This quarter the RSCA committee met only twice.

The first meeting was scantly attended. However, two deans and one VP were in attendance and three faculty representatives. Various topics discussed from the charge to the committee, but the discussion was centered on the issue of Periodic Review of Centers and Institutes, as well as having a written up procedure for the Human Subjects Committee in Cal Poly Campus.

The second meeting, March 18, had the following highlights:

1) The committee members made a recommendation on a study or survey on needs and means to promote the Teacher-Scholar model in Cal Poly. The underpinning idea is that Scholarly activities should be an incentive for faculty excellence.

2) Dr. Bradford Anderson presented to the committee the attached document on the report for Periodic Review Guidelines modifications. This document will be circulated to the committee members for comments and suggestions, and discussed in the next meeting.

3) Progress on the written procedures for function of the Human Subjects Committee continue, and will be discussed next meeting.

Rafael

Rafael Jimenez-Flores
Professor, Director Cal Poly CAB
r.jimenezflores@me.com
"Imagination grows by exercise and contrary to common belief is more powerful in the mature than in the young."
- W. Somerset Maugham
Periodic Review Guidelines for Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation

(DRAFT: 3/10/15, Approved by Academic Senate on March 11, 2014)

1. Overview
These guidelines govern periodic review for Campus Centers and Institutes with academic affiliation at the College or University level. Such Campus Centers and Institutes are engaged in the enhancement of selected disciplinary areas of research, teaching, and service.

This policy does not apply to the establishment or running of central administrative or service units such as the Gender Equity Center, the Multi-Cultural Center, the Advising Center, or the Center for Teaching and Learning, and Technology, which serve campus-wide functions and which may also use the term "Center" or "Institute." These guidelines do not apply to State or Federal centers or institutes with a presence on campus, which are instead governed by separate policies associated with the enabling entity (e.g. Small Business Development Center which is formed through the Federal Small Business Administration, or the CSU Agricultural Research Institute which is a system wide Institute governed by the CSU).

In accordance with the University's policy for the Establishment, Evaluation, and Discontinuation of Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation, and the California State University Chancellor's Office Executive Order Number 751, periodic program Coded Memorandum (CODE: AA-2014-18, dated October 24, 2014), periodic review is required for all Campus Centers and Institutes with academic affiliation (hereafter "Centers and Institutes").

For clarity, periodic review is different from the annual report requirement for all Centers and Institutes.

2. Distinguishing Factors of Program Periodic Review for Centers and Institutes
ProgramThe periodic review for Centers and Institutes is different from program review for degree granting academic programs offered by an academic college. Unlike an academic college, Campus Centers and Institutes do not award degrees, are not formed or operated for the exclusive purpose of delivering curricula for specific degree granting programs, and do not have a degree granting program curriculum committee.

Instead, Centers and Institutes operate in the context of supporting and contributing to the campus mission in the areas of research, scholarship, public service, training, experiential learning, instructional support, and/or other types of co-curricular activities. Centers and Institutes are not expected to create academic assessment plans, because academic assessment plans are designed to evaluate a specific degree granting program.

As a result of these differences between an academic college offering degree granting programs, and the support role of Centers and Institutes, it is beneficial to outline types of deliverables expected in connection with program review associated with Centers and Institutes.

3. Composition of Program Periodic Review Team Process
The program review will be prepared and submitted by the Director of the Center/Institute. or Institute is responsible for proposing the Review Team composition, preparing the Self Study Report, and addressing any requests for additional information or clarifications, each as more fully described below in this policy.
If the Center/Institute lacks a Director at the time of scheduled program periodic review, the Vice President for Research and Economic Development shall identify an appropriate substitute to perform the necessary tasks.

4. Contents of Self Study Report for Centers and Institutes
The Self Study Report shall be structured to handle the program review duties, following consultation with address the Dean activities of the Academic College where the Center/ or Institute is aligned on the organization chart (as applicable). The person responsible for preparing and submitting the program review may enlist the assistance of other willing volunteers to assist.

The Center/Institute may, but is not required, to include external constituents, such as members of business/industry and/or external peer reviewers. The involvement of external reviewers is ideal in situations where the Center/Institute engages in substantial off-campus activities with members of business and industry.

4. Contents of Program Review for Centers and Institutes
In the context of program review, Centers and Institutes may broadly categorize activities from a perspective of both quantitative output and qualitative outcomes contributions to the campus. For example, the number of students and faculty participating in a particular event, or the number of peer reviewed journal articles which contain research related to center/institute activities, can be measured as quantitative output. The caliber of sophistication in research and experiential activities can also be described as qualitative outcomes, and ideally would link to any one or more University Learning Objectives, Sustainability Learning Objectives, and/or Diversity Learning Objectives and/or program based learning objectives may serve as forms of qualitative support.

As Campus Center and Institutes are based upon a wide range of goals and missions, there is not a single format or scope of program review dictated as a standard. However, the program review team should carefully consider the inclusion of the following relevant items in a program review report:

The Self Study Report shall address each of the following items:

(A) Executive Summary.

(B) Academic Situational Analysis on outcomes related to the activities of the Center/Institute (Faculty and Student Activities and engagement):

(1) Statement of Center/Institute Mission and description of how activities have aligned with that mission, including any suggested revisions to the mission.

(2) Overview of how Center/Institute has supported College/University goals, in accordance with organizational documents for Center/Institute.

(3) Detailed information regarding seminars, competitions, training sessions, community events, and other activities hosted or sponsored by the Center/Institute, including details of faculty/student/industry/community participation and attendance.

(4) Detailed information regarding academic outcomes related to Center/Institute activities, including references to support of any Academic Program learning goals/learning objectives, as well as University Learning Objectives, Sustainability Learning Objectives, and Diversity Learning Objectives. To the extent the Center/Institute collaborates with academic units on collecting assessment data, provide the data and an analysis of the data.
(C) Intellectual Contributions.

Detailed list of intellectual output resulting from Center/Institute activities. Include faculty and student research, faculty/student peer reviewed journal publications, theses, conference presentations, and other intellectual contributions directly related to Center/Institute activities.

(D) Financial and Resource Condition.

Financial disclosure shall provide for transparency on the financial status and source/use of funds. Describe the financial and resource situation for the Center/Institute, including projected sustainability of Center/Institute activities and sources of funding.

(E) Accomplishment of Corrective Actions and Achievement of Aspirational Goals Identified in Prior Program Periodic Review.

Discuss and describe improvements and aspirational goals which were identified in the prior program review and how those improvements/aspirational goals were achieved. If certain improvements/aspirational goals were not achieved, discuss and describe why, including a corrective action plan (if applicable).

(F) Future Aspirational Goals.

Describe the aspirational goals of the Center/Institute for the upcoming five/seven year time period, including details of how these goals will benefit stakeholders and how fiscal and other resources will be obtained to support these goals.

(G) Conclusion-Safety.

Whenever reasonably possible, evidentiary support Discuss and describe the methodology, training, and protocols implemented to assure safety of persons, and protection of property, associated with activities of the Center or Institute.

(H) Review Team Specific Requests.

Address any specific requests from the members of the Review Team. (Note: Such requests are intended to be limited and well defined in a program review report is highly recommended. For example, a scope, and address unique needs not otherwise addressed in the categories above.)

An appendix containing copies of supporting documentation provides may provide beneficial artifacts and evidence to support the analysis contained within the program Self Study Report.

5. Composition of Review Team

The Review Team for the Self Study Report shall consist of:

(A) One director from another Cal Poly Center or Institute;
(B) One faculty member from Cal Poly (not affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review);
(C) One external reviewer (not affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review report) with expertise in the field associated with the Center or Institute; and

It is the duty of the Director of the Center or Institute to identify potential Review Team members, and consult with/obtain approval of the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review (or the Vice President of Research and Economic Development if the Center or Institute is not affiliated with an Academic College) on
the composition of the Review Team. Following such consultation and approval, the Review Team shall be appointed. Review Team members shall conduct a visit to the facilities of the Center or Institute in coordination with the Director.

6. Timing of Program Periodic Review Report

Each Center/Institute shall file a complete program review once per every five-year period. Academic Affairs publishes a schedule for Center/Institute program review reports in accordance with this timeline. If a Center/Institute is scheduled for program review within a particular academic year, the program review team shall be convened no later than November 1 of that academic year, and the program review report shall be due to Academic Affairs no later than March 1 of that academic year (e.g., program review due AY 2013-2014; team convened by November 1, 2013, and report filed by March 1, 2014). It is the duty of the Center/Institute Director to assure that these program review activities are completed in a timely fashion. In order to assure compliance with the program review deadlines, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs may declare the Center/Institute inactive and freeze all financial accounts associated with the Center/Institute when a program review report is not filed on time. If a program review report is thereafter filed (on a tardy basis), the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs may reactivate the Center/Institute or may dissolve the Center/Institute. The Vice President of Research and Economic Development shall post a periodic review schedule which complies with the Chancellor's Office policy. The Self Study Report and periodic review shall address the time period from the previous scheduled periodic review up to and including the most recent completed academic year, but need not include the current academic year during which the Self Study Report and periodic review is prepared and due.

The deadlines are as follows (references are to dates within the academic year in which the periodic review is scheduled to occur):

(A) Director identifies potential Review Team members and obtains approval for composition of Review Team - October 1;
(B) Review Team members are formally appointed - October 15;
(C) Review Team members communicate to Director any special requests/topics to be addressed in Self Study Report (per Section 4(H)) - November 1;
(D) Director submits completed Self Study Report to Review Team members - February 1;
(E) Review Team members transmit request (if any) for clarification on contents of Self Study Report to Director - March 1;
(F) Director submits clarification to Review Team - March 21;
(G) Review Team submits final written comments on Self Study Report to Director - April 15;
(H) Director submits Self Study Report, clarifications, Review Team comments, and any rebuttal to Review Team comments to the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review - May 1.
(I) Following review of the materials in Section 6(H), the Dean of the Academic College
affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review and the Vice President for Research and Economic Development shall consult and provide copies of these materials and any comments to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Copies of the documents described in Section 6(B) through 6(G) shall be simultaneously transmitted to the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review and the


   (A) The Provost and Executive Vice President for Research and Economic Development,

   In the Academic Affairs (or designee) will evaluate each program review report for completeness and sufficient detail, including evidentiary support. The program review report shall be deemed accepted by event of exigent circumstances which merit an extension, the Vice President for Research and Economic Development may grant an appropriate extension.

7. Action Items

   Based upon the information from the periodic review, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs if no clarifications or elaboration are requested within sixty (60) days, the Dean of original submission of the program review report.

   (B) In the event that clarifications or elaboration in the program review report are deemed necessary or desirable, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs shall serve the responsible individual for the program review of such College affiliated with the Center or Institute with one or more, and/or the Vice President for Research and Economic Development may request(s) for further information. The response to each such request must be completed and submitted within thirty (30) days clarifications and/or a corrective action plan from the date of request, unless a longer time period is allowed by the Provost and Executive Director of the Center or Institute. The Director shall address such items in a timely manner. The periodic review documents shall be stored by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The program review report shall be deemed accepted by the ProvostResearch and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs if no further clarifications or elaboration are requested within sixty (60) days following submission of the latest response to a request for clarifications or elaboration.
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