The University of North Carolina at Greensboro will redefine the public research university for the 21st century as an inclusive, collaborative, and responsive institution making a difference in the lives of students and the communities it serves.

UNCG is ...

- A learner-centered, accessible, and inclusive community fostering intellectual inquiry to prepare students for meaningful lives and engaged citizenship;
- An institution offering classes on campus, off campus, and online for degree-seeking students and life-long learners;
- A research university where collaborative scholarship and creative activity enhance quality of life across the life-span;
- A source of innovation and leadership meeting social, economic, and environmental challenges in the Piedmont Triad, North Carolina, and beyond; and
- A global university integrating intercultural and international experiences and perspectives into learning, discovery, and service.
The Mission of the Division of Student Affairs

Strategic Intent
Student Affairs will be the leader in student development and will be a primary provider of initiatives and collaborative efforts to impact student success. 
Adopted June 2010

Mission
The Division of Student Affairs, in support of the University’s mission, empowers students to be engaged citizens through fostering their development of lifelong skills by creating and supporting a rich learning environment in a community of care and mutual respect.

Beliefs that Guide our Work
Three basic assumptions guiding our work include:
1. The individual student is viewed from a holistic perspective.
2. Each student is treated as a unique individual.
3. The overall college experience is based on student learning both in and outside the classroom.

Context of our Work
The Division of Student Affairs at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro is committed to using the core values that guide the university as well as the student population to inform our own strategic planning process and daily work.

The University’s Core Values
1. Inclusiveness
2. Collaboration
3. Sustainability
4. Responsibility
5. Transparency

Students’ Five Core Values
1. Honesty
2. Fairness
3. Trust
4. Respect
5. Responsibility
2013-2014 Division Goals (revised June 2013)

ENGAGE:

1. Collaborate to create a vibrant student-centered environment supporting student learning, engagement, service, and leadership while preparing students to contribute to a global society.
   **Relates to UNC Strategic goals #1 and #3

ENCOURAGE:

1. Create a culture of care for all students which encourages student success.
   **Relates to UNC Strategic goals #1, #2, and #3

ENRICH:

1. Cultivate opportunities to enrich the student experience and the University’s rich traditions in celebration of diversity, service, life-long learning and Spartan Pride!
   **Relates to UNC Strategic goal #1, #2, and #3
2. Serve as wise stewards of University resources
   **Relates to UNC Strategic goal #5 and goals #4
Introduction

Comprehensive program reviews serve many purposes. Ideally, they allow the Division to improve programs and services, to identify strengths as well as growth opportunities, and to evaluate whether or not the needs of the student population are being met. In addition, program reviews provide a tool for long-term planning, and budgetary priorities and monitor whether or not the department is supporting the mission and goals of the University and the Student Affairs Division.

While guiding and measuring progress and growth is the primary rationale behind the program review process internally, the growing demands of external constituencies to “prove” the value and worth of a program cannot be dismissed lightly. Accrediting agencies are not new to higher education. However, over the past 15 years, the focus on assessment has sharply veered toward an emphasis on accountability instead of assessing for quality and excellence. As tuition and fees continue to escalate, external groups, including parents and students, are adopting a consumer-oriented approach to the educational system. Therefore, the process of reviewing programs and departments is designed to meet internal and external requirements simultaneously. The
aim is to ensure assessment for program quality, improvement, and effectiveness with assessment for accountability.

On the surface, this aim appears to be dichotomous in nature and, to some extent, this is a valid concern. On the other hand, a meaningful program review should be able to link and to reconcile the internal and external components. External constituencies often view accountability and economic worth as interchangeable. Thus, as a department shows its effectiveness through accountability, it justifies its existence. The ability to provide solid evidence of program impact on student learning has direct implications on whether or not a department will continue to be a financial priority within the institution. Without this evidence, resources for future directions, including technology, staffing requests, and additional programs or services, will not likely be forthcoming. It is necessary to demonstrate that a program has merit and contributes significantly to the mission of the university. In addition, anecdotal evidence is no longer acceptable. Programs cannot rely on others simply to trust that we are doing our job in an efficient and successful manner.

The purpose of this handbook is not to provide tools for developing an assessment plan. Rather, it is more of a “how to” guide for departments undergoing a program review and for the committee members responsible for the accomplishment of this task.

“We produce quality programs and we are successful in efforts to achieve our mission. We provide excellent opportunities for students. Here is firm and meaningful evidence that demonstrates our impact on campus life”
Council for the Advancements of Standards in Higher Education

The following information was taken from the CAS website (www.cas.edu).

Overview

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) develops and promulgates standards that enhance the quality of a student’s total learning experience in higher education. CAS is a consortium of associations in higher education whose representatives achieve consensus on the nature and application of standards that guide the work of practitioners. CAS derives its authority from the prestige and traditional influence of its member associations and from the consensus of those members in establishing requirements for high-quality practice.

The CAS philosophy is grounded in beliefs about excellence in higher education, collaboration between teacher and learner, ethics in educational practice, student development as a major goal of higher education, and student responsibility for learning. Taken together, these beliefs about practice shape the vision for all CAS endeavors.

CAS collectively develops, examines, and endorses standards and guidelines for program and service areas in higher education. The CAS approach to ensuring quality educational experiences is anchored in the assumption that its standards and guidelines can be used in a variety of ways to enhance institutional quality. They can, for example, be used for design of programs and services, for determination of the efficacy of programs, for staff development designed to enhance the skills of those providing professional services, for programmatic self-assessment to assure institutional effectiveness, and for self-regulation.

History

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, a name adopted in 1992 to reflect the expanded context of the Council’s higher education focus, was originally established in 1979 as a not-for-profit corporation called the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs. Impetus for its existence was encouraged by a movement on the part of several national associations to develop accreditation standards for academic programs that prepare counselors and counselor educators. This movement, which culminated in the establishment of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) in 1980, provided the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) with
impetus to create a set of preparation standards for use in master’s level college student affairs administration programs. Rather than promulgating these standards as its own, ACPA sought out other professional associations interested in the development of standards for student affairs preparation and practice. The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) indicated an interest in the project, and the two associations jointly issued invitations to a meeting of interested professional associations. Seven student affairs-oriented organizations sent representatives to the exploratory meeting held in Alexandria, Virginia in June 1979. This meeting resulted in the creation of an inter-association consortium for purposes of developing and promulgating professional standards to guide both student affairs practice and academic preparation of those who administer student support programs and services. A subsequent organizational meeting in September 1979 resulted in the establishment of CAS as a not-for-profit corporate consortium of 11 charter member associations.

Today, after more than three decades of collaboration and a name change to reflect its expanded interests, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education is composed of 39 member associations comprising a professional constituency of over 100,000 professionals, and has generated and promulgated 43 sets of functional area standards and guidelines, one set of master’s level academic preparation program standards for college student affairs administration, and statements regarding characteristics of individual excellence for professionals in higher education and the ethical principles that are held in common across the many areas of professional practice represented at CAS.

Mission

CAS was founded to implement several profession-wide initiatives, with emphasis on the development and promulgation of professional standards. As CAS evolved, its raison d’etre shifted as well. The following reflects the contemporary CAS mission.

The mission of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) is to promote the improvement of programs and services to enhance the quality of student learning and development. CAS is a consortium of professional associations who work collaboratively to develop and promulgate standards and guidelines and to encourage self-assessment (CAS, 2008).
The purposes of CAS are outlined below:

- To establish, adopt, and disseminate unified and timely professional standards to guide student learning and develop support programs and services and related higher education initiatives.
- To promote the assessment and improvement of higher education services and programs through self-study, evaluation, and the use of CAS standards.
- To establish, adopt, and disseminate unified and timely professional preparation standards for the education of student affairs practitioners.
- To promote the assessment and improvement of professional preparation graduate programs for student affairs administrators through the use of CAS standards for assessment, evaluation, and self-study purposes.
- To advance the use and importance of professional standards among practitioners and educators in higher education.
- To develop and provide materials to assist and support practitioners and educators in the use of professional standards in higher education.
- To promote and encourage public and private higher education systems and institutions to focus attention on the assurance of quality in all educational endeavors.
- To promote inter-association efforts to address the issues of quality assurance, student learning and development, and professional integrity in higher education.

As these purposes imply, CAS exists to accomplish several complementary tasks. A primary purpose is to provide a forum in which representatives from higher education organizations can meet and interact for purposes of seeking consensus on the fundamental principles of “best practices” that can lead to enhanced professional standards. The CAS initiative provides a forum wherein all voices can be heard in the creation of timely and useful standards to guide contemporary practice. This approach encourages the establishment of viable linkages among professional associations, most of which focus on highly specialized functions. This professional collaboration results in the creation of standards that represent a profession-wide perspective rather than a narrow and limited viewpoint.

Not only does the CAS initiative provide a vehicle for the development of functional area and academic preparation standards, but it also provides a well-recognized and credible
profession-wide entity to publish and promulgate standards and related materials and to encourage and educate practitioners to apply the standards effectively in their work with students. Further, and of special significance, the CAS consortium speaks with a single voice that bridges numerous specialty areas and can represent the profession-at-large on matters concerning professional standards and quality assurance.

**Guiding Principles**

The fundamental principles that undergird the work of CAS and guide its initiatives are organized into five categories. They were derived from theories and conceptual models implicit within human development, group dynamics, student learning, organizational management, and higher education administration that inform the work of student affairs administrators, student development educators, and student support service providers.

- students and their institutions
- diversity and multiculturalism
- organization, leadership, and human resources
- health engendering environments
- ethical considerations

CAS provides these guidelines as tools to use. Each program area is unique, and to prescribe a single set of rules to follow is unrealistic and will result in fruitless labor. CAS has determined that the most productive and useful manner in which to use the standards is the self-study process or program review.

---

**An Effective Program Review**

- is comprehensive
- will have an impact beyond completion of the review
- is forward-looking, not descriptive
- engages multiple campus constituents
- identifies growth opportunities
- provides suggestions for improvement
- is fair and objective
- recognizes strengths
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Program Review Procedures

The remainder of this guide will describe the basic procedures behind the program evaluation process so as not duplicate the details addressed in the CAS information which will be provided. Keep in mind that this document is written for two audiences: the department that is undergoing review and the committee who is reviewing the department.

The CAS Self-Assessment Guides (SAG) for each functional area and the companion book, CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, will be used throughout the review. The purpose of the companion book, which was published in 2012, is to provide a more focused approach to student learning and development and the assessment of each. It is essential that each committee member becomes familiar with both texts.

The program review encompasses two phases. The first phase of the program review commences when the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs or designee issues the charge (see Appendix A). The first phase is designed to ensure departmental compliance with CAS Standards. However, it is necessary to remember that the CAS Standards are minimal competencies to pursue. Thus, the second phase involves the committee studying one or two issues or special topics that are specific to the department. The department or unit will choose the area(s) they would like to have examined.

In summary, the committee reviews departmental compliance with the CAS Standards and Guidelines in phase one. These are the basic fundamentals required of any successful functional area. The second phase personalizes the process by allowing units to reflect upon ways to move their department “forward”. Ideally, the emphasis should fall on this aspect of the program review as it can be extremely valuable.

Program review committee

A committee officially appointed by the Division of Student Affairs will assist in the design and oversight of the program evaluation. The size and composition of the committee will depend on the needs of the department and the anticipated focus of the evaluation. In every case, the committee will include
the Director of Student Affairs Assessment as ex officio, at least one student representative, and at least two faculty or staff outside of the student affairs division. A departmental designee will serve as liaison and provide staff support for the steering committee. The Committee Chair will be appointed by May 1st of the year preceding the program evaluation and committee members by May 15th. All appointments must be approved by the Vice Chancellor. The program review chair will call the first meeting in August or September. At that time, it is appropriate to determine the most effective and efficient way to undergo the study of each CAS standard. Team members may want to divide the 12 sections up, or collaborate on one section at a time as a large group. The department will have completed the self-assessment guide, and the committee’s responsibility will be to review the ratings.

It is the responsibility of the chair of the program review team to ensure that each team member understands his or her role and the overall goals of the program review. Also, it is necessary to ensure that the committee members understand the differences and appropriate uses of the standards versus guidelines.

Beginning the process

I. The department whose program is being evaluated should provide each committee member with access to the Blackboard page for the assessment of their department that includes all necessary supporting documentation. Assessment results, brochures, focus group reports, student handbooks, and training guides are just a few examples of evidence that will assist the committee in determining to what degree the program has met the standard(s). Under most circumstances, the committee is not responsible for implementing assessments in order to gather evidence that might not have been provided or does not exist. However, if the department has requested the committee investigate special issue(s) apart from the CAS Standards, the committee may need to undertake additional steps to gather necessary evidence.

There is not a prescriptive list of items that must be included on the Blackboard page that the department prepares for the committee. However, the department undergoing review will want to familiarize themselves with the self-
assessment guides and the types of information that the committee will need. The program review chair and the director should work together to determine the manner in which the Blackboard page is designed prior to allowing the rest of the committee access to the page. In general, the items below are usually requested by program review committee members and/or have been suggested for departments to include.

**Documents**

**Phase 1** (for Blackboard)
1. Charge letter to the committee (appointment letter)
2. Contact information for each committee member
3. CAS Standards for each area(s)
4. Completed Self-Assessment Guide (with documentation)
5. Copies of blank Self-Assessment Guides for each area(s)
6. Mission statement
7. Organizational chart
Phase 1 (CAS documents)

1. **CAS Standards and Guidelines for the Area(s) Under Review**

   CAS standards and guidelines are organized into twelve components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>Organization &amp; Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6</td>
<td>Law, Policy, &amp; Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7</td>
<td>Diversity, Equity, &amp; Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 8</td>
<td>Institutional &amp; External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 9</td>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 10</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 11</td>
<td>Facilities &amp; Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 12</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Self-Assessment Guides (SAGs)**

   The department will provide completed self-assessment guides to the committee. The self-assessment guides (which are associated with each functional area covered by the CAS Standards) are a framework to rate the program. Each SAG has a series of overview questions and criterion measures with rating scale for each of the 12 CAS components. The SAGs also contain worksheets for recording findings and for creating an action plan.

   During the initial meetings, the committee should come to a consensus about how to handle rating discrepancies and the process by which they will evaluate compliance for each standard. Although some groups wish to judge items collaboratively, it is advisable for committee members to rate items individually, perhaps prior to the committee meeting. Often, if a team gathers around the table to vote as a joint effort, members may be less candid and forthright in their assessment. Be
prepared to use supporting documentation (or the lack thereof) to substantiate a chosen score. It is essential that the committee understands and agrees upon the ratings and how they are defined. Interpretative differences must be resolved early on in the process (typically the first or second meeting).

It is not unusual for team members to disagree on ratings. While some flexibility is expected, there may be occasions when a unified consensus cannot be reached. If this situation arises, the items in question should be noted and addressed in the final report or action plan.

In most circumstances, a rating of 4 should only be given when a program is in compliance with all aspects of the standard. **Moreover, any item rated below a 4 needs to be incorporated in the action plan developed by the review team.**

Phase 1 (examples of evidence to support self-assessment guides)

*(This list is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. It is simply to provide ideas as to what departmental evidence could be included or requested)*

- Student recruitment materials
- Brochures and other sources of information about the program
- Participation policies/procedures
- Participant evaluations
- Program documents
- Mission statements
- Catalogs and related statements
- Staff and student manuals
- Policies and procedure statements
- Staff memos
- Institutional administrative documents
- Statements about program purpose and philosophy relative to other educational programs
- Organizational charts
- Student and staff profiles
- Follow-up studies
- Program evaluations
- Previously published institutional self-study reports
- Portfolios
Developmental transcripts
Reports of special student accomplishments
Exit interviews
Student journals
Student papers
Observations
Surveys (telephone, written, web-based, large-scale, standardized, mail)
  Needs assessment
  Satisfaction
  Learning outcomes
  Campus environment
  Cost effectiveness
  Post-graduation
  Client use of services/programs/facilities
  Student culture

3. CAS Learning and Development Outcomes

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) promotes standards to enhance opportunities for student learning and development from higher education programs and services. Responding to the increased shift in attention being paid by educators and their stakeholders from higher education inputs (i.e., standards and benchmarks) to the outcomes of students attending higher education, in 2003 CAS articulated sixteen domains of learning outcomes. However, in 2008 after the publication of Learning Reconsidered 2 (2006), CAS reviewed the learning outcomes it had promoted and decided an integration of both learning outcome documents would enhance the profession’s efforts in promoting student learning and development. Consequently, CAS hosted a “think tank” involving writers of Learning Considered 2, CAS directors, and prominent practitioners and faculty members in student affairs to make recommendations for a revised learning outcomes document.

Upon recommendations of the think tank, CAS revised the student learning and development outcomes into six broad categories (called domains): knowledge acquisition, construction, integration and application; cognitive complexity; intrapersonal development; interpersonal
competence; humanitarianism and civic engagement; and practical competence. To comply with CAS standards, institutional programs and services must identify relevant and desirable learning from these domains, assess relevant and desirable learning, and articulate how their programs and services contribute to domains not specifically assessed. For each of the domains, CAS offers examples illustrating achievement of the student learning outcomes.

This learning outcomes model further defines or clarifies each of the six domains by identifying learning outcome dimensions. Offering dimensions of learning within corresponding domains allows for a more focused assessment approach based on institutional mission and priorities. The revised CAS learning outcomes document heightens the differentiation of interpersonal competence and interpersonal development (though certainly the two influence each other), highlights the integration of humanitarianism and civic engagement, and adds the dimensions of global perspective and technological competence to important learning outcomes.

The CAS Board of Directors reviewed and approved the six domains, learning outcome dimensions, and examples of learning and development outcomes at its October 2008 meeting. The domains and learning outcome dimensions will be embedded in each functional area standard. (CAS website, 2009)

The six learning outcomes domains are:

- Knowledge acquisition, integration, construction, and application
- Cognitive complexity
- Intrapersonal development
- Interpersonal competence
- Humanitarianism and civic engagement
- Practical competence

Phase 2

1. Focus area(s) to be studied
2. Rationale for choosing area
3. Existing data or literature related to focus
4. Institutions that the department would like to benchmark as “best practices” in the focus area

Identify and summarize evaluative evidence

Once each component has been reviewed and rated, it is essential to provide supporting documentation as to why the team chose a particular rating or response. For example, one of the standards (2.10d) for housing and residential life calls for staff members to provide students with a variety of educational programs. If the residential life staff provides one program per year and it is a social program, then the team would have to show an incredible amount of evidence in order to justify a rating of 4 (fully met) on this particular standard. The inverse is true as well. If a standard is given a low score or raters cannot agree on a score, then additional documentation and supporting statements must be provided by the team members.

Preparing an Action Plan for Phase 1

When the rating process is completed, the committee will need to devise an action plan that addresses any inconsistencies between their ratings and the department ratings. This plan also calls for identification of areas of strength that exist in the department. Since the Self-Assessment Guide general instructions provide a detailed 7-step process for formulating an action plan, these steps will not be repeated here.

The primary purpose of creating an action plan is to lay the foundation for future visions and direction for the department. It will include ideas and possibilities for ways to enhance particular programs and aspects of the department.
Summary

It is important to recognize that the conclusion of a program review is not intended to be an end. Ideally, the completion should signal the beginning of changes and improvements and acknowledge areas of excellence that will be sustained in the future. In addition, the action plan from a program review can be incorporated into short-range plans (annual goals) and long-range plans (5-year Strategic Plan). The hope is to start a cycle of continuous improvement and self-evaluation that blends seamlessly into staff members’ daily routine and tasks.
Appendix A
Timeline of Events

All program reviews must be completed within an academic year. The following timeline gives some suggested/approximate times that each task in the review typically takes to complete. This is to help the committee and the chair for planning purposes. Please provide your committee members as well as the Student Affairs Assessment office a completed copy of this following document. This is a “living” document so adjustments can be made as needed.

NOTE
30 days after the final report is received by the department undergoing review, the department head must submit a response to:

1. Program Review Chair
2. Department Supervisor
3. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
4. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
5. Director, Student Affairs Assessment

One year after the report, the department head must submit a progress report to:

1. Department Supervisor
2. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
3. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
4. Director, Student Affairs Assessment

*** Included in the documentation must be information regarding the department’s previous program review. A copy of the committee’s final report, the department’s response to the recommendations, and the one-year follow-up report should be provided on the Blackboard page.
# Timeline of Events

**Department:** ____________________________  **Academic Year:** ____________

**Program Review Chair:** ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Time</th>
<th>Activity (abbreviated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Start:________  
End:________ | 1 month  
Alternative:________ | Meet with individuals involved in the initial stages of planning for the program review; professional standards are determined; select chair and members; VC approves; focus area(s) selected |
| Start:________  
End:________ | 2 months  
Alternative:________ | Department compiles and organizes all documents related to standards; department completes self-assessment |
| Start:________  
End:________ | 1 month  
Alternative:________ | Department meets with committee and provide completed Self-Assessment Guide (SAG) |
| Start:________  
End:________ | 1 month  
Alternative:________ | Committee completes review of standards. |
| Start:________  
End:________ | 3 months  
Alternative:________ | Committee completes focus area study. |
| Start:________  
End:________ | 1 month  
Alternative:________ | Committee: Entire report due to VC. |

_________________________  __________________
**Department Director**  **Date**

_________________________  __________________
**Program Review Chair**  **Date**

_________________________  __________________
**Director of Assessment, Student Affairs**  **Date**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Time</th>
<th>Activity (abbreviated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Start: _______  
End: _______ | 1 month                   | Meet with individuals involved in the initial stages of planning for the program review; Select chair and members; VC approves; focus area(s) selected |
| Start: _______  
End: _______ | 2 months                  | Department compiles and organizes all documents related to standards; department completes self-assessment |
| Start: _______  
End: _______ | 1 month                   | Meet with committee and provide completed SAG.                                          |
| Start: _______  
End: _______ | 1 month                   | Committee completes review of standards.                                                |
| Start: _______  
End: _______ | 3 months                  | Committee completes focus area study.                                                  |
| Start: _______  
End: _______ | 1 month                   | Entire report due to VC.                                                               |

__________________________  ________________  
Department Director  Date

__________________________  ________________  
Program Review Chair  Date

__________________________  ________________  
Director of Assessment, Student Affairs  Date
## EXAMPLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Review</th>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Activity (abbreviated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EXAMPLE)</td>
<td>(EXAMPLE)</td>
<td>(EXAMPLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Meet with individuals involved in the initial stages of planning for the program review; Select chair and members; VC approves; focus area(s) selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June - August 2010</td>
<td>Department compiles and organizes all documents related to standards; department completes self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 15, 2010</td>
<td>Meet with committee and provide completed SAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 15, 2010</td>
<td>Committee completes review of standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September – December 15, 2010</td>
<td>Committee completes focus area study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 31, 2011</td>
<td>Entire report due to VC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXAMPLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Review</th>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Activity (abbreviated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EXAMPLE)</td>
<td>(EXAMPLE)</td>
<td>(EXAMPLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>Meet with individuals involved in the initial stages of planning for the program review; Select chair and members; VC approves; focus area(s) selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February – April 2011</td>
<td>Department compiles and organizes all documents related to standards; department completes self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 1, 2011</td>
<td>Meet with committee and provide completed SAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 15, 2011</td>
<td>Committee completes review of standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August – November 2011</td>
<td>Committee completes focus area study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 15, 2011</td>
<td>Entire report due to VC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

FAQs for departments undergoing review

Q) Does the program review take the place of our annual report?

A) No. Departments/units will conduct the program evaluation beyond their normal annual evaluation procedures on a five year cycle.

Q) Are all the program reviews within the Division identical?

A) Although, the general SAGs are identical, each department/unit is different. Thus, each review is unique to the particular needs of the department/unit under study. Each program evaluation will be based on identified priorities for evaluation as well as accepted standards in the specific discipline.

Q) How do I pay for any expenses associated with this?

A) In general, costs associated with program evaluation will be shared by the department/unit and the division office. This will be negotiated in concert with the development of the program evaluation plan. Many departments, although not all, choose to provide light refreshments for the committee meetings. The department is responsible for these expenses.

Q) What is the Student Affairs Assessment Committee’s role in the program review process?

A) The Student Affairs Assessment Committee will monitor the overall progress of the Program Evaluation Schedule as well as individual program evaluations to ensure that appropriate deadlines are met and follow-up activities are completed.
Q) I’m not certain I understand the reasoning behind self-assessment. If we provide the information, data, and paperwork on which we will be judged, what would prevent a department from misleading the committee?

A) A self-assessment is based upon a foundation of ethics and integrity. “The success of self-regulation depends on mutual respect between an institution and its members” (CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, 2006, p. 16). Bear in mind that program reviews are a global aspect of accreditation and each area is accountable for any documentation requested as part of the reaffirmation cycle.

Q) What is the role of the staff liaison?

A) The liaison is a member of the department under review. He or she serves as the contact between the department and the program review committee. He or she is available to answer questions, provide documentation, etc. The liaison’s purpose is to assist the committee and provide administrative support by gathering any requested documents or information. The liaison’s role is not to serve as a “reporter” to the department. Although the liaison needs to attend meetings on occasion, there are times when committee members desire to discuss issues without the presence of a departmental representative. Each committee and chair determines how often they need the liaison to attend. Some committees have the liaison attend alternate meetings while others will have the liaison attend the first hour of each meeting.

Q) What happens at the first meeting?

A) Generally, the director of the department that is under review often comes to address the group and share some information about the department. The chair and committee members will decide the best way to proceed with the task at hand and will determine a meeting schedule. The Director of Student Affairs Assessment may provide some explanatory comments on the purposes of a comprehensive program review. Some discussion about the rating process should occur as well.

Q) Who writes the final report?

A) The committee chair writes the final report. However, the committee assists in assembling a draft and perhaps writing certain sections.
Q) Our review has been completed! I guess we can scratch that off the list for the next 4 years.

A) Not exactly. In any given year, two to three departments will be preparing for program evaluation for the following year. Another two to three departments will be actively carrying out their program evaluations. And, another two to three departments will be applying program evaluation results received from their evaluation processes the previous year.
Appendix C

General Instructions for Self-Assessment Guides (SAGs)

Introduction and Instructions

I. Purpose and Organization of the Guide

The Self-Assessment Guides (SAG) translate functional area CAS Standards and Guidelines into a format enabling self-assessment. Educators can use this Guide to gain informed perspectives on the strengths and deficiencies of their programs and services and plan for improvements. Grounded in the self-regulation approach to quality assurance in higher education endorsed by CAS, this SAG provides institutional and unit leaders a tool to assess programs and services using currently accepted standards of practice.

The Introduction outlines the self-assessment process, describes how to put it into operation, and is organized into four sections. These include: I. Purpose and Organization, II. Self-Assessment Process, III. Rating Examples, and IV. Formulating an Action Plan. The introduction is followed by the Self-Assessment Worksheet, which presents the CAS Standards and Guidelines for the functional area and incorporates a series of criterion measures for rating purposes.

SAG Worksheet Format. CAS standards and guidelines are organized into twelve components.

Part 1. Mission
Part 2. Program
Part 3. Organization and Leadership
Part 4. Human Resources
Part 5. Ethics
Part 6. Law, Policy, and Governance
Part 7. Diversity, Equity, and Access
Part 8. Institutional and External Relations
Part 10. Technology
Part 11. Facilities and Equipment
Part 12. Assessment and Evaluation
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A rating scale designed for assessment purposes is displayed following the standards and guidelines, along with a series of criterion measures to be rated. Making performance judgments by applying the rating scale to individual items (criterion measures) is the first step in assessing the program.

II. Self-Assessment Process

CAS self-assessment procedures involve several steps:

A. Establish the self-study process and review team
B. Understand the CAS Standards and Guidelines and the Self-Assessment Guide
C. Compile and review documentary evidence
D. Judge performance
E. Complete the assessment process

Step A: Establish and Prepare the Self-Assessment Review Team
The first step is to identify an individual to coordinate the self-assessment process. Once a leader is designated, members of the institutional community [e.g., professional staff members, faculty members, and students] need to be identified and invited to participate. Whether a sole functional area or a full division is to be reviewed, the self-study team will be strengthened by the inclusion of members from outside the area(s) undergoing review.

As a group, the review team should examine the standards carefully before implementing the study. It may be desirable for the team, in collaboration with the full staff, to discuss the meaning of each standard. Through this method, differing interpretations can be examined and agreement generally reached about how the standard will be interpreted for purposes of the self-assessment. Whatever procedures are used to arrive at judgments, deliberate discussions should occur about how to initiate the rating process and select the optimal rating strategy. In such discussions, it is expected that disagreements among team members will occur and that resulting clarifications will inform all participants. It is important that the team achieve
consensual resolution of such differences before proceeding with individual ratings.

**Step B: Understand the CAS Standards and Guidelines**

CAS *Standards* represent essential practices as formulated by representatives of multiple professional associations concerned with student learning and development in higher education. CAS *Guidelines*, on the other hand, are suggestions for practice and serve to elaborate and amplify standards through the use of suggestions, descriptions, and examples. Guidelines can often be employed to enhance program practice. Following a long-standing CAS precedent, the functional area standards and guidelines published in *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* (2012) and presented in this SAG are formatted so that standards (i.e., essentials of quality practice) are printed in **bold type**. Guidelines, which complement the standards, are printed in light-face type. Standards use the auxiliary verbs “must” and “shall” while guidelines use “should” and “may.”

In this SAG, the CAS Standards and Guidelines, presented prior to each part of the SAG, have been translated into multiple criterion measures for rating purposes. Each criterion measure focuses on a particular aspect of the standard. The criterion measures are not designed to focus on completely discrete ideas, as would be true if the SAG were developed to be valid and reliable research instrument; rather, the measures are designed to capture the major ideas and elements reflected in the standards. For each of the 12 component parts, there is a series of numbered criterion measures that team members will rate. If the assessment team decides to incorporate one or more of the guidelines into the review process, each guideline can be similarly subdivided to facilitate the rating process.

**Step C: Compile and Review Documentary Evidence**

Collecting and documenting evidence of program effectiveness is an important step in the assessment process. No self-assessment is complete without relevant data and related documentation being used. It is good
practice for programs routinely to collect and file relevant data that can be used to document program effectiveness over time.

Documentary evidence often used to support evaluative judgments includes:

- **Student Recruitment and Marketing Materials**: brochures and other sources of information about the program, participation policies and procedures, and reports about program results and participant evaluations

- **Program Documents**: mission statements, catalogs, brochures and other related materials, staff and student manuals, policy and procedure statements, evaluation and periodic reports, contracts, and staff memos

- **Institutional Administrative Documents**: statements about program purpose and philosophy relative to other educational programs, organizational charts, financial resource statements, student and staff profiles, and assessment reports

- **Research, Assessment, and Evaluation Data**: needs assessments, follow-up studies, program evaluations, outcome measures and methodologies, and previous self-study reports

- **Staff Activity Reports**: annual reports; staff member vitae; service to departments, colleges, university, and other agencies; evidence of effectiveness; scholarship activities, and contributions to the profession

- **Student Activity Reports**: developmental transcripts, portfolios, and other evidence of student contributions to the institution, community, and professional organizations; reports of special student accomplishments; and employer reports on student employment experiences

Having a variety of evidence assists raters to make judgments about the wide range of program expectations articulated in the standards. Whatever is determined appropriate under given circumstances, multiple forms of evidence used should be reviewed and reported in the narrative section of the
SAG worksheets. The self-study rating process may identify a need to obtain additional information or documentation before proceeding to lend substance to judgments about a given assessment criterion. Support documentation should be appended and referred to in the final self-assessment report.

**Step D: Judge Performance**

Assessment criterion measures are used to judge how well areas under review meet CAS Standards. These criterion measures are designed to be evaluated using a 5-point rating scale. In addition to the numerical rating options, *Does Not Apply* (ND) and *Insufficient Evidence/Unable to Rate* (0) ratings are provided. This rating scale is designed to estimate broadly the extent to which a given practice has been performed.

### CAS CRITERION MEASURE RATING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Evidence/Unable to Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Meets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under rare circumstances, it may be determined that a criterion measure used to judge the standard is not applicable for the particular program (e.g., a single sex or other unique institution that cannot meet a criterion measure for that reason). In such instances, a ND rating can be used and the rationale for excluding the practice reflected in the criterion measure presented in the self-study report. The 0 response can be used when relevant data are unavailable to support a judgment. When either the ND or the 0 ratings are used, an explanatory note should be entered. 0 items should generate careful group consideration and follow-up action as appropriate.

Program leaders may wish to incorporate additional criterion measures, such as selected CAS Guidelines or other rating scales, into the procedures before the self-assessment process begins. Such practice is encouraged, and the SAG instrument can be amended to incorporate additional criterion measure
yardsticks for judging the program. In such instances, additional pages to accommodate the additional criterion measures may be required.

**Step E: Complete the Assessment Process**

A two-tiered (individual and group) judgment approach for determining the extent to which the program meets the CAS Standard is suggested. First, the self-assessment team and, if desired, the functional area staff members individually should rate each criterion measure using separate copies of the CAS Self-Assessment Guide. This individualized rating procedure is then followed by a collective review and analysis of the individual ratings.

The individual ratings should be reviewed and translated into a collective rating; then the team is ready to move to the interpretation phase of the self-assessment. Interpretation typically incorporates considerable discussion among team members to assure that all aspects of the program were given fair and impartial consideration prior to a final collective judgment. At this point, persistent disagreements over performance ratings may call for additional data collection. After the team review is completed, a meeting with concerned administrators, staff members, and student leaders should be scheduled for a general review of the self-assessment results. The next step, including discussion of alternative approaches that might be used to strengthen and enhance the program, is to generate steps and activities to be incorporated into an action plan. The Work Forms will guide this process.

III. Rating Examples

**Rating Standard Criterion Measures**

All CAS Standards, printed in **bold type**, are viewed as being essential to a sound and relevant student support program. Many of the statements contained in the standards incorporate multiple criteria that, to facilitate more precise judgment, have been subdivided into measurable parts for rating purposes. Consequently, a single statement in the standards may require several criterion measure statements that allow raters to judge it part by part rather than broadly. This approach often requires multiple judgments concerning a single statement in the standards, but leads to a more precise assessment. Using a “Mission”
standard as an example, the following illustrates how several criterion measures are used to assess a single standard statement.

Part 1. MISSION

Programs and services must develop, disseminate, implement, and regularly review their missions. The mission must be consistent with the mission of the institution and with professional standards. The mission must be appropriate for the institution’s student populations and community settings. Mission statements must reference student learning and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ND</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td>Insufficient Evidence/Unable to Rate</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Partly Meets</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Measures</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 develops, disseminates, and implements the mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 regularly reviews its mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The mission statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 is consistent with that of the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 is consistent with professional standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 is appropriate for student populations and community settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4 references learning and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using Guidelines to Make Judgments about the Program

As discussed above, program leaders may wish to include selected CAS Guidelines to be rated along with the standards. To accomplish this, criterion measure statements must be written for the guidelines selected. The self-study team can readily create statements to be judged as part of the rating process. Programs generally considered as being already in compliance with the standards can benefit especially by using guidelines in this way because
guidelines typically call for enhanced program quality. The following “Financial Resources” program guidelines rating example illustrates the process.

Part 9. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Programs and services must have funding to accomplish the mission and goals. In establishing funding priorities and making significant changes, a comprehensive analysis must be conducted to determine the following elements: unmet needs of the unit, relevant expenditures, external and internal resources, and impact on students and the institution.

Programs and services must demonstrate efficient and effective use and responsible stewardship of fiscal resources consistent with institutional protocols.

Financial resources should be sufficient to support study conceptualization, data collection, data entry and analysis, and the dissemination of assessment and research findings, as well as methodological training for staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ND</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td>Insufficient Evidence/Unable to Rate</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Partly Meets</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Measures</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 The program has adequate funding to accomplish its mission and goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 The program demonstrates fiscal responsibility, responsible stewardship, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost-effectiveness consistent with institutional protocols.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 An analysis of expenditures, external and internal resources, and impact on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the campus community is completed before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.1 establishing funding priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.2 making significant changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Financial resources are sufficient to support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.1 study conceptualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.2 data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.3 data entry and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.4 dissemination of assessment and research findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.5 methodological training for staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all programs under review will incorporate guidelines to be rated as part of their self-studies. Even though the guidelines are optional for rating purposes, raters are strongly encouraged to read and review them as part of the training process. When CAS Guidelines or other criterion measures are rated, they should be treated as if they were standards.

**IV. Formulating an Action Plan**

Typically, the assessment process will identify areas where the program is not in compliance with the standards. Action planning designed to overcome program shortcomings and provide program enhancements must then occur.

To complete the process, a final summary document should be produced that (a) explains the mission, purpose, and philosophy of the program; (b) reviews the outcome of the assessment; and (c) recommends specific plans for action. Following is an outline of recommended steps for establishing a comprehensive
plan of action using the CAS self-assessment work forms. Space is provided in the SAG for recording relevant information.

1. **Answer Overview Questions (In the Instrument)**

   a. Respond, in writing in the space provided, to the Overview Questions that immediately follow the rating section of each of the 12 components.

   b. Use answers to the Overview Questions, which are designed to stimulate summary thinking about overarching issues, to facilitate interpretation of the ratings and development of the self-study report.

2. **Identify Areas of Program Strength (Work Form A)**

   a. Identify criterion measure ratings where strength in performance or accomplishment was noted (i.e., program exceeds criterion, generally rated 4 or 5, and viewed as Exceeds criteria or is Exemplary).

   b. Identify remaining ratings in which performance Meets the criterion (i.e., acceptable practice as reflected in rating of 3).

3. **Identify Areas of Program Weakness (Work Form A)**

   a. Identify criterion measures where program weaknesses (i.e., program shortcomings that fail to meet criterion measures and/or rating discrepancies among raters of two points or more) were noted.

   b. Identify criterion measures viewed as Does Not Meet or Partly Meets by one or more reviewer.

4. **Describe Practices Requiring Follow-up (Work Form A)**

   a. Note criterion measure numbers where the standard was judged to be Insufficient Evidence/Unable to Rate and describe shortcomings that need to be improved.

5. **Summarize Actions Required for the Program to Meet Standards (Work Form B)**

   a. List each criterion measure and/or related practices that the self-study process identified as being Insufficient Evidence/Unable to Rate, Does Not Meet, Partly Meetings, or where rater discrepancies were noted. Be specific when noting the rationale for each shortcoming identified.

   b. List specific actions identified in the self-study that require implementation

   c. Prioritize the list by importance, need, and achievability of the desired change.
6. **Summarize Program Enhancement Actions (Work Form C)**
   
a. List each specific action identified in the self-study that would enhance and strengthen services.

b. Establish specific priorities for the action plan.

7. **Write Program Action Plan**
   
a. Prepare a comprehensive action plan for implementing program changes.

b. Identify resources (i.e., human, fiscal, physical) that are essential to program enhancement.

c. Set dates by which specific actions are to be completed.

d. Identify responsible parties to complete the action steps.

e. Set tentative start-up date for initiating a subsequent self-study.