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I. History of Program Review

Program Review is the systematic review of all academic and administrative units at the University. All academic departments, major research centers, and administrative units are reviewed once every seven to ten years through the Program Review process. Program Review at Northwestern University began in 1985 as a faculty initiative to achieve and maintain the highest standards and best practices within all academic and administrative units of the University. The central administration and General Faculty Committee (now the Faculty Senate) collaborated to create a systematic review process that has been continually adapted to the changing needs of Northwestern.

Since it began, more than 420 academic and administrative unit reviews have occurred and nearly 750 faculty and administrators have participated in the process as members of the Program Review Council or internal reviewers. In addition, more than 750 highly regarded experts from other universities and organizations have visited our campuses to serve as external reviewers. The reviews have been conducted in cycles lasting seven to ten years with the first cycle taking place from 1985-1991, the second from 1992-1999, and the third from 2000-2009. Northwestern is now in the fourth cycle of the review process. After the completion of each cycle, a hiatus year is taken during which the process itself is reviewed and, at its request, the Board of Trustees is also reviewed.

In the first cycle, each unit prepared a comprehensive self-study that described its history and identified strengths, weaknesses and opportunities in the context of the University's mission. The process included a review by an internal subcommittee, as well as by a team of visiting external experts. Based on these reviews and the resulting external reviewers’ report, each subcommittee developed a report on behalf of the Program Review Council that, along with the external reviewers’ report, was presented to the senior administration, the line administration, and the unit. Recommendations and plans for implementation were discussed with and agreed to by the Deans or Vice Presidents and department chairs or directors. Two years after the review, a follow-up report from the unit was requested to document the unit’s progress in implementing the recommendations.

After a review of the first cycle, procedures for the second cycle were modified to allow these reviews to build directly on the results of the first review. Units were asked to develop a list of key issues emanating from their previous review and from significant changes in the unit or emerging in the field since the review. An analysis of these issues then became the primary focus of the second cycle unit report. Other aspects of the process, such as the internal subcommittee review, the visit by external experts, and the follow-up administrative meetings, remained in place for the second cycle. Units were not necessarily reviewed in the same order as in the first cycle; a number of factors, such as the extent of problems identified in the first review of the unit, significant changes within the unit, schedule of accreditation visits, and the desirability of reviewing like units in the same year, influenced the scheduling process. Near the end of the second cycle, the follow-up process was changed from a two-year to a one-year timeframe to better gauge the unit’s efforts in implementing the recommendations and to provide assistance where needed.
Since the majority of the units reviewed during the third cycle were reviewed in the first and/or second cycles, the purpose of the third cycle was to assure that the unit had established and was working toward clear strategic improvements and addressing specific issues that grew out of the prior reviews or had arisen since each unit’s last review. In this way, the third cycle continued the spirit of the previous two cycles.

The evaluation of the Program Review process following the third cycle made several specific recommendations for further refinements to the process for the fourth cycle. While some of the recommendations confirmed existing procedures, others resulted in specific changes to the process. The major changes to the process include more systematic use of data, eliminating the internal subcommittee report, and an increased emphasis on implementation follow-up. A unit data profile and faculty/staff and customer surveys are now standard components of the review process. The data profile is a compilation of key performance indicators for the unit. Faculty/staff surveys are used to solicit the perspectives of all members of the unit and presented anonymously with other review materials. For administrative units, customer surveys are administered to gather feedback from the unit’s customer base. In addition to expanded data usage, another major change was streamlining the interviews and final report. Per the Third Cycle Review Committee’s recommendations, the internal reviewers now conduct interviews alongside the external review team. Further, the internal reviewers provide input to the external review team in the writing of the report, rather than submitting a separate internal report. The Committee also recommended adjusting the structure of the Program Review Council to be more fluid; rather than assigning PRC members to internal review teams, the internal reviewers are chosen in consultation with the Dean/Line Vice President and unit head to ensure relevance to the unit undergoing review. The final major change to the Program Review process is an increased emphasis on follow-up with participation from Deans and Line Vice Presidents.

II. Purpose of Program Review
Program Review requires a commitment of time and effort from all involved. In light of the costs of resources required, it is appropriate to ask, “Why should the University continue to engage in Program Review?” This has been the fundamental question that drives the review of the Program Review process at the end of each cycle. Each time, the value of Program Review has been affirmed because the benefits of doing it outweigh the costs. Further, the President, Provost, and Board of Trustees have indicated that they uniformly value Program Review’s insights into unit performance and utilize the findings as key inputs in University-wide strategic planning and decision-making.

The benefits of Program Review include:

- **Providing units with opportunities for self-study, strategic planning, and change**
  Program Review ensures that each unit systematically takes time to step back from everyday challenges to evaluate its strengths, weaknesses, and progress in order to create a strong foundation for the development of future strategic plans and priorities.
• **Facilitating continuous improvement**
The specific recommendations included in the implementation agreements resulting from Program Review help units benchmark progress in critical areas.

• **Providing information utilized in area-wide and University-wide strategic planning and decision-making**
Program Review has created a base of knowledge and shared understanding that provides a critical backdrop to school and University decision-making processes, including the setting of priorities, hiring plans, budget setting, space allocations, fundraising priorities, and program sizing.

• **Encouraging better communication and collaboration**
Program Review is designed to foster communication both within the unit as well as between the unit, Dean/Vice President, and Central Administration.

• **Providing candid assessment by external experts**
Program Review provides a mechanism for rigorous evaluation and feedback by experts in the field that are valued by both the unit and the administration. (In some cases, the unit has used the panel of outside experts for continuing consultations after the review.)

• **Fostering interdisciplinary understanding and socialization**
Faculty and administrators frequently remark on the improved understanding among related units due to the involvement of internal reviewers. A similar benefit is seen in faculty-administration relations as a result of faculty reviewers gaining a deeper understanding of the administrative operations of the University.

• **Fostering appreciation of complexity and diversity of the University**
Whether it is the variance in governance between departments or the details of what drives excellence across varied fields, Program Review makes these differences more visible and helps the University strategically address these variations in constructive ways.

• **Providing increased external visibility**
External reviewers often note the unanticipated strengths they observe at Northwestern or comment on the deepening of their respect for the institution as a result of their visit. The Program Review process also fosters dialogue amongst exemplary peers about the most effective ways to assess the quality of the University.

• **Providing accountability to the Board of Trustees**
Each year, review summaries, implementation agreements, and follow-up reports are provided to the Board of Trustees. The candor and commitment represented by this effort provides an important assurance to the Board that the University is evaluating itself and continually striving for improvement. The Board's support
for this process is also evidenced by its request to be reviewed at the end of each cycle.

### III. Program Review Council and Internal Reviewers

Program Review is overseen by the Program Review Council (PRC), an appointed group of senior faculty and administrators. The Chair of the PRC is appointed every two years from among the senior members of this group, while the Vice President for Administration and Planning serves as the Vice Chair on an ongoing basis.

At least two-thirds of the members of PRC are faculty. The members of the PRC are appointed by the Vice President for Administration and Planning based on the recommendations of Deans and senior administrators. The PRC is representative of the various disciplinary and administrative interests within the University (though not all areas are represented every single year). Members of the PRC are appointed to serve staggered, three-year terms. To participate in the Program Review Council, members must have served on at least one internal review team. Internal reviewers are invited to participate in program review based on nominations from Deans and senior level administrators, with the opportunity for the unit head to provide input.

Each Program Review is assigned two internal reviewers, who work in tandem with the external reviewers. The role of the internal reviewers is to serve as resource for the external reviewers and also provide a lens on the unique context of Northwestern during the external reviewers’ visit. Members of the internal review team cannot be members of the unit under review (including joint and courtesy appointments) and must also be free of any other potential conflicts of interest. Deans, Vice Presidents, and unit heads are given the opportunity to veto potential members if they believe such conflicts may exist. For administrative unit reviews, internal review teams include at least one administrator.

The Assistant Vice President of Program Review in the Office of Administration and Planning is responsible for coordinating the activities of the Program Review Council and assuring the completion of each Program Review. The Office of Administration and Planning provides other administrative and support services for the Program Review Council and the review teams.

### IV. Review Schedule & Timeline

Similar to previous cycles, the fourth cycle is scheduled to take place over ten years. The schedule for the complete review cycle is reviewed annually and revised during the cycle as needed (with the most current schedule available on the Program Review website). To build upon interdisciplinary connections, some units are grouped together for review in the same year; these clusters are based on functional compatibility rather than organizational lines (e.g., life sciences, cognitive sciences, business operations, etc.). For the most part, the ‘unit of analysis’ has been maintained across the cycles (e.g., departments in larger schools, smaller schools as a whole, large research centers, individual/small groups of administrative units depending on size).
In terms of setting the cycle schedule, the Vice President for Administration and Planning requests input from the Deans and Vice Presidents about their preferred scheduling of their units. Deans and Vice Presidents should consult with their units about scheduling options prior to providing feedback and final recommendations. The Vice President for Administration and Planning makes the final determination on scheduling; while most preferences can often be accommodated, some shifts may occur in order to smooth out the number of reviews in each year. Where possible and appropriate, the timing of the review relative to accreditation will reflect the preference of the Dean. However, while some of the materials required may be similar, the purpose and goals of an accreditation review are substantially different from those of Program Review and an accreditation is not be considered a substitute for Program Review. While units are typically reviewed in a similar order relative to the previous cycle, there will be flexibility in the order of reviews based on the current needs assessed by the university.

The Program Review of a unit will take place over a full year, beginning with an orientation the spring before the review year. Typically, the main activities for the review take place in the fall/winter quarter and the external reviewer visit takes place in the spring. The process is conducted over the course of the academic year.

An earlier review visit may be possible depending upon reviewer availability (e.g. winter quarter). Units are asked to notify the Vice President for Administration and Planning of this preference in advance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter (prior to review year)</td>
<td>Unit receives notification regarding its Program Review for the upcoming academic year and pertinent deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Unit attends orientation meeting to learn about the Program Review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Unit provides list of potential external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – Summer</td>
<td>External reviewers are finalized based on unit nominations and Dean/Vice President input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer – Fall</td>
<td>Data profile and faculty survey are completed and used to inform the unit self-study and provide background to the review team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Unit (in coordination with Dean/Vice President) identifies key issues to focus on in the upcoming review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Unit receives key issues feedback and writes the self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>External reviewers visit campus and together with the internal reviewers and conduct interviews with key unit faculty/administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>External reviewers provide final report and recommendations within 10 days of review visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Process Overview
The Program Review process includes the following steps, each of which is discussed in more detail below:

1. Notification and Orientation
2. External Reviewer Identification
3. Data Elements
   A. Data Profile
   B. Faculty/Staff and Customer Feedback Surveys
4. Identification of Key Issues
5. Self-Study
6. Review Visit
7. External Reviewer Report
8. Program Review Council Review
9. Distribution of Final Report to the Unit
10. Implementation Agreement Meetings
11. Communication of Review Outcomes
12. One Year Follow-Up

1. Notification and Orientation
Beginning in the winter quarter, members of the administration review the schedule of reviews for the upcoming year. Deans and Vice Presidents are asked to confirm with their units that the timing of the review is not problematic, and the schedule is adjusted to accommodate unit needs. Once the list of units to be reviewed has been confirmed, the units are formally notified by the Office of Administration and Planning during
winter or early spring quarter. The notification packet provides information on the unit’s previous review and lists the initial information requests (names of potential external reviewers, list of key issues, etc.) as well as the dates by which this information is needed. An orientation session is held with each unit head to discuss the review process, timing and answer any questions. Unit heads may identify other individuals from the department to join this discussion.

2. **External Reviewer Identification**
As in previous cycles, at least two outside experts are asked to review the unit based upon a review of the self-study and other Program Review materials as well as interviews they conduct during a visit to campus. The expertise and objectivity brought by the external reviewers has been relied upon heavily by the PRC and is often cited by units under review as a particular strength of the Program Review process.

The unit is responsible for nominating 8-10 individuals to serve as external reviewers. These individuals should be eminent leaders in their field and come from highly-reputable peer departments and institutions. Units are asked to avoid any conflict of interest in their nominations and clarify anything that might have the appearance of a conflict of interest. Units may also delineate reviewers by their areas of expertise and ask that the team be comprised of reviewers from each group to ensure coverage of sub-fields within the unit, typically providing 3-4 nominations for each area. Finally, units may request that a reviewer from a previous cycle serve again, if appropriate.

The list of potential external reviewers is then reviewed by senior administrators to ensure that there is consensus on the appropriateness of these individuals to serve as reviewers. The final selection of reviewers is the responsibility of the Office of Administration and Planning. Units are encouraged to submit their nominations as soon as possible, since it enables the Office of Administration and Planning to extend invitations to reviewers earlier and increase the likelihood that the unit will be able to get their preferred reviewers.

3. **Data Elements**
Though data has frequently found its way into Program Review materials, this cycle introduces a more standardized and complete framework for incorporating data into each review. The data elements that are being added help to frame the review, enhance the self-study process, and lead toward a cycle of continuous improvement that will be more relevant to the ever-changing environment of academe. These data elements include a data profile and unit and customer feedback surveys.

A. **Data Profile**
For academic units, the Office of Administration and Planning consults with each school to build a core data profile of relevant indicators. These data profiles are compiled by the Office of Administration and Planning (or the school/unit when they have access to the appropriate data) and provided to the unit for review and analysis. The data may be useful for identifying particular strengths and weaknesses of a unit, though no single data element should be regarded as an absolute metric by which to measure the unit’s current quality. Rather, these data elements provide tangible reference points for the
unit’s self-study and strategic planning as well as provide more detailed background for the reviewers to reference.

For administrative units, unique performance measures are often needed to objectively evaluate a unit’s performance. In cases where they do not exist or the data are incomplete, the University seeks to develop and maintain such measures, not only for Program Review but also to inform other University processes (e.g., budgeting, strategic planning, etc.). Units should work closely with the Dean or Vice president in the development of these measures. In cases where institutional data is needed, Office of Administration and Planning works to provide this data. In other cases, the unit provides the appropriate data and/or peer comparisons.

B. Faculty/Staff and Customer Feedback Surveys
In academic units, the Office of Administration and Planning gathers survey feedback from faculty for the purpose of gaining a diverse set of perspectives on the current state of the unit and opportunities for future strategic direction. The Office of Administration and Planning aims for a response rate of at least 80% for unit faculty/staff. The addition of a unit survey to the Program Review process serves two purposes. The first is that it allows the unit to take faculty/staff feedback into account to inform the self-study and strategic planning. The second is that it allows all unit members to have a voice in the process despite the fact that it is not always possible for every member to participate in the interviews with the external and internal reviewers. Where appropriate, surveys of graduate students and post-docs may also be included.

Where an administrative unit has a clear service mission, a customer feedback survey is also included. Customer feedback surveys are developed by the Program Review team and the Office for Information and Analytics, in conjunction with leadership of the unit undergoing review. The Office of Administration and Planning administers the survey and compiles the customer survey feedback. The Office of Administration and Planning aims for a response rate of at least 25% for customer feedback surveys. The unit head is provided with all survey results, as well as a more concise summary of the survey results by theme.

4. Identification of Key Issues
Each unit identifies a short list of key issues that it believes should be highlighted in its review. These should be the critical issues facing the unit currently and over the next three-to-five years. The list of issues is provided to the Office of the Vice President for Administration and Planning, who distributes it to the President, Provost, Vice President for Research, Dean of the Graduate School, and Dean/Line Vice President and other members of the senior leadership team as appropriate. The unit then receives a letter that summarizes the feedback received on these issues and may highlight additional issues that should be addressed by the unit during the self-study process. This feedback step is an important way to ensure alignment between the Dean/Line Vice President and central administration on the key issues facing the unit. As the review continues, additional issues may be identified either by the unit, Dean, Vice President, or Program Review Council. The initial identification of issues can give significant early focus to the review process, although the scope of the review is certainly not limited to
these issues. Each issue is addressed more thoroughly in the Self-Study document. For additional detail on identifying Key Issues, please see the [Key Issues Guidance](#) documents.

5. **Self-Study**
The process of creating the self-study report has been identified by many as perhaps the most important and valuable aspect of the Program Review process. The self-study phase of Program Review represents a valuable opportunity for the unit to candidly assess progress and consider options for how to further strengthen the unit. It implicitly supports difficult conversations that may be avoided in day-to-day interactions. Many units find the process to be useful for strategic planning within the unit, leading to better decisions about where to focus efforts and how to allocate resources within the unit.

The primary purposes of the unit self-study report are:
- To explicate the strategic plans of the unit, with specific reference to the mission and strategic plans of the unit’s school as well as the University as a whole
- To analyze program strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities
- To analyze the department’s strategic position relative to peers
- To address in detail how to best manage the challenges facing the unit
- To identify ways that the program can improve using existing resources

Please note that while opportunities which would require additional resources may be identified during the self-study, the document should not be regarded as a tool to persuade colleagues or the administration to allocate additional resources to the program. Every effort should be made to identify areas from which resources should be reallocated toward a better use (i.e. one that contributes more toward the strategic goals of the unit) and where resources can be leveraged more effectively in conjunction with related units.

In preparing the report, units are encouraged to identify a diverse committee of unit members to develop the report. Units are especially encouraged to identify a few junior members of the unit to participate in the self-study committee to bring new perspectives. The unit’s self-study committee should consider the previous Program Review and determine whether previously identified key issues have been adequately addressed. However, the self-study also provides an opportunity for a fresh examination of the unit, and should be a document that stands on its own in analyzing the current state of the unit and directly addressing critical issues, especially those identified in the key issues document. The data elements and survey results provided by the Office of Administration and Planning may also be utilized as input for analyzing the relative strengths and weaknesses of the unit as applicable. The self-study committee should meet with the other unit members to gather their input and perspectives on the various issues identified. The report may include, as appendices, any additional data or performance measures that the unit considers good indicators of its progress toward its goals. For additional detail, please see the [Self-Study Guidance](#) documents for academic and administrative units.
The Office of Administration and Planning maintains guidelines and templates that describe in greater detail what specific elements should be covered in the self-study report. While there is no single process that is required to be used, the final report should be shared with all members of the unit and should represent a good faith effort at reaching consensus. If true consensus is not possible, the report should clearly describe the nature of the disagreement and how final decisions about priorities were made.

The self-study report will be reviewed by the Office of Administration and Planning to ensure it is complete. Incomplete reports will be returned to the unit with specific feedback on how the report should be revised. The report does not become a public document, but is made available to the Program Review Council, internal reviewers, external reviewers, and relevant administrative officers. For academic units, this includes the President, Provost, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Research, Dean of the Graduate School (for units with graduate programs), and the Dean of the school. For administrative units, this includes the President and the Vice President(s) with line or related responsibility for the unit reviewed.

6. Review Visit
All logistical arrangements for the reviewers are made by the Office of Administration and Planning. In preparation for their visit, the reviewers receive and are asked to study their responsibilities for the review and all materials for the current review. They are also provided with the reports and recommendations from the previous review. In addition, the unit head is given contact information for the reviewers in advance of their visit so that the members of the unit can have the opportunity to provide individual comment directly if appropriate (especially in situations where someone will be unavailable during the visit).

When the external reviewers visit campus, they meet with the unit’s faculty and/or professional staff, students (both undergraduate and graduate), line administration involved (Dean or unit manager, appropriate Vice President(s), Provost, and President), and others appropriate to the review. Faculty/staff from closely-related or collaborating units are also usually included. The external and internal reviewers conduct all meetings together. The unit is responsible for coordinating the schedules of the appropriate people for the visit, although the list of individuals is shared with the Office for Administration and Planning and subject to input from the central administration. The visit is usually about two days in length but can be extended based on specific needs.

7. External Reviewer Report
Within ten working days of the visit, the external reviewers are asked to provide a written assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for the unit to the Office of Administration and Planning. A joint report written by all the external reviewers is strongly encouraged. The internal reviewers will review this report and in rare circumstances develop an addendum of key issues not addressed. The external reviewers are encouraged to make the report and recommendations as specific as possible. For additional detail, please see the External Reviewer Guidelines document.
The internal reviewers should remain available for consultation by the external reviewers if there is any need to clarify the substance of the report. Any differences of opinion that cannot be resolved, either between external reviewers or between external and internal reviewers, should be clearly detailed. The final report will also redact any comments about specific individuals. These comments will be placed in a confidential addendum.

8. Program Review Council Review
The Program Review Council (PRC) is a group of senior faculty and administrators that oversees the Program Review process. The PRC reviews all reports and guides the development of actionable implementation agreements.

Once an external reviewer report is received, the Program Review Council reviews the report and meets with the internal reviewers to have a more in-depth discussion and presentation of the report. At that time, the Program Review Council may request clarification or more details on any issues that they believe the report does not clearly address. Following this discussion, the key recommendations, along with any necessary clarification, are reflected in the draft implementation agreement. The PRC is responsible for drafting the implementation agreement. The implementation agreement is then used to guide the implementation discussion between the unit head, dean or line vice president, and central administration.

Though Program Review incorporates many data elements into the process, certain statements or recommendations will inevitably be based upon perceptions. Occasionally, despite the best efforts of the reviewers and the PRC, factual errors based on misperceptions occur in the final drafts of reports. In the interest of creating a valid and trustworthy report, the unit head will be given an opportunity to review the report to ensure that there are no factual errors. If factual errors are discovered, they will be promptly corrected prior to sharing the report with the unit, Dean/Vice President and central administration.

For academic reviews, the fact-checked final report is forwarded to the President, Provost, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Research, Dean of the Graduate School (for units with graduate programs), and Dean of the appropriate school. In administrative reviews, it is forwarded to the President, Provost, Vice President(s) to which the unit reports.

9. Distribution of Final Report to the Unit
Once the report has been fact-checked, members of the unit receive a communication from the Office of Administration and Planning notifying them of the availability of the report and timing of the implementation meeting that will be scheduled. The report is made available to all faculty and/or professional staff in the unit for review in the unit head's office. The report is considered confidential and should not be copied or distributed electronically. All members of the unit have the opportunity to provide comments on the report by providing them to the Office of Administration and Planning. The responses become a part of the permanent record for the review and will
be distributed the internal reviewers, President, Provost, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Research (as applicable), Dean of the Graduate School (as applicable), and other appropriate line administration.

10. Implementation Agreement Meetings
The draft implementation agreement is then shared with the unit head, who is asked to draft a written response from the unit, based on the reviewers’ report and with input from the Program Review Council, for each of the recommendations. This draft response version is then circulated to those attending the implementation agreement discussion as outlined below.

A. Meeting with Central Administration, Line Head and Unit Head
The President, the Provost, the Vice President for Administration and Planning, the Vice President for Research, and the Dean of the Graduate School meet with the Dean or appropriate line officer and the unit head to discuss the results of the review and recommendations, and to agree on the next steps for implementation. Based on this discussion, each unit will then receive an explicit implementation agreement that clearly describes the agreed-upon actions to be taken and specifies who is responsible for carrying out each of these actions (central administration, Dean, and unit). The Dean/Vice President is encouraged to be explicit about any resource commitments he/she is willing (or not willing) to make.

B. Line Head Meeting with Unit
Once the implementation agreement has been finalized, the Dean/Vice President and unit head should meet with the faculty or professional staff in the unit to discuss the agreement and needed implementation steps. It is the responsibility of the Dean/Line Vice President to schedule this meeting.

11. Communication of the Review Outcomes
A summary of findings and agreements for each unit reviewed in a given year is prepared for examination by the Board of Trustees. These summaries are also provided to the Program Review Council and to the Deans and Vice Presidents. In addition, the Board of Trustees receives a report on the progress demonstrated during the annual follow-up for those units reviewed during prior years.

Unit heads always have the option of sharing their report with related unit heads where cross-department or cross-school initiatives would be well-served. As a highly interdisciplinary university, this is encouraged but ultimately remains a unit-level prerogative.

12. One Year Follow-Up
Approximately one year from when the implementation agreement is finalized, units are asked to provide an update on progress. It is the responsibility of the Dean/Line Vice President to monitor the implementation progress. The implementation agreement provides the basis of the one-year follow-up report, and units are sent a template to use to respond (although this template has open-ended sections which allow each unit to add pertinent information). All units are instructed to work closely with their Dean or
Vice President in the development of this report. The report is submitted by the unit to the Dean or Vice President, who forwards it to Administration and Planning along with his or her comments. These reports are then reviewed by members of the University’s senior administration and units may receive written feedback on their progress-to-date following that meeting.

As part of the follow-up process, the Office of Administration and Planning and the Office of Information and Analytics is also working on developing a set of data indicators to be provided annually to unit heads, and are in the process of defining what indicators would be most valuable for units. In some cases, there are data indicators that can be linked to specific recommendations and tracked over time (e.g. student survey feedback or research awards). However, in other cases the recommendations require a more qualitative tracking approach. Ultimately, the goal is for all unit heads to receive a set of data indicators annually to help them track progress and foster a culture of continuous improvement, not just those units under review.

VI. Conclusion
The goal of Program Review is to encourage improvements in the quality of each unit at the University by providing a comprehensive and collaborative process to assess each unit on:

- Current strengths and weaknesses of the unit
- Opportunities for unit to achieve growth or distinction
- Key differentiators that distinguish unit from peers
- Metrics identified and tracked to determine progress
- Changes in the discipline or profession that need to be addressed in strategic planning
- Potential areas of cross-unit collaboration where the University and units’ resources could be leveraged

The product of this process should be plans which are explicit, realistic, and viable for helping each unit continuously improve and reach their highest aspirations.