

**UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES**  
(10/14/11)

**The purpose of the Program Review is to provide the departmental unit with the opportunity to evaluate its operation, to identify ways in which it is functioning well, and to identify areas where functions may be improved—from both an internal and an external view. Recommendations are for this to take place over 10 months in 3 phases, except for Alternate Reviews, which should be completed in 7 months. Reviews are done with the Directors, not enforced upon them.**

**All documentation that needs to be retained and that could be helpful to anyone involved with future UA Program Reviews should be kept on the common drive at this link:**

**N:\UA\UA-Common\UA PROGRAM REVIEWS 2011-2015**

**This allows for a central location for storage of Program Review information as well as providing assistance to those staff members who need Program Review background.**

**Phase 1 – This Self-Study process lasts approximately 6 months (for Alternate Cycle Reviews, it should be 3 months), concluding in a Program Review Report.**

- 1. Notice is given to the director and the unit to be reviewed.**
- 2. A Committee chair or co-chairs are assigned.** Responsibilities of the chairs are to arrange and conduct the meetings as well as seeing that the Program Review Report is completed.
- 3. Committee chairs meet with Senior VP & AVP of that unit.**
  - a. Using timeline from the AVPs, set the schedule and deadlines for each of the 3 Phases.
  - b. The AVP of the unit and the Director of the unit make suggestions to the committee chairs regarding members of the Program Review Committee. The committee should be between 5-7 individuals (but could vary, even smaller for Alternate Cycle Reviews) and may include representatives from the following groups:
    - Within University Advancement (representation within the 4 units)
    - From other divisions
    - Partners within the university
    - Students, Faculty and Faculty Emeriti
    - Alumni, parents, donors and friends
  - c. At this point, the Senior VP can provide direction to the Committee Chair, the AVP, and the Director as to what priorities or specific areas, if any, need to

be covered during the Program Review, and if there are any specific documents required by the SVP to be included in the Program Review.

**4. The goal is to assemble a committee that can provide an informed, objective view for improvements of the unit culminating in a Program Review Report.** Once this discussion has been held, the committee chairs should immediately request participation on the committee, perhaps through a formal letter from the Senior Vice President, and begin arranging committee meetings, even though the first one could be many months away.

**5. Discuss the documents that the unit should include in its Program Review Report to the committee.** Take into consideration the deadline for the submission of this Report, as it should reflect the results of the unit's self-study, including the unit's self-analysis of its strengths, weaknesses, and future improvement plans. Depending on the unit, the Report may include:

- **An organizational chart.**
- **Mission, Vision and Values Statements**
- **Review of Planning Database Goals and Objectives over the past 2 years.**
- **Collection of Budget Information over the past 2 years**
- **Policies & Procedures.** All units should provide up to date, complete policies and procedures. This consists of step-by-step procedures for all primary unit functions. Consider the creation of a Policy Manual if it does not exist.
- **Position descriptions & EWP's.** All units should provide up to date job descriptions for each AP faculty position & EWPs for each classified position.
- **S.W.O.T. Analysis.** Units will conduct & provide results of a SWOT analysis. Members of the unit should work together to form the SWOT analysis.
  - **Strengths:** What are the unit's top 3-5 strengths?
  - **Weaknesses:** What are the unit's most significant 3-5 weaknesses? (This could include being under-staffed, under-budgeted, insufficiently trained, etc.)
  - **Opportunities:** What problems, challenges, changes, external forces exist now or will exist that will provide opportunities to meet new needs, develop new services, etc.
  - **Threats:** What issues threaten the unit's ability to succeed now and in the future?
- **Key constituents.** All units should provide names of major constituents & partners. This will offer lists of key units and key individuals for the committee.
- **Key peer groups & contact information.** There should be a listing of key peer groups at other institutions with contact information. These could be key Virginia institutions or perhaps recognized peer groups of institutions outside the state.
- **Goals and objectives.** All units should include ongoing goals, objectives & initiatives. Focus should be on the present and future rather than past achieved objectives. In addition to the overall unit review, focused reviews on one or two topics or areas may be conducted. Consider these questions: What is currently not part of the operation that should be, and how do we extend this program?

- **Recommendations for an external reviewer.** All units should include the names and contact information for potential external reviewers. This may be discussed at the initial meeting and therefore may not be needed in the report, but could be a part of Phase 2.
- **Current operational and personnel office budget,** as well as budgets from the previous 2-4 fiscal years.
- **Other information** that may be relevant could include budget information, accomplishments with measurable data, internal audit reports, surveys completed, past customer research, and recommendations for questions to be asked as part of customer surveys and focus groups.
- **Program Review Committee chairs are free to require whatever self-study information is needed,** in their view, to provide the most helpful data for making the strongest recommendations for quality improvement, whether they are listed above or not.

**6. Self Study launched.** The unit will be given approximately 6 months to complete the self-study portion of the program review (3 months for Alternative Cycle Reviews). In this way, it can plan its activities, collect data over a period of time, and locate or create the necessary materials for the Program Review Committee in a timely manner.

## **Phase 2. The Program Review Committee process lasts approximately 3 months.**

**1. The Unit delivers all reports, data, and materials to co-chairs.** The work done in Phase 1 should result in the creation of a Report reflecting the self-study activities of the unit.

**2. The Report is distributed to committee members for initial review.** Committee members are encouraged to review the contents of this Report closely.

**3. The committee meets for the first time (suggested 2-3 hours).**

- Overview provided, considering 3 Themes: Organization, Strategy, and Execution. If these subcommittees are utilized, that should be determined prior to the first committee meeting by the Chair and the Director.
- Major issues discussed.
- Subcommittees and subcommittee chairs are selected, if needed. Subcommittees should be designed based on the research that needs to be done.
- Select an External Reviewer if needed. The external review may be conducted during phase 1 with those findings reviewed during phase 2. The External Reviewer could be on campus for 1-2 days, operating separate from the committee.
- Consider further research by the committee to make additional recommendations for improvement of the unit, based on the self-study results.
- Finalize schedule of additional meetings (probably 2-3) during Phase 2.

**4. Sub-committees may consider conducting research.** Research could include such methods as customer focus groups, surveys, personal internal and/or external interviews & peer reviews. The Office of Institutional Research could help Program Review Committees conduct survey research. Any written findings and recommendations would then be provided by Sub-committee chairs to Program Review Committee Chairs.

**5. The object is to concisely report key trends and findings and make relevant recommendations, including assessment of successes and failures.** The Report is compiled and distributed to the AVP, Director of the unit, and Program Review Committee members. It is important at this stage to allow the Director to provide feedback and guidance based on the trends, findings & recommendations in the initial draft of the report.

**6. Final committee meeting (2-4 hours)**

- Response from Director of the unit and/or AVP.
- Discussion of key issues.
- Discussion of major findings, suggestions for editing the final report, adjusting findings, and finalizing recommendations.
- The most important questions the report should address: What is the current quality and level of the unit's performance? What are specific recommendations for improving the unit's performance in the future? Does it need more staff, more funds, better processes, more data, more training, etc?

**7. The Report is sent to the Senior Vice President, AVP and Director of the unit by the committee chairs at least two week prior to the final meeting, to give everyone a chance to review the material prior to the final committee meeting. Following that review, he/she will meet with the AVP, the Director of the unit, the committee chairs, and the committee members to give feedback.**

**Phase 3. The Final process should last no more than 1 month. The Senior Vice President of University Advancement will initially meet with the Committee Chairs and the AVP of the unit to review the Final Report early in Phase 3.**

They will review and evaluate the Final Report's findings, suggested actions, strategy, and determine which recommendations will become objectives, adding those to any existing strategic plan and into the Planning Database. Afterwards, the evaluation should be shared with the appropriate Director by the AVP of the unit and Senior Vice President. This 10 month process of a Program Review (7 months for Alternate Cycle Reviews) is concluded with the final recommendations of the Senior Vice President.