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The purpose of this document is to provide information on the process and outcomes of Administrative Unit Review (AUR).

Executive Summary

Unlike the previous academic and learner-support program review cycles, the process for review of administrative units was completed using cabinet members’ discretion. Divisions had the choice to use an online template and process developed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in the Division of Academic Affairs, or to establish one of their own making. The only stipulation was that all reviews would be completed at the division-level by December 1, 2018, so that discussions with the president could be completed during spring semester 2019.

This report tracks the results of those using the online template to complete the AUR cycle.

Administrative Unit Review Process

According to the Integrated Program Review and Planning Model (rev. May 29, 2018), developed for reporting to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), as part of evidence collection for WMU’s upcoming reaccreditation comprehensive visit, Administrative Unit Review was scheduled to begin during fiscal year 2017-18 with a Beta development year, followed by full-implementation in fiscal year 2018-19. Data would be collected to examine program effectiveness as well as alignment with the Gold Standard 2020, WMU’s institutional strategic plan. Specifically, questions were to be developed to “test” the following GS2020 categories developed during the “academic” and “learner-support” program review cycles:

- Strategic Planning (e.g., divisional and unit plans, program mission and vision, etc.)
- Demand and Assessment (e.g., communication, assessment of program outcomes, internal/external program review, etc.)
- Learning and Discovery (e.g., personnel, diversity and inclusion, experiential learning, etc.)
- Law and Policy (e.g., compliance, program guidelines, etc.)
- Resource Management (e.g., human and financial resources, facilities, etc.)
- Impact and Opportunity (i.e., overall impact, opportunity analysis)

At the time, it was anticipated that 61 administrative offices within the divisions of Academic Affairs; Business and Finance; Development and Alumni Relations; Diversity and Inclusion; Government Affairs and University Relations; Intercollegiate Athletics; Legal Affairs and General Counsel; Research; Student Affairs; and, the Office of the President would be reviewed.

As administrative units function very differently from academic and learner-support programs, as well as across divisions, WMU President Montgomery announced, in February 2018, that all cabinet members would conduct reviews of their divisions by whatever means they deemed valuable, and provide a summary of their findings to him by December 1, 2018.
Scope of the Review

Administrative Unit Review took place during a period of leadership turnover and division-level restructuring. The Office of University Relations was separated from the Office of Government Affairs, in June 2018, when WMU created a new vice president for marketing and strategic communication. The office was renamed the Office of Marketing and Strategic Communications, beginning July 1, 2018, and given a new direction. As such, this new division was exempt from completing the AUR process during this cycle. In addition, to accommodate the appointment and transition of a new senior athletic director and senior woman administrator, Intercollegiate Athletics was granted an extension through July 2019 to begin its review process.

Self-Study Template

With guidance from the vice president for business and finance, a uniform template was condensed and reorganized from previous integrated program review templates, and made available in paper and online formats for those wishing to use one (see Appendix A). The online version was built into Compliance Assist: Program Review, a module of the Campus Labs enterprise system. To introduce the online platform to members of the President’s Cabinet, an online letter was emailed on February 21, 2018 (see Appendix B).

Training and Training Materials

Between March 27 and October 31, 2019, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness held face-to-face training sessions with each division that chose to use Compliance Assist: Program Review platform to conduct reviews. In addition to demonstrations of how to use the system, trainings covered information on the purpose of the review and its intended outcomes, and how the process fit with regional accreditation compliance. chose to use Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist: Program Review platform to conduct a review Participants received copies of the “Administrative Program Review and Planning Guidelines” (see Appendix C), “Technical User Guide for Completing the AUR Self-Study Template” (see Appendix D), and the condensed version, “Accessing and Using Compliance Assist” (see Appendix E). Unit supervisors also received a copy of the “Observation and Next-Level Walkthrough Guide” (see Appendix F), while Cabinet members received the “Division-Level Walkthrough Guide” (see Appendix G). Members of the Institutional Effectiveness team remained on-call, throughout the process, to provide additional one-on-one assistance as needed.

Completion of the Process

The self-study completion period ran from April 1 through October 31, 2018, with submissions from 35 units in six divisions. Following is an overview of each participating division:

Office of the President

The Office of the President chose to use Compliance Assist: Program Review platform to conduct a review of its administrative operations and those of the Chief of Staff. Division-level review was completed on October 28, 2018.

Key Findings

The Office of the President staff has strategically navigated an important transitional period in the history of Western Michigan University while stewarding alignment with the strategic plan. Staff remains focused on supporting the President’s transformational approach to leadership. Presidential connectivity, image, and influence are all managed through the Office with care and diligence. Staff has prioritized unifying around function, mission, and skill in order to best serve executive leadership and evolving initiatives. Staff is deeply committed to WMU and the numerous stakeholders.
The Office of the President staff continues to assess processes and procedure as it relates to assisting executive leadership. Streamlining logistics takes time organizing complexities and transforming past practice. Continued collaboration and effort will lead to advanced efficiencies that can serve as an example for other divisions on campus.

**Action & Follow Up Items**

The Office of the President staff will continue to develop a functional foundation involving annual strategic planning and assessment analysis. Staff seeks review opportunities and champions continuous improvement. Continued change is inevitable in this highly functioning and visibly key division as organizational priorities are developed and implemented. The review and supporting material provided is thorough and accurately describes the forward direction of this important leadership area.

**Academic Affairs**

The Division of Academic Affairs also chose to use Campus Labs' [Compliance Assist: Program Review](https://wmich.edu/effectiveness/program/administrative) platform to conduct all of its reviews. The following units participated in this cycle:

- College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office
- College of Aviation Dean's Office
- College of Education and Human Development Dean's Office
- College of Engineering and Applied Sciences Dean's Office
- College of Fine Arts Dean's Office
- College of Health and Human Services Dean's Office
- Extended University Programs
- Graduate College Dean's Office
- Haenicke Institute for Global Education
- Haworth College of Business Dean's Office
- Office of Assessment and Undergraduate Studies
- Office of Information Technology
- Office of Institutional Effectiveness
- Office of Institutional Research
- Lee Honors College
- University Libraries

The aforementioned units were tasked to submit their completed self-study/self-review reports to the provost no later than September 1, 2018; however, due to changes in administration, the deadline was extended to October 1 for those unable to meet the initial deadline. Final division-level reviews were completed by December 21, 2018.

Having participated in prior reviews of academic and learner-support programs, the Division of Academic Affairs focused its Administrative Unit Review on the operational concerns of its college- and associate provost-level units. Focus areas included evaluating the development of unit-level strategic planning and alignment with the division’s strategic plan; units’ major functions or services, and how they relate to and impact the division and university; internal and external communication with campus and community stakeholders; promotion of a culture and climate of assessment throughout the university; opportunities for unit staff and administrators to engage in learning and discovery; compliance with laws and policies specific to units; management of unit-level resources; and, identification of potential challenges and opportunities for the next five years. The following is summary of the key findings from the review.
Key Findings

- Planning and alignment. Academic Affairs units are self-reflective. Although relatively new to strategic planning, they keep the division’s plan in mind when setting unit-level goals and identifying metrics. Units report on their progress semi-annually, and are beginning to use that information in decision-making.

- Major functions. Academic Affairs units are diverse, spanning nine colleges and seven non-academic units that work collaboratively with all other divisions to conduct the main work of the university; educating and graduating generations of future experts and leaders. Units strive to be responsive to change, developing academic programs with flexible delivery mechanisms to meet the needs of a rapidly changing economy, while providing support for domestic and international learner success both inside and outside of the classroom. Units are collaborative, working collectively with other university areas, as well as developing partnerships with business, community, and industry that provide a plethora of opportunities for internships and extra-curricular, service-learning, research, and community-outreach activities.

- Assessment. Academic Affairs is leading the university-wide effort to advance the growing climate of assessment into a culture of assessment. The Office of Assessment and Undergraduate Studies facilitates the University Assessment Steering Committee, a university-wide cross-collaborative body tasked with educating on and assisting with the development of student learning and operational outcomes assessment. The office also conducts direct and indirect assessments of student learning, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, and the Collegiate Learning Assessment.

- Compliance. The Division of Academic Affairs oversees the university’s regional accreditation and compliance with U.S. Department of Education policies and processes. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness works with the Accreditation Liaison Officer to prepare the university for its 2021 Comprehensive Evaluation by the Higher Learning Commission, and facilitates the work of criterion teams as they prepare the Assurance Argument. The office also facilitates training for strategic plan reporting.

- Challenges and opportunities. Academic Affairs units identified a need for stronger coherence between departments, colleges, and divisions, working toward dismantling existing siloes and preventing new ones in the future. Units see this as possible through better communication practices within and across units, specifically regarding policy changes and development of additional avenues for stakeholder feedback. Regarding personnel, units identified a need to be more attentive to hiring and programming not only for historically underrepresented populations, but also mindful of field-specific underrepresented demographics. In addition, the need for more opportunities for staff and administrator professional development and engagement in research and scholarly/creative activities was identified. Problems associated with lagging resources are expected to improve by the implementation of a new university budget model.

Business and Finance

The Office of Business and Finance chose to use a paper-based template, of their own creation, that used the same information as the online template. The vice president for business and finance then chose the following units to participate during this cycle:

- Accounts Receivable/Cashiering
- Auxiliary Enterprises
- Community Outreach
- Facilities Management
- Grants and Contracts
OBF reported that all units successfully completed their self-study reporting and unit-level reviews by their November 1, 2018 deadline. Division-Level review was completed by November 26.

Business and finance performed an extensive review of the majority of the critical operations carried out by the division. Aspects of the review included evaluating the alignment of mission and values, staffing talent, interaction with campus and the broader community, efficiency and effectiveness of operations, and whether or not the division’s efforts promote the broader strategic vision of WMU – school of choice, diversifying revenue streams, and recruitment and retention. The results of the review itself are extensive. This summary remains focused on the key discoveries resulting from the review.

Key Discoveries

1. Business and finance is a diverse organization that performs critical functions essential to the success of WMU. We provide the power; keep campus clean, attractive and operating; we pay people; we collect tuition dollars; we procure the goods and services necessary for campus; we design and construct the buildings; we invest the cash; we pay bills; we manage the total work-life from hire to retire; we manage benefits; we negotiate contracts; we maintain roads and parking lots, we keep campus safe; and, we are often the “go to” division. Business and finance has a significant impact on campus life – both for the present and the future.

2. We are an evolving organization. The degrees, professional certifications, licenses, and training certificates of today’s work force represent a much stronger human capital portfolio than in past years. This evolution has been promoted through a deliberate hiring and training strategy as we have as staffing opportunities arise.

3. The culture within business and finance is aspirational. As a division, we are strongly committed to fostering change. Our historical record as well as current efforts are a testament to our team members’ adaptability and openness to new ideas. We evaluate our initiatives on the basis of whether or not the change allows us to better serve the campus community as well as gain efficiencies. In evaluating the merits of the change, we use data and best practices to determine whether or not to proceed.

4. Business and finance has implemented an effective succession strategy. Potential internal talent is identified early. Training and leadership growth opportunities are provided to continue to develop this talent. If the organizational hierarchy is too narrow, positions are added which allow for more professional growth opportunities to continue to nurture talent. We also recognize the benefit of hiring talent from the external market. When this occurs, we attempt to provide overlap between the current incumbent and the individual assuming that role. This approach to talent growth and also continuity and transfer of institutional knowledge enables us to maintain operations that function at a peak level.

5. Facilities Management is one of our strongest departments as you consider alignment of mission and values, peer benchmarking, and defined operational metrics. It is also an operation where it is easier to obtain peer comparative information due to the national professional societies and published information.

6. For those areas that noted additional development needed, the focus was usually on the need to more clearly define and align the mission and values between the department/division/university, greater use of outcome metrics and peer benchmarking, as well as policy and procedure review. The repetitive nature of the areas needing attention,
signals that effort has been more focused on daily output and business needs rather than developing the strategic framework for operations.

Some of the specific changes that occurred as a result of the review are listed below:

- Grants and contracts organizationally moved to research
- Retiree health insurance billing moved from quarterly to monthly and became mainstream with regular invoicing process
- Recycling transferred to Facilities Management from Academic Affairs (Office for Sustainability)
- Completed the retirement investment initiatives projects which impacts all benefits eligible employees – both active and retired
- Requested proposals for working capital and endowment investment advisory services and subsequently engaged a new advisor and modified the investment policy statement
- Evaluated and changed how we manage seasonal/cyclical work in facilities that require a unique skill set and training
- Created a K-9 unit
- Completed a market recalibration project for our salary compensation system employees
- Purchased and implemented a contract management software.

7. The review highlighted the need to continue to make greater use of technology to enhance both efficiency and effectiveness. One department identified where this need is the greatest is and human resources. Many current processes are either manual or rely on technology that is outdated or does not interface well with other systems. We dedicated both financial and human resources and have identified new technology that will be implemented to make the hiring process better for the hiring department as well as human resources. Position management is critical to our future success.

8. We also identified our tuition assessment structure and billing as another critical area needing improvement. As a result, we engaged one of the premier consultants to help us deploy a new billing model that will make it easier to administer as well as for our students to understand. Roll-out will occur summer 2020.

Diversity and Inclusion

The Office of Diversity and Inclusion chose to use Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist: Program Review platform to conduct its review of the ODI Central Office and IT Unit. All other ODI units were reviewed during the Learner-Support Unit Review cycle. Division-level review was completed on July 23, 2018.

Diversity and Inclusion focused its program review on strategies for better use of resources, engaging in collaboration across our area and campus, fostering opportunities for professional development for students, staff and faculty as well as contributing to the recruitment of more diverse faculty, staff and students. As a unit we found that we have done some significant work in the areas but also were able to identify areas of improvement. Through this review we were able to identify additional strategies to meet our goals.

Findings and Actions:

- In the area of assessing the efficient and effective use of our resources, both human and financial, ODI had each staff member complete a time study of daily activities as well a budget review for each area. This led us to create a budget analyst position, and reclassify the Director of Operation Position to a Budget Manager.
• We also created Teams to address assessment needs, staff morale, marketing needs and streamline our administrative functions. This also led to creating a VP Leadership Team to oversee operational policies and procedures. We reallocated positions with the office of the VP and Disability Student Services to improve sustainability of programming and services.

• To maintain our efficiency, we have centralized our time reporting and created a centralized database to store all program activities on a monthly basis.

• It has also been a goal of ODI to reduce waste, so we have significantly reduced our use of paper by utilizing the TEAMS application to communicate and share information across areas, have improved the use of our webpages.

• As financial resources are reduced we have intentionally sought alternative means to fund programs. This resulted in securing a grant from the Kalamazoo Community Foundation for $47,000 to help support CAMP students beyond the first year, a grant to allow us to hire a part-time position for LBGT-SS to assist with doing pre-college programming for LGBT students and collaborated with Student Affairs, HIGE and Speech, Language and Hearing Science Dept. to cost share for programs. We are also soliciting donors to support ODI programs and areas.

• We improved the diversity network by dissolving the Diversity Council and enlarging the Diversity Steering Committee by adding athletics, honor’s college, graduate college and extended university programs.

• We have developed new collaborations with Human Resources to provide online training in diversity and inclusion for new employees. Collaborated with Admissions to provided diversity and inclusion presentations to first year students as part of new student orientation and work with the Office of Institutional Equity to offer implicit bias training to more staff and faculty.

• We continue to engage in pre-college programming with our collaborations with Kalamazoo Public Schools: Bronco Buds, High School Visitation Day, Middle School Career Cruising, and Gear Up. Through these programs we provided programming for 180 middle school and high school students.

• We continue to foster the interest in research and partnerships as evidenced by the Real Talk programs, Everyone Counts Diversity Learning Communities, Safe on Campus and Concerned Student workshops, and sponsoring of Student Organizations events, Multicultural Meet and Greet, and co-sponsoring with the Honors College and Student Affairs our participation in the Equity in Mental Health Project through the Steve Fund.

• WE have had two undergraduate students conduct research projects re: the experience of LGBT students on campus and had students in our Kalamazoo Promise Scholars program present at the Clemson University Men of Color Summit with a graduate intern.

• To highlight and encourage diversity and inclusion work across campus we have provided some avenues to showcase diversity and inclusion work such as the Teach-In as part Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration and our Excellence in Diversity Awards.

Follow-Up:

• ODI plans to administer a Campus Climate survey to students, faculty and staff in spring 2020. The survey results will better assist us in identify needs to be addressed in improving the climate on campus.

• ODI has begun to reach out to alumni, faculty and staff to assist with the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and staff.

• At this time the professional development regarding diversity and inclusion issues is limited so the focus will be in developing more education opportunities through the Office of Diversity Education and in collaboration with other entities on campus.

• Offering an online module for students to engage with diversity and inclusion issues.
Research

The Office of Research and Innovation chose to use Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist: Unit Review platform to conduct a review of its administrative operations. Division-level review was completed on October 24, 2018 with an update as many changes have occurred with the recruitment of a new Vice President for Research and Innovation. The Office of Research and Innovation identified the following as its key strengths:

- **Leadership**: Recent reorganization and culture changes have empowered the staff leading the functional areas to be more responsive to WMU needs and implement more positive changes directly.
- **Staff**: The move of Grants and Contracts reporting to ORI as well as physically to Walwood has increased communication and efficiency.
- **Infrastructure of the office**: The remodeling of space at Walwood has created an improved working environment. After years of neglect computer refreshing is now standard in ORI increasing staff efficiency.
- **Collaborations and new ideas**: ORI has revised the Research Advisory Team meetings to be more collaborative with the colleges.

In addition, OVPR sees the following as its key challenges:

- **Lack of IT systems for research administration**: ecrt for effort reporting is a welcome addition, however the PAF system is home grown and suffers from many issue and is not sustainable. All other systems are paper.
- **Shrinking faculty pool partially driven excessive use of faculty specialists**: The increase in faculty specialists who do not have research in the role has decreased the pool of potential funded investigators.
- **Graduate school and tuition issues on grants**: The need to increase graduate students funded on grants and graduate assistants to do research with new faculty versus service roles on GA/RA positions is a challenge that needs significant review.
- **Aging equipment**: Equipment is aging and there are not dedicated funds to address this issue, analysis indicates that WMU is at the bottom of all Michigan universities in % of expenditures for research support of all expenditures.
- **Lack of an up to date space system**: There are concerns for the F and A proposal, efficient space utilization to support funded researchers and safety issues that space data is not readily available.

Office of Research and Innovation believes there is room for growth and higher quality services to be provided to the faculty and staff at WMU, and next steps are also dependent on members of WMU outside ORI (Deans, faculty and staff) and require a collaborative approach.

Student Affairs

The Division of Student Affairs chose to use Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist: Program Review platform to conduct all of its reviews. The vice president for student affairs then chose the following units to participate during this cycle:

- Assessment and Effectiveness
- Business Operations
- Facilities
- Finance and Infrastructure
- Information Systems
- Marketing

Division-Level reviews were completed on December 11, 2018.
Key Findings

- The review serves as a reflection process for both new and returning directors during which, directors can take the time to think holistically and critically about their unit in accordance with the criteria provided. It also served as an opportunity to reinforce how each unit serves and supports divisional and institutional priorities.
- Staff found the initial round of feedback (provided by the director of assessment) to be helpful prior to supervisory or divisional level review.
- Capturing the complex operation of the administrative units in Student Affairs in a succinct way that is easily understood for multiple audiences was challenging. Multiple offices reflected on their desire to tell their story and communicate their work.
- Most of the administrative units had substantial documentation, evidence, or data related to their practices. In line with, many offices mentioned the desire to devote time and energy towards key performance indicators, benchmarks, and strategic pathways for their units.
- Across administrative units there was a deep commitment to providing quality service.

Action & Follow Up Items

- Several units spoke to the desire to continue collaboration across Student Affairs and the institution in order to engage in diversity and inclusion work, provide assessment and strategic planning information, market information consistently, reduce risk, and provide policies and procedures that are meaningful and improve the student experience.
- Using data to drive decisions is an area of strength for some units and an area of growth for other administrative units. This is true for the division at-large. One action item for Student Affairs is to develop meaningful key performance indicators which serve as lead and lag metrics for the division and institution and can be benchmarked with other institutions to serve as an indicators of best practices. UPDATE: Since the administrative review wrap up, the divisional leadership team has developed a set of lead and lag metrics for the division and in also invested in an analytics platform which allows us to connect information across the multiple units in Student Affairs to make data-informed decisions as a whole.
- Continuing to provide support for strategic planning and program review is also a part of this effort.
- Finally, Dining Services was considered under the Learner Support Program Review; however, this unit would be better served undergoing the administrative program review and will make this change for the future.
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Self-Study Reporting Template

February 13, 2018

The purpose of this document is to serve as the paper-based collection instrument for completing the Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) cycle. It also serves as the framework for building an electronic template in the Compliance Assist: Program Review platform.

Administrative Support Programs

For the purpose of this program review, administrative support programs are defined as functional units of this institution that provide stewardship and support in delivery of fiscal, human, and physical resources to advance the university’s mission and strategic goals. This definition is flexible in order to allow divisions to identify programs. The vice president responsible for the division, in which the administrative support program exists, will have the final say in identifying programs to be included in this review.

General Guidelines for Completing the AdmRP Template

The Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) template is designed around criteria that will structure the program’s self-review in line with the university strategic goals, and how collected data and review information will be used in future strategic planning.
Responses must be based on credible, verifiable sources (e.g., institutional data, etc.), and must be appropriately cited. For example, if comparisons to the State of Michigan population demographics are being referenced, a website showing the data should be provided as the source, and the reader should be given relevant descriptive statistics as part of the response. Note: Once an electronic template is available in the Compliance Assist: Program Review platform, self-review completers will be able to upload and attach cited material to the template.

When providing evidence in the form of data (e.g., “participation increased 15% from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017,” etc.), template completers must also comment on how data impact program planning. For all responses, care must be taken to provide evidence that can be identified in the source line, particularly when making comparisons or including program ranking information.

Although some questions may seem similar to others, each question is based on a specific criterion, so each requires an authentic response. Copying and pasting responses within a program template, or between program templates, will not provide accurate program-specific information.

It is possible that some programs may not be able to respond to some criteria. An honest response of “we don’t know” is valuable information for planning purposes. Responding with “N/A,” “not applicable,” “not available,” etc., however, is not sufficient on its own, and must include a brief rationale.

Please remember that completed review templates will be read by individuals who may not be familiar with the program’s taxonomy. Therefore, acronyms and initials should be kept to a minimum. When including acronyms and initials, the official title or proper name must be written out in its first instance.

The template is a fillable form. Click or tab in each box to enter information. Note: although fillable areas will expand to fit submission, please limit responses to 200 words.

---

**Overview**

Please provide the officially recognized program identification information. For the purpose of this program review, administrative programs are determined by the division’s vice president or director.

*Please complete the following information. Note: if the division directly supervises the program, do not complete “College or Unit Name” or “College or Unit Head.”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Enter program’s official name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College or Unit Name</td>
<td>Enter official name of program’s supervising unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMU Division Name</td>
<td>Enter official name of VP-level division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>Enter submission date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Head</td>
<td>Enter name and title of program head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or Unit Head</td>
<td>Enter name and title of unit head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP or Division Director</td>
<td>Enter name and title of division head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please enter the address and physical location of the program offered.

Click or tap here to enter text.

---

In what year was the program initiated?

*Programs initiated prior to 2000 may enter the phrase “prior to 2000”*

Enter the four-digit year

In what year was the last significant revision made to the program?

*Programs revised prior to 2000 may enter the phrase “prior to 2000”*

Enter the four-digit year

What revision was made, and what mitigated the revision (e.g., best practices, stakeholder recommendations, etc.)?
Strategic Planning

1. Please provide your program’s mission statement, vision and value statements.

2. How does your program’s mission support the division’s mission as well as the university’s goals and strategies?

3. What are your top three to four strategic goals for the upcoming year and how do they align with your mission?
   i. Enter top strategic goal for the program.
   ii. Enter top strategic goal for the program.
   iii. Enter top strategic goal for the program.
   iv. Enter top strategic goal for the program.

4. Please provide your organizational chart.

   Right-click inside the box, below, to paste a JPG, PNG, or other “picture-type” copy of your organizational chart.

5. List and briefly describe the major functions performed/services provided by your department. For each function, indicate the frequency in which the activity is performed (daily, weekly, monthly, or annually). Also for each activity, indicate the stakeholder(s)/customer(s) served.

   Click or tap here to enter text.
6. Review the functions/services performed and determine whether or not the activity falls within the purview of your department and should continue to be performed.

Communication and Assessment

1. List and describe any external reviews/assessments conducted within the past five years of your department. Provide information on who performed the review, when it was conducted, activities performed during the review, and the outcome.

2. What actions did you take as a result of the findings of the external review/assessment?

3. List and describe routine communications made by your department on a regular basis. Provide the frequency of the communication and identify the intended audience.

4. What metrics do you use to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of your operations? Identify three to five metrics you used to evaluate your operations.

5. Are you able to benchmark your performance against externally recognized metrics for either best practice and/or performance? If so, please provide performance metrics as benchmarked against external data. The external source must be a verifiable source and must be appropriately cited and attached, where appropriate.

Learning and Discovery

1. List and describe any programs/activities that your department engages in that supports and provides:
   - Learning/discovery opportunities
   - Research and/or grants
   - Global engagement

2. Detail and comment on how your department participates in, facilitates, or promotes community outreach.

Law and Policy

1. List laws and regulations that you must comply with in performing your services.
2. How frequently do you review your department’s policies and guidelines? What causes the review?
Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Detail and comment on the program’s preparedness for threats, emergencies, and crises.
Click or tap here to enter text.

Resource Management

1. For your department, please provide the following information:
   - Operating budget for the 2017-18 year (can be a glow report or any other report format)
     Click or tap here to enter text.
   - Operating expenses and revenues incurred year-to-date
     Click or tap here to enter text.
   - Number of FTEs
     Click or tap here to enter text.
   - Required degrees, professional certifications, or other professional credentials required to satisfactory perform the work of your department
     Click or tap here to enter text.
   - If you have employees who have voluntarily completed training and received certificates and/or other externally recognized degrees/program certifications/professional honors, please note these
     Click or tap here to enter text.
   - If you have employees who participate in regional, state, or national professional organizations as members please list these organizations
     Click or tap here to enter text.
   - List presentations made at professional conferences or at professional group meetings
     Click or tap here to enter text.

2. List any awards/honors received for specific projects/accomplishments within the past five years. Identify who provided the award/honor as well as for the reason earned.
Click or tap here to enter text.

3. How does your department support diversity and inclusion?
Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact and Opportunity

1. As you look forward to the next five years, describe challenges and opportunities that your department will face.
Click or tap here to enter text.
2. As a result of this review, what opportunities have you identified to change the level and delivery of services to reduce costs, increase revenues, enhance the level of service, or to be more effective in the delivery of service?

Click or tap here to enter text.
APPENDIX B

Letter to Cabinet Members

February 21, 2018

Emailed to Cabinet Members
February 21, 2018

Hello Cabinet Members;

I have become aware that the president has distributed the draft Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) materials at the February 19 Cabinet meeting. I believe there is a bit more information that you need in order to move forward. I have provided here a few more points of information, but would like to offer to meet with each of you to address your specific plans, as I believe the president indicated that there is a great deal of freedom in deciding how your division will conduct the Administrative Program Review and Planning process. Institutional Effectiveness has spent the last five years working on integrated program review and, through the lessons learned in the Academic and Learner-Support Program Reviews, I think we can assist with your planning. Please reach out to me at your earliest convenience.

Here are some additional points of information:

1. The university has purchased the Compliance Assist software platform, from Campus Labs, to utilize in program review and planning. This additional tool greatly streamlined the process for the Learner Support Program Review and Planning cycle, conducted in 2016. It provides a comprehensive report of the self-study and evaluation comments throughout the process. We have developed a number of support documents to facilitate use of the software as well as understanding of the self-study and evaluation process.

2. Institutional Effectiveness will need to know the names of the units you plan to include in the 2018 Administrative Program Review and Planning cycle, and when units that not being included now, will be. If you are planning to use Compliance Assist to conduct your self-studies and review, then we actually create a separate template for each unit and provide access to an individual in that unit for submission purposes. Of course, next-level and administrative access is also given, when identified.

3. You have been given the option to use some or all of the criteria listed on pages 4 through 6 in the Administrative Program Review and Planning document, shared on Monday. If you are planning to use Compliance Assist, you cannot add additional criteria but could simply mark “not applicable” or “NA” if you chose not to use a specific item.

4. In the current Administrative Program Review and Planning document, you will see, on pages 3 and 4, the procedures followed in previous program reviews; Step 1 is self-study of a program
across the 6 categories; Step 2 is the next-level review, where evaluation is made in regard to the criteria (e.g., Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, etc.); and, Step 3 includes planning decisions regarding the findings of the self-study and review. While not listed in the current document, Academic and Learner-Support Program Reviews used a planning decision regarding the program (i.e., continuous quality improvement, remediation, growth, program restructuring, and elimination). Further planning documents were then required based on the planning decision.

5. Whether you use the planning decision language or not, all divisions are to provide a summary report to the president by December 1, 2018. The details of the report should indicate findings of self-study and planning recommendations. This report will be used as evidence for the Higher Learning Commission Evidence File for Criterion 5: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. This must be an electronic file.

6. Finally, if you are planning to utilize information gained from your independent process of administrative review, rather than conduct a new series of self-studies, the obligation to respond in summary form to the president still stands and is to cover the six criteria included in the proposed Administrative Program Review and Planning document.

Sincerely,

Jody Brylinsky, Ph.D.
Associate Provost Institutional Effectiveness
APPENDIX C
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The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for completing the Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) cycle.

The University Strategic Plan

The University Strategic Plan (USP) describes the institution as “learner centered, discovery driven, and globally engaged” (Western Michigan University, 2020). Specifically, Goal 5: Sustainable Stewardship reads “Advance economic and environmental sustainability practices and policies.” Aligning effective assessment with campus-wide continuous improvement is key to building a culture of sustainable stewardship. Administrative support programs make a valuable contribution toward the achievement of the University’s mission and goals; therefore, should be part of campus-wide integrated program review.

Statement of Purpose

A comprehensive review of University programs should facilitate strategic planning in creating, sustaining, growing, merging, or eliminating programs in order to maintain program relevancy for WMU stakeholders and the community. Program review is a collaborative process that allows the unit to focus not only on the stated mission and goals, but also on how well the unit is accomplishing those goals by measuring efficiency, effectiveness, satisfaction, resource allocation, outcomes, and other items. Program review assists with continuous improvement of programs and services, demonstrates a unit’s effectiveness, and helps with institution-wide understanding and coherence of units. It is critical that the process and criteria be fully transparent.
Intended Outcomes

1. Provide direction as to how to enhance current and new administrative support programs as part of continuous quality improvement.
2. Promote a suite of programs, services, policies, and procedures across the University that insures all units are aligned with strategic objectives that support the mission and goals of the University.
3. Further integrate program assessment and budgetary decisions.
4. Provide indications for resource allocation to meet the current and future needs of the University.

Administrative Support Programs

For the purpose of this program review, administrative support programs are defined as functional units of this institution that provide stewardship and support in delivery of fiscal, human, and physical resources to advance the university’s mission and strategic goals. This definition is flexible in order to allow divisions to identify programs. The vice president responsible for the division, in which the administrative support program exists, will have the final say in identifying programs to be included in this review.

Compliance with the Higher Learning Commission

In meeting its obligation for reaffirmation of accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission, WMU must engage in a process of continuous improvement that insures institutional effectiveness. Specifically, as it relates to Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP), WMU must provide evidence in support of the HLC Criteria for Accreditation, especially Criterion 5 Resources, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness: The institution’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Components 5.A, C, and D are most relevant.

5.A. The institution’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution’s resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution’s organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution’s staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution’s sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Guiding Principles

WMU adopts the following guiding principles for the development, implementation, and utilization of a program review and planning framework, based on lessons learned during Academic Program Review and Planning in 2014-15 and Learner Support Program Review and Planning 2016-2017. Specifically, the Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) process will be:

1. **Transparent**: The review and subsequent strategic planning process will be collaboratively developed and supported by senior leadership, administration, and staff in communication with the University community.

2. **Comprehensive**: The review criteria will be meaningful and extensive as to provide for a fair and unbiased evaluation of all programs.

3. **Consistent**: The same review criteria and standards will be applied to each program within a Division, allowing for unique program performance measurements, as appropriate. The process of review for all programs within a Division will be applied in the same way.

4. **Inclusive**: All administrative support programs will be reviewed in a specified time period.

5. **Data-Driven**: The review will be based on both quantitative and qualitative data using consistent, clearly defined terms. Data sources will include institutional data, unit-derived data, and external data.

6. **Respectful**: Those involved in the review and planning process will remain cognizant of the human effects of its outcomes. Planning decisions will exercise institutional flexibility in maximizing human, economic, and social resources.

Procedures

The ADMPR&P process is intended to provide a mission-driven, data-informed, and participatory process for continuous quality review, incorporating three phases: self-study, review, and planning. Each Division is responsible for establishing a process and timeline for program review. All levels of review and planning are to be completed by November 1, 2018, with submission of Division summary planning recommendations to the president by December 3, 2018.

**Phase One: Self-Study and Self-Review** is intended to improve the effectiveness of the program by linking professional standards to program improvement efforts. Each unit will engage in a self-study process responding to the criteria selected by Division leadership across the 6 program review categories:

1. Strategic Planning
2. Communication and Assessment
3. Learning and Discovery
4. Law and Policy
5. Resource Management
6. Impact and Opportunity

**Phase Two: Next- and Division-Level Review** is intended to ensure that programs are functioning at the highest possible levels of quality, and are consistent with the mission of the University and its strategic plan. Reviewers will evaluate the specified criteria items as

- Exceeds Expectations— program excellence in specific criterion
- Meets Expectations – reasonable level of quality relative to criterion
- Needs development – program characteristic not living up to University or unit norms, stated purposes, or mission of the program; may be a work in progress
- Incomplete Response – data or narrative provided does not address the criterion, narrative may not provide sufficient data or evidence to support he given narrative, no explanation has been provided for missing data or narrative.

**Phase Three: Planning, Decision-Making, and Implementation** is intended to utilize information and observations contained in the program review for the purpose of integrated strategic planning. Each senior leader will provide a summary report of planning initiatives resulting from the self-study review to the President by December 3, 2018 as evidence in support of HLC Criterion 5 Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.

**Administrative Program Review and Planning Criteria**

The criteria are mission-based and connected to the goals and strategies of the Higher Learning Commission Criteria for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, and University Strategic Plan. Each Division may select and or add criterion but must contain at least 1 area for review in each of the 6 program review categories. If existing program review data is being substituted for the specified criterion below, Division leadership is responsible for a summary report that would provide an account of program review and planning contained in the established criteria.

**Overview**

**Program Description**: Contact information for all levels of oversight; location of the program; official start date of the program; and, significant revisions to the program.

**Strategic Planning**

1. Please provide your department’s mission statement, vision and value statements.
2. How does your department’s mission support the division’s mission as well as the University’s goals and strategies?
3. What are your top three strategic goals for the upcoming year and how do they align with your mission?
4. Please provide your organizational chart.
5. List and briefly describe the major functions performed/services provided by your department. For each function, indicate the frequency in which the activity is performed (daily, weekly, monthly, or annually). Also for each activity, indicate the stakeholder(s)/customer(s) served.
6. Review the functions/services performed and determine whether or not the activity falls within the purview of your department and should continue to be performed.

**Communications and Assessment**

1. List and describe any external reviews/assessments conducted within the past five years of your department. Provide information on who performed the review, when it was conducted, activities performed during the review, and the outcome.
2. What actions did you take as a result of the findings of the external review/assessment?
3. List and describe routine communications made by your department on a regular basis. Provide the frequency of the communication and identify the intended audience.
4. What metrics do you use to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of your operations? Identify three to five metrics you used to evaluate your operations.
5. Are you able to benchmark your performance against externally recognized metrics for either best practice and/or performance? If so, please provide performance metrics as benchmarked against external data. The external source must be a verifiable source and must be appropriately cited and attached, where appropriate.

**Learning and Discovery**

1. List and describe any programs/activities that your department engages in that supports and provides:
   - Learning/discovery opportunities
   - Research and/or grants
   - Global engagement
2. Detail and comment on how your department participates in, facilitates, or promotes community outreach.

**Law and Policy**

1. List laws and regulations that you must comply with in performing your services.
2. How frequently do you review your department’s policies and guidelines? What causes the review?
3. Detail and comment on the program’s preparedness for threats, emergencies, and crises.

**Resource Management**

1. For your department, please provide the following information:
   - Operating budget for the 2017-18 year (can be a glow report or any other report format)
   - Operating expenses and revenues incurred year-to-date
   - Number of FTEs
   - Required degrees, professional certifications, or other professional credentials required to satisfactory perform the work of your department
   - If you have employees who have voluntarily completed training and received certificates and/or other externally recognized degrees/program certifications/professional honors, please note these
   - If you have employees who participate in regional, state, or national professional organizations as members please list these organizations
   - List presentations made at professional conferences or at professional group meetings
2. List any awards/honors received for specific projects/accomplishments within the past five years. Identify who provided the award/honor as well as for the reason earned.
3.  How does your department support diversity and inclusion?

**Impact and Opportunity**

1.  As you look forward to the next five years, describe challenges and opportunities that your department will face.

2.  As a result of this review, what opportunities have you identified to change the level and delivery of services to reduce costs, increase revenues, enhance the level of service, or to be more effective in the delivery of service?
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Administrative Support Programs

For the purpose of this program review, administrative support programs are defined as functional units of this institution that provide stewardship and support in delivery of fiscal, human, and physical resources to advance the university’s mission and strategic goals. This definition is flexible in order to allow divisions to identify programs. The vice president responsible for the division, in which the administrative support program exists, will have the final say in identifying programs to be included in this review.

General Guidelines for Completing the AdmRP Template

The Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) template is designed around criteria that will structure the program’s self-review in line with the university strategic goals, and how collected data and review information will be used in future strategic planning.

Responses must be based on credible, verifiable sources (e.g., institutional data, etc.), and must be appropriately cited. For example, if comparisons to the State of Michigan population demographics are being referenced, a website showing the data should be provided as the source, and the reader should be given relevant descriptive statistics as part of the response.
When providing evidence in the form of data (e.g., “participation increased 15% from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017,” etc.), template completers must also comment on how data impact program planning. For all responses, care must be taken to provide evidence that can be identified in the source line, particularly when making comparisons or including program ranking information.

Although some questions may seem similar to others, each question is based on a specific criterion, so each requires an authentic response. Copying and pasting responses within a program template, or between program templates, will not provide accurate program-specific information.

It is possible that some programs may not be able to respond to some criteria. An honest response of “we don’t know” is valuable information for planning purposes. Responding with “N/A,” “not applicable,” “not available,” etc., however, is not sufficient on its own, and must include a brief rationale.

Please remember that completed review templates will be read by individuals who may not be familiar with the program’s taxonomy. Therefore, acronyms and initials should be kept to a minimum. When including acronyms and initials, the official title or proper name must be written out in its first instance.

The template is a fillable form. Click or tab in each box to enter information. *Note: although fillable areas will expand to fit submission, please limit responses to 200 words.*
Accessing and Using Compliance Assist

The Academic Program Review template will be completed online using Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist platform. Following is a step-by-step, pictorial guide to accessing and using Compliance Assist. Since this is a web-based application, you will not need any special software and may access it from any computer with an internet connection.

Locate and Open Compliance Assist
Open a browser and login to GoWMU with your Bronco NetID and password.

In your “My Work” channel, click the arrow next to “All Links,” to drop the menu down

Select “Campus Labs” – Note: This will redirect you to the main WMU Campus Labs landing site

Select “Compliance Assist” from the menu

Then, select “Program Review” to launch the template selector page

The dark bar shows what template you are using, and which program you’ve selected – Note: one template is usually created for each program that will be reviewed
How to Complete Templates

The program template has a series of four tabs:

- **Introduction** – this tab summarizes the purpose and procedures of the Learner Support Program Review and Planning cycle – *this is the same information found on pages 2 and 3 of this guide*
- **AdmRP Template** – this tab is the template you will need to complete for each program – *it is identical to the MS Word version of the template found posted on http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review*
- **Next- & Division-Level Review** – this tab is where the program’s next- and division-level supervisors will complete their reviews
- **Document Directory** – this is where you will upload and save your evidentiary documents

Completing the Template

After reviewing the introduction tab, click “AdmRP Template” to view the self-study template, as shown below. This template is identical to the Microsoft Word AdmRP template shared on the Institutional Effectiveness website.

![AdmRP Template](http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review)
This view shows the question number and title, the question to be answered, and instructions for responding.

To add your response, click the arrow next to “Options,” and select “Edit Item”

NOTE: When an item is opened in edit mode, it becomes “checked-out” of the system, and will need to be “checked-in” when completed.

Scroll down and place your response in the “Narrative” section

~ If working directly in Compliance Assist, just begin typing

~ If you used the MS Word version of the template, copy and paste your response here
Click “Save & Close” to return to view the completed response. This will generate a warning window.

Click “Check-In” to register the response – you may always return, later, to make additions or corrections.

**A word of caution:** Responses that are left “checked-out” do not register, and will not become part of the report.
Document Directory

When you have completed entering your information, it’s important to include resources to support your narrative. These resources serve as your evidence for reporting.

Click the “Document Directory” to begin uploading your files

Make certain to convert your documents to PDF format, first. Then, upload the PDF version to this directory. This allows a single document to be used in multiple responses.

To upload your documents, click “Options,” and select “Manage Files.”

Then, select “Upload File”

To upload a single document, click “Select” to open a “File Explorer” window

Select your document and click “Open”
The filename appears confirming that it is an acceptable file type.

Click “Upload Files” to complete the process.

This will generate a confirmation window allowing you to continue or return to the...
Completing the Template Questions

Example Narrative

Overview

Please provide the officially recognized program identification information. For the purpose of this program review, administrative programs are determined by the division’s vice president or director.

Please complete the following information. Note: if the division directly supervises the program, do not complete “College or Unit Name” or “College or Unit Head.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Office of Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Program Head</th>
<th>College or Unit Name</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>College or Unit Head</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WMU Division Name</td>
<td>Division of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>VP or Division Director</td>
<td>Jody A. Brylinsky, Ph.D., Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Susan Stapleton, Ph.D., Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submission Date: 4/30/2018

Please enter the address and physical location of the program offered.

3074 Seibert Administration Building, MS: 5204; 2002 W Michigan Ave, B112 and B113, MS: 5253

In what year was the program initiated?

Programs initiated prior to 2000 may enter the phrase “prior to 2000”

In what year was the last significant revision made to the program?

Programs revised prior to 2000 may enter the phrase “prior to 2000”

2004

2012

What revision was made, and what mitigated the revision (e.g., best practices, stakeholder recommendations, etc.)?

The office’s menu of projects was changed. Remaining institutional assessment projects (e.g., NSSE/FSSE and CLA administrations, ICES Online, etc.) were transferred to the association provost for assessment and undergraduate studies, along with supervision of the Office of Faculty Development. The associate provost for institutional effectiveness was named Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) to the Higher Learning Commission, which resulted in gaining responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the university’s strategic plan, Academic Affairs strategic plan, and institutional integrated program review and planning.

Strategic Planning

1. Please provide your program’s mission statement, vision and value statements.

   The mission of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is to provide leadership to develop, integrate, and improve regional- and program-level accreditation, strategic planning, and integrated program review, while monitoring institutional compliance with federal regulations.

2. How does your program’s mission support the division’s mission (e.g., Academic Affairs, Budget and Finance, etc.) as well as the university’s goals and strategies?

   IE’s mission supports the Academic Affairs strategic plan through alignment with Strategy 1.3b: “Implement the findings of the Academic Program Review and Planning (APR&P) process to grow, improve, remediate, or eliminate programs,” and Strategy 1.3c: “Provide resources necessary to support the needs of nationally and internationally recognized undergraduate and graduate programs, and model this trajectory to cultivate other programs.”
IE’s mission supports the university’s goals and strategies through alignment with:

- Strategy 2.1e: “Identify and support growth in the number of programs that achieve national or international distinction;”
- Strategy 4.3c: “Promote human resource practices and programming that meet the needs of WMU employees to enhance workplace engagement;”
- Strategy 5.1a: “Expand use of a resource-effective integrative review processes for all programs and services;”
- Strategy 5.1c: “Expand and improve integrated data-driven information systems for decision-making;”
- Strategy 5.1d: “Promote transparency and university accountability in all institutional systems;” and,
- Strategy 5.3a: “Maintain a leadership position in conservation efforts to reduce energy consumption and costs.”

3. What are your top three to four strategic objectives or their strategies for the 2017-18 fiscal year, and how do they align with your mission?

i. “Objective 1.2: Implement a new electronic system (i.e., Compliance Assist: Planning from Campus Labs) to support and measure the University Strategic Plan progress” aligns with IE’s mission to “provide leadership to develop, integrate and improve ... strategic planning ...”

ii. “Objective 4.1: Implement the Administrative Program Review cycle using the Compliance Assist: Program Review platform from Campus Labs” aligns with IE’s mission to “provide leadership to develop, integrate and improve ... integrated program review ...”

iii. “Strategy 5.4a: Provide support to the Office of the General Counsel in developing a university-wide policy on policies” aligns with IE’s mission to “improve regional-level accreditation” and monitor “institutional compliance with federal regulations.”

iv. “Strategy 5.4b: Provide support to the Office of Community Outreach in developing the application for Carnegie classification on engagement” aligns with IE’s mission to “improve regional-level accreditation” and monitor “institutional compliance with federal regulations.”

4. Please provide your organizational chart.

*Right-click inside the box, below, to paste a JPG, PNG, or other “picture-type” copy of your organizational chart.*
5. List and briefly describe the major functions performed/services provided by your unit. For each function, indicate the frequency in which the activity is performed (e.g., percentage of time, daily, weekly, etc.). Also for each activity, indicate the stakeholder(s)/customer(s) served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Stakeholder(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with the Strategic Management Executive Council (SMEC) to manage and communicate reporting for the university’s strategic plan (typically monthly; 15%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the Collaborative Risk/Opportunity Management (CRÖM) action teams (typically weekly; 15%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement an online system to support and measure the progress of the university’s strategic plan, including cross-functional collaboration on platform structure, relationships with peer institutions and the platform’s vendor (Campus Labs), and development and implementation of end-user training (daily; 25%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; Campus Labs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and report the progress of the Academic Affairs strategic plan, Invest in Gold, including alignment of Academic Affairs goals with university strategies (semi-annually; 5%) – stakeholders: administrators, faculty, staff, and students within the Division of Academic Affairs; future students and their families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with the Higher Learning Commission, WMU’s regional accreditor, to ensure university compliance with accreditation standards and federal regulations and mandates, including dissemination of information to the university community (daily to annually); preparing for assurance argument and HLC’s 2020 Decennial Visit, including streamlining the evidence collection and population process (daily); establishing and serving on the HLC Advisory Council (weekly to monthly), and coordinating and reporting annual updates (annually); approximately 10% – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; the City of Kalamazoo, the State of Michigan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the implementation of the Signature quality initiative, including cross-functional collaboration with the Division of Student Affairs (daily; 5%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the specialized program accreditation activities of accredited academic and non-academic programs and facilities to ensure compliance with agency standards and requirements (weekly to monthly; 10%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, implement, and provide support to the university’s integrated program review and planning endeavors, including cross-functional collaboration on self-study and reporting materials and procedures, relationships with the online reporting platform’s vendor (Campus Labs), development and implementation of end-user training, and end-of-cycle reporting (daily to weekly; 5%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the development and implementation of university-wide, cross-functional projects such as developing a policy on policies, developing a complaints tracking system, and establishing and being recognized for better community engagement practices, etc. (daily; 10%) – stakeholders: the university community; present and future community partners; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Review the functions/services you listed in the previous question, and determine whether or not the activity falls within the purview of your unit and should continue to be performed.

According to the Association for Higher Education Effectiveness, offices of institutional effectiveness intentionally integrate multiple functions (e.g., strategic planning, institutional research, assessment, accreditation, program review,
Communication and Assessment

1. List and describe any external reviews/assessments conducted within the past five years of your unit. Provide information on who performed the review, when it was conducted, activities performed during the review, and the outcome.

The first, and only, external review conducted for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness was held February 26 through 28, 2012. This was a self-initiated review during the administrative transition period between the retirement of the inaugural vice provost and the current associate provost for institutional effectiveness. Rebecca G. Adams, Ph.D., then associate provost for planning and assessment at University of North Carolina at Greensboro, was selected as the peer reviewer. At the time, there were no best practices by which to establish metrics, and this office had no strategic plan. Dr. Adams facilitated group interviews with stakeholders of each of the office’s projects and activities to develop a SWOT analysis. A final report, including the SWOT analysis and planning recommendations, was made disseminated to WMU’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on March 21, 2012 (see attached report).

Although a number of recommendations were made for restructuring the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, as well as other offices with cross-functional responsibilities, the office’s menu of projects and activities continued to evolve, through provost and presidential reassignment, causing many of the recommendations to become moot, while others remained outside of the office’s ability to implement. Recommendations for improving campus-based regional and specialized program accreditation activities, however, were adopted, such as expanding support to programs engaged in accreditation reviews.

2. What actions did you take as a result of the findings of the external review/assessment?

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness revised its mission statement, developed vision and values statements, and created it’s first-ever strategic plan built on the sections of the SWOT analysis that remained pertinent to the office’s projects and activities (i.e., HLC accreditation, specialized accreditation, strategic planning). The current version of that plan, 2015-2020, guides all projects and activities facilitated and supported by the office.

3. List and describe formal communications made by your unit on a regular basis. Provide the frequency of the communication and identify the intended audience.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as the point of contact for accreditation, strategic planning, and program review.

For regional accreditation, IE works directly with Extended University Programs to periodically draft and submit “change request” documents to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). IE works with the offices of Business and Finance, Student Financial Aid, and Institutional Research to complete the Annual Institutional Data Update to HLC.

For specialized program and facilities accreditation, IE works with program and facilities coordinators to complete their periodic self-study and status reports, and participate in their accreditation site visits.

For strategic planning, IE participates on CRôm Action Teams, and works with unit and divisional leadership to complete mid-year and annual reports to the university president and cabinet. IE also provides training to report designees in using the online reporting platform.
For program review, IE drafts and disseminates procedures guides and training materials to unit and division-level designees, and works with them to complete their cyclical self-study/self-review reports. IE also provides training in using the online reporting platform. IE provides secure access to authorized university personnel to review PDF copies of completed reports.

4. What metrics do you use to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of your operations? Identify three to five metrics you used to evaluate your operations.

Objective 1.2: Implement a new electronic system (i.e., Compliance Assist: Planning from Campus Labs) to support and measure the University Strategic Plan progress:
- Success Measure: IE enters the data for initial mid-year report by October 31, 2017 (completed)
- Success Measure: Training has been completed by May 31, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: The preferred system is fully implemented by June 30, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: All divisions report their fiscal year priorities in October/November using the common template and reporting format (progress on track)
- Success Measure: All divisions report progress toward their fiscal year priorities in December/January and May/June (progress on track)

Objective 4.1: Implement the Administrative Program Review cycle using the Compliance Assist: Program Review platform from Campus Labs:
- Success Measure: IE provides a minimum of one face-to-face training, during March and April 2018, to all self-study completers who will use Compliance Assist: Program Review (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE ensures that templates for all programs that will use Compliance Assist: Program Review are available for use no later than April 1, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE ensures that a technical guide is available for all self-study completers that will use Compliance Assist: Program Review, no later than April 1, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE provides a minimum of one face-to-face training, during September 2018, to all self-study completers who will use Compliance Assist: Program Review (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE uploads PDF copies of completed reports to the Integrated Program Review SharePoint™ site within five business days of each completed stage (progress on track)

No success measures or metrics were developed for the following strategies:
- Strategy 5.4a: Provide support to the Office of the General Counsel in developing a university-wide policy on policies
- Strategy 5.4b: Provide support to the Office of Community Outreach in developing the application for Carnegie classification on engagement

5. Are you able to benchmark your performance against externally recognized metrics for either best practice or performance? If so, please provide performance metrics as benchmarked against external data. The external source must be a verifiable source and must be appropriately cited and attached, where appropriate.

Although there are numerous ways in which one institution of higher education can benchmark itself against another (e.g., VSA, IPEDS, Carnegie Classifications, etc.), there are no externally recognized metrics for either best practice or performance for offices of institutional effectiveness. It is hoped that the Association for Higher Education Effectiveness (https://www.ahee.org) may be able to develop a set of benchmarks in the near future.

**Learning and Discovery**

1. List and describe any programs/activities that your unit engages in that supports and provides:
   - Learning/discovery opportunities
Research and/or grants
Global engagement

Learning and Discovery Opportunities: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides support to the HLC Quality Initiative (Signature program).

Research and Grants: IE provides support to development of a grant that supports volunteer opportunities under the auspices of Shared Gold, the university’s civic action plan

Global Engagement: IE reviews all affiliation agreements with its international partners

2. Detail and comment on how your unit participates in, facilitates, or promotes community outreach.
IE financially supports one Faculty Fellow to lead and oversee the Shared Gold process, along with one undergraduate student assistant.

Law and Policy

1. List key laws and university regulations that you must comply with in performing your services.
The Office of Institutional Effectiveness complies with The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEOA). The associate provost for institutional effectiveness serves as the university’s accreditation liaison officer (ALO) to the Higher Learning Commission, and assures that the university complies with HLC’s Core Components, Assumed Practices, and Federal Compliance for Title IV funding.

Something about Academic Affairs hiring practices and procedures, and those of the Graduate College (for GAs); SEVIS

2. How frequently do you review your unit’s procedures and guidelines? What causes the review?
Reimbursement policy for accreditation fees; we review when we recommend policy as a product of HLC changes (e.g., Faculty Credentials, etc.)

3. Detail and comment on the program’s preparedness for threats, emergencies, and crises.
The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as a secure repository for regional, specialized program, and facilities accreditation, strategic planning, and program review. All IE documents are produced, reviewed, disseminated, and filed electronically. Staff members have access to a secure shared-drive maintained in the Office of Information Technology. OIT performs routine back-ups and security checks on all of its network servers.

For inclement weather or building-specific emergencies (e.g., fire, human threats, etc.), IE follows the workplace emergency plans set up for employees of Henry Hall Annex, and the Seibert Administration Building.

Resource Management

1. For your unit (e.g., what is used specifically by the dean’s office), please provide the following information:
• Operating budget for the 2017-18 year (can be a glow report or any other report format)
The FY 2018 Booked Budget for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness was distributed as follows:
• Operations:
  o Compensation: $398,622
  o General supplies and equipment: $7,752
  o Staff professional development: $5,335
• Integrated program review and planning activities: $20,966
• (Specialized Program) Accreditation fees and reimbursements: $102,135
• Institutional-level strategic planning: $160,958
• Regional accreditation annual activities: $6,400

Total FY 2018 Booked Budget = $702,168

• Operating expenses and revenues incurred year-to-date

Expenses to-date:
• Operations:
  o Compensation: $398,778
  o General supplies and equipment: $5,656
  o Staff professional development: $5,131
• Integrated program review and planning activities: $16,295
• (Specialized Program) Accreditation fees and reimbursements: $102,111
• Institutional-level strategic planning: $51,030
• Regional accreditation annual activities: $3,664

Total FY 2018 Expenses = $582,665
Revenues to-date (i.e., VPAA carryforward return): $48,929

• Number of FTEs

Administrator = 1.0 FTE (Brylinsky)
Staff = 2.0 FTE (Cardoso Reyes; Springsteen)
GAs = 1.0 FTE (0.50 FTE x 2 GAs)

Total FTE = 4.0

Note: The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs has assigned one administrative assistant senior (Phillips) to work half-time in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and half-time in Office of Academic Labor Relations. Since this employee does not receive compensation through IE, she was not counted in the FTE.

• Key attributes, required degrees, professional certifications, or other professional credentials required or desired to perform the work of your unit

Assistant provost for institutional effectiveness: earned terminal degree from an accredited institution; must have experience with accreditation...

Assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation (regional): master’s degree in a related field from an accredited institution; experience with federal reporting...

Assistant director for integrated program review and accreditation (specialized program): master’s degree in a related field from an accredited institution; experience with specialized program accreditation or other external program review.

• If you have employees who have voluntarily completed training and received certificates and/or other externally recognized degrees/program certifications/professional honors, please note these

Assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation (regional):
• Graduate certificate in Education Leadership: Higher Education Student Affairs
• Certificate of completion from the Academic Leadership Academy
• Certificate of completion from “Behind the W” Brand Ambassador Training

Assistant director for integrated program review and accreditation (specialized program):
• Certificate of completion from “Eliminating Racism and Claiming/Celebrating Equality” (ERAC/CE) training
• Awarded the WMU Make a Difference Award, 2004

• If you have employees who participate in regional, state, or national professional organizations as members please list these organizations

  Associate provost:
  • Executive board, Special Olympics, Michigan

  Assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation (regional):
  • Organization of Latino Social Works, Treasurer

• List presentations made at professional conferences or at professional group meetings


2. List any awards/honors received for specific projects/accomplishments within the past five years. Identify who provided the award/honor as well as for the reason earned.

  No work-related awards or honors have been received by IE staff or administrators for the past five years.

3. How does your unit support diversity and inclusion?

  The Office of Institutional Effectiveness supports diversity and inclusion through hiring and recruitment processes; all IE employees belong to one or more underrepresented groups.

  To prepare to serve effectively on search committees, WMU senior leaders participated in the Implicit Bias Workshop for Search Committees, offered through the Office of Institutional Equity.

  IE also supports diversity and inclusion through its support of professional development opportunities. Examples include employee participation in the Everyone Counts Diversity Learning Communities and Real Talk Diversity Series event offered through the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and participation in the MI-ACE Network and its Women of Color Collaborative. Until she left in June 2017, the former assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation served as WMU’s institutional representative.

  IE provided financial support for 50 Upward Bound students in 2014 and 2017.

**Impact and Opportunity**

1. As you look forward to the next five years, describe challenges and opportunities that your unit will face.

  The greatest challenge the Office of Institutional Effectiveness faces is consideration of the role of IE in the Montgomery administration, and changes in Academic Affairs leadership. In addition, there will be a leadership change in IE as the current associate provost plans to retire in 2019. At an associate provost level, the office is physically placed in a position of diminished authority to carry out a number of its current functions (e.g., university strategic planning, HLC compliance, etc.), and there is a risk that the university community sees IE as an Academic Affairs only entity.
With personnel and organizational change, IE also has renewed support. With more and more research on the need for offices of institutional effectiveness, AHEE could pursue Integrated Institutional Effectiveness (IEE) as “...the purposeful coordination and integration of functions that support institutional performance, quality, and efficiency; those functions include strategic planning, outcomes assessment, institutional research, regional/specialized accreditation, and program/unit review.” This includes “cross-functional institutional initiatives, assuring implementation, monitoring progress, and facilitating change as needed” (2017).


2. As a result of this review, what opportunities have you identified to change the level and delivery of services to reduce costs, increase revenues, enhance the level of service, or to be more effective in the delivery of service?

Proposal for restructuring to be submitted to the provost and president May 1, 2018.

---

**ATTACHMENTS**

---

**External Review of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness**

Submitted by Rebecca G. Adams

March 21, 2012

The original purpose of the review conducted as the basis for this report was to provide a SWOT analysis of Western Michigan University’s (WMU’s) Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) and to make recommendations for goals to be included in its strategic plan to be developed and implemented under the new Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness. In the process of reviewing the documentation provided by OIE staff and available via the Internet (see Appendix A for a list of these documents) and in discussing the institutional effectiveness challenges facing WMU with the Provost and others during the site visit (see Appendix B for a list of participants), the scope of the report was expanded to include overall recommendations regarding the structure and function of the IE enterprise across all of the relevant WMU offices.

Before discussing the implications of the SWOT analysis (see Appendix C) for the overall institutional effectiveness challenges facing WMU and for the OIE strategic plan, I would like to thank the numerous faculty and staff who took time out of their busy schedules to meet with me, especially Cathe Springsteen and the other very able staff currently assigned to OIE. As an associate provost at one of WMU’s peer institutions, my visit to WMU was particularly informative and, to this Toledo-born-Carolina-dwelling relative of Michigander farmers, autoworkers, and railroad workers, it was also nostalgic.

**Overall Institutional Effectiveness Challenges**

The mission statement of the OIE is a list of loosely-connected tasks rather than an overall mandate to ensure institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement: “The mission of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is to provide leadership to develop, integrate, and improve university- and program-level accreditation, university-level assessment, and faculty recognition, while monitoring institutional compliance with regulations stemming from the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.” Although OIE
certainly supports the institutional effectiveness function, much of the work of assessing and demonstrating continuous improvement is actually assigned to the Office of Assessment and Undergraduate Studies (OAUS). It is, for example, the OAUS that provides funding for all University Assessment Steering Committee endeavors including technical training, workshops, and awards.

Like the IE mission statement, the Framework for Institutional Effectiveness at Western Michigan University (see Appendix D) is a list of tasks rather than a comprehensive IE policy. It merely lists and describes the elements of institutional effectiveness (strategic planning and academic priorities, academic program planning and enrollment management, institutional and program accreditations, institutional program assessments, and academic resource effectiveness). It does not specify the purpose of the “policy,” who is responsible for ensuring it is enforced, the procedures through which institutional effectiveness will be achieved and documented, the responsibilities of the various offices that serve institutional effectiveness functions, a description of the workflow among offices necessary to ensure continuous improvement, methods of enforcement of expectations, or how the process will be reviewed.

Possibly due to the mismatch of the names of both the OIE and OAUS with their assigned functions or because of the frequent change in their assignments and rapid staff turnover, the campus community seems to be confused about what these offices do and what support they offer. During the last six years, the structure of the OIE has changed as many times, seemingly to accommodate shifts in personnel rather than as a result of a systematic consideration of goals and assessment data. Of the 19 staff employed during the last 6 years, only 5 are currently affiliated with OIE and one of them is about to resign from the University. An overdependence on temporary staff and students contributes to confusion because the staff constantly changes and connections have to be reestablished. It is clear that the new Associate Provost has the wide-spread support of stakeholders, but some anxiety surrounds the transition because of the perception that whatever success OIE has enjoyed in the past was largely attributable to the work of the recently-retired Vice Provost.

Exacerbating this resulting problem of lack of transparency regarding the function of the various IE offices is poor communication. Although senior leadership and the staff of the offices comprising the IE system apparently send appropriate communications to the Deans and Associate Deans, they do not seem to reach or at least do not seem to be read by most unit- and program-level faculty and staff. The existence of this repeatedly-mentioned communication problem was confirmed by comparing the knowledge of OIE services by program leadership for recently-reaccredited specialized programs and by the Associate Deans.

So, recommendations regarding how to address these overall institutional effectiveness challenges include:

- As part of an examination of the structure and workflow of IE efforts across all relevant offices, rethink the missions of the OIE and of other offices with IE responsibilities, describing their overall mandates in addition to listing their areas of responsibilities and possibly changing their names to reflect assigned tasks;
- Develop a comprehensive institutional effectiveness policy that clearly specifies the function of each office involved and the workflow and division of labor among them;
- After reorganization, commit to a stable structure and stable or growing support for staff in the relevant offices through the next reaffirmation of accreditation; and
- Reconsider the OIE communication plan, including alternative communication paths, visits to units, and media in addition to email.

Restructuring the IE Initiative

As is confirmed by background research conducted by WMU’s OIE staff on the structure of institutional effectiveness initiatives at peer institutions (see Appendix E) and similar research conducted by UNCG’s Office of Planning and Assessment staff on University of North Carolina System schools (see Appendix E), every university divides the IE functions among various offices in different ways.
and following different organizational principles. At WMU, it seems that the principle underlying the changes made recently is to divide tasks according to whether the time horizon for them is long-term (in the case of OIE) or short-term (in the case of OAUS). OIE is currently assigned responsibility for HLC Accreditation, Specialized Accreditations, Strategic Planning and Environmental Scanning, Faculty Development, the Voluntary System of Accountability, External Faculty Recognition, and Institutional-Level Assessment of Student Learning. OAUS is charged with Academic Success, Curriculum Review, General Education, Academic Program Planning, Academic Program Assessment (for both undergraduate and graduate programs), and Academic Advising. The Associate Provosts for OIE and OAUS serve as ex-officio members of the University Assessment Steering Committee which approves assessment plans of degree-granting and non-degree granting units. In addition to OIE and OAUS, the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) supports the institutional effectiveness responsibilities of both offices. Although this division of labor based on length of planning horizon may make sense from an administrative perspective, it does not contribute to transparency and creates communication challenges.

Although a campus-wide conversation about the division of labor among the IE offices is essential before any decisions about reorganization are reached, my preliminary recommendations would be as follows:

- **Now that accreditation has been reaffirmed, move academic program planning (including academic program prioritization) and academic program assessment back to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness;**
  - Change the name of OAUS to the Office of Undergraduate Studies (OUS);
  - Possibly create a position for a Director of Academic Assessment to report to the Associate Provost of IE, charging him or her with the assessment of all academic programs, the Voluntary System of Accountability, and closing the loop on the institutional-level assessment of student learning and student engagement (including of General Education, CLA, and NSSE);
  - Consider having the Director of Institutional Research report to the Associate Provost for IE;
  - Move the data collection and reporting functions for institutional-level assessment of student learning and for the VSA to OIR, providing the office with a survey research/testing staff position with OIE continuing to be responsible for using the data to “close the loop” at the university level;
  - Assign OIR responsibility for environmental scanning and evaluation of organizational capacity (as per new HLC criteria and guidance from the Associate Provost for IE); and
  - Consider elevating the position of Associate Provost for IE to executive level and having the incumbent report to the President instead of to the Provost or having the Associate Provost of IE report to the President on accreditation and to the Provost on other matters.

- **Charge OUS with the academic success of undergraduate students,** improving undergraduate student retention (a major focus of the new HLC standards), General Education (not its assessment), undergraduate curriculum review, and undergraduate academic advising.

- **Charge the Graduate School with responsibilities parallel to the functions assigned to the OUS** if not already done (the Dean of the Graduate School was not involved in this visit).

- **Remove Faculty Development from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness,** creating a full-time position for an Associate Provost (or Director) for Faculty Development, assigning him or her responsibility for the current faculty development effort, ICES, external faculty recognition, serving the needs of graduate students as well as faculty, and possibly for the Faculty Technology Center;
  - Address some of the staffing deficits in this area by offering unpaid internships to graduate students and developing a network of volunteer faculty fellows to extend the reach of the office, but consider adding at least one additional full-time staff member in addition to the new Associate Provost (or Director);
  - Charge the Associate Provost (or Director) for Faculty Development to support both the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the Dean of the Graduate School but not to report to either of them; and
• Add responsibility for “closing the loop” on the assessment of faculty engagement (FSSE) to this office, relying on OIR to collect and report on the data.
• After restructuring and the development of a comprehensive institutional effectiveness policy, rethink the allocation of budgets and the assignment of space across offices charged with IE responsibilities.

Recommendations for the Strategic Plan for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness

As stated in the introduction, the original purpose of this external review was to develop recommendations for goals to be included in the OIE’s strategic plan. Most of the following recommendations are implied by the suggestions for restructuring outlined above and all of them are intended to support the ultimate goals of improving WMU’s effectiveness and increasing faculty and administrative awareness of the importance of assessment to continuous improvement:

• Revise OIE’s mission;
• Lead the examination of the structure and workflow of IE efforts across existing offices;
• Oversee the development of a comprehensive institutional effectiveness policy;
• Develop an OIE communication plan, including increased attention to reporting out data to faculty and administration;
• Coordinate the development of processes to educate and engage the University in continuous self-assessment and improvement; and
• Develop IE training programs for associate deans, unit heads, and program coordinators.

In addition, initiative-specific recommendations to be addressed by the OIE include:

• Review the new HLC policies regarding institutional effectiveness and work with senior leadership to come into compliance with new expectations (e.g., including a review of assessment data as part of the budget allocation and de-allocation process).
• Expand support for specialized accreditation;
  o Include the formatting, printing, and submission of reports;
  o Provide a centralized support system for visits; and
  o Provide a more coordinated response to reviews.
• Train specialized accreditation coordinators and arrange for them to share best practices and lessons learned.
• Improve communication regarding the services available for units undergoing specialized accreditations and expectations for documentation.
• Work with the Provost’s Council to establish metric targets and to prioritize initiatives developed to support the strategic plan.

Note that the SWOT analysis also includes suggestions regarding faculty development, ICES, and external recognition of faculty which are not directly related to the IE function.
IE STRATEGIC PLAN
2015 - 2020

REVISED AUGUST 21, 2017

That All May Learn
OVERVIEW

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness at WMU desires to foster a culture of

1. continuous quality improvement
2. best practices
3. effectiveness through efficiency and the appropriate alignment of resources to priorities
4. appreciation, transparency, and information-sharing through the building of effective relationships with key stakeholders in University governance
5. safety and a liberalness of ideas

that all may learn.

What is Institutional Effectiveness?

The Association for Higher Education Effectiveness (AHEE) defines Integrated Institutional Effectiveness (IEE) as:

"...the purposeful coordination and integration of functions that support institutional performance, quality, and efficiency; those functions include strategic planning, outcomes assessment, institutional research, regional/specialized accreditation, and program/unit review." This includes "cross-functional institutional initiatives, assuring implementation, monitoring progress, and facilitating change as needed." [https://www.ahee.org/about](https://www.ahee.org/about).

The following diagram on page 2 illustrates the cross-functional institutional initiatives described in the aforementioned definitions.
Institutional effectiveness is a combination of the tasks required to develop, initiate, and maintain the organization’s performance that includes strategic planning, strategic implementation, process evaluation, strategic monitoring, and outcome evaluation.

- Development of a strategic plan begins with an analysis of the institution's risks and risk appetite (Enterprise Risk Management), and intentional goal setting to mitigate those risks. It then incorporates strategic budgeting and strategic human resources management so that appropriate resources are made available to ensure success of planning initiatives.

- Strategic implementation creates and administers processes that ensure that barriers to success are identified and mitigated, including the removal of potential workarounds that cause delays in implementation.

- Process evaluation is a method of assessing how a program is being implemented that focuses on the program’s operations, implementation, and service delivery.

- Strategic monitoring bridges the gap between planning and operations through regular observations and minor course corrections. Records of these observations feed into outcome evaluations.

- Outcome evaluation measures the program's outcomes and assesses the program's overall effectiveness. It also provides necessary information about program changes made between implementation and operationalization.

Objective 1.1: Liaise with the Strategic Management Executive Council (SMEC) to manage and communicate reporting for University Strategic Planning. – *NEW: combines portions of the original Objective 3.1 with portions of former strategy 5.3d.*

   (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1a: Integrate the actions of SMEC and CRÔM to inform strategic planning.

   *Success Measure: Define the role of CRÔM Action Teams.*

   (In Progress)

   *Success Measure: Division and unit plans use standard terminology as their plans are revised to align with the University Strategic Plan.*

   (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1b: Revise plan-reporting metrics to provide increased accuracy and relevancy of data metrics availability.

   (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1c: Implement process for aligning progress measures to resource management processes.

   (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1d: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for strategic planning. – *Formerly Strategy 5.3d.*

   (In Progress)

Objective 1.2: Implement a new electronic system (i.e., Compliance Assist: Planning from Campus Labs) to support and measure the University Strategic Plan progress.

   (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.2a: Gain approval of using the preferred system for data collection and reporting of University Strategic Plan success measures.

   (In Progress)

   *Success Measure: The preferred system is fully implemented by April 2018.*

   (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.2b: Create USP template for progress reporting.

   (In Progress)

   *Success Measure: IE enters the data for initial mid-year report by October 2017.*

   (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.2c: Train divisional designees to use the new system for reporting progress.

   (In Progress)

   *Success Measure: Trainings have been completed by November 2017.*

   (In Progress)
Strategy 1.2d: Regular divisional progress reports are submitted using the system during the set, semi-annual intervals. (In Progress)

   *Success Measure: All divisions report their fiscal year priorities in October/November using the common template and reporting format. (In-Progress)*

   *Success Measure: All divisions report progress toward their fiscal year priorities in December/January and May/June. (In-Progress)*

Objective 1.3: Align the Academic Affairs divisional plan with the revised USP for immediate implementation. (In Progress)

   **Strategy 1.3a:** Revisions are made upon approval of the USP to match its direction. (In Progress)

   *Success Measure: A revision and implementation structure is in place to make any necessary realignments. (In-Progress)*

   **Strategy 1.3b:** Academic Affairs planning reports 2016-17 inform prioritization of resources for 2017-18. (In Progress)

Objective 1.4: Strategic alignment of Academic Affair (AA) unit budgets that support University Strategic Plan (USP) priorities. (In Progress)

   **Strategy 1.4a:** Demonstrate how AA budgets align with University Strategic Plan (USP). (In Progress)

   *Success Measure: Unit budgets demonstrate strategic allocation of resources to support USP priorities. (In-Progress)*
ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM REVIEW

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness places emphasis on programs using the outcomes from the different forms of program review (e.g., accreditation, WMU’s integrated program review, STARS, etc.) to continuously improve the quality of their programs. This section is broken into “external review” (i.e., regional and specialized program accreditation), and “internal review” (i.e., WMU’s integrated program review).

External Review

The former “Accreditation” category has been renamed “External Review” in order to create a culture that accreditation is a form of external program review.

It satisfies IE’s desire to:

• Build culture of best practices of accreditation
• Fully utilize the results of program review
• Prepare the institution for HLC reaccreditation
• Overcome fear, reduce protectionism tendencies as the relate to accreditation
• Ensure implementation of the Signature initiative

GOAL 2: MAINTAIN HLC “GOOD STANDING” ACCREDITATION STATUS, THE HIGHEST STANDARD AVAILABLE.

Formerly Goal 1

Objective 2.1: WMU is in compliance with HLC Assumed Practices for complaints and faculty qualifications. (In Progress)

Strategy 2.1a: Complaints tracking process is implemented into the CRM by spring 2018; and fully operational by Summer I 2018. (In Progress)

Success Measure: Complaint tracking system is accessible by all through WMU website.

Strategy 2.1b: Faculty Credentials policy is finalized and implemented by spring 2018.
Success Measure: Documentation of all unit policies, procedures, and forms are available by December 31, 2017. (In-Progress)

Objective 2.2: WMU successfully implements the Signature quality initiative that meets HLC expectations by fall 2018. (In Progress)

Strategy 2.2a: Work with the Division of Student Affairs to finalize the personnel structure by the end of fall semester 2017. (In Progress)

Success Measure: All necessary stakeholders are engaged through the committee structure. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2b: The Signature timeline is met, so that piloting begins in fall 2016 and full implementation begins fall 2017. (In Progress)

Success Measure: The Signature is fully implemented fall 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Annual progress reports are submitted for the evidence prior at the close of each fiscal year. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2c: The Signature becomes self-sustaining with a long-term plan. (In Progress)

Success Measure: The budget protocol is established for the program to run in perpetuity. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2d: Submit the report to HLC on the level of success achieved in 2018. (In Progress)

Success Measure: The report and findings are reviewed and approved by HLC in 2018-19 FY. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2e: Work with student affairs to populate the staff and faculty involved in pathway communities. (In Progress)

Success Measure: Pathway Community Leaders have been identified by September 1, 2017. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2f: The Signature Quality Initiative meets the HLC evaluation criteria for genuineness of effort during the Quality Initiative. (In Progress)

Success Measure: By fall 2017, ensure that the Signature program is informed that HLC will evaluated the quality of the initiative on the following:

a. Seriousness of its undertaking of the Signature designation. (In-Progress)

b. The scope and impact of the Signature Program designation. (In-Progress)

c. Commitment and engagement in the Signature designation. (In-Progress)
d. Adequate resource provision for the Signature designation. *(In-Progress)*

Objective 2.3: Achieve reaffirmation in WMU’s 2020-21 decennial review. *(In Progress)*

Strategy 2.3a: Orient and gain commitment of the HLC Advisory Council to participate in the assurance system for full participation by spring semester 2017. *(In Progress)*

  *Success Measure: Identify need for assurance system training for HLC Advisory Board. One person will be trained to use HLC's electronic system by end of spring 2018. *(In-Progress)**

Strategy 2.3b: Streamline the evidence collection process to request only necessary information by fall 2018. *(In Progress)*

  *Success Measure: Evidence collection process is identified by spring 2018. *(In-Progress)**

Strategy 2.3c: Populate the assurance system with evidence that demonstrates WMU’s compliance with HLC’s criteria for accreditation and federal compliance standards by the end of spring 2019. *(In Progress)*

  *Success Measure: All evidentiary items are referenced and linked in the report by the end of spring 2019. *(In-Progress)**

  *Success Measure: The assurance argument system is closed and submitted for review eight weeks prior to the scheduled visit. *(In-Progress)**

Strategy 2.3d: Investigate and recommend web-based software so the institution will be able to recognize, provide evidence of faculty/staff credentials, scholarly works, and creative accomplishments. *(In Progress)*

  *Success Measure: The preferred system is implemented by fall 2017. *(In-Progress)**

Strategy 2.3e: Analysis of HLC Accreditation Readiness will be ongoing beginning fall 2017. *(In Progress)*

  *Success Measure: Implement process of Heat Map evaluation and reporting by fall 2017. *(In-Progress)**

  *Success Measure: Stakeholders are identified and lists are created with contact information by fall 2017. *(In-Progress)**

Strategy 2.3f: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for institutional accreditation measures. – Formerly Strategy 5.3d. *(In Progress)*
GOAL 3: LEAD THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF WMU’S RELATIONSHIP WITH AGENCIES THAT PROVIDE ACCREDITATION, CERTIFICATION, AND LICENSURE TO ITS PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES TO MAINTAIN COMPLIANCE WHILE SUPPORTING STRATEGIC PLANNING.

Formerly Goal 2

Objective 3.1: WMU continually provides learners with highly recognized academic and learner-support programs and award-winning facilities by actively seeking and obtaining accreditation, certification, licensure, or “approval” from prominent professional organizations. (Ongoing)

Strategy 3.1a: Academic and learner-support program coordinators actively seek accreditation and certification through the most prominent professional organizations in each of their areas. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that curriculum review documents for all new programs, effective fall 2018, reference the accreditation or certification standards of the agency, and provide evidence of collaboration with an agency liaison. (In-Progress)

Objective 3.2: WMU maintains a relationship in good standing with agencies that provide its academic and learner-support programs and institutional facilities with accreditation, certification, licensure, and “approvals.” (Ongoing)

Strategy 3.2a: Programs and facilities comply with the standards, requirements, and mandates of their professional organizations and state agencies. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE coordinates with academic programs to respond to new and revised requirements with five business days prior to agency deadlines. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE reviews initial site visit reports and program responses, prior to agency deadline, to ensure any cited weaknesses have been addressed, and that errors of fact have been corrected. (In-Progress)

Strategy 3.2b: Programs and facilities comply with the standards and requirements of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and with WMU policies and procedures. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: All academic programs that can be accredited, where that accreditation provides a significant benefit to the program’s students or graduates, are maintaining continuing accreditation or are in pursuit of new accreditation. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Programs and facilities submit final drafts of all documents to Institutional Effectiveness for review by posted IE deadlines. (In-Progress)
Objective 3.3: WMU fosters a culture of compliance with accreditation, certification, licensure, and approval through transparency and communication. (Ongoing)

Strategy 3.3a: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as WMU’s point of contact regarding the accreditation, certification, and licensure status of academic programs and University facilities. (In-Progress)

- **Success Measure:** IE informs WMU leadership of all impending reporting, visits, and actions mandates from agencies at the time deadlines are posted. (In-Progress)

- **Success Measure:** IE directs the operations and administration of the WMU Accreditation Library, including maintenance and auditing of the library’s electronic holdings on a continuous basis. (In-Progress)

**Internal Review**

**GOAL 4: LEAD THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF WMU’S INTEGRATED PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING ENDEAVORS TO SUPPORT STRATEGIC PLANNING EFFORTS TOWARD QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.**

Objective 4.1: WMU espouses a culture of continuous assessment through program evaluation. (Ongoing)

Strategy 4.1a: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness ensures that administrative programs effectively execute the policies and processes associated with conducting institutional-level integrated program review and planning projects. (In-Progress)

- **Success Measure:** IE provides a minimum of three face-to-face training opportunities to self-study completers during January 2018. (In-Progress)

- **Success Measure:** IE provides a minimum of one face-to-face training opportunity to “next-level” and “division-level” program reviewers during April 2018. (In-Progress)

- **Success Measure:** IE provides one-on-one technical assistance and supplemental training to self-study completers and program reviewers on a continuous basis. (In-Progress)

- **Success Measure:** IE develops and initiates communication plans to inform self-study completers, program reviewers, WMU leadership, and other University stakeholders of all upcoming events and phase-related activities at key points within the process. (In-Progress)

Strategy 4.1b: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness leads the Administrative Program Review and Planning project team tasked to identify appropriate standards, develop evaluation questions,
determine appropriate data collection methods, and produce reports on findings and continuous use of results. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE constitutes a project management team of administrative program-level peers by September 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that all technology and PMT document revisions are completed by November 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that the conversion from the project management team to an oversight committee coincides seamlessly with the launch of the official reporting period – January 1, 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that an observation team is constituted, trained, and provided with accurate and appropriate materials by February 1, 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that the oversight committee completes its duties and reporting requirements by June 30, 2018. (In-Progress)

Strategy 4.1c: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as WMU’s point of contact regarding integrated program review and planning. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE uploads PDF copies of completed reports to the Integrated Program Review SharePoint™ site within five business days of each completed phase. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE updates the Administrative Program Review and Planning website (http://wmich.edu/effectiveness/program/administrative) with the most current versions of all relevant documents and timelines. (In-Progress)

---

**INTEGRATION**

**GOAL 5: PROVIDE HIGH-CALIBER STEWARDSHIP OF IE RESOURCES AND SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY DIVISIONS THAT PROMOTE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.**

Objective 5.2: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness establishes budget priorities that clearly align projected expenses with its mission and goals, and those of the University. (In Progress)

Strategy 5.2b: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness uses a zero-based budgeting model to allocate effectively its annual funding to program priorities. (In Progress)
Success Measure: Draft a proposal for conducting administrative program review during FY 2018 that includes a cost analysis of resources (i.e., personnel, technology, and other operations) by September 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Perform a cost/benefit analysis to determine whether IE should continue reimbursing annual accreditation fees, or if funds should be reallocated to units by October 31, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Perform a mission-alignment analysis for projected strategic planning expenses (i.e., personnel, technology, and other operations) by November 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Perform a mission-alignment analysis for projected integrated program review expenses (i.e., personnel, technology, and other operations) by November 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Create a semi-permanent “standard of practice” to be used between fiscal years 2018 and 2020 for all IE-related budgeting activities by January 5, 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Draft a fiscal year 2018 “zero-based” budget projection based on the individual budget analyses by February 28, 2018. (In-Progress)

Objective 5.3: Establish a software-platform user-group organizational structure and governance to manage and communicate reporting. (In Progress)

   Strategy 5.3a: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for student success and assessment of learning measures. (In Progress)

   Strategy 5.3b: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for student engagement measures. (In Progress)

   Strategy 5.3e: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for student, faculty, and staff complaint measures. (In Progress)

Objective 5.4: Support cross-functional institutional initiatives, assuring implementation, monitoring progress, and facilitating change as needed. (In Progress)

   Strategy 5.4a: Provide support to the Office of the General Counsel in developing a university-wide policy on policies. (In Progress)

   Strategy 5.4b: Provide support to the Office of Community Outreach in developing the application for Carnegie classification on engagement. (In Progress)

   Strategy 5.4c: Provide support to WMU’s Campus Compact Action Planning Team. (In Progress)
GOAL 6: MANAGE THOSE POLICIES AND PRACTICES THAT RELATE POSITIVELY TO EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION AND WORKPLACE ENGAGEMENT.

Objective 6.1: Become a leader in sustainable office practices to improve workplace. (In Progress)


   Success Measure: IE is able to achieve 50 percent of the points toward a Green Certificate by spring 2018. (In-Progress)

Objective 6.2: Professional development activities are designed to increase employee performance and office efficiencies. (In Progress)

   Strategy 6.2a: All IE staff will participate in the StrengthsQuest assessment and subsequent professional activities. (In Progress)

   Success Measure: IE staff find meaningful growth areas that lead to increased employee satisfaction. (In-Progress)
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Condensed Version of the Technical Users Guide
Accessing and Using Compliance Assist

The Academic Program Review template will be completed online using Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist platform. Following is a step-by-step, pictorial guide to accessing and using Compliance Assist. Since this is a web-based application, you will not need any special software and may access it from any computer with an internet connection.

Locate and Open Compliance Assist
Open a browser and login to GoWMU with your Bronco NetID and password.

In your “My Work” channel, click the arrow next to “All Links,” to drop the menu down

First, select “Campus Labs” — Note: This will redirect you to the main WMU Campus Labs landing site

Then, select “Compliance Assist” from the menu

The dark bar shows what template you are using, and which program you’ve selected – Note: one template is usually created for each program that will be reviewed
How to Complete Templates

Example: Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) Template

In this example, program template has a series of four tabs:

- **Introduction** – this tab summarizes the purpose and procedures of the Learner Support Program Review and Planning cycle – *this is the same information found on pages 2 and 3 of this guide*

- **AdmRP Template** – this tab is the template you will need to complete for each program – *it is identical to the MS Word version of the template found posted on [http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review](http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review)*

- **Next- & Division-Level Review** – this tab is where the program’s next- and division-level supervisors will complete their reviews

- **Document Directory** – this is where you will upload and save your evidentiary documents

After reviewing the introduction tab, click “AdmRP Template” to view the self-study template, as shown below. This template is identical to the Microsoft Word AdmRP template shared on the Institutional Effectiveness website.

---

**Click on the number to open and review the question.**
This view shows the question number and title, the question to be answered, and instructions for responding.

To add your response, click the arrow next to “Options,” and select “Edit Item”

NOTE: When an item is opened in edit mode, it becomes “checked-out” of the system, and will need to be “checked-in” when completed.

Scroll down and place your response in the “Narrative” section

~ If working directly in Compliance Assist, just begin typing

~ If you used the MS Word version of the template, copy and paste your response here
Click “Save & Close” to return to view the completed response. This will generate a warning window.

Click “Check-In” to register the response – you may always return, later, to make additions or corrections.

A word of caution: Responses that are left “checked-out” do not register, and will not become part of the report.
Document Directory

When you have completed entering your information, it’s important to include resources to support your narrative. These resources serve as your evidence for reporting.

Make certain to convert your documents to PDF format, first. Then, upload the PDF version to this directory. This allows a single document to be used in multiple responses.

To upload your documents, click “Options,” and select “Manage Files.”

Then, select “Upload File.”

To upload a single document, click “Select” to open a “File Explorer” window.

Select your document and click “Open.”
The filename appears confirming that it is an acceptable file type.

Click "Upload Files" to complete the process.

This will generate a confirmation window allowing you to continue or return to the...
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Accessing and Using Compliance Assist

For cabinet-level divisions who completed the Administrative Program Review template online using Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist platform, following is a step-by-step, pictorial guide to accessing Compliance Assist: Program Review, and completing “observations” and the “next-level review.” Since this is a web-based application, you will not need any special software and may access it from any computer with an internet connection.

Locate and Open Compliance Assist

Open a browser and login to GoWMU with your Bronco NetID and password.

In your “My Work” channel, click the arrow next to “All Links,” to drop the menu down.

Select “Campus Labs” – Note: This will redirect you to the main WMU Campus Labs landing site

Select “Compliance Assist” from the menu

Then, select “Program Review” to launch the template selector page

The dark bar shows what template you are using, and which unit you’ve selected – Note: one template was created for each unit asked to be reviewed
Reviewing Completed Templates

Example: Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) Template

The template has a series of four tabs:

- **Introduction** – this tab summarizes the purpose and procedures of the Administrative Program Review and Planning cycle – *this is the same information found on pages 2 and 3 of the procedures guide*

- **AdmRP Template** – this tab is the completed template in which you will review and add observations for each reviewed program – *it is identical to the MS Word version of the template found posted on http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review*

- **Next- & Division-Level Review** – this tab is where you will provide a summary of key strengths and weaknesses for the overall unit, and where you will add your planning recommendation.

- **Document Directory** – this tab serves as the unit’s evidentiary documents repository

To review the self-study and complete the observations, click “AdmRP Template” tab, as shown below.

*Click on the number to open and review the question.*
This “read-only” view provides immediate access to the information provided by the self-study completer, and allows you to review it before deciding on an “observation type.”

To select an observation type, click the arrow next to “Options,” and select “Edit Item.”

Select the “Observation Type”

Then, scroll down and add the reason(s) why you chose the observation type

The “Unit-Level Supervisor Comments” provides space for comments not directly related to choosing the observation type.

[Image of the software interface with steps highlighted]
Click “Save & Close” to return to the read-only screen.

NOTE: When an item is opened in edit mode, it becomes “checked-out” of the system, and will need to be “checked-in” when completed.

Click “Check-In” to register the response – you may always return, later, to make additions or corrections.

A word of caution: Responses that are left “checked-out” do not register, and will not become part of the report.

Clicking on the “AdmRP Template” tab returns you to the “table of contents.”

Once an observation type has been selected, a related icon appears before the item number – this helps track those items that have been reviewed.

You will need to complete all observations prior to completing recommendations.
Completing Recommendations

Select the “Next- and Division-Level Review” tab to make planning recommendations.

Select “1” to open the “Next-Level Supervisor Review” form. This action opens an overview page in read-only format. Please note that “2” will be completed by your vice president during “Division-Level Review.”

To select planning recommendations and to add your comments, select “Edit Item” from the Options list.

At the top of the editable page, select the recommendation that best describes how the unit should move forward in its planning endeavors:

Click the arrow to select your choice of recommendation

NOTE: the default is Continuous Quality Improvement
Recommendation Types

*Continuous Quality Improvement*

Units should prepare plans for advancement and enhancement that address ways to boost current quality or demonstrate increasing unit distinctiveness through annual strategic planning and assessment reports.

*Growth*

Units will utilize AdmRP reports in continued planning. New or transitioning units will be expected to meet established benchmarks and resume standard unit review criteria in the next AdmRP cycle. An action plan with specific time table may be recommended.

*Remediation*

Units should implement plans that address identified challenges raised by the review, and identify discernible improvements as priorities in annual strategic plans and assessment reports. An action plan with specific time table may also be requested.

*Program Restructuring*

Units will be required to provide a summary of unit restructuring strategies and outcomes in a Unit Modification Plan.

*Elimination*

Units will be required to submit a plan for disinvestment and/or elimination.

Once you’ve chosen a recommendation type, scroll down the page to enter the key strengths of the overall unit.

Scroll down, again, to enter the key weaknesses of the overall unit.

Scroll down, a third time, to add your rationale for choosing the recommendation type, and follow-up steps for the unit to prioritize in their next year’s strategic plan.
When completed, select “Save & Close.”

This action will generate a warning window.

Click “Check-In” to register the response and return to the read-only view

**A word of caution:** Please remember to always “check-in.” Responses that are left “checked-out” do not register, and will not become part of the report.

Return to your AdmRP unit list, select the next unit, and repeat the aforementioned steps until all of your reviews have been completed.

For further assistance, please contact Cathe Springsteen, assistant director for integrated program review and accreditation at kathleen.springsteen@wmich.edu.
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Accessing and Using Compliance Assist

For cabinet-level divisions who completed the Administrative Program Review template online using Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist platform, following is a step-by-step, pictorial guide to accessing Compliance Assist: Program Review, and completing the “division-level review.” Since this is a web-based application, you will not need any special software and may access it from any computer with an internet connection.

Locate and Open Compliance Assist
Open a browser and login to GoWMU with your Bronco NetID and password.

In your “My Work” channel, click the arrow next to “All Links,” to drop the menu down

Select “Campus Labs” – Note: This will redirect you to the main WMU Campus Labs landing site
Select “Compliance Assist” from the menu

Then, select “Program Review” to launch the template selector page

The dark bar shows what template you are using, and which unit you’ve selected – Note: one template was created for each unit asked to be reviewed
Reviewing Completed Templates

Example: Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) Template

The template has a series of four tabs:

- **Introduction** – this tab summarizes the purpose and procedures of the Administrative Program Review and Planning cycle – this is the same information found on pages 2 and 3 of the procedures guide

- **AdmRP Template** – this tab is the completed template you will need to review for each unit – it is identical to the MS Word version of the template found posted on [http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review](http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review)

- **Next- & Division-Level Review** – this tab is where the unit’s supervisor provided a summary of key strengths and weaknesses for the overall unit, and where you will complete your summary of findings.

- **Document Directory** – this tab serves as the unit’s evidentiary documents repository

After reviewing the introduction tab, click “AdmRP Template” to view the self-study template, as shown below. This template is identical to the Microsoft Word AdmRP template shared on the Institutional Effectiveness website.

Click on the number to open and review the question.
This read-only view shows all of the information entered by the unit and unit supervisor.

If you choose to add comments specific to this item, click the arrow next to “Options,” and select “Edit Item.”

NOTE: When an item is opened in edit mode, it becomes “checked-out” of the system, and will need to be “checked-in” when completed.

Scroll down and place your comments in the “Division-Level Supervisor Comments” section.

Click “Save & Close” to return to view the completed response. This will generate a warning window.
A word of caution: Responses that are left “checked-out” do not register, and will not become part of the report.

Completing Recommendations

Select the “Next- and Division-Level Review” tab to make planning recommendations.

Select “2” to open the “Division-Level Supervisor Review” form. This action opens an overview page in read-only format.

To add your comments, select “Edit Item” from the Options list.

This action opens an editable page in which to enter your overall unit-specific comments.

At the top of the editable page, select the recommendation that best describes how the unit should move forward in its planning endeavors:
Continuous Quality Improvement

Units should prepare plans for advancement and enhancement that address ways to boost current quality or demonstrate increasing unit distinctiveness through annual strategic planning and assessment reports.

Growth

Units will utilize AdmRP reports in continued planning. New or transitioning units will be expected to meet established benchmarks and resume standard unit review criteria in the next AdmRP cycle. An action plan with specific time table may be recommended.

Remediation

Units should implement plans that address identified challenges raised by the review, and identify discernible improvements as priorities in annual strategic plans and assessment reports. An action plan with specific time table may also be requested.

Unit Restructuring

Units will be required to provide a summary of unit restructuring strategies and outcomes in a Unit Modification Plan.

Elimination

Units will be required to submit a plan for disinvestment and/or elimination.
Scroll down the page to enter the key strengths of the overall unit.

Scroll down, again, to enter the key weaknesses of the overall unit.

Scroll down, a third time, to add comments on why you chose the given recommendation, and follow steps for the unit to prioritize in their next year’s strategic plan.

When completed, select “Save & Close.”
This action will generate a warning window.

A word of caution: Please remember to always “check-in.” Responses that are left “checked-out” do not register, and will not become part of the report.

Return to your AdmRP unit list, select the next unit, and repeat the aforementioned steps until all of your reviews have been completed.

For further assistance, please contact Cathe Springsteen, assistant director for integrated program review and accreditation at kathleen.springsteen@wmich.edu.