Guidelines
for
Program Review
For Service Units
at
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

November 2010

Office of Planning & Institutional Improvement
301 University Boulevard, Suite 4049
Indianapolis, IN 46202
Phone: (317) 274-4111
Fax: (317) 274-4651

Guidelines
for
Program Review
For Service Units
at
IUPUI

PURPOSE FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review is a collaborative process designed to bring to bear the judgment of respected colleagues in assessing and improving the quality of academic and administrative units. This process involves staff, students, faculty, alumni, community members, Responsibility Center (RC) and campus administrators, and external specialists in the profession in (1) gathering information about a unit, (2) reviewing and analyzing this information during a site visit, (3) synthesizing all available information and making judgments about overall quality and recommendations for improvement, and (4) following up to ensure that the unit is fully supported in its efforts to address the outcomes of the review.

While self-study and peer review are also fundamental components of the **external** process of accreditation, program review at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) serves important **internal** purposes. In its statement of mission and goals this campus has committed itself to continuous improvement of its programs and services, to setting new standards for collaboration and interdisciplinary work, and to strengthening community connections that promote academic and cultural activities as well as economic and human development. Program review at IUPUI places emphasis on (1) involvement of campus administrators, staff and faculty from units other than the one undergoing review; (2) linkages between the program and the community it serves; and (3) connections between the review and planning, decision-making and resource allocation at departmental, school, and campus levels. These emphases ensure that the reviews contribute in a fundamentally important way to the attainment of the campus mission and that warranted recommendations for improvement stemming from them are carried out. Units that are strengthened through peer review will enhance the overall quality and reputation of IUPUI.

Program review at IUPUI increases the sense of shared purpose among its many diverse programs and reinforces the need for coordinated planning for the future by all campus units. The involvement of campus administrators in the reviews ensures that meaningful and effective follow-up for each review will occur. The involvement of IUPUI staff and faculty from units outside the one being reviewed promotes campus-wide understanding of the contributions of each unit to the mission of the institution. The involvement of community members who have an interest in the unit emphasizes the importance of IUPUI's connections with the community it serves and, at the same time, furthers community understanding of the unit and of IUPUI. It should be noted that the term 'community' may be construed broadly in this context; some units may perceive their community to be Indianapolis and central Indiana, others may wish to involve community members from throughout the State, while still others consider the region, the nation, or the world as their community.

Responsibility for Program Review

All units will be scheduled for review over an eight-year period. Unit review may be coordinated with the administrative review of the RC head. If a unit also experiences periodic peer review for purposes of accreditation, the internal and external review processes will be carefully coordinated to minimize duplication of time and effort.

The RC head will be responsible for carrying out the reviews of programs within his or her Responsibility Center. Staff in the Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement will develop and coordinate the overall review schedule and orient units using these **Guidelines**. The Program Review and Assessment Committee, which includes two representatives appointed by the dean of each school, will serve in an advisory role to the staff in Planning and Institutional Improvement to ensure the continuity and integrity of the review process and follow-up activities.

Staff in Planning and Institutional Improvement will work with the RC head and the department head to plan the self-study and review. The department head and representative staff and students will prepare a self-study in the year prior to the review using the "Criteria for Self-Study" outlined below. The self-study may be reviewed by a school or campus committee in advance of the visit by the review team. When this is the case, the unit responsible for the self-study would be expected to make changes if a majority of the members of the review committee recommend such modifications.

Two or three external reviewers from the profession or discipline will be chosen to take part in a site visit. Two internal reviewers and a community member will also be selected to join the review team. The Chancellor and his/her staff, the RC head and her/his staff, department heads and interested staff and faculty from related departments, advisory groups, staff, faculty, and students will take part in the review according to a pre-arranged schedule developed by the RC head and/or department head in cooperation with staff in Planning and Institutional Improvement. Participation by those who support the unit as well as those who participate in it and benefit from its offerings serves to emphasize the openness of the review process.

CRITERIA FOR SELF-STUDY

Every effort will be made to standardize the formats of the various requests for information directed to campus units for purposes of planning, resource allocation, and program evaluation, including peer review. Thus several campus offices, including the Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support, will be able to assist staff in the unit undergoing review in assembling information for the self-study.

The self-study outline that follows is meant to be suggestive rather than prescriptive. Each department will have additional information to include and may choose a different order for parts of the narrative

Purposes, Reputation, Aspirations

Brief History of the Unit - Origin and significant events in its development. How does the unit organize its operations and functions? How has this changed over time?

Vision, Mission, and Goals

- Statement of vision and mission, including relationship to the RC and campus missions.

- Specific goals and implementation plans (e.g. business plan and relevant policy statements).

- Evidence of external demands, university and campus needs for the unit.

- Statement of long-term changes envisioned in the field and what the effect will be on the unit.

Resources

Staff

- Who are the staff? What is the function of each within the unit? (an organization chart may be helpful).

- Evidence of staff accomplishments, including participation in campus-wide student initiatives

- Description of criteria for evaluation/reward/recognition of staff

- Resumes for key staff members

- Have any significant staffing or organizational changes taken place in the last five years? How have these changes affected the unit? Have there been any recent changes in leadership? How have these changes affected the unit's operations? its morale? its service orientation?

- What efforts have been made to make the unit more diverse with regard to ethnicity and gender? At what levels in the organization has hiring of minorities and/or females occurred? What has been the pattern of employee retention overall, and by ethnicity and gender?

- How have changes in service delivery required changes in the skills of staff? How are staff being trained, retrained, and developed? What staff development opportunities have been utilized in the past five years?

Program Costs
- Specific analysis of income and expenses associated with the program for the current or most recently completed academic/fiscal year.
- Projected analysis for at least two successive years of program income and expenses with a discussion section tied to any planned or anticipated changes in the program.

Physical Facilities - Overview of the physical environment for the unit, including technologies, other equipment, and supplies.

- How well does the unit's current space meet its needs? Is reallocation or renovation needed to accomplish the unit's goals? What are the unit's long-term space needs?

- How has technology been integrated into the service and administrative functions of the unit? How successful have these efforts been? How has the unit developed hardware, software, and training support? How has the unit addressed security and obsolescence issues?

Implementation Process

- What improvements have been made in the delivery of services from the unit to its constituencies?

- Has the unit implemented any innovative or state-of-the-art approaches to improve its effectiveness and efficiency?

- How does the unit determine who the users are and what the users value? How does the unit assess its users' needs? How flexible is the unit in responding to those needs?

- Are any new services being planned by the unit based upon users' current or anticipated needs? How will these change current unit operations?

- Is there overlap or duplication of services with other units of the campus? How could this be reduced, if appropriate?

- Describe how the program contributes to increased student retention.

- Describe the demand for the programs/services your unit offers

- As applicable, describe how the programs you offer promote the Principles of Undergraduate Learning.

- Describe how the programs or services you offer promote/aid in university research.

- Describe how your programs or services connect to the Metropolitan Indianapolis community and/or enhance your profession.

- Describe any benchmark data from professional associations that you use for analysis of your programs or services (such as financial ratios, levels of service, service ratios, etc.).

Outcomes

- Evidence of demand for your programs/services

- Evidence of quality derived from any surveys (please consult the Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support) or quality improvement efforts

- Evidence of how your programs/services exemplify the principles of good practice in your profession or discipline

- Evidence of the level of achievement of your implementation processes/plans (i.e. comparison of your initial scope, time, cost, and needs/expectations to be met to the actual results).

- Evidence of the ease of use of your programs/services by clients, students, faculty, or staff (Are there established standards? If so, how are those standards met?)

Overall Assessment of Program Strengths and Concerns

Based upon all the foregoing information, what is the unit pleased about and what are its principal concerns? What needs to be improved? What areas should the program emphasize? How does the unit view its future? What are the highest priorities for the next five years?

THE FOLLOW-UP PROCESS

Within a month of the date of the site visit, external and internal reviewers will collaborate to provide a written report summarizing the strengths of the unit and recommending changes if these seem to be warranted. Within six months following receipt of the reviewers' report, the unit staff will draft a written response to the reviewers' report, indicating the actions to be taken to address each recommendation.

The RC head will call a follow-up meeting within a year of the date of the site visit for the purpose of discussing the staff response to the reviewers' report. All appropriate representatives of the campus administration will be invited to this meeting in order to bring to bear all the university resources that are needed to assist the unit in making essential improvements. In subsequent years, the program's progress in each targeted improvement area should be addressed in its annual planning/budgeting review. During the third year following the review, the Program Review and Assessment Committee will schedule a meeting with the department chair for discussion of the longer-term outcomes of the review.