



ACADEMIC AFFAIRS GUIDELINES

Section 4:	Program Review and Accreditation	
Title:	Institutional Program Review Guidelines	
Number (Current Format)	Number (Prior Format)	Date Last Revised
4.2	II.E.1	11/2017
Reference:	BOR Policy 2:11	
Related Form(s):	AAC Form 4.2 – Institutional Program Review Report to the Board of Regents	

Approval Summary Quick View

Program Review ► VPAA ► CAO ► AAC ► BOR

1. **Purpose:** Institutional program reviews assist in the continuous improvement of educational program quality. Institutional program reviews involve stakeholders and analyze past performance as a way to inform present and future decision-making. The review process should integrate strategic planning, budgeting, regional and specialized accreditation processes, and student-learning outcome assessment. The Institutional Program Review and its related process are not the same thing as Program Productivity Review (Program Productivity Review has its own set of guidelines and processes).
2. **Board of Regents Submission Process:**
 - 2.1. Institutions submit summaries of completed program reviews to the Board of Regents (BOR).
 - 2.2. Institutions shall submit summaries of Institutional Program Reviews to the system Chief Academic Officer (CAO) no later than the conclusion of the academic year in which the review is completed. An institution may submit multiple Institutional Program Reviews at the same time. Institutions shall submit summaries on the “Institutional Program Review Report to the Board of Regents Form” (see AAC Form 4.2 within the AAC Guidelines).
 - 2.3. The Institutional Program Review summary is prepared as an information item for the Academic Affairs Council (AAC) and the Board of Regents. The university Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) submits the Institutional Program Review documentation to the system Chief Academic Officer.
3. **Overview:** Program review involves the comprehensive and intensive examination of a particular program, including the undergraduate and/or graduate academic programs (if applicable), research, scholarship, and creative activity, and the service/outreach component. Qualitative and quantitative data are useful in evaluating the program and determining areas for improvement.

- 3.1. Individual campuses maintain their own processes for completing institutional program reviews. Contact the university Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) for specific information related to campus guidelines and processes.
- 3.2. All degree programs are subject to program review requirements. Individual institutions may elect to review multiple degree programs within an individual academic unit (e.g., department, college) concurrently as part of a single program review. If a concurrent review is conducted, data and discussion for all degree programs included in the review must be integrated comprehensively into the self-study. Degree programs include degree programs (majors) at the associate, bachelor's, master's, education specialist, and doctoral levels. Degree programs do not include emphases, specializations, certificates, and minors.
- 3.3. Beginning in 2019-20, program reviews shall include identification of undergraduate cross-curricular skill requirements as part of programmatic student learning outcomes and a review of assessment methods and outcomes for cross-curricular skill requirements per Board of Regents Policy 2:11.
- 3.4. The academic program component of the review includes major requirements, other related requirements such as a minor or support courses, general education, and other degree requirements and general electives.
- 3.5. The definition of program quality emerges from honest professional discourse about how graduates of the program meet or exceed disciplinary academic standards and are able to address identified societal needs.
- 3.6. An effective program review process requires faculty involvement and investment.

4. Scope:

- 4.1. Program reviews shall occur at least once every seven years for undergraduate and graduate programs that are not subject to specialized accreditation or nationally recognized review processes. The university Vice President for Academic Affairs may require a shorter review interval.
- 4.2. Universities may use national accreditation reviews to satisfy the requirement for periodic program review. In such cases, the timing of the review will be determined by the cycle of specialized accreditation. Accredited undergraduate programs and non-accredited graduate programs in the same discipline should be reviewed at the same time when possible.
- 4.3. Non-accredited graduate programs shall follow these program review guidelines. If academic units would like to propose an alternative time to evaluate non-accredited graduate programs, contact the university Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- 4.4. Programs that are nationally accredited and/or reviewed are required to submit a program review report using the template provided in AAC Form 4.2 of the AAC Guidelines to the system Chief Academic Officer. The program review report is due no later than the

conclusion of the academic year in which the review is completed. An institution may submit multiple Institutional Program Reviews at the same time.

- 4.5. Appendices to this guideline and tables provided with the Institutional Program Review Report to the Board of Regents Form (AAC Form 4.2) are illustrative of procedures, processes, and documentation used at individual Regental institutions for program review. Individual institutions determine the internal procedures and forms used on their respective campus.

SOURCE:

AAC March 2016; September 2017 (Clerical); AAC November 2017.

Appendix A
Institutional Program Review Guidelines

TASK LIST FOR COMPLETING INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

Department/college/school personnel shall follow their internal institutional program review guidelines. This list is a broad overview of the required tasks involved in the review process.

1. Establish a schedule identifying the year to review the program.
2. Select a person to coordinate the program review.
3. The Review Coordinator, Vice President for Academic Affairs, relevant Dean(s), assessment personnel, and others identified by the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall meet to discuss the review process.
4. Establish timetable and strategy for conducting self-study, site visit, and related reporting responsibilities.
5. Identify external and internal reviewers and determine site visit dates.
6. Identify and secure needed resources for conducting the review.
7. Complete a consultant contract for reviewers as needed.
8. Host/conduct the site visit.
9. Prepare and receive reviewer reports.
10. Submit reviewer reports to appropriate Vice President of Academic Affairs and other required institutional offices.
11. Submit report to Board of Regents office Chief Academic Officer using AAC Form 4.2 (Institutional Program Review Report to the Board of Regents Form).
12. Integrate findings and recommendations into long-range and budget planning.

Appendix B
Institutional Program Review Guidelines

**GUIDELINES FOR PROVIDING/GATHERING INFORMATION FOR
INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEWS**

- I. Introduction:** Describe the unit/program under review, including undergraduate/graduate majors, specializations, minors, and certificates offered; the research, scholarship and creative activity conducted (including amount of funded research expenditures per annum since the last review); the outreach, engagement and service activities provided both within the university and externally. This should include a summary of offerings via distance education and university centers or other off-site locations.

- II. Mission Centrality:** The institutional mission is the basis for strategic planning and priority setting. Provide data and evidence demonstrating how the program supports the mission, vision and strategic goals of the University.
 - A.** Clearly state the program’s mission, strategic goals, and student learning outcomes and explain how faculty and students are made aware of them. Include a copy of the department/program strategic plan, if available.

 - B.** Explain how the program contributes to other programs (undergraduate, graduate, and student support) across campus. If the program plays a significant role in supporting other programs, provide a brief description of the extent, including identifying the supported programs.

 - C.** Include detailed placement data for graduates (bachelors, master’s, and doctoral) for the most recent three to five years. Indicate if graduates are working in discipline-related fields. State whether the program is meeting state, regional, national and international employment needs and include labor market projections for likely careers pursued by graduates (if available).

 - D.** Explain how the program’s outreach, community service, and other external linkages support the cultural, educational, and economic development of the state and region. Topics may include how the program serves the state and region beyond producing graduates, the benefits of any linkages to PK-12 education, and formal and informal linkages with external communities, groups, or organizations and related benefits.

- III. Quality:** Provide data, evidence, and explanation addressing whether the program is of high quality.
 - A.** Demonstrate the program’s commitment to creating an environment that engages students in their learning, including encouraging students to critically explore multiple and diverse perspectives. The intent of this item is to recognize that alternative points of view exists in all fields, including competing theories, methodologies in research and practice, and ethical decisions related to application of knowledge.

B. Describe the classroom-based and co-curricular activities designed to develop the ability to understand the discipline from different perspectives (and provide copies of syllabi). Describe practical learning experiences (internships, field experiences, service learning, research opportunities, practica, etc.) that contribute to student engagement. Explain the use of technology and other tools used in student learning.

C. Describe the use and availability of library resources by students and faculty, including identifying any trends in library publications and journals that demonstrate how the collection has changed over the past three to five years.

D. Demonstrate the curriculum is contemporary and coherent, appropriately representing the breadth and depth of the discipline. In this section, describe curricular changes made since the last program review and the data sources and process used for reviewing and updating curriculum.

E. Demonstrate well-developed program assessment processes, including measurable student learning outcomes based on commonly accepted disciplinary standards. Explain the use of assessment data in improving programs (undergraduate and graduate) and student learning. Demonstrate assessment employs multiple measures to evaluate learning outcomes and that assessment processes are consistent, continuous, formalized, and documented. Explain how student learning outcomes remain current with disciplinary standards, how assessment data are shared with faculty, how curriculum changes are made and what differences any changes have made in student learning?

F. Demonstrate the program promotes equity, diversity, and inclusiveness. Demonstrate the program values multiple perspectives, including race, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, ethnicity, age, and disability in recruitment and retention of students (undergraduate and graduate), staff and faculty, and the content and delivery of the curriculum.

G. Demonstrate program faculty and instructional staff are current in their disciplines and use current knowledge and strategies to engage students in active learning. Demonstrate the program utilizes the scholarship of teaching and learning and that learning activities include evidence-based instructional practices. Explain how faculty are remaining current in their disciplines, how the department promotes these efforts, and how professional development plans assist in the development of needed knowledge and skills.

H. Demonstrate the program's faculty members have been and continue to be productive scholars, researchers, and/or creative artists in ways that support the institution's mission. Provide 3-5 years of evidence of scholarly engagement, including peer-reviewed publications, performances, exhibitions, and funded research expenditures per annum for faculty who support the program. Describe how faculty members recognize the importance of engaging students in collaborative scholarly activities and creative projects as a critical component of learning. Provide 3-5 year of evidence of graduate student research productivity including theses, dissertations, co-authored papers, etc.

I. Demonstrate the program unit uses academic advisors who support student learning. Explain the process for assigning and assessing advising responsibilities. Provide 3-5 years of information on faculty who advise graduate students, the number of advisees and the number of graduates in each year.

J. Demonstrate the program contributes in a unique way to the university's identity and distinctiveness through its teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service.

K. Demonstrate the program has sufficient staffing to provide effective continuity and stability in consideration of the number and longevity of faculty, professional staff, and career service. Explain how the unit/program is positioning itself to hire personnel with the expertise in strategic areas. Provide a list of faculty by name, year of hire, rank, area/s of expertise as well as career service and professional staff members.

L. Demonstrate the program has sufficient facilities (classrooms, laboratories, etc.) and equipment to provide effective teaching, learning, and research environments.

IV. Cost: Provide information showing the program as financially viable yet cost efficient. Provide a copy of the program budget (revenues and expenses), including personnel, operations, and maintenance costs, as well as supplemental revenues. Provide separate revenue/expenses for off-campus or self-support faculty and staff. Provide and review 3-5 years of data, including analyzing for trends.

A. Provide the number of instructional faculty and graduate teaching assistants in the program. Provide the number of student credit hours generated at the graduate, upper-division (300-400 level), lower-division (100-200 level) levels. Provide the credit hours generated for pre-general education courses if applicable.

B. Provide the number of self-support student credit hours generated at off-campus sites (e.g., university centers) or through distance education. Provide the total credit hours generated per full-time equivalent (FTE) instructional staff.

V. Program Productivity: Demonstrate the program's productivity. Provide program enrollment figures from most recent census figures for fall semester. Provide the number of graduates in each degree program per year (based on CIP Code). Outline action steps to strengthen the program's enrollment and graduation rates, including setting specific targets. Programs identified as not meeting the program productivity guidelines may require evaluation again within the next three years.

VI. Future Planning: Demonstrate a plan for the program's future. Include targets and goals for change and plans to enhance quality and competitiveness based on this evaluation process. Demonstrate a plan for assessing and tracking future success, including identifying 5-10 key benchmarks.