UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA AIKEN

Guidelines for Program Review Reports: USC Aiken Administrative Offices and Programs

Each office and program at USC Aiken is expected to prepare an annual program review report following the format given below. These reports are intended to accomplish the following:

- Provide readers with an overview of the unit's overall performance as well as areas of strength and weakness as determined by a research-based assessment program
- Serve as a management tool to track and improve performance
- Transmit and justify requests for resource allocation for the next fiscal year
- Comply with Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 of the SACS *Principles of Accreditation* (2004, rev. 2006)

These reports will be submitted annually in the fall and reviewed by the senior University administrator responsible for the Division. Reports may also be shared with members of other campus groups and committees, and they will also be posted online by the IE Office in an electronic program review archive.

Section 1. Data and Key Performance Indicators

Tables presented in this section should represent clear, quantifiable, and summarized data that demonstrate the success, effectiveness, or efficiency of the unit or program. Five years of trend data should be provided (if these data aren't initially available, begin in 2006-07 and add data for five years). Wherever possible, it is recommended that these indicators be linked to the unit's assessment system.

All reports should present 5 to 10 tables and must include Table 1.1 as presented below with appropriate budgetary information for the unit. This table should be cut and pasted into the report (notes may be excluded).

Table 1.1 Financial Performance

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-06	2006-07[(b)]
Total Expenditures[(a)]						
FTE Students[(b)]	2,703	2,773	2,823	2,802	2,724	2,801
Expenditures per FTE[(c)]						
Additional lines as needed [(d)]						

(a) Total expenditures for the fiscal year represents all actual expenses, including salary and benefits as of June 30.
(b) The number of annualized full-time equivalent students is calculated by the IE Office each year based on 12-month credit hour production. The most recent year is projected based on Fall FTE.
(c) For each year, divide the dollar amount in cell (a) by the corresponding amount in cell (b); round to the nearest dollar.
(d) For units that have client- or student-based operations, it will be valuable to add lines for these activities and use them as divisors for total budgetary expenditures. For instance, the Admissions Office might include a line for the total number of new students who enrolled each year and a line for total expenditures per the number of new matriculants.

Tables 1.2 and Following

An additional set of about 4 to 9 tables should present data chosen by the unit or office director in consultation with the senior administrator responsible for the division. These tables should provide the “big picture” about the unit’s activities or performance over time (preferably 5-6 years).

Section 2. Mission, Goals, and Objectives for Outcomes

This section should list the unit’s mission, goals, and objectives for outcomes—the unit’s objectives must be phrased as intended or expected outcomes.

Mission

Provide the unit’s mission statement. A mission statement should define what the unit does and why it exists. Good mission statements are short, focused, clear, and easily understood by someone outside of the unit (Stern, Drucker & Hesselbein, 1999).

Goals

A list of the unit’s broad areas of activity and emphasis should be provided. Goals listed here should provide general statements about the unit’s major ongoing operational activities, not goals for a specific year. Well-written goals employ a strong action verb. Goals may be written as outcomes, though this is not a requirement.

Objectives

Specific statements of what the unit intends to do on an ongoing basis (not objectives for a specific year) should be listed. Objectives should be measurable and must be written as outcomes. Outcomes represent what clients, such as students, faculty, staff, or others (but not unit staff) do as a result of the unit’s efforts, programs, or activities. Well-written outcomes have “clients” or “students” as their grammatical subject and also employ a strong action verb.

Fictional Example: Grants Office

Mission
The Grants Office provides centralized management of internally and externally grant-funded activities, including support for grant writing, competition, and submission; budget oversight; procurement; and assessment of grant outcomes.

Goals and Objectives

1. Coordinate the budget management and auditing of all grant-funded activities. [Goal]
   - 1.1. All grant-funded activities will stay within budget. [Objective stated as an outcome]
   - 1.2. All grant-funded activities will document their budget outlays following stated guidelines. [Objective stated as an outcome]

2. Manage and review all assessment activities of grant-funded programs. [Goal]
   - 2.1. All grant-funded activities will assess the outcomes of their activities as stated in their grant proposals. [Objective stated as an outcome]
   - 2.2. Etc.

Section 3. Assessment

This section of the program review report should provide a research-based examination of the extent to which goals and objectives were accomplished. The intent of this section is to identify the unit’s relative strengths and areas for improvement based on evidence collected throughout the year in a systematized assessment program that ideally places the unit’s goals and objectives in *rank order* in terms of success.

Based on the material presented in this section, a reader should know what a unit's strengths and weaknesses are based on the data presented about the unit's effectiveness. It is expected that the unit will have some areas that are relatively weaker than others; the purpose of this section is to show that these areas have been identified.

This section should be organized by the objectives stated in Section 2, not by assessment instruments or methods. Data identifying relative strengths and weaknesses should be presented. Plans to address areas for improvement should be provided in Section 6 (below).

The assessment section of the program review report should be no shorter than one page in length and may be somewhat longer. Whenever possible key assessment indicators should be linked to data presented in Section 1 (simply refer to Table 1.x). Additional tables and graphs should be provided as needed to illustrate how effectively the outcomes have been accomplished. Complete assessment findings may be included as an appendix.

Section 4. Accomplishments

Provide a bulleted list of accomplishments for the year being reviewed

Section 5. Obstacles

Provide a bulleted list of obstacles for the year being reviewed.

Section 6. Future Plans

Provide a description of plans to address areas for improvement identified in the assessment section. A bulleted list of additional future plans should also be provided.

Section 7. Needs and Budget Requests

Cut and paste the table below into this section for each budget request for the upcoming year.

Budget Request Template

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Funding Request</th><th colspan="2">Amount</th><th rowspan="2">Unit-Level Objective (number and description)</th><th rowspan="2">Relevant Assessment Data</th></tr>
<tr><th>One-Time</th><th>Recurring</th></tr>
<tr><td>[List the Request Here]</td><td>[$ Amount]</td><td>[$ Amount]</td><td>[Paste Relevant Unit-Level Objective Here]</td><td>[Paste Relevant Assessment Data Here]</td></tr>
</table>

Example Budget Request (Office of Institutional Effectiveness)

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Funding Request</th><th colspan="2">Amount</th><th rowspan="2">Unit-Level Objective (number and description)</th><th rowspan="2">Relevant Assessment Data</th></tr>
<tr><th>One-Time</th><th>Recurring</th></tr>
<tr><td>Tableau Software – Visual Analysis for Databases (1 License)</td><td>$746</td><td>$0</td><td>4.2 2. Provide ongoing research support for the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and other senior administrators</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Formal Studies</th><th>Presentations (Internal)</th><th>Presentations (External)</th></tr>
<tr><td>2003-04</td><td>11</td><td>9</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>2004-05</td><td>7</td><td>13</td><td>2</td></tr>
<tr><td>2005-06</td><td>11</td><td>23</td><td>4</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

References and Resources

Hosch, B. (2006). *Evaluation of the administrative program review process at USC Aiken.* Aiken, SC: Office of Institutional Effectiveness, University of South Carolina Aiken. Retrieved May 15, 2007, from http://ie.usca.edu/research/Institutional/AdminProgRevEval.pdf.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2006). *Principles of accreditation: foundations for quality enhancement.* Revised. Commission on Colleges. Decatur, Ga. Retrieved May 1, 2007, from http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2005). *Resource manual for the Principles of accreditation: foundations for quality enhancement.* Commission on Colleges. Decatur, Ga. Retrieved, May 1, 2007 from http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/handbooks/Exhibit%2031.Resource%20Manual.pdf.

Stern, G., Drucker, P., and Hesselbein, F. (1999). *Drucker Foundation self-assessment tool: process guide.* New York: Jossey-Bass. Relevant sections are available online at: http://www.leadertoleader.org/knowledgecenter/sat/mission.html.