

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW 2002-2003
UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL'S EVALUATION
for the

Reading Institute
SERVICE/RESEARCH CENTER

I. COUNCIL'S GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE CENTER

The Reading Institute has questionable value to the strategic thrust of KSU in terms of a mission not clearly defined, understood, and accepted by the College of Education. There is virtually no “client productivity” data offered. The Center is absorbing critical human and financial resources at a time when we are seeing increased budget reductions by the State and Board of Regents, increasing student enrollments, and requests for faculty lines to maintain quality of current graduate programs and to accommodate planned growth.

The self-assessment appears to focus “on them” and blaming others for the reasons it has been less than effective. This Council is charged with reviewing actual performance rather than assuming all current problems can be addressed with the development of a future five-year plan. It is incumbent on the leadership of the Reading Institute to have “made things happen” in a proactive manner.

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS

II. Summary of Center's Overall Productivity Council's Observations:	No Comments	Weak
---	--------------------	-------------

The self-evaluation does not offer any specific productivity data in terms of clients served, costs per clients, and outcomes measures

II A. Fulfillment of the Center's Purpose & Attainment of Goals Council's Observations:	Weak	Weak
--	-------------	-------------

The comments indicate no support from the organization, inadequate resources, And lack/of interest and/or cooperation from responsible departments. This suggests a leadership gap in no addressing these issues during the existence of the Center. “There is also competition from the George Northwest RESA which offers the Endorsement Program as well.” This suggests duplication of efforts combined with The fact we do not have competitive advantage.

The self-study speaks to low enrollments in the Summer Reading Institute for Summer 2002 yet provides no data.

II B. Services Rendered by the Center to the Campus Community Council's Observations:	Strong	Weak
--	---------------	-------------

Again the self study state “considering the lack of adequate support, the

Reading Institute performance on this indicator is assessed as strong. A series of activities are listed with no indication of numbers of participants, Assessment of effectiveness, etc.

II C. Services Rendered by the Center to External Communities **Satisfactory Weak**
Council's Observations:

Again no productivity measures are provided. The self-report states "Considering the severely limited resources in the Reading Institute ..."
Are we suggesting providing additional resources to this unit? The self Study indicates the need for additional support to improve productivity.

II D. Grants & Contracts Acquired by the Center **Weak Weak**
Council's Observations:

"None" Then the statement is made "one has to consider the fact that the Reading Institute is only three years old." However a theme that is present in this self-study is that someone needs to provide more support.

II E. Center Publications, Reports, & Professional Presentations **Satisfactory Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

II F. Sponsorships, Endowments & Gifts Acquired for the Center **No evaluation Weak**
Council's Observations:

None

II G. Sales, Service Fees, & Income Generating Activity **No Evaluation Weak**
Council's Observations:

II H. Return on Investment **No evaluation Weak**
Council's Observations:

The return on investment is negligible in financial terms.

II I. Contribution to Achieving KSU's Mission **No Evaluation Weak**
Council's Observations:

"There are three areas the Reading Institute claims to contribute to KSU's Commitment to public service: (1) making consultant services available, (2) publishing a newsletter, and (3) maintaining a web site with links to

different resources ...” Again there is no data indicating client usage. This section concludes with **three requests for more resources** when there is minimal demonstrated evidence current resources have been utilized productively for the last three years.

QUALITY INDICATORS

III. Summary Conclusions About the Strength of the Center's Overall Quality **No Evaluation Weak**
 Council's Observations:

“What the Center does do, it does it well.” Further it alludes to evaluations, student products and services, and annual performance reviews. However, no substantiating documentation is furnished and the key objectives of the Center are not stated.

III A. Public Recognition, Honors & Awards Received by the Center **No Evaluation Weak**
 Council's Observations:

None. What is troublesome is, once again, the reasons lie outside the Center.

III B. Stakeholder Satisfaction with the Center's Work & Accomplishments **No Evaluation Weak**
 Council's Observations:

There is no supporting data.

III C. Other Assessments of the Quality of the Center's Work **Satisfactory Weak**
 Council's Observations:

None

III D. Center's Responsiveness to State Needs & Changing Conditions **No Evaluation Weak**
 Council's Observations:

Self-evaluation refers the reader back to section IIA and our comments are indicated under that section of this document.

III E. Quality of the Faculty & Staff Supporting the Center **Very Strong Weak**
 Council's Observations

Entire self-evaluation indicates poor support and requests for expanding the operations, services, physical space, and equipment are made throughout.

III F. Quality of KSU Facilities & Equipment Supporting the Center
Council's Observations: **Satisfactory Strong**

Based upon the productivity of this Center it would appear adequate resources are provided.

III G. Quality of the Overall Annual Financial Investment
in the Operation of the Center
Council's Observations: **No Evaluation Satisfactory**

Requests for additional funding is not supported with current levels Of performance.

III H. Quality of Advanced Technology Available to the Center
Council's Observations: **Very Good Very Strong**

III I. Leadership Position of the Center
Council's Observations: **Weak Weak**

IV. CENTER'S VIABILITY AT KSU
Council's Observations: **Viable Not Viable**

V. MODEL CENTER POTENTIAL
Council's Observations: **Distinctive**

This conclusion is based upon external parties “doing things” to make The Reading Institute more relevant and effective.

VI. COUNCIL'S OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE PLANS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY & PRODUCTIVITY

The Reading Institute is to be commended for having an improvement plan. It clearly needs focus. It needs to address strategic and tactical issues. Currently it emphasizes operational activities.

It also relies heavily on “others to do things” which has contributed to the current level of performance. Similar

activities are specified, such as relocating the Center to larger space and acquiring funds to travel abroad. Given the level of performance to date and the realities of budgets for education, one would have to question these as reasonable plans.

A copy of a response for more information is attached.

VII. EXPAND, MAINTAIN CONSOLIDATE, OR DISCONTINUE
Council's Observations:

Enhance

Discontinue

COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP