

Saint Mary's College of California
Administrative Department Review
Guidelines and Process

Introduction

The Administrative Department Review process is designed to assess the College's administrative departments (referred to hereafter as "departments"). The goal of this process is to assess the department's strengths and weaknesses, formulate action plans for improvement, and enhance a department's contribution to the mission and strategic direction of the College. This review process should result in improved performance and enhanced quality of service, better coordination with other departments, improved budget planning, and optimal allocation of resources.

Process

The Administrative Department Review process is administered by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and its support staff. The IEC will maintain a 5-year cycle for reviews, and the reviews will be staggered so that there is roughly an equal number each year. The chair of the IEC will appoint an Administrative Department Review Board (ADRB), which will be assigned for a single departmental review. The ADRB will consist of at least one faculty and two staff members drawn from a larger Administrative Review Committee.

Steps in the Process

1. The IEC routinely reviews the ADR calendar, including specific deadlines and responsible parties for individual departments.
2. The vice president/provost and the department head receives instructions via email from IEC staff one year prior to the deadline for the self-study.
3. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) will conduct a 360-degree review of the department, often including an internal satisfaction survey. This report is delivered to the department head.
4. The vice president determines whether external review of the department is appropriate
5. The department head provides a complete draft of its self-study to the vice president/provost and the IEC, appending the IR report and the external review (if applicable).
6. Four hard copies and a digital copy of the completed report are delivered at the pre-arranged deadline by the department head to the IEC.
7. The Chair of the IEC appoints the Administrative Department Review Board.
8. The department head and vice president/provost responsible for the department are invited to the ADRB discussion of the unit. Following this discussion, the ADRB drafts a preliminary report. The department, with input from the vice president, is given an opportunity to respond in writing.
9. The vice president/provost responds to the ADR letter with a formal action plan for the department. At that time, all documents related to the review, including the action plan, are forwarded to the president.

Instructions and Format for Self-Study

The department head is responsible for the self study, and the process is intended to be an open one including the participation of all members of the department through meetings, retreats, formal surveys, and other means of gathering information.

- 1) Statement of departmental relationship to the College's mission and strategic goals.
 - a) How does the department's work help to fulfill the mission of the College?
 - b) How does the department enhance student success?
 - c) How does the department foster progress toward inclusive excellence?
 - d) How does the department support the strategic directions of the College?

- 2) Response to previous Departmental Review recommendations (applies only to programs in their 2nd cycle or beyond): Please summarize your progress toward meeting the goals specified in your last review and action plan.

- 3) Departmental Self-Appraisal
 - a) What is the department's mission?
 - b) Describe the department's primary functions.
 - c) Describe the department's customers (internal and external, if applicable)
 - d) Describe the organization of staff, especially how primary functions are carried out.
 - e) Describe how the work of this department compares in organization and function to at least two peer institutions, selected in consultation with the appropriate vice president.
 - f) Outline how the department defines quality and success (including metrics).
 - g) Describe with evidence how well these quality metrics are met.
 - h) Discuss budget issues in the department, such as resource allocation, opportunities for increased efficiency and the potential use of new technologies to improve productivity.
 - i) Describe professional development plans and activities of the department.

- 4) Reflection
 - a) Identify goals that seem to be met well and what specifically led to this success.
 - b) Identify goals needing improvement, and what actions, specifically, will be done to improve, including a timetable for changes, costs, and proposed evidence to be used to evaluate results.
 - c) Identify departmental potential for increased service or productivity and indicate conditions needed for success.