**PROGRAM REVIEWS**

**Background/Information**

**C&R Recommendations:   Review of Vice Presidents' Units (3AS.04 which supersedes 1AS.02)**

*Each Vice President should develop a meaningful review process for their units. Unit reviews should include comparisons with peer units at other universities and specific action plans to improve quality and efficiency. Reviews would be analyzed and critiqued by individuals with relevant expertise. This analysis may be done by a Colorado State team of experts or may require review by outside consultants. The responsibility for correcting any deficiencies uncovered or implementing any improvements called for in the self assessments shall be assigned to the appropriate*

*Vice President.*

**Service Units - Six-year Reviews (3as.18)**

*For units where services may be provided by the private sector, six-year reviews should include both peer comparisons at other universities and comparisons with the private sector. Reviews must also show quality of service as indicated by customer evaluation, cost, and centrality to the University's mission. Reviews would be analyzed by individuals with expertise in delivering services. This analysis may be done by a Colorado State team of experts or may require outside review by consultants. The responsibility for correcting any deficiencies uncovered or implementing any improvements called for in the self assessments shall be assigned to the appropriate Vice President.*

**The Model**

The following model evolved through the C&R pilot program review process, and was slightly adjusted to better meet current needs. The components of this model can be adapted by all administrative and academic-support department programs as they develop their own plans for assessments of cost effectiveness and quality of service.

a.      **Commitment of Leadership**

- Full participation: Any meaningful and productive evaluation of services offered by Colorado State requires the active participation and leadership of line managers, including the appropriate vice president, throughout the entire process. The evaluation cannot simply be a structured bureaucratic effort that becomes an end unto itself. It must be an effective means towards full assessment of the program.

- Each program director is responsible for effectively communicating with all their staff relative to the program review process, and how this fits in with the University Strategic Plan.

- Each program director is responsible for methodically and effectively reviewing each activity and program currently within their area, to see if modifications are needed to serve the overall best interests of the institution (i.e., "the big picture" perspective). Carefully review these

programs and activities within the context of the updated USP and guidance from the appropriate vice president. Each program director is responsible for providing the leadership to assure this is initiated, concluded, and productive.

b.      **Describe the Program and Services**

•       Overall view:  Develop and build a data base of information on each program, including comparative data on programs with other institutions, as well as private sector providers of the service - see items c-f below.  Provide complete and thorough data and information that helps describe and define the functions and requirements of each program.  Include qualitative and quantitative information to provide descriptive information to the campus community, especially those who might not be familiar with this particular program.  For every program, specific information must be provided which defines the consequences of not having the program and/or reducing it in a major way.

Each review should include the following elements:

-       Define functions and requirements of each program; and the service levels the program strives to meet.

-       Define information received which indicates areas of strengths and areas of needed improvements suggested for the program, and how the unit plans to address these.

-       Provide descriptive information about the programs, including peer comparative data whenever possible, that can provide a qualitative context for the cost/unit of providing a program at a comparable level of service.

-       Specifically define the budget for the program for the past 5 years, the most current year, and include actual expenditures as well.  Break budget and actual expenditures out by salaries and benefits versus other major support costs.

-       Provide 5-year history on all data trends, if at all possible.

- Review all sources of funds, not just 1-3 funds.

- Provide an organization chart for the program. This organizational chart should highlight functions and services, not just individuals (including a 5-year staffing history).

- Define any regulatory code or other requirements now supported by the program, and how these could be addressed if the program was eliminated.

• Consider new market and revenue opportunities and consequences.

• Reallocation is expected from each program as part of the program review process. Reallocation can take many forms, including shifts in assignments of responsibilities for staff, all the way to base budget funding that must be provided for central institutional needs. Each director must describe, in detail, all reallocations/savings reviewed. Proposed reallocations must provide information that details the reduction and specific implications of the reduction.

• The University's faculty and staff are its greatest asset. Any required personnel dislocations should be accommodated, to the extent possible, through normal attrition, reassignments or early retirement. If personnel reductions are proposed, please discuss these with the appropriate vice president and HRS director before taking any action.

• It is recommended that services be defined in an "RFP" type format that would facilitate comparisons of cost and service levels with peers and other providers, and using standards appropriate for the service/program. The purpose is to define the structure of quantitative comparisons of the program to other similar providers, as noted in Section d. below.

• Develop RFPs based on services, costs and quality indicators for comparable services.

c.    **Define ideal model(s)**

• Search literature for conceptual ideas, including projected costs to provide services at this level.

- Trends

- Examples

d.    **Gather data**

- Gather comparative data in formats that match the structure defined in Section c. so as to facilitate reasonable comparisons.

- Consider any information from clients that would serve to clearly suggest that operations at a higher level are desired.

- Define "peer" programs at other institutions of higher education (in state and out of state) and gather comparable data that would provide specific information on cost for the level of services provided.

- Gather comparative information from private sector programs.  If possible, use the RFP type format described in Section b. above in order to gather comparable data that would provide specific information on cost for the level of services provided.

- Gather data from benchmarking studies for this program, through national/regional/statewide professional associations.

e.    **Evaluation of services**

- Evaluate the services as they relate to the mission of the Institution.

- Review formal customer satisfaction feedback from campus clients.

- Identify an evaluation team of external individuals who would review the program and provide an independent assessment of the level of services provided for the resources expended.

f.    **Internal assessment (self-evaluation)**

- Provide a self-analysis of cost effectiveness and quality of service of the program.

- Identify    specific    areas    of    excellence,    and    areas    for

improvement/change and how changes will be accomplished.

g.     **Action plan**

•       The final report of the evaluation must define specific action plans leading to greater efficiency, effectiveness and customer service. These reports should be submitted up through the organization to the appropriate vice president.  The vice president is responsible for assuring that the results from this evaluation are noted in the annual USP update process for their unit, and are available to be shared with the campus and the USP planning committee.

**Actions and Activities Planned for Communications of Administrative and Academic-Support Program Reviews**

1.     An e-mail notice to Campus.

2.     Articles in COMMENT providing information on those administrative and academic-support department programs scheduled for review during the current fiscal year.

3.     Periodic reminder boxes will appear in COMMENT and on e-mail about sending comments on units undergoing program reviews.

4.     An article about last year's program reviews will appear in COMMENT sometime in late fall.

5.     A short article updating the status of the reviews will appear in early February.
6.     A summary report (if available by this time) on the program review outcomes will appear in the next to last/last issue of COMMENT for the Academic year; along with a schedule of program reviews scheduled for upcoming fiscal year.

In addition, units or departments undergoing review should set up an e-mail response address so that people can provide comments, suggestions, etc. electronically.

**Contact**:     Vice President for Administrative Services, Administration Building, 491-5257