Western Carolina UNIVERSITY

Division of Academic Affairs

Guidelines and Procedures for

Administrative Program Review

Revised Fall 2009

Table of Contents

Administrative Program Review[1]

I.   Introduction & Purpose

Administrative Program Review in the Division of Academic Affairs is a component of the University's strategic planning and institutional effectiveness process. The primary purpose of program review is to advance the quality of student academic and administrative support services. Each unit will assess its mission, operations, and resources relative to the same core effectiveness criteria (see Appendix A), understanding that these criteria will have varying degrees of relevance and applicability across administrative programs.

It is the intent of the program review process that each administrative program[2] will have the opportunity to articulate their aspirations and goals and to explain how the program's current activities support the mission and priorities of the University. As the primary record of this process, the administrative program will work incrementally toward developing a Program Self-Study to help capture the thoughtful, detailed analysis of the program's key issues and challenges as informed by the feedback from external experts, students, institutional effectiveness activities and other program assessments. It is expected that the program's ongoing assessment and strategic planning activities will be critical to the review process.

II.   Goals of Administrative Program Review

1. Alignment of all WCU administrative or academic support units with core mission, vision, and values of the University.

2. Ensure efficient and effective use of University resources.

3. Promote excellence and quality in all administrative and academic support units.

4. Improve and enhance services to academic programs, students, and other University constituents.

5. Reduce/eliminate unnecessary duplication and redundancy.

---

[1] Elements of this review process are adapted from Drake University Administrative Program Review process.
[2] For purposes of this document, 'program' refers to a discrete administrative or support function or unit with a definable budget.

III. Structure of Review Process

Academic Program Review will occur on a regular 7 year cycle and is a three stage process:

1. Internal Program Evaluation is conducted by the program staff utilizing data provided by institutional sources such as the Office Institutional Planning & Effectiveness, Office of the Provost, Administration and Finance, etc. as well as data generated by the program itself. The Internal Program Evaluation consists of a program's initial response to the Review Criteria (outlined in Appendix A) and a subsequent opportunity to reflect on the review process and to offer a rationale to support a plan for program development (see Section V for outline of Executive Summary).

2. The External Program Evaluation consists of an off-site review of the program's Response to the Review Criteria, a site visit by the review team, and a written report summarizing the team's findings and recommendations. External Program Evaluation is provided by a team of one non-WCU reviewer and two WCU reviewers, one from the faculty and one from a separate administrative program.

3. The Program Development Plan (PDP) addresses the substantive findings and recommendations from both the internal and external evaluations.

IV. Procedures

1. Administrative Program Review Criteria are included in Appendix A of this document.

2. a). Non-accredited Programs

Non-accredited programs will conduct a program review every seven years.

b). Accredited or Grant/Supported Programs

Accredited programs on a cycle of seven years or less will complete the program review in conjunction with the timeline established by their external accrediting agency. If the accreditation cycle is more than every seven years, the program will be subject to the seven year review process. Documentation used in the accreditation study may also be used for the program review; however, the Provost, in consultation with the supervising vice chancellor or associate/assistant vice chancellor (hereafter referred to as 'unit supervisor') will

determine the need for an external review team evaluation based on a comparison of accreditation guidelines and the program review criteria. When using an accreditation report in the program review process, a Table of Contents will need to be developed indicating the page of the report providing the requested information in WCU's review. If information is not included in the accreditation report the program will need to supplement the Table of Contents with the requested information.

3. External Program Evaluation:

The external review team consists of 3 persons, one non-WCU reviewer and two WCU reviewers, one from the faculty and one from a separate administrative program. The non-WCU reviewer will be selected by the Provost or his designee, from a list of two to three nominees provided by the unit director, after consulting with the unit staff and the unit supervisor. The WCU faculty reviewer will be selected by the Provost or his designee from a list of two to three full-time nominees provided by the unit director and unit staff, following consultation with the Chair of the University Faculty and college dean. The WCU reviewer from a different administrative program will be selected by the Provost or his designee from a list of two to three nominees provided by the unit director and unit staff, following consultation with the nominee's unit director and unit supervisor. This person must be from a unit not under concurrent review.

4. Under certain extenuating circumstances programs may be subject to review outside of the regular seven year cycle. Expedited review may be triggered by:

   ‣ issues related to students or faculty/staff that impact the ability of the program to meet its educational mission;
   ‣ financial exigency; or
   ‣ other extenuating circumstances.

Programs selected for expedited review will be determined by the Chancellor and/or Provost. Unit Directors or Unit Supervisors also may request an expedited review of the administrative program(s) under their supervision. Such requests should be made to the Provost and offer a compelling reason for expediting a scheduled

review. All requests for expediting a program review should be made at the beginning of the calendar year and are subject to availability of resources.

5. The Office of Institutional Planning & Effectiveness will be responsible for notifying Unit Directors about the cycle of program review and will provide oversight to the review process in conjunction with the Unit Supervisor.

6. The Office of Institutional Planning & Effectiveness, in consultation with the staff of the program under review, will provide administrative programs with supporting data, as identified in Section V below, to include in the Program Self-Study.

V. Calendar[3] for conducting the Administrative Program Review and Outline of Contents for the Program Review Self-Study.

Calendar:

Year 1	Task	Responsible Party	Date
●	Notification sent to administrative program undergoing review	OIPE	By January 15
	Meet to review/confirm calendar and criteria	OIPE, Unit Director, Provost/AVC	By February 15
●	Submit nominees for external review team to Provost/AVC	Unit Director	150 days prior to visit
●	Identify selected reviewers for External Review Team	Provost	120 days priort to visit
●	Standardized data sent to programs under review (Highlighted items in Appendix A will be provided by OIPE)	OIPE	120 days prior to visit
●	Invite external reviewers and make appropriate travel arrangements	AVC	120 days prior to visit
●	Submit Response to Standards (see Appendix A) to Unit Supervisor, AVC, and OIPE	Unit Director	60 days prior to visit
●	Submit Response to Standards to External Review Team	OIPE	30 days prior to site visit
●	Develop schedule for site visit	Unit Supervisor, Unit Director, OIPE	30 days prior to site visit
●	Submit External Review Team Report to Unit Director, Unit Supervisor, and Provost	Chair of External Review Team	Within 30 days of visit.
●	Arrange meeting with Provost, Unit Supervisor, Unit Director, and OIPE to develop Program Development Plan (see Appendix B).	Provost	Within 60 days of visit
●	Finalize Program Development Plan	Unit Supervisor, Unit Director, OIPE	Within 90 days of visit

Years 2-7	Task	Responsible Party	Date
●	Implementation of PDP and on-going annual program of assessment.	Unit Director	On-going

---

[3] This calendar will not apply to programs participating in a review during 2009 pilot year, but will apply to all programs undergoing review beginning in 2010.

Contents of Program Self-Study:

I.   Cover Page
   - a. Program Title
   - b. Year of Review
   - c. Name and Contact Information for Program Director

II.   Executive Summary – maximum length 2 pages, minimum font size 11pt., minimum line spacing 1.5- will accompany Response to Criteria
   - a. Reflections from the process
   - b. Summary of key findings from Response to Review Criteria

III.   Response to Criteria – <u>maximum length 15 pages not including appendices, minimum font size 11 pt., minimum line spacing 1.5</u> (see Appendix A for a complete outline of Review Criteria)
   - a. Program's response to each Review Criterion
   - b. Appendices of all supporting data/materials

IV.   External Review Team Report
   - a. Program Strengths
   - b. Areas for Improvement
   - c. Summary of Recommendations

V.   Program Development Plan (see Appendix B for PDP template)

Program Review Criteria

Response to Program Review Criteria:

The program should provide a brief, but comprehensive response to each criterion[4] outlined below. The *maximum* length for the entire narrative is 15 pages. The *minimum* font size is 11 pt., using either Times New Roman or Arial style. The *minimum* line spacing is 1.5. The standards are arranged thematically in order to contextualize the review in the larger planning and effectiveness framework of the institution. Required documentation and other supporting materials should be included as appendices and only referenced in the body of the report.

History and description of unit

1. State the primary purpose and key functions of the unit.

2. List the top 3-5 goals/priorities of the unit.

3. Summarize the history of this unit on campus.

4. Describe the structure of the unit and how it is situated organizationally within the institution.

5. Provide an organizational chart of the unit with every employee identified by title and name. Attach a brief (3-4 bullets) list of the primary duties carried out by each employee on the chart. Also, for each full-time staff member provide a full *curriculum vitae* or 2-page *vitae/résumé* summary.

6. If applicable, describe the number and contribution of student employees or graduate assistants to the unit's programs and services.

---

[4] Academic Centers/Institutes must include a response to additional questions/criteria that are outlined in University Policy #105 and are also included at the end of Appendix A.

Alignment with WCU Mission, Vision, Values

1. How does the unit mission align with the university mission with specific reference to support of the QEP, *UNC Tomorrow* and the academic colleges/schools?

2. How has the purpose of the unit changed in the past 5 years?

3. How do you expect the purpose to change in the next 5 years?

Demand for the program

1. Who are the key users/participants of the unit's programs or services?

2. How do you identify and measure demand for the unit's programs or services?

3. List those other units on campus that interact most with this unit. Briefly describe the nature of those interactions.

4. List other units on campus that provide related programs and services.

5. Describe the unique contributions of this unit.

Quality

1. How do you identify and measure quality of the unit's programs or services? List the top benchmarks used to assess quality.

2. How do you use the results of quality assessments to improve programs and/or services? Provide specific examples.

3. What were the major accomplishments of the unit in the past 5 years? Include those directly related to unit functions AND/OR other contributions related to University goals.

Cost Effectiveness

1. How do you identify and measure cost effectiveness of this unit? List the top benchmarks used to assess cost effectiveness.

2. Attach an itemized spreadsheet (see template) outlining ALL revenues/resources generated and expenses incurred (including salaries) for the unit for the past 3 years.

Opportunity Analysis

1. How can programs or services offered by the unit be enhanced? Examples might include:

   o Automation of processes

   o Collaboration with other units on campus

   o Outsourcing to a independent contractor

2. How do the activities of other units advance or hinder the effectiveness of your unit? Focus should be on those units that were identified in item #3 in the section on "Demand for the Program".

3. What programs and services offered by the unit are redundant or outside the scope of the unit's primary purpose?

4. What are similar units at peer or aspirant institutions doing that this unit would like to do or should be doing?

5. What additional cost-savings could be achieved in this unit?

6. What external funding opportunities (grants, contracts, etc.) exist that could be pursued by this unit? If applicable, describe any efforts to pursue such funding to date?

7. What would it take to make the program exemplary?

Appendix B

Program Development Plan Template

Program Development Plan   Program: Division: Date:

Strengths:

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Strategic Action	Resources needed C=current R= reallocation N=new	Costs	Person(s) Responsible	Date of Review

Update #1   Date:_____
Comments:

Further Action Needed: (add to strategic actions)

Update #2   Date:_____
Comments:

Further Action Needed: (add to strategic actions)

Appendix C

Selection Process and Qualifications for External Reviewers[5]

Selection Process:

Non-WCU Reviewers. The Unit Director should submit 2-3 names of potential reviewers and a brief summary of their academic and/or professional background to their Unit Supervisor. From that list, the Unit Supervisor and Provost (or his designee) will select one individual to serve on the external review team. Invitations to serve on a program review team will be issued jointly by the Unit Supervisor and the Provost. Additionally, all offers regarding travel and honoraria will be negotiated by the Office of the Provost. Although not a requirement, every effort should be made to submit nominees from southeastern regional institutions to minimize travel costs. If you would like a list of comparable institutions contact the Office of Institutional Planning & Effectiveness at extension 7239.

If you have difficulty identifying potential reviewers, check resources offered by your professional organizations. Professional organizations often maintain databases of members willing to serve as program reviewers or listservs on which you can post a query. Potential reviewers can also be identified by querying peers at other institutions. If your administrative program is unique or is of a multidisciplinary nature, reviewers from similar programs can be considered

WCU Administrative Program and Faculty Reviewers. The Unit Director should submit 2-3 names of potential reviewers from another WCU administrative program and 2-3 names from the WCU faculty. From those lists, the Unit Supervisor and Provost (or his designee) will select one individual from each area to serve on the external review team following consultation with staff person's Unit Supervisor or the Chair of the University Faculty. Invitations to serve on a program review team will be issued jointly by the Unit Supervisor and the Provost. The WCU reviewers must not be affiliated in any formal manner with the program under review.

---

[5] All expenses related to travel and honoraria for the External Review Team will be paid by the Office of the Provost.

Expected Qualifications of External Reviewers

Required Credentials

1. Extensive experience in or knowledge of the primary functions of the program under review
2. Regional or national reputation as an expert in the area of the program under review.
3. Familiarity with current trends, theories, and standards in the area of the program under review.
4. <u>Not</u> be actively involved in any current or recent (within past 5 years) collaborative activity with staff in the program under review.
5. Ability to participate in a site visit within specified timeframe.

Preferred Credentials:

1. Knowledge of or experience in a SACS accredited institution
2. Knowledge of or experience in a North Carolina public institution of higher education

Appendix D

Budget Spreadsheet

COSTS	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
	Budgeted	**Expended**	**Budgeted**	**Expended**	**Budgeted**	**Expended**
Salaries -Total						
Benefits						

Equipment
    purchases
    maintenance (contracts/repairs)						

Travel costs						
Supplies costs						
Printing costs						
Entertainment						
Memberships						
Accreditation costs						
Other program costs (specify):						
Total Cost		0		0		0

REVENUES	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
Tuition						
Other Student Fees						
Restricted Gifts						
Endowment Earnings						
Grants*						
Tickets						
Outside Contracts						
Other (specify):						
Total Revenue		0		0		0

*Please provide details regarding the grant term and possibility of renewal

Note: If there is an unusual, nonrecurring cost or revenue item in any particular year, you may provide a written explanation (not to exceed 1/2 page in length) and attach it to the Cost Effectiveness Template.

Anticipated Future Budget Needs:

Item	Estimated Cost	Year Needed