Ohio University

Program Review Guide

Charge to the department

Division of Student Affairs

SUMMER 2021

*Subject to change*

Introduction

The purpose of program review is to improve the quality of departments, division, and the institution as a whole. The review provides each department an opportunity to reflect, self-assess, and plan for the future. The process facilitates in-depth communication between the department and senior leadership and informs future planning and decision-making. By stimulating department or program planning and encouraging department-based strategic planning, the program review process can advance OHIO’s overall mission.

Program review in the Division of Student Affairs at Ohio University emphasizes:

* Involvement of all department staff to accurately portray the varied experiences of the department across all stages of organizational membership and function.
* Collaboration within and across the OHIO community to craft a reflective self-study review, including applicable data and information
* Conversations about the future of the department with DOSA leadership, emphasizing improvement, planning, decision-making, and resource allocation

Program reviews aim to generate a sense of shared purpose and connection to the campus mission and reinforce the need for coordinated planning for the future. In doing so, the program review process intentionally involves several key stakeholders:

* Staff, faculty, students, and other stakeholders undergoing review: this provides an opportunity for those directly involved in the department to assess its strengths and areas for improvement
* The involvement of the Dean, Assistant or Associate Dean of Students, VPSA, campus leadership, and administrators: ensures that meaningful and effective follow-up for each review will occur
* The involvement of staff or faculty from other units on campus: promotes campus-wide understanding of the contributions of each department to the mission of the institution
* The involvement of program reviewers from the same line of work: offers peer review and input on strengthening the department’s purpose, reputation, and future direction

**Committee Composition**

The review committee is typically composed of 1-3 persons external to Ohio University and 1-2 persons from within the institution (but outside of DOSA), plus 1-2 community members. One of the external reviewers will chair the committee.

The department will suggest (a) up to three external reviewers, (b) one to two internal reviewers external to DOSA, and (c) one community member to serve on the external review committee. External reviewers should be experts in the field of the department under review and should be from aspirational institutions i.e. from departments at other institutions the department aspires to emulate, or a community member for the departments where it makes sense. The internal reviewer could be a campus partner or aspirational campus partner, or have some other connection to the department. The internal reviewer(s) will provide context on Ohio University and the department under review for the external reviewers. The community member should have some relevancy to the review but not a conflict of interest with participating in the review.

The departmental director and Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment will submit a list of potential reviewers to the Vice President for approval. Upon final confirmation of reviewers, the Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment and department director will formally invite the reviewers to participate in the review process.

Review Schedule 2021-2026

Ohio University’s Division of Student Affairs reviews all departments on a 5-year cycle.

2021

* Dean of Students
* Community Standards and Student Responsibility
* Campus Involvement Center

2022

* Housing and Residence Life
* Conference and Event Services

2023

* Counseling and Psychological Services
* Conference and Event Services

2024

* Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

2025

* Survivor Advocacy Program (last conducted spring 2019)
* Office of Sorority and Fraternity Life (last conducted spring 2019)
* Culinary Services (last conducted spring 2019)

2026

* Division of Student Affairs review (last conducted fall 2018)

Overview of the Review Process

Within each cycle of program review, there are several key events. These main components are listed below.

**Kick-off Meeting**

Six to twelve months prior to the site visit, the Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment convenes a meeting to provide an overview of the review process. Specifically, a) work with the department leadership to provide an overview of the review process; b) draft a list of questions that the department hopes the review will address; c) discuss the self-study and identify which standards will guide it; d) brainstorm reviewers.

This meeting will typically include the department head, their supervisor, the Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment, and anyone else pertinent to the conversation.

**Self-Study**

The department prepares a report that addresses the points outlined in the Standards for Program Review, stated later in this document. All staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students who work for the department should have the opportunity to contribute to the self-study. The Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment is available to provide analytical support and liaison to the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

The department will save a copy of the completed self-study and share it with the Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment. The deadline to submit the self-study will be determined at the kick-off meeting. The Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment must approve any deviation from this deadline.

**(Optional) Follow-up Meeting(s)**

Initiated by the department leader, follow-up meetings can occur to prepare or review the draft self-study. For example, the department can meet with their supervisor to review the developing self-study and seek feedback; or with the Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment to review and discuss relevant data.

**Site Visit and Committee Report**

The review committee will conduct a one or two-day visit to gather input from staff, faculty, students, and administrators. The visit will be digital or in-person. Within one to two months of the campus visit, the reviewers collaborate to produce a written report summarizing the strengths of the department and recommending changes where appropriate. The reviewers also address any questions posed by the department in the self-study process or document.

**Follow-up Meeting**

The Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment will convene a follow-up meeting with the department within two to eight months of the date of the site visit, for the purpose of discussing the department’s response to the reviewers’ report. All appropriate representatives are invited to this meeting in order to bring to bear all the campus resources needed to assist in making essential improvements.

**Department Response**

After the follow-up meeting, the department will draft a written response to the reviewers’ report, indicating the actions to be taken to address each recommendation for which action is warranted. This is submitted to the Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment and will be displayed online.

Roles and Responsibilities

Responsibilities for key persons involved in program review are detailed below.

Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment

* 6-12 months prior
  + Schedules kick-off meeting with department leader. During meeting, answer any questions, discuss aims and focus for the review, and data. Following the meeting Director will initiate any data that needs requested from Institutional Research and Effectiveness.
* 10-12 weeks prior
  + Director reviews the draft self-study and emails comments and suggestions to department leader within two weeks of receipt of it.
* 2-8 months after
  + Director schedules a debrief meeting with department leader and key leadership to discuss and define next steps.

Department leader and department

* 6-12 months prior:
  + Department leader works with department to identify a list of possible external and internal reviewers; sends list to Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment and VPSA for consideration and review.
  + Invite the reviewers to participate in the review, after approval
  + Work with VPSA to contact possible external and internal reviewers
  + Once review committee is in place, notify all constituents involved of review dates.
  + Book travel, meeting rooms, and hotel for external reviewers
  + Write self-study
* 7-10 weeks prior
  + Finalize agenda for site visit and share it with review team members and relevant campus constituents involved in the process
  + Confirm travel details with external reviewers
  + Send self-study, schedule, team list, this document, and any other relevant information to review team, Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment, and Office of the VPSA.
  + Coordinate meals for site visit.
* During site visit
  + Facilitate visit.
* 1 week after site visit
  + Works with VPSA to send thank-you letters/emails and requests information to complete reimbursements and receipts for included out-of-pocket expenses.
  + Process travel reimbursements for teams and remits hotel and food bills. DO NOT process honorarium until report is received.

Program Review Committee Chair

* 1-2 weeks before site visit
  + Facilitate a pre-visit communication with the program review committee, team introduces itself, discusses initial questions, and plan for site visit
* 1-2 months after site visit
  + Coordinate and submit final report to department leader and Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment

Program Review Committee

* 3-6 weeks prior to site visit
  + Receives electronic copy of department self-study.
* 1 week after site visit
  + Turn in any travel receipts to department coordinator for reimbursement, as applicable.
* 1-2 months after site visit
  + Reviewers send final report to department leader and Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment.

Paying for Program Review

The department is expected to cover the following expenses as part of Program Review

* External reviewer(s) travel and lodging
* Any associated room reservation costs
* Catering and food costs for the external review
* Honorarium (work with Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs to determine range for honorarium)

Should the department have difficulty covering any of these costs, this should be brought up at the kick off meeting to mitigate and resolve in consultation with VPSA.

Criteria for Self-Study

Each program review should begin with a self-study. Data and artifacts help tell the story of the department’s work. Data may include learning outcomes data, satisfaction data, usage numbers, fiscal data, historical trends, or other sources. Artifacts may include relevant printed publications, reports, departmental strategic or annual plans, awards, etc.

The self-study will range in length based on department size, history, and depth of topics covered. It is recommended that the self-study range from 15-20 pages, plus appendices. The self-study should be able to be public facing, organized around the following standards, and address all of the components as stated.

Any particular professional standards associated with the department in review should be incorporated. The self-study will be organized around either a) the standards listed below; b) the CAS standards as fit to the department; or c) standards from an accrediting or professional organization as appropriate.

DOSA Standards for Program Review

1. **Section I: Introduction and Overview (no more than 5 single-spaced pages)**
2. History and overview
   1. Brief history of the department
   2. Description of how the department is organized for function and reporting purposes
   3. A candid assessment of strengths and weaknesses
   4. Optional: reflection of the overall quality of the department within its larger field of practice (contrast/comparison to peers)
3. Mission and strategic plan
   1. Statement of department mission, vision, values (if exist)
   2. Statement of existing goals
   3. Department strategic and/or operational plan
4. A look back and a look ahead
   1. A discussion of what staff, students, and graduate students consider the most important developments in the department over the last five years
   2. A discussion of the major opportunities and challenges facing the department over the next five years
   3. What did you learn and change in response to the last program review (if applicable)
5. Questions for the review committee
6. **Section II: The Department**
7. Overview of key work
   1. Summary of prominent department work and innovations
8. Staff
   1. Discussion of staff, key job duties, credentials
   2. Summary of institutional service for past three years—committees, appointments, etc.
   3. Summary of professional service for past three years—editorial boards, professional associations, publications, etc.
   4. Staff goals for the current year (if exists)
   5. Staff and department highlights (optional)
9. Student employees
   1. A discussion of student employee job functions
   2. List of goals/work accomplished
   3. List of current student employee majors
   4. List of what student employee alumni now do (employment status, graduate school, location) (optional)
10. Graduate student employees, if applicable
    1. A discussion of graduate student employee job functions
    2. Discussion of how graduate student employment in the department contributes to academic learning
    3. List of current student employee majors
    4. List of goals/work accomplished
    5. List of what student employee alumni now do (employment status, graduate school, location) (optional)
11. **Section III: Outcomes (3-5 single spaced pages)**
    1. Listing of DOSA Learning goals and learning outcomes the department contributes to and how
    2. Assessment cycle plan for the next five years (see DOSA Introduction to Assessment Workbook for template)
    3. Listing of department collected data (see reporting template) and collaborative data collection efforts
    4. Listing of university data the department examines or consults (as applicable)
    5. Evidence of department operational quality (e.g. surveys/interviews of current students, graduates, employers, community members or agencies, benchmarking operations against practitioner peers)
12. **Governance and Facilities (.5-2 single spaced pages)**
13. A description of standing and ad hoc committees run by the department
14. A description of the department’s physical space and facilities, including a discussion of the extent to which they are adequate
15. **Equity and Social Justice (1-3 single spaced pages)**
16. Highlight efforts and actions undertaken by department to recruit, retain, mentor, and provide professional development opportunities for students and employees in support of divisional and institutional goals for equity and social justice
17. Discussion of retention of staff and recruitment of new staff for past three years, include challenges and efforts taken to advertise new positions
18. List of department-level equity and social justice goals for past three years and describe the impact they have had
19. Identify challenges, opportunities, and future strategies that the department plans to pursue to advance equity and social justice
20. **Appendices and Tables**
21. Data analyses
22. Evidence of program impact

Available Data for Program Review

Data from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

* Staffing appointments
* Changes in staff over time

Data from the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

* Analyses of student behaviors by membership or affiliation with department programming (e.g. retention, graduation, GPA compared to like peers)
* Disaggregate institutional data by membership or affiliation with department programming (e.g. NSSE data)
* Please visit WEBSITE for a listing of additional available datasets

Consulting, workshops, and supporting materials

* Available from DOSA Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment
* DOSA Equity and Social Justice Committee
* Women’s Center
* Career and Leadership Development Center

Other Offices as needed

Visit Schedule Requirements and Example Template

The onsite or digital, program review visit typically spans one or two days. Below details the components of the visit followed by an example schedule. This schedule is flexible and often changes based on department size, operations, when staff are available, and term. The schedule is decided upon and coordinated by the department, in consultation with its supervisor.

**Required Review Schedule Components**

* Department full- and part-time staff
* Student employees (can be combined with graduate student employee meeting)
* Graduate student employees (can be combined with full- and part-time staff meeting)
* Administrative staff (required separate meeting)
* Meeting with key partners
* Meet with Vice President of Student Affairs, Chief of Staff, and Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment
* Tour of department
* Anonymous feedback (where no staff members from the unit are present)

**Example Review Schedule**

Day 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Meeting | Objective | Location |
| 7:40am | Associate director picks up guests and brings to campus | Meet, discuss | Ohio University Inn |
| 8:00-8:45am | Committee eats catered breakfast with student leaders | Discuss their experience with the department, ask questions, hear concerns and ideas | Baker University Center, conference room |
| 9:00-9:45am | Committee meets with department leader and tour of department | Meet, discuss self-study, clarify objective, answer questions | Department leader’s office |
| 10:00-11:30am | Committee meets with department full- and part-time staff | Meet, discuss department in relation to peer units, discussion future vision, ask and answer questions | Baker University Center, conference room |
| 11:30am-12:30pm | Committee lunch with student and graduate student employees | Discuss their experience with the department, ask questions, hear concerns and ideas | Latitude 39 |
| 12:30-1:00pm | Committee discussion with themselves or break | Discuss draft response report or take break | Baker University Center, conference room |
| 1:00-2:00pm | Committee meets with key academic or community partners | Meet, discuss department in relation to academic units, hear challenges, opportunities, future directions | Baker University Center, conference room |
| 2:00-2:45pm | Committee meets with students who are a member of key programs | Meet, discuss ideas, challenges, and gains from key program | Baker University Center, conference room |
| 3:00-4:00pm | Committee meets with Vice President of Student Affairs and Chief of Staff | Discuss reflections, context, emerging observations | Cutler 212 |
| 4:15-5:00pm | Anonymous feedback session | Collect feedback | Baker University Center, conference room |
| Dinner | Committee meets with Department Leader and Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment | Debrief the day, answer questions, discuss timeline and next steps | Department leader’s office |

**Example Review Schedule from Survivor Advocacy Program**

**Sunday February 3, 2019**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Meeting | Objective | Location |
| 9:10 p.m, | Transported to the Ohio University Inn & Conference Center, Athens, OH by KC Waltz, Advocate, Survivor Advocacy Program | Arrive | Port Columbus International Airport |

**Monday February 4, 2019**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Meeting | Who? | Location |
| 8:00 a.m.-9: 15 a.m. | Breakfast/Review of the Charge | *with Director LISW-S, Director, Survivor Advocacy Program* | *Ohio University Inn, Cutler’s Restaurant* |
| 9:30 a.m.-10:00 a.m. | Tour of SAP Office |  | *Lindley Hall, Ohio University* |
| 10:00-11:00 a.m. | 1:1 Meeting with Survivor Advocate | *Survivor Advocate, MSW, LSW* | *Lindley 032* |
| 11:00 a.m.- 12:00 p.m. | 1:1 Meeting with Survivor Advocate | *Survivor Advocate, LISW* | *Lindley 038* |
| 12:00-1:15 p.m. | Lunch with SAP Graduate Assistant’s/field interns | *SAP Graduate Assistant, LSW & SAP Graduate Assistant, SWT* | *Latitude 39- Baker Center* |
| 1:15-1:30 p.m. | Break |  |  |
| 1:30-2:30 p.m. | ECRC/CSSR, Group Meeting | *All staff names from ECRC and CSSR* | *Baker 226* |
| 2:30-3:30 p.m. | Ohio University Police Department & Athens Police Department, Group Meeting | Captain, Ohio University Police Department  , Ohio University Police Department  Ohio University Police Department  Ohio University Police Department  Ohio University Police Department  Chief, Athens Police Department  Athens Police Department  Athens Police Department | *Baker 226* |
| 3:30-4:30 p.m. | Campus Partners/Stakeholders | *representatives from the following departments:*  Dean of Students Office  Housing & Residence Life  Counseling & Psychological Services  Office of Diversity & Inclusion  Health Promotion  Sorority & Fraternity Life  Social Work Department | *Baker 230* |
| 4:30-5:00 p.m. | Break |  |  |
| 5:00-6:00 p.m. | Pizza with Students | Student representatives from various departments and organizations invited  (After meeting, SAP Graduate Assistant, will transport back to the Ohio University Inn.) | *Baker 356* |

**Tuesday February 5, 2019**  
Breakfast on own (Charge to room)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Meeting | Who? | Location |
| 9:10 p.m, | *Transported to Ohio University* | *Advocate, Survivor Advocacy Program* | OU Inn |
| 9:30-10:30 a.m. | *1:1 meeting* | Director’s Supervisor(s) | *Baker 345* |
| 10:30-11:00 | Final Wrap | Director |  |
| 11:00-11:30 | Final Wrap | SAP Team |  |
| 11:30-1:00 | Lunch | SAP professional staff | Salaam |
|  | Leave for Airport | Survivor Advocate |  |

Anonymous Feedback Sessions

External reviewers are encouraged to incorporate the questions listed below into their meetings with department staff.

**Questions for Staff from Department being reviewed**

1. Does your supervisor discuss your personal ESJ professional development goal with you and offer coaching and feedback related to that goal?
2. Did your supervisor discuss the departmental ESJ goal with you and how you can contribute in your role?
3. How has this office made you feel valued as a member of the university community and your contributions to its goals? What could they have done to make you feel more valued?
4. How do you see this office removing barriers to equity and inclusion in the campus community? What could they do better?
5. How does this office promote equity through the facilitation of learning? How so? How could it be improved?
6. How do you see this office promoting equity by cultivating community? How could it be done better?
7. How do you see this office promoting equity by empowering all staff? How could it be done better?

Anonymous Feedback Sessions

Visits are required to hold anonymous feedback sessions. In these sessions, anyone from campus is welcome to attend and invited to answer any or all of the questions listed below. Department staff, supervisors, and student employees must be excluded. External Reviewers should be careful to manage bias and carefully document all feedback provided.

**Student Questions:**

1. Have you ever heard of this office/department? If so, in what ways?
2. What is your understanding of the mission of this office/department?
3. When would you visit or contact this office/department?
4. Do you perceive this office as a place where all people are accepted and welcome? Please explain and provide examples.
5. What steps, if any, do you believe this office could implement to improve their access to resources and opportunities for students who are:

* Under-represented on campus
* Under-resourced

1. How does this office advocate on the part of students to:

* Encourage a sense of safety on campus and surrounding areas
* Promote respect among students and the campus community

1. How has this office made you feel valued as a member of the university community? What could they have done better toward this end?
2. How do you see this office removing barriers to equity and inclusion in the campus community? What could they do better?
3. How does this office promote equity through the facilitation of learning? How so? How could it be improved?
4. How do you see this office promoting equity by cultivating community? How could it be done better?
5. How do you see this office promoting equity by empowering all students? How could it be done better?

**External to Department Staff/Faculty Questions:**

1. Have you ever heard of this office/department? If so, in what ways?
2. What is your understanding of the mission of this office/department?
3. When would you visit or contact this office/department?
4. Do you feel that you are able to work with individuals from this office in a collaborative manner? Please explain and provide examples if possible.
5. Do you feel that your perspective is taken into consideration when working with a representative from this office? Please explain and provide examples if possible.
6. Do you perceive this office as a place where all people are accepted and welcome? Please explain and provide examples if possible.
7. What steps, if any, do you believe this office could implement to improve access to resources and opportunities for students who are underrepresented or under resourced on campus?
8. How do you see this office removing barriers to equity and inclusion in the campus community? What could they do better?
9. How does this office promote equity through the facilitation of learning? How so? How could it be improved?
10. How do you see this office promoting equity by cultivating community? How could it be done better?
11. How do you see this office promoting equity by empowering all staff? How could it be done better?
12. How does this office advocate on the part of staff to:

* Encourage a sense of safety on campus and surrounding areas
* Promote respect among staff, students, and the campus community

Program Review Committee Report Outline

Based on the findings from the self-study and the site visit, the program review committee is asked to write a report. The suggested outline for the report is located below; however, the review team members are encouraged to include any issues or topics they deem necessary. There is a separate template that review committees can use to start their report.

**Report Outline: step one**

Please provide narrative addressing the following:

1. Response to self-study
2. Response to on-campus visit
3. Response to questions posed in the self-study
4. Optional additional foci:
   1. Areas of Excellence: Describe what the department does well, how the department supports the division’s mission and priorities, and how the department could be seen as pioneers/leaders in the field (if applicable).
   2. Areas for Improvement: Describe the areas that the department should improve on and the reasons that these areas need improvement.
   3. Proposed areas for focus for the future: Describe areas the department should focus on for the next five years

**Evaluation of Significant Items: step two**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report chapter** | **Proposed areas for future focus** | **Strengths** | **Notes** |
| **Section I: Response to self-study** |  |  |  |
| **Section II: Response to on-campus visit** |  |  |  |
| **Section III: Response to departmental questions** |  |  |  |
| **Section IV: Conclusion** |  |  |  |

**Recommended follow up actions: step three**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

**Concluding Comments: step four**

Please share any additional comments for the good of the department, division or university. Please note that this written report will be distributed to members of the department.

Departmental Response and Action Plan Outline

**Step 1**

Address the following in a narrative or table:

* Proposed goals
* Timeline for completion
* Responsible parties
* Implementation strategy
* Metrics to measure progress and evaluation process

**Step 2**

Create an action plan. Example template provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** | **Responsibility** | **Barriers to implementation** | **Next Steps** | **Needs/ Cost** | **Partners/ Collaborators** | **Progress Updates** |
| **#1:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **#2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **#3:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **#4:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |