees supplied by the North Central Association.

Each ad hoc review committee will have available the statistical profile and the departmental report. In addition, the committee would be expected to meet with the faculty, attempt to assess student evaluation, and to consult with the dean of the unit under review.

7. With the option to appoint larger committees and additional outside consultants for complex units, i.e., a non-departmentalized school.

8. See Part I of Self-Evaluation Report, supra, Stage B
After receiving the appraisal of the consultant, the UWM members of the review team will have the primary responsibility of preparing the committee's report and submitting recommendations. The report should culminate with a specific recommendation to strengthen, maintain, consolidate, reorganize, or phase out the academic program under review. The report of the ad hoc review committee will be forwarded to the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee, with copies directed to the unit being reviewed and to the relevant dean.

In hearings before the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee, review units and their deans will have an opportunity to respond, orally or in writing, to the reports and recommendations of ad hoc review committees and to propose amendments and modifications.

The Academic Program and Curriculum Committee will prepare a final report and recommendations for each unit under review and forward copies to the Vice Chancellor, to the dean of the school or college concerned, and, if faculty action is required, to the UWM Faculty Senate.

V. ADMINISTRATION OF UNDERGRADUATE REVIEWS

The Academic Program and Curriculum Committee is the unit of faculty governance at UWM primarily responsible for the supervision of undergraduate reviews. In addition to proposing the general procedures and guidelines, it will have the duty to monitor the program and to recommend such modifications in policy and procedure as time and experience seem to dictate, and the Committee will be the vehicle through which the faculty at large will be involved in the process. The Office of Vice Chancellor will provide administrative support.
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