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Who we are

• Dr. Melissa Canady Wargo
  Assistant Vice Chancellor, Institutional Planning and Effectiveness

• David Onder
  Assessment Coordinator, Institutional Planning and Effectiveness

• Mardy Ashe
  Director, Career Services

Objectives for session

Describe the development and implementation of administrative program review at WCU.

Outline the process and standards.

Discuss example: Career Services.
Why administrative program review?

- **Catalysts**
  - Shrinking Budgets
  - Demands for Accountability – internal and external
  - UNC Tomorrow

- **Buy-in**
  - Campus leadership
  - Staff input

How was the process developed?

- **Administrative Council**
  - Charged by Provost
  - Membership – directors of all academic support units

- Vetting the criteria

- Outlining the process

What are the goals of the process?

- Alignment with core mission, vision, values of the University
- Ensure efficient and effective use of University resources
- Promote excellence and quality
- Enhance services to all University constituents
- Reduce/Eliminate unnecessary duplication and redundancy
What is the structure of the process?

Notification & Planning

Selection of Review Team

Preparation of self-study

Campus Visit

Review Team Report

Program Development Plan

What are the review standards?

- Unit History & Description
- Alignment with mission/values
- Program Demand
- Program Quality
- Cost Effectiveness
- Opportunity Analysis

Unit history and description

- Purpose and key functions
- Unit goals/priorities
- Brief history of unit on campus
- Organizational structure of the unit/staff bios (including student workers)
Mission Alignment

- Unit mission alignment with the university mission - QEP, UNC Tomorrow and the academic colleges/schools
- Past changes in unit purpose
- Anticipated changes to unit purpose

Program Demand

- Key users/participants
- Means for identifying and measuring demand
- Nature of interactions with other campus units
- Related programs and services provided by other units
- Unique contributions of this unit

Program Quality

- Means for identifying and measuring quality of programs or services (including top benchmarks used to assess quality)
- Description of how results are used for improvement (with examples)
- Major accomplishments of past 5 years related to unit functions AND/OR other contributions related to University goals.
Cost Effectiveness

• Means for identifying and measuring cost effectiveness (include top benchmarks used to assess cost effectiveness)
• Itemized revenues and expenses for last 3 years (including salaries)

Opportunity Analysis

• Possible enhancements to programs or services (including automation of processes, collaboration opportunities, outsourcing, etc.)
• Activities of other units that advance or hinder the effectiveness of your unit
• Redundant or secondary programs and services
• Comparison to peer or aspirant units
• Possibilities for cost savings

WCU Career Services/Cooperative Education

• Why we volunteered......
  – Had data
  – Had a positive sense about the outcome
  – CAS summary from 2006
  – Wanted to be first
Timeline

Pre-Visit

August 6, 2009
- Volunteered to be 1st

August 28, 2009
- GET ORGANIZED; who’s doing what

September 2, 2009
- Selected Review Team

Mid October, 2009
- Documentation to OIPE

Site Visit

December 9-11, 2009

Documents Submitted

Response to Criteria
(15 pages)

Executive Summary
(1 ½ pages)

Appendices
- Budget (3 years) (Cost Effective)
- Org Chart
- Resumes
- Staff University Activities (Value, Alignment, Opportunity Analysis, Cost Effective)
- CAS study (2009) (Demand, Quality)
- Student usage (5 years) (Demand, Quality, Opportunity Analysis)
- Student and employer participation in career events (5 years) (Demand, Quality)

- Staff involvement in university activities (Value, Alignment, Opportunity Analysis, Cost Effective)
- Graphs of Evaluations of Events (Demand, Quality)
- Senior survey –responses to Career Services (Demand, Quality)
- Benchmark survey of Peer institutions (Cost Effective, Quality, Demand)

Timeline

Site Visit

November 2009
- Planned group meetings, scheduled rooms – who, where and when

December 4, 2009
- Met with CS staff for last minute preparations

December 9, 2009
- Met external reviewer
Timeline

Post-Visit

January 30-31, 2010
- Reviewers report received

January 2010 - present
- Implementing changes

March 2010
- PDP

Outcomes

• Recognition – word spreads fast

• Opportunity to get “needs” noticed….
  • Larger space, Add staff, Associate Director, Budget, Salaries, Travel

• Some Suggestions/recommendations for us...
  • Visibility - Peer Career Mentors; Faculty Liaisons
  • On – line Services; Maximize Software
  • Expand Services - Collaborate with other offices; Service Learning, OIPE, etc.

Lessons Learned

Process

• Very different audiences
  – Greater number and variety

• Academic Program

  • Unit

    • Colleges

    • Other Units

  • Administrative

Western Carolina
Lessons Learned  
**Process 2**

- Time Management
  - More meetings
  - More review team time
  - Added pre-meeting
  - Meetings on class schedule

Lessons Learned  
**Process 3**

- Costs More
  - More people involved
  - Needs more time

Lessons Learned  
**Site Visit**

- Response to Criteria and/or Executive Summary should be available for group members to review if requested
- Center director needs to meet with the review team early in the schedule
Lessons Learned

For the Unit

- Be thoughtful in the choosing of the review team, especially the external reviewer.
- Meeting room clean, water/snacks available for participants.

See our website for the presentation slides and handouts

http://www.wcu.edu/27729.asp