

# CENTERS / INSTITUTES PROPOSALS AND REVIEW

## SCAP Criteria for Evaluation of New Centers / Institutes Proposals, Periodic Centers / Institutes Reviews, and Centers / Institutes Discontinuances\*

### Criteria for Evaluation of New Center / Institute Proposals

A decision to initiate a new Center or Institute (hereafter “institute”) will be based essentially upon educational considerations, and will involve financial implications. Educational considerations and financial implications must reflect the long-range judgments that the educational mission of the University will be maintained or enhanced by the institute.

The proposal should be fully vetted by the relevant departments/schools, colleges, and the appropriate curricular committees. Relevant parties include those that will directly support the proposed institute by providing funds, staff, management, accreditation services, space, technology, equipment, or other resources. In the vetting process, relevant parties must consider a proposal for a new institute in its entirety. After the vetting process, the proposal will be submitted to the Standing Council for Academic Planning (SCAP) for consideration, based on the criteria set forth in this document. SCAP will vote on the proposal and submit its recommendation to the Provost. In some cases the Provost may conclude that the proposal will also require the approval of the Board of Trustees. In certain time-sensitive cases, the proposal for a new Center or Institute may be submitted directly to the Provost who will decide if the proposal merits an expedited review.

Proposals for new institutes will be reviewed using the following criteria. The order of the criteria does not imply any ranking of the various items. While all criteria may not be satisfied, all criteria must be addressed in a proposal.

#### **1) Mission**

Ways in which the proposed institute responds directly or indirectly to the written mission of the university

#### **2) Alignment with the University Strategic Plan**

Ways in which the goals of the proposed institute align with the university’s overarching objectives and strategies

\* A “Center” or “Institute” is a program run by a University staff or faculty member that operates with the financial support of the University or that anticipates the possibility of seeking such financial support in the future. A “Center” or “Institute” does not include programs that award student academic credits or are otherwise evaluated under academic program standards.

### **3) Demand for Institute**

- a) projected demand for proposed institute
- b) qualitative data regarding the proposed institute based on internal information and/or comparisons with peer institutes in addition to a basic business plan
- c) for institutes requiring additional faculty or staff lines or extensive resources, external market analysis arranged by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research.

### **4) Relationships to other existing institutes**

- a) potential service to students, faculty, and other constituents important to Loyola University
- b) enhances/complements existing institutes, programs, and curricula
- c) overlap and collaborations with other existing institutes, programs

### **5) Adequacy of current resources and additional resources required**

- a) current human and operating resources, including those available through consortial agreements, and number of new personnel required (may involve a stepped approach depending on growth projections)
- b) Library
  - i) Information resources – including an assessment of the Monroe Library’s resources in comparison with potential peer institutes, to be provided by the library liaison.
  - ii) Instructional technology resources and staffing (e.g., learning management system capabilities, streaming media, videoconferencing, classroom capture)
- c) Information Technology (learning management system capacity, network capacity, lab software)
- d) other academic support services
- e) space requirements (including administrative support space)
- f) actual or potential external grants
- g) contributions to and impact on fundraising
- h) annual operating budget
- i) plan for profit sharing, if applicable
- j) accreditation or certification expenses

### **6) Assessment**

- a) assessment plan that includes long-term sustainability
- b) structure and process for administrative and academic oversight
- c) impact on accreditation or certification
- d) key performance indicators

## **Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Institutes**

The primary purpose of the institute review process is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the current status of an institute based on its activities and achievements since its last institute review. Reviews of institutes provide an opportunity to identify strengths and weaknesses in the provision of quality services; support the educational (learning) outcomes of the university; contributions in accomplishing the Jesuit mission of the university; and special services provided by the institute.

Institute reviews should allow the institute to plan and build on existing strengths, maximize opportunities for growth, and solve current problems. The reviews should lead to more effective planning which should be linked to the budgeting process.

SCAP will use the following criteria in its periodic evaluations, and based on its findings will provide appropriate feedback to the institute and appropriate university academic and budgetary planning groups. The following list does not imply any ranking of the various items. While all criteria may not be satisfied, all criteria must be addressed in an evaluation.

### **1) Mission**

Ways in which the institute responds directly or indirectly to the written mission of the university

### **2) Alignment with the University Strategic Plan**

Ways in which the goals of the institute align with the university's overarching objectives and strategies

### **3) Demand for Institute**

- a) demand for institute as evidenced by constituents' needs
- b) qualitative and quantitative evidence of serving constituents' needs

### **4) Relationships to other existing institutes**

- a) service to students, faculty, and other constituents important to Loyola University
- b) enhances/complements existing institutes, programs, and curricula
- c) overlap and collaborations with other existing institutes, programs

### **5) Adequacy and appropriateness of resource utilization**

- a) current human resources and operating expenses, including those available through consortial agreements or grants
- b) Library (information resources and staffing)
- c) Information Technology
- d) other academic support services
- e) space requirements and classroom technology
- f) contributions to and impact on fundraising
- g) accreditation expenses

## **6) Planning and Assessment**

- a) assessment plan that addresses sustainability
- b) assessment results
- c) external reviews
- d) structure and process for administrative oversight
- e) impact on accreditation or certification
- f) impact on other institutes
- g) key performance indicators

## **Criteria for Institute Discontinuances**

A decision to discontinue formally an institute will be based essentially upon educational considerations, which may involve financial matters. Educational considerations and financial implications do not include cyclical or temporary variations in demand for the institute, but must reflect the long-range judgments that the educational mission of the University as a whole will be maintained or enhanced by the discontinuance.

If institute discontinuation has the potential to result in faculty termination, Procedures for Termination Because of Discontinuances will be followed (*Faculty Handbook* 9.E.).

The proposal to discontinue an institute should be fully vetted by the relevant departments/schools, colleges, and the appropriate curricular committees. Relevant parties include those that directly support the institute by providing funds, staff, management, accreditation services, space, technology, equipment, or other resources. In the vetting process, relevant parties must consider a proposal to discontinue an institute in its entirety. After the vetting process, the proposal will be submitted to the Standing Council for Academic Planning (SCAP) for approval, based on the criteria set forth in this document. SCAP will vote on the proposal and submit its recommendation to the Provost. In some cases the Provost may conclude that the proposal will also require the approval of the Board of Trustees.

Proposals for institute discontinuation should demonstrate clear deficiencies in the institute using the following criteria. The order of the criteria does not imply any ranking of the various items. While all criteria may not be satisfied, all criteria must be addressed in a proposal.

### **1) Mission**

Ways in which the institute responds directly or indirectly to the written mission of the university

### **2) Alignment with the University Strategic Plan**

Ways in which the goals of the institute align with the university's overarching objectives and strategies

### **3) Demand for Institute**

- a) demand for institute shown as evidenced by constituents' needs
- b) long term trend data (at least five years) for demand
- c) analysis of the institute based on internal information and/or comparisons with peer institutes
- d) qualitative and quantitative evidence of serving constituents' needs

### **4) Relationships to other existing institutes**

- a) service to students, faculty, and other constituents important to Loyola University
- b) enhances/complements existing institutes and curricula
- c) overlap and collaborations with other existing institutes

### **5) Adequacy and appropriateness of resource utilization**

- a) current faculty resources, including those available through consortial agreements

- b) Library (information resources and staffing)
- c) Information Technology
- d) other academic support services
- e) administrative support staff resources
- f) space requirements and classroom technology
- g) external grants received
- h) contributions to and impact of discontinuance on fundraising
- i) annual operating budgets since the last review (provide analysis)
- j) accreditation expenses

**6) Assessment**

- a) results of performance improvement based on prior assessment plans and external reviews
- b) assessment results
- c) structure and process for administrative and academic oversight
- d) impact of discontinuation on accreditation or certification
- e) impact on other institutes
- f) impact on existing faculty resources