**Administrative Units and Programs Review Guidelines**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to outline the instructions, processes, and standards regarding the review of administrative units and programs at Kutztown University as required in Pennsylvania’s State System Board of Governors Policy 1986-04-A: Program Review. Administrative departments/units are organized areas of the University structured to deliver unique sets of services, support functions, or student learning experiences that support the institutional mission (e.g., student success, infrastructure sustainability, community support).

Administrative program reviews generate knowledge about how well programs are supporting the University’s strategic plan and mission. They provide programs with a platform to exercise self-reflection on performance and to identify the strengths and weaknesses that inform future planning. Emphasis should be placed on strengthening the self-evaluation capacity of programs/units so that they can effectively adapt to change and practice continuous improvement.

**Rationale**

The purposes of program review are:

1. Assure deliberate and continuous attention to the enhancement of the quality of administrative programs.
2. Provide analyses using quantitative and qualitative data, including student learning outcomes, to assess program sustainability and program effectiveness to contribute to both University and State System planning.
3. Provide the Council of Trustees, Chancellor, Board of Governors, and accrediting bodies including the Middle States Commission on Higher Education with assurance that programs are being assessed in a systematic fashion and that plans for making continuous improvements are developed, implemented, and communicated.

**Program Review Process**

1. An annual assessment update is to be provided by the administrative unit supervisor to the division vice president.
2. An internal self-study is required every five (5) years. Each vice president, in collaboration with the Implementation Team for Institutional Effectiveness, will determine the schedule of administrative program reviews for the respective division.
3. The unit/program supervisor will meet with the vice president to outline the plan for the program review committee, self-study preparation, and review process.
4. The program review committee analyzes the program’s mission fit, outcomes assessment, progress made on the action plan from the previous review, and cost effectiveness.
5. The program review committee writes the self-study including an action plan addressing its recommendations. The committee submits the self-study to the department, supervisor, and vice president for review and feedback.
6. If necessary, the self-study will be revised and re-submitted to the vice president for input.

**Contents of the Self-Study**

The goal of these reviews is to recognize program strengths, identify opportunities for improvement, and provide recommendations for improvements or modifications. Results and action plans to implement recommendations will be used in the unit operational planning process and documented in TracDat.

The sections of the self-study are outlined in Appendix A: Academic- and Student-Support Program Review Summary Form.

**External Program Review**

1. An external review is required the year following the self-study.
2. The purpose of external review is to garner additional perspectives on program strengths and weaknesses from individuals in the field, or closely related field, who are affiliated with other institutions. According to Board of Governors Policy 1986-04-A, except under special circumstances, external evaluators are to be from outside the State System.
3. The program review committee recommends candidates for external evaluators to the supervisor. The supervisor, in consultation with the vice president, will select up to two external evaluators.
4. The unit will contact the approved recommended individual(s) and make arrangements concerning duties, timeline, and compensation (travel and honorarium).
5. Prior to the visit, the unit will send the external evaluator(s) the program review committee’s self-study report and action plan.
6. Usually a one- or two-day visit by the evaluator(s) is planned.
7. During the campus visit, external evaluator(s) will generally meet with members of the office along with supervisors, the vice president, and recipients of the office’s services.
8. The opportunity for structured as well as unstructured meetings with department members should be planned for the external evaluator(s).

The external reviewer(s) written report should be submitted within one to two months of the visit and should provide the following information:

1. In what way did the self-study documentation provide the necessary context to complete the program review?
2. Were department/unit mission, goals, and objectives appropriate? How did they support the University strategic plan?
3. How were previous self-study recommendations addressed?
4. Are the resources available to support this function adequate and appropriate?
5. Are assessment processes appropriate? Do they contribute to measuring program effectiveness and supporting a cycle of continuous improvement? Do they inform program planning?
6. Are the internal program review recommendations appropriate for achieving goals?
7. What are recommendations resulting from this review?

**Function of Implementation Team for Institutional Effectiveness**

The Implementation Team for Institutional Effectiveness is tasked by the President and Cabinet with overseeing and implementing administrative units and program reviews.

The Team is to:

1. review the self-study reports. See Appendix B: Academic- and Student-Support Program Review Evaluation Sheet for the rubric used by the Team. Include the external review report in the evaluation.
2. endorse program action plans for improvement.
3. recommend completed program self-studies/external reviews to the Cabinet for final acceptance and approval.

**Appendix A**

**Kutztown University**

**Academic- and Student-Support Program Review Summary Form**

***Based on Board of Governor’s Policy 1986-04-A***

**Program/Department Title:** *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

**Division:** *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_* **Date of Last Review:** *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

**Documents Enclosed:** [ ]  Self Study [ ]  External Evaluation

**Completion Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟**

**I. Program Review Criteria Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Meets** | **Comment** | **N/A** |
| Program review team composition |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Goals set during last review and progress in meeting those goals. |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Mission centrality |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Environmental scan |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Program demand |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Program organization |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Currency of departmental policies/guidelines/procedures |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Accreditation |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Program outcomes |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Unique/special program features |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Post review implementation plan |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Other |[ ] [ ] [ ]

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments** |
|  |

**II. Reviewed By**

 **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Implementation Team for Institutional Effectiveness / Date**

**III. Program Review Checklist Descriptions**

 ***Program Review Team Composition***

List the names and position titles of all individuals involved in the review including university and non-university faculty, staff, and students.

 ***Goals set and progress made***

Action plans that were drafted as a result of recommendations from the last review should be listed and along with the progress made in implementing the recommendations. If this is your first review, list your current goals, action plan, and progress toward implementation.

 ***Mission centrality***

The department’s mission statement should be provided along with a description of how the mission drives the department’s activities and supports the mission of the university.

 ***Environmental scan***

A SWOT analysis or other environmental scan should be provided covering topics such as changing student characteristics, impact of technology on services, evolving student/staff expectations, and changing regulatory requirements.

 ***Demand***

Demand for the department’s services should be described which may include number of students/staff served, transactions requested, and/or mandated service requirements.

 ***Program Organization***

Provide an organizational chart along with a description of how the structure of the department facilitates the attainment of goals and objectives. Also list interactions with other departments/organizations internal and external to the University.

 ***Currency of departmental policies***

Provide a listing of departmental policies along with the date(s) of their latest review.

 ***Accreditation***

If applicable, list accreditations available to the department and if achieved.

 ***Program outcomes***

Provide a list of program outcomes achieved. Consider faculty/staff achievements, student satisfaction, and other documented program outcome results, including the assessment of student learning outcomes where applicable.

 ***Unique/special program features***

If applicable, describe other aspects of the department that may be beneficial in reviewing the department.

 ***Post review implementation plan***

A plan to provide for continuous improvement by building on strengths and addressing challenges should be provided. The recommendations and action items should be accomplished by the next review period.

**APPENDIX B**

**Kutztown University**

**Academic- and Student-Support Program Review**

***Evaluation Sheet***

**Program/Department Title:**

**Division:**

**Review type:** [ ]  Self Study [ ]  External Evaluation **Completion Date:**

**🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟🞟**

**I. Program Review Criteria Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Meets** | **Comment** | **N/A** |
| Program review team composition |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Goals set during last review and progress in meeting those goals |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Mission centrality |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Environmental scan |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Program demand |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Program organization |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Currency of departmental policies/guidelines/procedures |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Accreditation |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Program outcomes |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Unique/special program features |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Post review implementation plan |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| Other |[ ] [ ] [ ]

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments** |
|  |

**II. Reviewed By**

 **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

 **Implementation Team for Institutional Effectiveness / Date**