

GUIDELINES FOR
PUBLIC SERVICE AND
RESEARCH UNIT REVIEWS

Introduction

Reviews of public service and research units provide the campus and governing boards an opportunity to evaluate the economic and educational soundness of each unit and assess progress toward the unit's accomplishment of goals and objectives. Reviews also serve as a way to mark achievements of the unit's faculty and staff, and to assess student demand and continuing social and institutional needs. These reviews occur on an eight-year schedule.

The Review Process

The public service and research unit review process begins with a notice from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and an initial meeting between the unit and its supervising administrator (dean/institute director). The *Academic Plan* includes summaries of each of the unit reviews, and the *Academic Plan Supplemental Volume* includes the complete unit review reports. Both volumes are submitted to the Board of Trustees each year, while only the *Academic Plan* is submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

Each summer, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will prepare a calendar to provide the dates by which various segment of the review process are to be completed. The general process to be followed is summarized as follows:

April (1.5 years before report is due)	The Provost's Office notifies units scheduled for review during the coming year and provides each with a copy of the review and format guidelines. (If faculty are assigned to the unit, release time from instruction may be provided to the writer of the document. This should be arranged with the supervising administrator a year in advance when the spring schedule is prepared.)
Mid-August	The unit begins its review.
Mid- to Late October	The supervising administrator will review the data needed with each unit. He or she will go over review guidelines and identify any issues that may merit special consideration.
July 15	The unit receives IBHE statewide issues from the Provost's Office (if applicable to the unit).
July 31	The unit completes its initial review and gives a draft to its supervising administrator, school curriculum committee, or undergraduate/graduate council (as appropriate), and the Provost's Office for review and identification of any areas in the document that need further development by the unit.

Mid-August	The appendix addressing IBHE questions is completed (if applicable to the unit).
Late August	The supervising administrator notifies the unit of any deficiencies in the review document and prepares the university analysis and recommendations section in consultation with the Provost.
Mid-September	Full unit reviews are submitted by the supervising administrator, school curriculum committee, or council, and the Provost's Office for review and identification of areas still requiring attention by the unit (if any).
Mid-October	Final draft of unit review (including responses to IBHE questions) is submitted to the supervising administrator and school curriculum committee or Council.
Late October	School curriculum committee or Council completes its review.
Late October/Early November	If the appropriate council has not been involved in earlier review of the document, the supervising administrator and unit representative present the review to the undergraduate or graduate council for analysis and approval.
Late November	Council forwards the final unit review and their recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
January	The Provost combines the unit reviews with the program reviews for the year into the <i>Academic Plan</i> for submission to the Faculty Senate. Provost submits the <i>Academic Plan</i> to the Chancellor's Office as a draft for review.

February	Chancellor’s staff meets with the Provost to review the planning statements and program and unit reviews.
March	Provost submits final <i>Academic Plan</i> to the BOT.
April	Chancellor recommends <i>Academic Plan</i> to the BOT for approval.
July 1	University forwards the <i>Academic Plan</i> to the IBHE as part of the <i>Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)</i> submission.

Data and Material Required

Administration’s Responsibility. To facilitate the smooth conduct of unit reviews, the Provost’s Office will provide a copy of the unit’s previous review (if applicable). The Provost will also assist the unit in obtaining additional institutional information from other university offices such as the Budget Office and the Grants and Contracts Office.

Survey Research Office’s Responsibility. Some units may want to use the resources of the Survey Research Office to conduct a user satisfaction survey. Additional information can be obtained by consulting the guidelines for academic program reviews.

Public Service and Research Units’ Responsibility. Units under review will be responsible for gathering the following required information and materials:

- information and analyses gathered through user surveys;
- current information on the credentials and primary areas of expertise of each unit faculty/staff member as well as a summary of his or her accomplishments and work during the review period;
- information on the operation of similar units in other institutions; and
- information on generally accepted measures or standards on which the quality of the unit are judged.

Unit Review Format

The basic format for unit reviews is established by the University of Illinois Board of Trustees and the university. This format is reproduced below and sets forth the basic section headings, outline, and subjects to be addressed in the review. While there is room for some tailored elements to be added, this basic format should be followed when preparing the review report for presentation to the appropriate school curriculum committee, council, and administrative office. In the format presented below, each outline category contains topics and questions that must be addressed. Located after each of these statements or questions is an interpretation and set of

suggested guidelines that have been established by the university for unit review reporting purposes. (Attachment A provides an outline in short form for quick reference.)

If a unit under review finds any of the guidelines inappropriate and wishes to change them or substitute others, these modifications must be reviewed by the supervising administrator and recommended to the Provost for approval. The approval of the Provost will be in writing and sent to the requesting unit and the supervising administrator. The statements/questions and the university's guidelines should not be reproduced in the final review report.

Unit review reports should be as brief as careful assessment allows. The text of the report should be accompanied by appendices containing only the information or data necessary to substantiate the assertions and conclusions presented in the report. As backup information related to the review, the unit should retain a copy of the questionnaire used to survey its clientele (when such a survey was used). This information does not, however, need to be appended to review or forwarded as part of the review.

Documentation Style. The author-date citation system of the *Chicago Manual of Style* should be used when documentation of references is necessary. The university library has a reference copy of the manual available.

Heading Format

The following is a sample heading, which should appear on the first page of the unit review.

University:	University of Illinois at Springfield
School:	School of Public Affairs and Administration
Unit:	Center for State Policy and Leadership
CIPS Classification Code (if applicable)	4404

Public Service and Research Unit Review Outline

In preparing the review report, public service and research units should follow the outline below as closely as possible. Some of the topics in the outline will apply more directly to certain units than to others. A unit need only address the items that are relevant to its activities, noting in its report any topic that is not applicable to the activities of the unit.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this section is to give the reader of the report enough information about the unit to follow the review discussion topics.

- Indicate the date the unit was initiated.
- Briefly describe the unit's mission. Describe the need the unit is intended to address. Has the unit's mission changed during the review period? If so, in what ways?

- List unit objectives, using bullet or numbered format. Objectives should be achievable, as well as measurable, by some accepted set of standards. If changes in these objectives are expected during the next review period, identify and explain these changes.
- Briefly describe the unit's administrative structure. How does the unit fit into the university's organization? Has the unit's organization undergone any major revision since the last review? If so, describe the revisions and the rationale for these changes.

I. POTENTIAL FACULTY/STAFF QUALITY

This section assesses the potential quality of the current faculty/staff as compared to institutional standards, faculty/staff in similar units at UIS, and faculty/staff in similar units at other institutions.

A. Appropriateness of Qualifications

Are faculty/staff qualifications appropriate to the area of responsibility? Do faculty/staff hold the requisite terminal degree(s) and/or experience?

B. Scholarly/Professional Activity

Provide brief narrative descriptions of key scholarly/professional activities of staff and faculty associated with the unit. Indicators of such activities might be:

- publications in refereed journals and other scholarly contributions subject to external review;
- grants received in national/state competition;
- individual research rewards and recognitions;
- participation in professional events; and
- offices held in regional and national professional organizations.

II. CENTRALITY

A unit should evaluate itself in this section in terms of its centrality to the mission of the university. The objectives and nature of the unit should be reviewed in relation to the mission statement of the university and in light of the extent to which the unit furthers the fundamental principles identified by the Strategic Planning Task Force.

A. Support of Campus Vision

Focusing on key points, briefly describe how the unit supports UIS' vision for the future. (A point-by-point discussion of the vision statement is not necessary to illustrate the unit's relationship to the vision statement.)

B. Support for Campus Directives

Continue with relationship to instructional programs from academic program guidelines.

III. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

A. Adequacy

Are facilities and equipment sufficient in quantity and quality to support the needs of the unit? Rate the adequacy of the unit's facilities and equipment using the following scale:

- *Excellent*—facilities and equipment exist to support high quality services;
- *Satisfactory*—facilities and equipment are adequate or need only minor upgrading to be adequate; or
- *Poor*—facilities and equipment need substantial improvements to properly support the unit.

Provide an explanation of the rating.

B. Improvements Needed

Identify what would be necessary to achieve an excellent or satisfactory rating (as applicable). Determine the costs associated with this upgrade to the extent possible. Refer to the resources generally available to units of comparable size and function, if possible.

IV. LOCATIONAL ADVANTAGES

This section identifies the advantages of the unit due to the location of the institution and access to particular types of external resources. The advantages could be of many types, depending on the demography, economy, and geography of the area.

The unit should identify any existing locational advantages and discuss how the unit is profiting from them.

V. COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

A. Unique Unit Features

If applicable, discuss any unique feature(s) that in some way allow the unit to gain competitive advantage over competing units.

If the unit does not have a competitive edge, could the unit acquire some sort of comparative advantage? How could this be achieved?

B. Barriers to Competitiveness

Identify existing barriers that prevent the unit from becoming competitive with other institutions. Discuss possible actions necessary to overcome the barriers to make the unit competitive.

VI. COMMUNITY IMPACT

This section addresses the many forms of community impact the unit may have. Most units have an impact on at least one internal or community front.

The unit should indicate activities undertaken since the last review and assess its impact on its communities—both positive and negative. Among the communities to be considered are prospective students, alumni, faculty, legislators, and groups such as teachers, newspaper editors, physicians, town merchants, arts organizations, state agencies, the courts, community groups, the business sector, etc. The unit may want to elaborate further on its current and potential partnerships with various segments of the community. (Units may choose to append highly detailed information rather than include it in the body of the report.)

VII. COST/REVENUE RELATIONSHIP

Most public service and research units generate revenue from federal, state, and/or local units of government, business, and/or foundations. One measure of the value of these functions is the extent to which state-appropriated funds are matched by external funds.

Compare the ratio of appropriated/non-appropriated funds the unit generates to other similar units in the university and to other similar units at public universities in Illinois.

If the unit attracts support that is less than university or state averages, provide an explanation and discuss the steps being taken (if any) to change the funding picture.

VIII. QUALITY OF SERVICE OR RESEARCH

The university should assure the quality of the services and research efforts of its units. The program review process provides an examination of several factors that contribute to the quality of these units, including their objectives, faculty base and qualifications, and support resources.

A. Quality of Service

Assess the quality of services provided, judged on the basis of tangible information to the extent possible (e.g., student evaluations, user evaluations, reviewing group).

B. Adequacy of Faculty/Staff to Meet Needs

Are there enough faculty and staff members to ensure the delivery of high quality services? To the extent possible, compare the unit's faculty/staff size to that of similar units at UIS and other institutions throughout the state or country serving similar needs. Comment on how faculty and staff ratios/workloads might be modified to better reflect institutional, statewide, and/or national averages.

C. Concerns from Previous Review

The unit should identify and discuss any concerns raised in its most recent review and identify the extent to which these concerns have been and are being addressed.

IX. ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY CONSIDERATIONS

If applicable, give examples of reallocation and/or plans for reallocation of unit human and budgetary resources to improve unit operations, better serve clientele, improve the quality of the unit, etc. As examples, the unit might discuss the feasibility of

consolidation with other units or identify technologies that might promote increased productivity.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Current Recommendations (written by the supervising administrator)

As a result of the unit's self-study, what changes did the supervising administrator— in consultation with the unit's faculty/staff— conclude should be made during the next eight years to improve the overall quality of the unit's service? What is the rationale for each recommendation?

Include recommendations that lead to enhancement or improvement of the unit, address problems disclosed from the review, or provide for the maintenance of a high quality unit. These recommendations must be discussed by the school curriculum committee and undergraduate or graduate council. The supervising administrator, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the unit involved must agree to the recommendations.

B. Implementation

How does the university plan to implement the recommendations above? Will this require additional resources?

XI. STATISTICAL DATA

The Office of Enrollment Services provides standardized statistical data for academic programs to use in preparation of their reviews. No such data exists for public service and research units. Please provide any statistical data the unit has compiled that illustrate its productivity, effectiveness, and/or demographics of its clientele.

Attachment A
Public Service and Research Unit
Review Outline

BACKGROUND

- I. POTENTIAL FACULTY/STAFF QUALITY
 - A. Appropriateness of Qualifications
 - B. Scholarly/Professional Activity
- II. CENTRALITY
- III. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
 - A. Adequacy
 - B. Improvements Needed
- IV. LOCATIONAL ADVANTAGES
- V. COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES
 - A. Unique Unit Features
 - B. Barriers to Competitiveness
- VI. COMMUNITY IMPACT
- VII. COST/REVENUE RELATIONSHIP
- VIII. QUALITY OF SERVICE OR RESEARCH
 - A. Quality of Service
 - B. Adequacy of Faculty/Staff to Meet Needs
 - C. Concerns from Previous Review
- IX. ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY CONSIDERATIONS
- X. RECOMMENDATIONS
 - A. Current Recommendations (written by the supervising administrator)
 - B. Implementations
- XI. STATISTICAL DATA

2003 version, corrected 2015