

IU Bloomington Procedures for Responding To Doctoral Program Self-Studies

1. The faculty of the doctoral program area submit their self-study report to the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs on the agreed upon reporting date.
2. The Associate Dean receives the self-study report and submits it to the members of the ad hoc Committee appointed for that purpose.
3. The members of the committee individually read the self-study report, noting strengths and weaknesses in terms of the criteria set by Policy Council, but especially, at this stage, noting criteria for which incomplete information is provided.
4. The Committee meets with the Associate Dean to discuss areas of incomplete information and to derive a set of questions intended to clarify those areas.
5. The Committee and the Associate Dean meet with the doctoral program representatives (usually the liaison person appointed to work on the doctoral self-study, the chairman of the program area, and one or two other faculty members whom the chairman may designate) to raise the questions prepared in Step 4 informally, both so that the program faculty may have some advance notice regarding the Committee's further questions and to provide an opportunity to clarify simple misunderstandings or failure to note relevant information.
6. The Committee revises its questions based on the interaction in Step 2 and submits them formally to the program faculty, extending an appropriate deadline for response (usually about six weeks).
7. The program faculty provide the additional information.
8. Steps 3 through 6 are recycled as needed.
9. When the Committee believes that it has all of the information which is needed (or can be made available), it prepares a tentative assessment report, in which it notes the strengths and weaknesses identified for each criterion, basing that report both on its reading of the self-study report and subsequent interactions with program personnel. The Committee includes in its assessment report whatever recommendations it cares to make which it feels would be responsive to its assessment, i.e., ameliorate the weaknesses and reinforce the strengths.
10. The Committee and the Associate Dean meet with program representatives (as in Step 5) in order to discuss the assessment report informally, in order to provide some advance notice to the program faculty of the likely content of the assessment report, and to provide an opportunity to the program faculty, first, to clarify any misunderstandings, and second, to comment on the feasibility and desirability of carrying out suggested responsive actions. The appropriate Division Director shall also participate in this meeting to comment in any way that he considers appropriate.
11. The Committee refines its assessment report on the basis of the interaction in Step 10 and submits that report formally to the Associate Dean. Committee action terminates at this time.
12. The Associate Dean studies the assessment report and prepares a statement of action requirements which he believes are responsive to the Committee's noted weaknesses and strengths. He bases

his statement on the Committee's written recommendations, on the program faculty's informal responses, and on such other advice as he may solicit, including the advice of Policy Council and Administrative Council when he considers it appropriate to seek it.

13. The Associate Dean submits his statement of requirements to the doctoral program faculty. Information copies are sent to the Division Director and to the ad hoc Committee members.
14. The program faculty studies the statement of action requirements and responds with a proposed action program designed to respond to the noted strengths and weaknesses. This action proposal is sent to the Associate Dean, and both he and the program faculty shall regard it as the first draft of what will ultimately form a contract for self-improvement between the program faculty and Policy Council.
15. The program representatives (as in Step 5) meet with the Associate Dean to negotiate the action program. The appropriate Division Director is included in the negotiation both to lend advice and judgment and to concur in any stipulations that involve administrative matters, e.g., budget, staffing, etc. When necessary other members of the Dean's Office will be asked to concur in stipulations touching their areas of responsibility.
16. The program representatives draft the negotiated final form of the action program as agreed upon in Step 15 and obtain the Associate Dean's signature to signify his concurrence.
17. The Associate Dean reports on all above steps to Policy Council and solicits their ratification of the negotiated action proposal. When Policy Council concurs (by vote, if necessary) the action proposal. When Policy Council concurs (by vote, if necessary) the action proposal will be treated as a formal contract for self-improvement between the program area and Policy Council, which the Associate Dean is mandated to monitor.
18. The Associate Dean monitors the action contract, meeting at least quarterly with the Program chairman to assure adequate communication. The Associate Dean will report to Policy Council from time to time on the progress of the contract. Disputes between the Associate Dean and the program faculty shall be adjudicated by Policy Council.