

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY ~ DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

PROGRAM REVIEW MANUAL
Research, Academic Service, and Community Engagement Entities



EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

2001-2011
2004-2005 Update

Last updated: 03/15/04

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	3
Program Review Schedule	3
Components of the Program Review process.....	3
Guidelines for Program Review reports.....	5
Explanation of Program Review ratings.....	6
Outcomes of Program Review.....	8
Conclusion.....	8
.	
APPENDICES	
Appendix A . Report Template ~ Research & Community Engagement Entities.....	9-12
Appendix B . Report Template ~ Library.....	13-15
Appendix C . Report Template ~ Continuing Education.....	16-18
Appendix D . Report Template ~ World College.....	19-21
Appendix E . Executive Overview Template.....	22
Appendix F . Post-Review Improvement Plan Template.....	23

**Program Review at Eastern Michigan University
Research, Academic Service & Community Engagement Entities
2000-2011**

[For a general discussion of the definition, purpose, philosophy, types, goals, and assumptions of program review at Eastern Michigan University, please refer to the most recent version of the Program Review Department Manual.]

The Division of Academic Affairs will maintain a calendar scheduling organized research (centers, institutes, and laboratories), academic service, or community engagement entities for program review. Centers that are subunits of institutes or laboratories will be reviewed as part of the parent unit.

Except for the year in which a full program review is scheduled, less comprehensive annual reports will continue to be required of all organized research units.

The Program Review Schedule

Reviews of research, academic service, or community engagement entities are scheduled in two four-year cycles, with the accreditation self-study and site visit for the Higher Education Commission of the North Central Association (NCA) of Colleges and Schools anchoring the schedule during the ninth and tenth years.

When circumstances warrant, the Provost, the Associate Provost, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, the Dean, or the senior administrator of the unit may request more frequent reviews of a unit.

The Provost's Office is responsible for the program review schedule. The Associate Provost, in consultation with the administrators supervising the units, will propose a schedule for the Provost's approval. All requests for variance from the master schedule shall be addressed to the Provost. A master schedule of reviews will be maintained at all times, with copies distributed to the supervising administrators, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, and unit directors at the beginning of each fiscal year.

Components of the Program Review Process

The Program Review process takes place over the course of a year and a half. The process begins during the winter term one year prior to the date the reports are due to the Associate Provost. The Program Review process is broken down into six phases: workshops, report compilation, executive assessment, campus comment, ratings, and follow-up.

1. Workshops

Workshops presenting Program Review expectations and the process will be conducted by the Academic Programming staff separately with each research, academic service, and community engagement entity. All those who will be directly involved with the compilation of each unit's report(s) should attend the workshops.

2. Report Compilation

Directors or other senior administrator are responsible for conducting the review of their research, academic service, or community engagement entity, including all subunits. All reviews should be conducted with the full participation of all faculty and staff involved in the unit's programs and services.

The director or other senior administrator will write the report and make recommendations regarding the improvement and future direction of the research, academic service, or community engagement entity. The program review document should follow one of the templates provided in the appendices of this document. The final submission should also include an executive assessment where appropriate, to be completed by the executive administrator for the research, academic service, or community engagement entity being reviewed.

It is essential that the main text of the program review document be succinct; not to exceed 50 pages, excluding appendices. Units may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or other evidence if they believe the additional material will enhance understanding of the unit, in the form of appendices.

3. Executive Assessment

The director or other senior administrator of the research, academic service, or community engagement entity is responsible for forwarding the program review materials, supporting documents and recommendations to the unit's executive administrator (Department Head, Dean, Associate Vice President for Extended Programs, etc. as appropriate), who will assess the Program Review report and recommend a rating for the unit. The recommended rating will correlate with one of the four outcomes discussed later in the manual.

4. Campus Comment

The documents will be distributed to interested parties across campus for review and comment. The unit will then participate in an open discussion, to include the unit's director or senior administrator and staff, the Provost, the Associate Provost, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research and any other interested parties.

5. Ratings

After the open discussion, the Associate Provost and the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, where appropriate, will review and evaluate all materials and recommend a rating for each research, academic service, or community engagement entity according to the scale in the next section. The recommended ratings will reflect the program's viability, value, quality, effectiveness, and efficient use of resources. It will include not only a narrative justifying the rating of the program, but also a recommendation to the Provost's Office for any follow-up actions required.

The Provost will review the recommended rating for each research, academic service, or community engagement entity, along with all materials that formed the basis of the recommendation, including but not limited to feedback from interested parties and notes from the open discussions. A final rating will be assigned based on review and analysis of the available information.

6. Follow Up

The Provost will include, in the final rating document, specific follow up for programs rated (2) *Continuation with Specific Changes*, (3) *Probation*, or (4) *Phase Out*. Responsibility for oversight and monitoring of follow up activities is outlined in the explanation of program ratings.

Guidelines for Program Review Reports

The following guidelines should be used in conducting program reviews:

- The report will be goal oriented. Specific goals should be stated for the unit and the attainment of those goals should be the focus of the report. The goals should reflect the university's mission and any relevant departmental, college, divisional, or crosscutting strategic plans.
- The report will be forward-looking. It will focus not only on where the unit has been but also on where it wishes to go (its goals). Using data provided to or generated by the unit, it will analyze and assess whether the goals are appropriate to the needs of stakeholders, sponsors, and the University's mission.
- The focus of the report will be on analysis rather than on description. The report will evaluate progress toward unit goals rather than merely document the status of the unit. It will analyze all available data, both quantitative and qualitative, that have been provided to or generated by the unit, to assess progress in meeting its goals.
- The report will evaluate the unit as a whole. The focus will be on the unit, not on individual activities of the unit to the exclusion of others.

- Recommendations will be expressed in terms of action. Recommendations for action will indicate who will do what specific tasks, when, and for what purpose.
- The program review process will be continuous. With appropriate input from unit staff, the director, related administrators, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, the Associate Provost, and the Division of Academic Affairs will continuously monitor the health of the unit.

Explanation of Program Review Ratings

The Program Review process will result in one of four ratings for each research, academic service, or community engagement entity:

- (1) Continuation.
- (2) Continuation with specific changes.
- (3) Probation.
- (4) Phase out.

The Provost will assign a rating to all participating research, academic service, or community engagement entities at the close of each rotation of Program Review. The ratings assigned by the Provost will include specific follow up actions and due dates. Each rating requires a different level of follow up, outlined below:

(1) Continuation

If the Provost assigns a Program Review rating of *(1) Continuation*, the unit will be reviewed in the next four-year cycle, and no specific follow-up action will be required, aside from normal continuous improvement activities and annual reporting requirements.

(2) Continuation with specific changes

If the Provost assigns a *(2) Continuation with specific changes*, the unit will not be reviewed again until the next four-year program review cycle, but the director or senior administrator will supervise the writing and implementation of a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan within three months (90 days) of the receipt of the Program Review rating. The purpose of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan will be to respond to the concerns highlighted in the Program Review final ratings, propose improvements, and develop a timeline for implementing the recommended improvements.

When the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is completed, the director or senior administrator will send the report to the executive administrator for the research, academic service, or community engagement entity. The executive administrator will determine if the planned corrective actions are consistent with the unit's goals, as described in the Program Review report, as well as the requirements assigned by the Provost, deciding if the plan should be approved and implemented.

Once a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is adopted, the director or senior administrator will monitor the plan's implementation and report to the executive administrator for the research, academic service, or community engagement entity quarterly, in writing, on progress made. After receiving progress reports from the director or senior administrator, the executive administrator will summarize these reports, in writing to the Associate Provost or the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, at the end of each academic year. This information will be integrated into the annual report to the Board of Regents on the previous year's program reviews.

(3) Probation

For research, academic service, or community engagement entities that are rated (3) *Probation*, the director or senior administrator for the unit, along with staff and faculty where the unit is based, will be given 30 days to respond, in writing, to the Provost. If it is decided the unit will go on probation, the director or senior administrator will supervise the writing and implementation of a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan within three months (90 days). The plan will include a detailed timeline, not to exceed three years, to eliminate the deficiencies noted in the Program Review.

When the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is completed, the director or senior administrator will send the report to the executive administrator for the unit. The executive administrator will determine if recommendations adopted in the report are consistent with the unit's goals as described in the Program Review report and the requirements assigned by the Provost, and decide if the plan should be approved and implemented.

Once a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is approved, the research, academic service, or community engagement entity staff will have direct access to the Academic Programming, Undergraduate Studies, and Graduate Studies and Research staffs to assist where needed with implementation of the plan. Those research, academic service, or community engagement entities in need of assistance will be a priority concern for any services required.

The research, academic service, or community engagement entity on probation will also conduct Program Review *annually* until noted deficiencies are rectified. The executive administrator will report to the Associate Provost or the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research quarterly, in writing, on progress made in the implementation of the Post-Review Improvement Plan. After receiving progress reports from the executive administrator, the Associate Provost or the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research will summarize these reports in discussion with the Provost. This information will be integrated into the annual report to the Board of Regents on Program Review.

(4) Phase Out

If a research, academic service, or community engagement entity is rated (4) *Phase Out*, the director or senior administrator for the unit, along with staff and faculty where the unit is based, will be given 30 days to respond in writing, to the Provost. Subsequently, if the Provost maintains that the unit will be phased out, the director or senior administrator will supervise the

writing and implementation of a detailed transition plan, due to the Associate Provost or the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, no later than 30 days after the final decision is made. This plan should address the following:

- An appropriate method for dispersing, reallocating, or transferring current funds, equipment, facilities, or other resources that may be specifically tied to the unit.
- An outline of outstanding projects and commitments and how and when they will be resolved.
- An outline and a timeline for the institutionally related administrative tasks that must be undertaken to officially phase out a research, academic service, or community engagement entity.
- If phase out is implemented, any assigned faculty, lecturers, and staff will be reassigned, retrained, or terminated based on stipulations in the Eastern Michigan University AAUP, Federation of Teachers, UAW 1976, and UAW 1975 contracts. It is the responsibility of the Office of Academic Human Resources to ensure that contractual issues are appropriately managed.

Once a Phase Out plan is adopted, the executive administrator will report to the Associate Provost quarterly, in writing, on progress made on the phase out action. After receiving progress reports from the executive administrator, the Associate Provost will summarize these reports in discussion with the Provost. This information will be integrated into the annual report to the Board of Regents on Program Review.

While under development, program reviews, post-review program improvement plans, external reviews, and related reports will be regarded as confidential; essentially, this means that they should be distributed within defined communities and not made generally accessible.

Outcomes of Program Review

Program review results will have budgetary implications. According to the following guidelines, resources may be allocated, where justified, for the improvement or enhancement of research, academic service, or community engagement entities. The Associate Provost may determine, subject to the approval of the Provost, the recipients of these allocations.

The Provost's office may provide funding for improving research, academic service, or community engagement entities that have been recommended for Continuation with Specific Changes or for Probation. (Centers are not eligible for base funding.) The decision to provide funding will be based on the unit's viability, effectiveness, and relation to the University's mission. Additional resources may be available to make good units better. Decisions to award additional funding will be based on the unit's quality, effectiveness, efficient use of resources, and potential for added value to the university.

Conclusion

Strong academic programs are augmented by the various research, academic service, and community engagement entities at Eastern Michigan University. They are fundamental building blocks of a progressive, vibrant, and responsive learning environment. The purpose of Program Review is to enhance the learning environment of Eastern Michigan University, thereby maximizing each student, staff and faculty member's opportunity for success.

Appendix A
Program Review Report Template
Research and Community Engagement Entities

I. MISSION. State the mission of the research, academic service, or community engagement entity.

II. GOALS.

- A. Describe the goals of the research, academic service, or community engagement entity.
 - 1. How and by whom were these goals determined?
 - 2. Have they changed since the last unit review? If so, why and how? If not, why?
 - 3. What is the relationship to the University's mission and strategic directions, and strategic initiatives of the division, college, and/or related units and crosscutting committees?
 - 4. What is the relationship to the needs of the unit's constituencies (people served by the unit's activities, including sponsors)?
- B. How do you measure attainment of the above goals?

III. OBJECTIVES.

- A. List specific objectives for the unit during the period under review.
 - 1. How does each objective support the unit's goals?
 - 2. Who was responsible for achieving each objective, and by what date?
- B. To what extent was each objective achieved or not achieved by the due date?
 - 1. What remains to be done?
 - 2. If the objective was not achieved, explain why.
- C. Report evidence showing how the objectives respond to emerging issues for the unit (e.g., developments in the discipline, new knowledge, changes in the labor force, changes in employer needs, changes in the funding priorities of sponsors, etc.).

IV. INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE.

- A. Instruction.
 - 1. If appropriate to the mission and goals, describe and assess any training or instructional activities sponsored by the unit.
 - 2. For credit programs, indicate the amount of credit (SCH) by year produced by each program.
 - 3. For noncredit programs, indicate per year the number of persons served and hours of training provided.
 - 4. Describe the delivery system for each program (type and location, clientele, extent of online instruction, subcontracts to vendors, etc.).

B. Research.

1. Describe and assess the research, scholarly or creative activity of the unit.
2. How many and which grants or contracts specifically required research?
3. Indicate whether the level of scholarly activity is satisfactory and, if not, describe plans to increase the level of activity.
4. List any peer-reviewed publications, presentations, or other disseminated scholarly product that resulted directly from research performed by the unit.
5. Describe the involvement of faculty and students with research, scholarly, or creative activity within the unit.

C. Service. Describe and assess any service the unit has provided to the university, local community, region, state, nation, and world.

1. Provide evidence that the unit has served the needs of its sponsors and beneficiaries.
2. Support of academic units. With which academic units did the unit collaborate during the review period?
 - a) Describe and assess the nature of the collaboration.
 - b) Was it mutually beneficial?
 - c) What conflicts arose, if any, and how were they resolved?
3. To what extent did the unit share the benefits of sponsored projects and other unit activity with collaborating departments (e.g., credit, indirect cost recovery, recognition)?
4. Briefly summarize efforts made by the unit to support the instructional, research, and service obligations of faculty who worked for the unit, and their progress toward tenure and promotion.

V. INFRASTRUCTURE.

A. Organization.

1. Describe and assess the organizational structure and current staffing of the unit.
2. List all faculty and staff who provided work for the unit during the review period, and their roles, compensation, and contribution.
3. If applicable, describe and list members of advisory committees (function, frequency of meetings, etc.).
4. Is the organizational structure adequate to fulfill the unit's mission and accomplish its goals?

B. Location.

1. Describe and assess the unit's physical location and work environment (if space is rented, include square footage and rental cost).
2. Is it convenient and accessible to stakeholders?
3. Is it attractive? Functional? Efficient?

C. Equipment.

1. Describe and assess any major equipment items controlled by the unit.
2. What are the unit's most pressing equipment needs (include an itemized budget and

acquisition plan)?

D. Marketing.

1. Describe efforts to publicize the services and accomplishments of the unit among stakeholders and potential clients.
2. Describe efforts to cultivate sponsor support and positive relations with actual and potential sponsors.
3. Attach as an appendix any marketing materials (brochures, posters, displays, event programs, etc.) that were used during the review period.
4. Describe number of copies, distribution, audience, etc.
5. Assess the marketing efforts made during the review period.
 - a) What was effective and what was not?
 - b) What new approaches are needed, if any?

VI. COST EFFECTIVENESS.

A. Unit Cost.

1. Provide the unit budget for each year under review, including internal and external funding sources in separate columns.
2. Describe how funds were used for each year by budget category (personnel, SSM, travel, equipment, other).
3. Note and explain any significant year-end deficits or surpluses.
4. State by year the amount of indirect-cost recovery distributed to unit accounts.
5. Describe how indirect-cost revenues are used to advance the goals of the unit.
6. Describe unit goals to offload administrative costs onto non-federal grants or contracts, and onto federal grants where costs are project related in a direct way.
7. How successful has the unit been in meeting these goals?

B. List of Proposals Submitted.

1. Provide a complete list of proposals submitted for external funding during the period under review.
2. Include only those proposals submitted directly by the unit through ORD.
3. Include proposal title, ORD transmittal number, sponsor, amount requested, name

of

principal investigator, project period, date submitted, and outcome (funded, not funded, pending).

C. List of Awards.

1. Provide a complete list of external grants/contracts awarded during the period under review.
2. Include only those proposals submitted through ORD.
 - a) Include proposal title, ORD transmittal number, sponsor, amount awarded, indirect cost recovery, institutional matching funds, name of principal investigator, and date of award. Include total figures by year for awards, indirect cost, and matching funds.

D. Other Income.

1. Describe any other income generated by the unit during the evaluation period (e.g. gifts, fees, tuition from short courses, training, etc.).

E. Fundraising and Friend-Raising.

1. What efforts has the unit made to cultivate philanthropic support of the unit?
2. What has been the result of these efforts?
3. Describe efforts to cultivate donors and partners.
4. What new relationships and opportunities for the University has the unit identified during the evaluation period?
5. Describe the unit's relationship with the EMU Foundation.

F. Cost-Benefit Analysis.

1. Assess the cost-effectiveness of the unit.
2. Evaluate the benefits and value provided by the unit (to the University and to its stakeholders) in relation to unit cost.
3. Include here any benefits unrelated to grants and gifts (e.g., awards, recognition, community service, support of students and student learning, patents, licenses, copyrights, public relations, and so on).

VII. RESOLUTION OF ISSUES.

A. Internal Review.

1. Describe any recommendations that were made as a result of the last internal program review.
2. Describe how the unit has responded to each recommendation.

B. Mandates/Concerns.

1. Describe any concerns raised by the institution's accrediting body, state, or federal requirements, etc. (e.g. requirements for federally funded grants, NCA, etc.)
2. Describe any concerns raised by a professional association, advisory board, etc. (e.g. an outside entity that you choose to participate with).

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE.

- A. What steps should be taken to strengthen the unit?
- B. How can quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency, and resource value be improved?
- C. Should the unit be expanded, maintained at the current level, downsized, eliminated, restructured, or merged with another unit? Provide a brief rationale for the recommendation.

APPENDICES. Units may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the program.

Appendix B
Program Review Report Template
Library

I. MISSION.

- A. Goals.
- B. Objectives.
- C. What is your relationship to the University Mission and the Strategic Plan?
- D. What is your role on campus?
- E. What is your interface with academic departments and other service areas?
- F. Policies.

II. ORGANIZATION AND RESOURCES.

- A. How are you organized?
- B. Describe your resources.
 - 1. Human.
 - a) Faculty.
 - b) AP/CS/PT.
 - c) FM.
 - 2. Describe your facilities and equipment.
 - a) Are your facilities and equipment adequate?
 - b) What are your facility and equipment needs?
 - 3. Financial.
 - a) Budget information.
 - b) Assess your ability to address the various strengths and weaknesses with the available resources.
 - 1) How well are you funded to achieve your goals?
 - 2) Identify cost or funding concerns.

III. PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.

- A. Collection development.
 - 1. Monographs.
 - 2. Journals.
 - 3. Indexes and databases.
 - 4. Miscellaneous resources.
- B. Technical Services.
- C. User Services.
 - 1. Reference services.
 - 2. Instruction services.
 - 3. Client services.
 - 4. Circulation.
 - 5. Reserves.

6. Inter-library loans.
7. Liaison activities.
8. Faculty instructional support (audio/visual).
9. Facility management.
10. Technology support (internal).

IV. OUTREACH.

- A. Web site.
 1. What is its purpose?
 2. Is it current?
 3. How often is it updated?
 4. Is it intuitive?
 5. Does it answer basic questions?
 6. Are there use friendly links to student services, etc.?
 7. Is the format/layout approved by University Marketing?
 8. Has there been any effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the website?
- B. Community activities and involvement.
 1. Does the service entity participate in community activities?
 2. How do they benefit students/program/community?
- C. Fundraising/development.
 1. What contacts have the service entity made and developed?
 2. What success has the service entity had in obtaining gifts?
- D. Advisory committees.
 1. Does the service entity have one? If not, what efforts are begin made to establish one?
 2. How is it used?
 3. What role does it play? Are there plans to increase the role?
 4. How does the service entity benefit?
 5. What suggestions of feedback have they provided?
- E. Relationships.
 1. Internal.
 - a) Academic departments.
 - b) Faculty.
 - c) ICT.
 2. External.
 - a) Public libraries.
 - b) Other universities.
 - c) Other research resources (e.g. www2, etc.)

V. EVALUATION.

- A. Based on your goals and objectives.
 1. How are we doing?
 2. What are our strengths?

3. What are our weaknesses?
4. What improvements can be made?
 - a) Statistics.
 - b) Surveys.
 - c) Usage.
 - d) User feedback.

VI. EFFECTIVENESS.

- A. Benchmarking.
- B. Identify and discuss 3-4 similar libraries from other institutions.
 1. Who do you compare yourself with?
 2. What are your markers of quality?
 3. How are they similar/different from you?
 4. How do they achieve their educational mission?
 5. How effective are their techniques?
 6. What is successful and what is not?
 7. Do you consider them to be your competition? Why/why not?
 8. Are they members of the same professional associations and/or accrediting bodies?

VII. CONCERNS.

- A. Identify specific needs.
 1. Personnel.
 2. Budget.
 3. Programmatic.
 4. Services.
 5. Facilities.
 6. Policies.
- B. Discuss ongoing issues and concerns that you must deal with on a frequent or regular basis.
- C. Share any suggestions or solutions to handle these areas.

VIII. NEXT STEPS.

- A. Recommended directions.
 1. Based on what you have learned.
 2. What steps to strengthen?
 3. How can quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency, and resource values be improved?
- B. Identify 3-5 priorities to accomplish before the next cycle of Program Review.

APPENDICES. Units may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the program. These materials might include, but are not limited to:

- Marketing pieces.

- Brochures.
- Training materials.
- Surveys.
- Faculty vitae.
- Screen capture of your web site.

Appendix C
Program Review Report Template
Continuing Education

I. MISSION.

- A. Mission statement.
- B. Values and operating principles.
- C. Goals and objectives.
- D. Relationship to the University Mission and Strategic Plan.

II. ORGANIZATION & RESOURCES.

- A. Describe the organization and its resources.
- B. Organizational chart.
- C. Organizational model.
- D. Financial model.
- E. Facilities and equipment.

III. PROGRAMS & SERVICES.

- A. Off-campus programs:
 - 1. Regional sites.
 - 2. International.
 - 3. Corporate.
 - 4. Alternative formats.
- B. Distance Education:
 - 1. EMU-Online.
 - 2. Independent Learning.
- C. Non-Credit programs:
 - 1. Workforce Education.
 - 2. Contract training.
 - 3. Open enrollment programs.
 - 4. Online training.
- D. Partnering:
 - 1. Summerquest.
 - 2. Elderquest.
 - 3. Eastern Scholars.
 - 4. APA support.

5. Conferences.
- E. Services & Infrastructure:
 1. Accounting/Payroll.
 2. Marketing.
 3. APA support.
 4. Program planning.
 5. Data analysis.
 6. Environmental scanning/demand analysis.
 7. Program development support.
 8. Web enhanced tools, training & support.
 9. Contract development and negotiation.
 10. Grant administration
- F. Student & Faculty Services:
 1. Program tracking.
 2. Advising.
 3. Retention.
 4. Recruiting.
 5. CE admit.
 6. Library services.
 7. Lecturer/Faculty support.

IV. OUTREACH & RELATIONSHIPS.

- A. Internal.
 1. Advisory Boards.
 - a) Urban Teacher Certification (UTC) advisory board.
 - b) Parson's Board.
 2. Office of Community College Relations.
 3. Academic departments.
 4. Library.
 5. Office of Enrollment Services.
 6. Participation in campus events.
- B. External.
 1. Web site.
 2. Community College partnerships.
 3. Community activities and involvement:
 4. K12/ISD.
 5. Chamber of Commerce.
 6. Leadership Ypsilanti.
 7. Fundraising and development.

V. EVALUATION.

- A. Based on your goals and objectives use:
 1. Statistics.

2. Surveys.
3. Anecdotal evidence.
4. Other feedback.
5. Benchmark & best practices.

VI. EFFECTIVENESS.

- A. How are you doing?
- B. What are your strengths?
- C. What are your weaknesses?
- D. What improvements can be made?

VII. CONCERNS.

- A. Identify specific concerns.
 1. Opportunities.
 2. Threats.
- B. Discuss ongoing issues and concerns that you must deal with on a frequent or regular basis.

VIII. NEXT STEPS.

- A. Recommended directions.
 1. Based on what you have learned.
 2. What steps to strengthen?
 3. How can quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency, and resource values be improved?
- B. Next steps: Identify 3-5 priorities to accomplish before the next cycle of Program Review.

APPENDICES. Units may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the program. These materials might include, but are not limited to:

- Promotional materials.
- Training materials.
- Surveys.
- Screen capture of your web site.
- List of memberships & associations.
- Any other appropriate supporting documentation.

Appendix D
Program Review Report Template
World College

I. MISSION.

- A. Goals.
- B. Objectives.
- C. What is your relationship to the University Mission and the Strategic Plan?
- D. What is your role on campus?
- E. What is your interface with academic departments and other service areas?

II. ORGANIZATION & RESOURCES. Describe the organization and its resources.

- A. Organizational chart.
- B. Organizational model.
- C. Financial model.
- D. Facilities and equipment.

III. PROGRAMS & SERVICES.

- A. Programs.
- B. Linkages.
 - 1. Active student exchanges.
 - 2. Partnerships.
- C. Collaboration with academic departments.
- D. Faculty development & support.
- E. Student support.
 - 1. Exchange student assistance.
 - 2. Study abroad advising.
 - a) General.
 - b) Program specific.
- F. Conferences/seminars/workshops.
- G. Publications/newsletters.
 - 1. Global Dimensions.
 - 2. Focus.
 - 3. Study Abroad Newsletter.
- H. Special projects and events.
 - 1. Hosting foreign guests.
 - 2. International week.
 - 3. World Scholars Reception.
 - 4. Tali project.
 - 5. Colors in Harmony.

IV. OUTREACH.

- A. Campus.
 - 1. Colleges, academic departments, and faculty.
 - 2. International student services.
 - 3. Admissions.
 - 4. Housing.
 - 5. Registration.
 - 6. Student accounting.
 - 7. General accounting.
 - 8. Media services.
 - 9. Public information.
- B. International partnerships.
 - 1. Investigating opportunities/launching new partnerships.
 - 2. Maintaining and enhancing existing partnerships.
- C. Participation in campus events.
- D. Web site:
 - 1. What is its purpose?
 - 2. Is it current? How often is it updated?
 - 3. Is the format/layout approved by University Marketing?
 - 4. Has there been any effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the website?
- E. Community activities and involvement.
 - 1. Does the service entity participate in community activities?
 - 2. Describe the links to local school systems, community colleges, domestic and international partners.
 - 3. How do they benefit students/program/community?
- F. Fundraising/development.
 - 1. What contacts have the service entity made and developed?
 - 2. What success has the service entity had in obtaining gifts?
 - 3. What grant activity has taken place?
 - 4. What is the purpose?
 - 5. What are the outcomes?
- G. Advisory committees.
 - 1. Does the service entity have one? If not, what efforts are being made to establish one?
 - 2. What role does it play? Are there plans to increase the role?
 - 3. How does the service entity benefit?
 - 4. What suggestions or feedback have they provided?

V. EVALUATION. Based on your goals and objectives use:

- A. Statistics.
- B. Surveys.
- C. Anecdotal evidence.
- D. Other feedback.

E. Benchmark & best practices.

VI. EFFECTIVENESS.

- A. How are you doing?
- B. What are your strengths?
- C. What are your weaknesses?
- D. What improvements can be made?

VII. CONCERNS.

- A. Identify specific needs.
 1. Personnel.
 2. Financing/budget.
 3. Programmatic.
 4. Services.
 5. Facilities.
- B. Discuss ongoing issues and concerns that you must deal with on a frequent or regular basis.
- C. Share any suggestions or solutions to handle these areas.

VIII. NEXT STEPS.

- A. Recommended directions.
- B. Based on what you have learned.
 1. What steps to strengthen?
 2. How can quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency, and resource values be improved?
- C. Next steps: Identify 3-5 priorities to accomplish before the next cycle of Program Review.

APPENDICES. Units may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the program. These materials might include, but are not limited to:

- Informational material.
- Application packets.
- Brochures.
- Screen capture of your web site.
- Any other appropriate supporting documentation.

Appendix E

Program Review Executive Overview Template

I. GOALS & OBJECTIVES. How do the goals and objectives of the unit reinforce the divisional and University mission and strategic direction?

II. ORGANIZATIONAL PHILOSOPHY.

- A. Describe the organizational philosophy for the unit.
- B. Explain the role of the unit to the University mission and strategic direction.
- C. Describe the benefit of the unit's activities to the University.

III. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS.

- A. To assist in future Program Review efforts, describe the process within the unit.
- B. How was the report developed?
- C. Who wrote the report?
- D. How was workload addressed?
- E. How long did the process take?
- F. What suggestions do you have to improve the process?

IV. ISSUES & CONCERNS.

- A. Describe the strengths & weaknesses of the unit.
 - 1. How do they affect the unit?
 - 2. What improvements can be made?
- B. Identify specific needs the unit may have.
- C. Discuss ongoing issues and concerns that the unit must deal with on a frequent or regular basis.
- D. Share any suggestions or solutions to handle these areas.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDED RATING. Summarize your comments and provide a recommended rating and suggested follow up activities for the unit, based on the ratings outlined in the Program Review manual.

Appendix F

The Post-Review Program Improvement Plan

I. SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REVIEW RATING AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

- A. Describe the research, academic service, or community engagement entity that was reviewed.
- B. State the recommendations that were made for the unit.
- C. State any difference in recommendations made by the Provost, the Associate Provost, or senior administrator.

II. ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROGRAM REVIEW.

- A. Which recommendations from the program review are to be adopted? If different, which recommendations from the Provost, the Associate Provost, or the senior administrator will be adopted? State the rationale for not adopting any recommendation.
- B. Indicate which planned changes in the unit derive all or in part from the program review, a prior unit review, or an external review. When possible, reference document cited by page and line number.
- C. Describe the planned corrective actions. Is there a consensus concerning the corrective changes that need to be taken? Include the views from those who could not reach a consensus in a supporting addendum.

III. STEPS TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS.

- A. Provide a timeline of changes that will occur in the unit.
- B. Describe the steps that can be implemented immediately to improve the unit. Explain each of these steps in detail and identify the individual/committee that will oversee each step.
- C. Outline the steps that can be completed by the end of one year, and after years two and three. Describe each step and identify the person/committee that will be responsible for each step.
- D. Express the long-term outcomes expected in five years if the program improvement plan is successful. What long-term outcomes are expected in 10 years?

IV. RESOURCE REALLOCATION.

- A. Describe any internal unit resources that will need to be reallocated in order to implement the adopted recommendations.
- B. Describe any external resources that will be needed in order to implement the adopted recommendations.

V. ASSESSMENT OF THE POST-REVIEW PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN.

- A. Describe how the outcome of the adopted unit changes will be evaluated. State the results that define a successful or unsuccessful outcome.

- B. Describe how incorporation of the improvement will strengthen the unit. Explain how unit quality, productivity, satisfaction, and resource value will be improved.