As a result of the fourth cycle of DePaul University's Academic Program Review Process (Cycle 4), the participants in the process enter into the following agreements. The participants understand that this document will be available to be made public once all the signatures are in place.

Note: The current director has become DePaul’s Ombudsperson, and the College has recently hired a new dean, so the actions and issues in this Memo of Agreement will serve as recommendations to the new director and to the new dean. The acting dean thanked the current director for his time spent on this review and for his dedication to the Center and to the College of Law. The acting dean and the incoming dean noted that the College of Law is committed to the Center’s continued activity and will help the Center as it rethinks its mission in this time of transition.

Actions agreed upon for the coming academic year, and suggestions for incoming director:

1. **Determine key projects, focus, and priorities.** The Center’s outgoing director and the College’s incoming dean note that the Center is in a point of transition and is therefore in a position to rethink its mission, focus, and the scope of its major projects. To inform the selection of a new director, the current director, acting dean, and incoming dean will meet to set a basic structure and determine the Center’s general direction. They will also discuss how, in the interim, the Center can continue to maintain core functions and sponsor a few interim projects.

2. **Reconstitute Executive Committee.** This Chicago-based group, whose primary focus has been fundraising and outreach for the Center, will be reconstituted and have its role redefined. The core group on this committee will remain, but the director notes that there are people in the city who are interested in the Center’s work and want to be involved in an advisory capacity. The acting dean has sent a letter to the current members notifying them of the transition in directorship and asking them for input regarding the Center’s direction.

3. **Develop by-laws for the Board.** While the Executive Committee will be reconstituted, the Legal Scholars Advisory Board will continue in its current role. However, the current director recognizes the need to develop by-laws for the Board’s membership and governance and suggests that this be a priority as the Center redefines its mission. As new by-laws are developed, the Center will consider the structure of the governing committees, i.e. if it will be more effective to have two boards or if they should be reconstituted as one board.

4. **Seek more integration into University.** As it redefines its mission, the Center will look for ways to integrate more fully with the rest of the University beyond the College of Law and to increase participation by other units of the university in the Center’s activities.

   a) Integration may be accomplished through joint sponsorship of projects with other units such as Commerce, SNL. Suggestions for joint projects included a lecture series on faith-based initiatives; a certificate course for clergy on government regulation/zoning of religious institutions; or another project on the issue of school vouchers.
b) The Center will work to develop a more formal relationship with the Religious Studies Department. The director has had conversations with Jim Halstead, who serves on the Center’s Board and will become the new chair of the Department, regarding opportunities for involvement of the Center in Religious Studies courses and activities. These conversations should continue.

5. **Increase faculty involvement.** A critical issue for the Center is increasing faculty involvement. This will be a priority as the Center redefines its mission and sets programming priorities. The director acknowledged that the Center needs more close connection with academic programs to create a wider audience and interest among faculty in the Center’s work. A proposed strategy for increasing faculty involvement would be to find a program that solidifies interest of a core group of faculty, organize a scholarly agenda around this issue, and maintain faculty interest in this issue through joint projects and activities. Another strategy would be to create links through coursework; currently, courses don’t arise from the center, but church-state topics could be taught in the College of Law by Law faculty.

6. **Develop measures of effectiveness.** The Center recognizes the need to more formally evaluate the effectiveness of its activities, especially as a way to inform the discussions about the Center’s mission and priorities. Some measures of effectiveness might include the citation in the legal community of the Center’s lectures/publications; the publication of lecture series/books; feedback from families that participate in the Center’s interfaith mediation groups; measuring attendance at the Center’s events. In the short-term, the Center will ask regular constituencies about their vision and opinion of the center as one way to gather feedback about effectiveness and inform planning. In the long-term, the Center will work to develop measures of effectiveness/success which are appropriate to the center and easily communicated to the dean and to various publics.

7. **Continue publications.** The current director and acting dean are committed to continuing the publication and dissemination of single-author works and documents from discussion forums. However, they agree that the Center should reconsider its work on the larger, multiple-author centerpiece books, since these projects have tended to become unmanageable. The Center will re-evaluate what kinds of publication projects will be appropriate in the future.

**University-level Issues and Commitments**

During Cycle 4, the Centers & Institutes’ individual self-studies raised several issues that have important implications for all Centers & Institutes, and which require action at the university level. These issues will be discussed in further detail at a meeting with the Centers & Institutes Advisory Board, the APRC Chair, the Associate Vice President and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. Commitments and actions arising from that meeting’s discussion will be documented in a General Memorandum of Agreement for all Centers & Institutes.

***
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