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BACKGROUND:
Seattle University is currently conducting a comprehensive review of all non-academic departments and offices, and is preparing to undertake a comparable process across our academic areas over the course of this academic year.

This work is being done at the direction of the Board of Trustees, and is part of a broader set of activities, including development of new academic programs, finding ways to increase non-tuition revenue, and stronger financial planning and management. The purpose of all these activities is to position the university for continued academic excellence and financial sustainability within a changing and challenging environment.

Preparatory work last summer included discussion by the Council of Deans (CoD) of different models for academic program review in higher education. The CoD determined that a process designed by the Education Advisory Board is the most appropriate model for the Division of Academic Affairs at Seattle University. This model is intended “to enhance quality by reallocating resources from lower impact activities to higher-impact mission aligned priorities” and includes reviews of five “instructional cost drivers”: section fill rates, course enrollment, course completion rates, curricular complexity, and faculty course load.

The CoD came to agreement to move forward on a model that both incorporates the EAB analysis and systematically assesses operational performance at the college, school and university levels. The CoD agreed to call this process an “Academic Affairs Operations and Portfolio Review” – a moniker intended to capture the comprehensive nature of the review.

CHARGE:
The Planning and Design Committee is charged with building on the preliminary work done by the CoD by developing a process that is based on the EAB model and that involves all parts of the Division of Academic Affairs. This work includes developing specific processes, timelines and templates, governance structures, and other planning needed to ensure the overall effectiveness of the review. This process must conclude in time for the Provost to provide his final recommendations to the President before the May 2016 Board of Trustees meeting.

In addition to the overall parameters outlined above, this process must reflect certain key values and principles. This process should be designed in a way that is respectful of the time invested by faculty and other stakeholders. It should ensure careful thought and consideration is given to the information and ideas coming from all participants. Most importantly, it should be designed in a manner that recognizes and reflects the fact that academic excellence is and will remain the most essential component of our success as a university.
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