UNC Student Services Program Review Guidelines

Program review at the University of Northern Colorado is intended to support, develop, and maintain high quality programs. It is a collaborative process involving faculty, administrators, and students that respects the diversity of program missions and cultures while also recognizing the primacy of institutional mission. The program review process involves collecting and synthesizing program information to evaluate quality, identify opportunities, and make recommendations on actions and resources necessary to realize desired levels of excellence. Program review outcomes are used by faculty and administrators to promote campus goals and objectives, support strategic planning and decision-making, and inform budget and resource allocation.

Program Review Guidelines

The primary process through which program review is conducted at UNC is the comprehensive self-study. The self-study provides program faculty, administrators, staff, and the provost an opportunity to reflect on the historical role and outcomes of the program, evaluate the current program strengths and weaknesses, and strategically plan for the future of the program. These guidelines provide a consistent framework for conducting the self-study and presenting the findings. While the process through which programs conduct the self-study are left to the discretion of the program personnel working in consultation with university administrators, programs should address each of the topics identified within the guidelines following the report format described herein. These guidelines represent the institutional requirements for program review. Individual divisions may expand on these requirements as recommended by the division's personnel.

Definition of a Program
A student services program is defined as a co-curricular organizational and budgetary unit that is responsible for delivering services, specialized programs, and/or courses not leading to a degree. For purposes of program review, personnel within each division, working collaboratively with the division head[1], identify what programs exist within their respective division. This collaborative process provides flexibility to organize the review process so that it produces meaningful contributions to budget and strategic planning decisions.

Timeline
Each program should complete a comprehensive review every five years. Division personnel and the division head should prepare a review schedule for each ten year period between regional accreditation. For professionally accredited programs the schedule should align UNC program review to accreditation timelines wherever possible.

CAS Standards
UNC has selected the CAS Standards to serve as the framework upon which programs will be reviewed. The CAS Standards consist of twelve components identified by the national Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) that together comprise essential characteristics of high quality programs. These standards address the following:

-Mission	-Ethics	-Financial Resources
-Program	-Law, Policy, & Governance	-Technology
-Organization & Leadership	-Diversity, Equity, & Access	-Facilities & Equipment
-Human Resources	-Internal & External Relations	-Assessment

---

[1] Assistant/Associate Vice President or Dean

Programs should use the guidelines and rating scale developed by CAS to assess program strengths and weaknesses. Documentary evidence to support the evaluation of services and demonstrate program efficacy should be provided in an electronic portfolio (preferred format) or binder as an addendum to the self-study report.

Accredited Programs
Programs that are professionally accredited or those that operate under other nationally recognized standards may substitute those standards for the CAS Standards. The accreditation site team's report may serve as the external review report, and the accreditation self-study, including any supporting documents, may substitute for the evidence binder. Programs seeking to use an accreditation report are required to provide an executive summary of the report that describes the following: (1) how the program supports the university mission and strategic plan; (2) a brief discussion of significant program strengths and challenges; (3) goals for the next review period; and (4) discussion of resources necessary to achieve future goals.

External Review
External review of programs is expected and may be fulfilled through any of the following options:

- External accreditation site visit/review;
- Program-area expert external to the University; or
- Individual or review team comprised of industry experts and/or employers.

Programs should consult with their division head and the program director/coordinator's supervisor to determine the appropriate option for conducting the external review. It is the responsibility of all involved to avoid conflicts of interest that would prevent an objective review of the program. Programs should avoid selecting reviewers with any of the following characteristics: (1) former employees or program participants; (2) individuals with a financial interest in the outcomes of the review (vendor representative, for example); or (3) individuals with a personal relationship to any employees in the program. Upon approval of a reviewer, programs should issue a contract using the University's Independent Contractor Procedures.

Reviewers should provide the program with a written evaluation of the program's strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for improvement within 30 days of completion of the review. Funding for the review is available through the Office of Assessment. Final payment to reviewers may not be issued until the reviewer's report has been received by the program.

Comprehensive Program Review Documentation

The final Comprehensive Program Review self-study report consists of a narrative report and supporting documentation. The narrative report should be no more than 25 pages and is comprised of the following sections:

1. Program description (mission, organizational chart, major activities or services offered, students served, etc.)
2. Program's alignment with the University's mission and Strategic Framework
3. Outcomes for the goals and actions identified in the prior comprehensive review
4. Program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats based on the CAS Standards (or professional accreditation standards), external review, and feedback from supervisor and division head

5. Future goals identified through analysis of the program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats
6. Resources necessary to support future goals and program improvement

In addition to the narrative report, programs should provide the following supporting documents:

1. Data tables of any relevant program or institutional data used in the self-study (last five years)
2. Documentary evidence to support conclusions in the report (binder or electronic portfolio)
3. External reviewer report
4. Supervisor and division head memos with recommendations for next review period

Program Review Data
Programs should identify institutional and program-level data necessary for completing the self-study. Any data used should be reported in data tables that include information from the most recent five years.

Program review data to consider include the following:

Activities, Services, and Participation Rates
- Number of students served by program
- Demographic characteristics of students served
- Number of activities and sponsored events provided by the program
- Retention and graduation rates of students served by program
- Student credit hour production (for programs that deliver credit-bearing courses)

Financial data
- Personnel costs by employee classification (including student employees)
- OCE
- Travel
- Number and amount of extramural awards

Personnel
- Number of full-time and part-time classified, exempt, and/or faculty employees
- Number of student hourly/salaried employees, graduate/research assistants, and/or teaching assistants
- Staff awards and recognitions, publications, and/or conference presentations.

Comprehensive Program Review Process
The comprehensive review process involves review by the following individuals and bodies: (1) Division head[2]; (2) Program supervisor[3]; (3) External reviewer(s); (4) Director of Assessment; and (5) Vice President/Provost.

The steps for completing the comprehensive review process are as follows:

<u>Step 1.</u> Initial meeting with program director/coordinator, division head, supervisor, and Director of Assessment. The purpose of this meeting is to clarify the process and establish a schedule for completing the remaining activities associated with the comprehensive review.

---

[2] Assistant/Associate Vice President or Dean
[3] Applies only to programs where the director/coordinator reports to someone other than the division head

Step 2. Select and schedule the external reviewer(s). Programs should work with their division head and supervisor to select an appropriate reviewer.

Step 3. Complete first draft of the self-study document. The program director/coordinator is responsible for distributing the self-study draft to the division head and supervisor.

Step 4. Review of the self-study document. The self-study document will be reviewed by the division head and supervisor. The reviewer(s) will provide written feedback with recommendations for improvement and commendations for program strengths no later than one week prior to the meeting described in Step 5 below.

Step 5. Meeting with the program director/coordinator. Prior to completing the final comprehensive program review report, the program director/coordinator will meet with the division head and supervisor to discuss the recommendations from the reviewers, agree upon goals for the next review period, and identify any resources needed to improve and/or maintain program quality. **Note: programs that report directly to the Vice President of their division will skip this step.**

Step 6. Submission of comprehensive program review report to the Office of Assessment. Programs should submit a copy of the comprehensive program review report and supporting documents to the Office of Assessment no later than August 1. Documents should be submitted electronically where possible.

Step 7: Meeting with Division Vice President/Provost. The Director of Assessment will review the comprehensive program review report and provide a summary of strengths and issues for discussion to the appropriate Vice President. The Vice President and Director of Assessment will meet with the program's director/coordinator, division head, and supervisor to discuss the comprehensive review. Following the meeting, the Vice President and Assessment Director will prepare a memorandum describing the outcome of the meeting, deadlines for any specific actions the program will take as a result of the program review, and any resource commitments.

Step 8. Using the results. Program personnel, supervisors, and division heads should use the results of the comprehensive review to guide program planning, decision making, and requests for resources. During the fall of the year following the comprehensive review, the program should meet with the Office of Assessment to update the program's assessment plan.

Origin: Office of Assessment and Accreditation
Effective Date: December 21, 2017