

SAUP Program Review: Final Report Overview

The final program review report should be **concise** and answer basic questions:

- Specifically, how did the committee conduct research in support of the self-study?
- What findings/conclusions were drawn as a result of the research? (What appears to be true about the unit and its constituents, particularly in relation to the unit's mission, vision, and values?) Findings should include statements of apparent fact that are both positive as well as identifying possible areas for improvement.
- What specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-framed recommendations does the committee suggest in concert with the AVP and director to make improvements in the unit's performance?

Perhaps the most important outcome of each program review is a series of report recommendations that become departmental objectives that are entered into and managed through the planning database for the performance improvement of the department for the next 1-4 years.

Section 1: The Executive Summary

*The Executive Summary should be written so that a reader can grasp all of the critical elements of the review. It should be no more than **two** single-spaced pages and include:*

- A brief overview of the program review process
 - Key persons and dates
 - Concise description of research methods (survey, focus groups, etc.). This description does not include the detail that is added for the full report section.
- Findings/Conclusions: These approximately 10 to 25 relevant statements of apparent fact related to the study based on triangulation of/trends from research. Findings may reflect departmental strengths, weaknesses, constituent perceptions, etc. Each finding should be a specific statement that focuses on one primary item. (Avoid "laundry list" findings but use a separate finding for each main item.)

Sample Findings:

- *(The department) has seen an increase of 15% in student satisfaction scores during the past five years.*
 - *(Department) staff members report a high level of morale.*
 - *Key constituents report feeling that the department is understaffed and that that negatively impacts its ability to appropriately serve customers.*
 - *(The department) fell 7% below CAS standards in its assessment of student engagement since the last program review.*
- Recommendations based on findings: This should be approximately 5-10 recommended steps/objectives/initiatives that are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-framed

- Recommendations should reflect the committee's view of what specific steps or initiatives could be taken to improve the department's performance in light of its mission, vision, values and objectives.
- It may be helpful to include contextual comments in specific recommendations, noting for instance if the recommendation arose out of student feedback, the external review, etc.
- Among other things, the report may recommend that the department:
 - Create an initiative for increased spending for the next budget cycle or future budget cycles
 - Draft a proposal for a new position
 - Add, change, or stop a process or procedure
 - Initiate a new approach to assessment of learning
 - Change a customer service approach
 - Adopt a practice or standard based on the national model
 - Do further research or study on a particular issue

Sample Recommendations (5-10):

- *For the next budget cycle, (the department) should submit an initiative for \$22,000 to fund (_____).*
- *By January 15, 2017, (the director) should draft a proposal to the AVP for the acquisition of 1 new full-time Administrative & Professional Faculty position to lead the new (_____) team.*
- *By September 1, 2018, the department should research, draft, finalize, and begin executing an internal strategic communication plan.*
- *By July 1, 2019, the department should enact an assessment plan for (_____).*

Section 2: The Full Report

The full report includes the detail needed so that readers, particularly external readers such as auditors or accreditation-related teams, know that the review was thorough, balanced, and based on valid methodologies. It should include:

- Introductory Statement
 - Write a paragraph to introduce the report to the reader. Let the reader know what to expect in Section 2.
- Overview
 - Detailed description of Program Review
 - Full timeline, what happened when
 - What research methodologies (survey, focus group, peer study, external reviewer, etc.) did the committee choose and why.
 - If there was an external reviewer, describe the process and the reviewer's credentials.
- List the updated mission, vision, values of unit from Self-Study Binder. Those should be the anchor points for findings and recommendations.

- List the key elements of the SWOT analysis from the Self-Study Binder. (Recommendations should have the effect of leveraging the strengths, improving the weaknesses, capitalizing on the opportunities, or anticipating the threats.)
- List the program review committee members (Name, department, committee role, subcommittee responsibility, etc.)
- Research: Introduction to the research completed by the committee. This may be categorized in terms of the various research subcommittees if subcommittees are used.

Research Subcommittee #1

- Description of research (narrative of timeline and process)
- Key findings
- Draft recommendations (if applicable)

Research Subcommittee #2

- Description of research (narrative of timeline and process)
- Key findings
- Draft recommendations (if applicable)

Research Subcommittee #3

- Description of research (narrative of timeline and process)
- Key findings
- Draft recommendations (if applicable)

Director's Response

After the first draft of the report is created, it should be sent to the AVP and director for review. The AVP and director review the report carefully and provide feedback to the committee co-chairs for the improvement of the report. The co-chairs may make improvements to the report based on the AVP/director feedback and/or may include the AVP and/or director responses to certain elements of the report verbatim as added narrative in the report. The AVP, director and co-chairs work together to determine how to incorporate AVP/director feedback into the final version of the report.

Section 3: Appendices

- Appendix A: External Reviewer's Full Report (if applicable)
- Appendix B: Comparison of Department Versus Industry Standard from Self-Study
- Appendix C: Relevant Detailed Assessment Results (if applicable)
- Appendix D: Subcommittee #1 Full Report
- Appendix E: Subcommittee #2 Full Report
- Appendix F: Subcommittee #3 Full Report

Additional appendices may be used to include raw data or other important content.