

July 22, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: David L. Buhler

SUBJECT: Revision to Policy R411, Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews

Background

Cyclical reviews of academic programs have long been conducted by Utah System of Higher Education (USHE) institutions in accordance with Policy R411 to foster improvement and assure quality. In numerous instances, institutions also pursue and receive specialized accreditation for academic programs where such recognition is available and is deemed to be beneficial, vital, or necessary.

Issue

Under accrediting organizations recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or the U.S. Department of Education, the process by which an academic program is granted specialized accreditation is comprehensive and rigorous. Accordingly, the USHE Chief Academic Officers and the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff have developed revisions to Policy R411 that would allow an institution to submit evidence of an academic program's specialized accreditation in lieu of submitting separate program review documentation as currently required by Policy R411. Specialized accreditation is such that academic program improvement and quality standards in Policy R411 would be met, and efficiencies in terms of effort and expense would be realized.

Summary of changes:

- Section 3—Responsibility
 - Minor edits
- Section 4—Review Procedure
 - Moved current Section 6 (Review Committees) to revised Section 4.1
 - Clarified minimum number and qualifications of external and internal reviewers in revised Section 4.1
 - Moved current Section 4.4 to Section 4.3

- Inserted new Section 4.4: "If a program holds specialized accreditation from an organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or the U.S. Department of Education (as advised by the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality), an institution may choose to submit the specialized accreditation letter(s) and report(s) in lieu of conducting and submitting a program review as described herein."
- Other minor edits throughout section
- Section 5—Review Schedule
 - Deleted sentence in introduction recommending coordination of cyclical program reviews and specialized accreditation (since specialized accreditation would be accepted in lieu of cyclical program reviews)
 - Clarified that the standard program review schedule (at least once every seven years for doctorate-granting and master's universities, and at least once every five years for all other institutions) may differ for academic programs that undergo specialized accreditation
 - Inserted provision from Policy R401 that a list of scheduled program reviews is to be submitted annually to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff
- Section 6—Program Review Template (currently Section 7)
 - Deleted current instructions and inserted new instructions similar in content and format to instructions for proposal templates in Policy R401
 - Inserted Cover/Signature Page (not included in current Policy R411)

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends the Regents approve the revision to Policy R411, *Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews*.

David L. Buhler
Commissioner of Higher Education

DLB/GVB
Attachment

R411-1. Purpose: To provide policy and procedures for the review of existing programs in the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE). The primary purpose for conducting institutional program reviews is to improve the quality of education.

R411-2. References:

2.1. Utah Code §53B-16-102, Changes in Curriculum

2.2. Policy and Procedures R220, Delegation of Responsibilities to the President and Board of Trustees

2.3. Policy and Procedures R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Changes, Discontinued Programs, and Program Reports

R411-3. Responsibility: The chief responsibility for reviewing existing programs is assigned to institutional faculty and administrators, and to institutional Boards of Trustees (Trustees) with accompanying Board of Regents (Regents) oversight. Program review is accomplished through the combined efforts of presidents, vice presidents, provosts, deans, department chairs, and ~~individual~~ faculty so that meaningful change can occur.

R411-4. Review Procedure: Program reviews will be evaluated first by the institutional ~~B~~Board of ~~T~~Trustees, and then forwarded to the Commissioner of Higher Education and Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff for review and recommendation to ~~by~~ the Regents as a General Consent Calendar item ~~an Information Item~~.

4.1~~R411-6. Review Committees:~~ Program reviews will be conducted in accordance with procedures developed by each institution consistent with its respective faculty governance system. Departments whose programs are under review shall prepare detailed written materials for review committees based on system and institutional criteria. Review committees for each program shall ~~should be established that include~~ a the minimum of one ~~(1) two external reviewers with expertise in the discipline, or consultant.~~ (2) one external reviewer and one internal reviewer ~~consultant (not affiliated with the program).~~ External and internal reviewers shall be individuals holding positions as academic administrators and/or faculty. Additionally, Program Advisory Committee members and/or other external industry experts may be used.

4.21. Submissions: Institutional Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) shall provide summaries of completed d program reviews to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff. The summaries shall ~~should~~ include the reviewers, a program description, five-year ~~faculty/and student staff~~ data, five

¹ Approved July 15, 1980; amended September 13, 1983, March 20, 1984, April 11, 1986, November 17, 1989, July 27, 1990, May 29, 1998, October 27, 2005, March 24, 2009, and September 16, 2011.

~~year enrollment data, a five-year financial data analysis, a program assessment, and the institution's response (see Program Review Template, Section 6). See 0 for the template.~~

~~4.32. Evaluations:~~ Program review summaries will be evaluated by the Commissioner's staff, who may ask for further information. ~~In addition to the completed program review template, institutional CAOs shall provide to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff copies of regional and specialized accreditation reports, including focused and interim reports, and other reports upon request.~~ The staff will prepare program reviews as ~~information~~ items for the Regents' General Consent Calendar agendas.

~~4.4. Programs with Specialized Accreditation:~~ If a program holds specialized accreditation from an organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or the U.S. Department of Education (as advised by the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity), an institution may choose to submit the specialized accreditation letter(s) and report(s) in lieu of conducting and submitting a program review as described herein. ~~3. Other Information:~~ ~~In addition to the completed program review template, institutional CAOs shall provide to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff copies of regional and specialized accreditation reports, including focused and interim reports, and other reports as requested.~~

~~R411-5. Review Schedule:~~ To ensure a thoughtful and careful examination of each program in the USHE, the following review schedule should be followed as closely as possible. ~~It is recommended that the timing of these reviews should be coordinated with regional and/or specialized accreditation review schedules whenever possible to avoid duplication of effort and/or expense.~~

~~5.1. Doctorate-Granting and Master's Universities:~~ All programs will be reviewed at least once every seven years, except where the specialized accreditation cycle for a program may be different.

~~5.2. All Other Institutions:~~ All programs will be reviewed at least once every five years, except where the specialized accreditation cycle for a program may be different.

~~5.3. List of Scheduled Program Reviews:~~ An annual list of scheduled program reviews is due to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff at the beginning of each September.

~~R411-6. Review Committees:~~ Program reviews will be conducted in accordance with procedures developed by each institution consistent with its respective faculty governance system. Departments whose programs are under review shall prepare detailed written materials for review committees based on system and institutional criteria. Review committees for each program should be established that include the minimum of one external consultant, one internal consultant (not affiliated with the program). Additionally, Program Advisory Committee members may be used.

~~R411-67. Program Review Template:~~ The template specifies the information to be supplied and provides the format to be used when submitting the review for the Regents.

~~6.1. General Formatting for Submissions.~~

~~7.1.1. All submissions must be written in a formal style, using third person.~~

~~7.1.2. All submissions must be sent to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff as an electronic document in Microsoft Word format.~~

~~7.1.3. All submissions must use Arial Narrow 12 point font, single spaced. Remove italics when using templates.~~

~~7.1.4. All submissions must have 1" margins.~~

~~7.2. Template. Information provided should be concise and cover the last five academic years.~~

Instructions:

- The Program Review Template should be used for those items identified as needing the Report Template in R411 and listed as possible items to check on the Cover/Signature Page below.
- A Report Template consists of a Cover/Signature Page and a Five- or Seven-Year Program Review.
- Prepare the Five- or Seven-Year Follow-Up Report per R411 instructions as a Word document (no PDF formats). When *descriptions of the content required for each section appear in this font color, the descriptive italics are to be removed and replaced with the institutional content before the institution submits the proposal to the OCHE.*
- Institutions providing evidence of specialized accreditation in lieu of conducting a Five- or Seven-Year Program Review should submit the Cover/Signature Page with the appropriate specialized accreditation letter(s) and report(s) attached.
- The CAO or his/her designated representatives should e-mail the completed Program Review material (including electronic signature) to academicaffairs@ushe.edu.
- The institution is responsible for maintaining a record of the submission as the OCHE Academic and Student Affairs office is not responsible for storing electronic copies of submitted reviews.

Cover/Signature Page – Program Review Template

Institution Submitting Review: Name of Institution

Program Title: Name of Program

School or Division or Location: Name of School/Division Location

Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Name of Department/Area Location

Institutional Board of Trustees' Approval Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Review Type (check one):

<u>Regents' General Consent Calendar Items</u>		
<u>R411 Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews</u>		
<u>SECTION NO.</u>		<u>ITEM</u>
<u>4.4</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Programs with Specialized Accreditation</u>
<u>5.1</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Seven-Year Program Review</u>
<u>5.2</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Five-Year Program Review</u>

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:

I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this review to the Office of the Commissioner.

Signature

Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee

Five- or Seven-Year Program Review
Higher Education Institution
Program
MM/DD/YEAR

Reviewers: (Add bullets as needed. Remove italics when using template)

- External Reviewer(s), Affiliation
- Internal Reviewer(s), Affiliation

Program Description: One- to three-paragraph description of the program. (Remove italics when using template).

Data Form: Faculty, student, and financial data for the past five years.

The following table in R 411 is designed to gather data about the institutional unit being reviewed. The table has been designed to present consistent data to Trustees and Regents who will receive the report. Institutions decide on the configuration of the unit to be reviewed, and in most cases, the review is at the department level. However, in some instances, the unit being reviewed provides services that are different from those provided by traditional academic departments. When providing data on such units, please offer an explanation that clarifies the purpose of the unit, preparation of faculty or staff who provide the service, attendance data on participants, cost of providing services, and any credential that may be offered to completers if this applies. With sufficient explanation, the data table can be adjusted for that purpose. Use this template and make appropriate changes to present a full picture of the unit that was reviewed.

R411 Data Table					
Department or Unit--					
	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX
Faculty					
Headcount					
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
With Master's Degrees					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
With Bachelor's Degrees					
Full-time Tenured					

Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
Other					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
Total Headcount Faculty					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
FTE (A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition)					
Full-time (Salaried)					
Teaching Assistants					
Part-time (May include TAs)					
Total Faculty FTE					
Number of Graduates					
Certificates					
Associate Degrees					
Bachelor's Degrees					
Master's Degrees					
Doctoral Degrees					
Number of Students—(Data Based on Fall Third Week)					
Total # of Declared Majors					
Total Department FTE*					
Total Department SCH*					
*Per Department Designator Prefix					
Student FTE per Total Faculty FTE					
Cost (Cost Study Definitions)					
Direct Instructional Expenditures					
Cost Per Student FTE					
Funding					
Appropriated Fund					
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants of Contracts					
Special Fees/Differential Tuition					
Total					

Program Assessment: *Strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations from the reviewers. (Remove italics when using template.)*

Institution's Response: *Responses to review committee findings and recommendations. (Remove italics when using template.)*

R411-1. Purpose: To provide policy and procedures for the review of existing programs in the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE). The primary purpose for conducting institutional program reviews is to improve the quality of education.

R411-2. References:

2.1. Utah Code §53B-16-102, Changes in Curriculum

2.2. Policy and Procedures R220, Delegation of Responsibilities to the President and Board of Trustees

2.3. Policy and Procedures R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Changes, Discontinued Programs, and Program Reports

R411-3. Responsibility: The chief responsibility for reviewing existing programs is assigned to institutional faculty and administrators, and to institutional Boards of Trustees (Trustees) with accompanying Board of Regents (Regents) oversight. Program review is accomplished through the combined efforts of presidents, vice presidents, provosts, deans, department chairs, and faculty so that meaningful change can occur.

R411-4. Review Procedure: Program reviews will be evaluated first by the institutional Board of Trustees, and then forwarded to the Commissioner of Higher Education and Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff for review and recommendation to the Regents as a General Consent Calendar item.

4.1. Review Committees: Program reviews will be conducted in accordance with procedures developed by each institution consistent with its respective faculty governance system. Departments whose programs are under review shall prepare detailed written materials for review committees based on system and institutional criteria. Review committees for each program shall be established that include a minimum of (1) two external reviewers with expertise in the discipline, or (2) one external reviewer and one internal reviewer not affiliated with the program. External and internal reviewers shall be individuals holding positions as academic administrators and/or faculty. Additionally, Program Advisory Committee members and/or other external industry experts may be used.

4.2. Submissions: Institutional Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) shall provide summaries of completed program reviews to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff. The summaries shall include the reviewers, a program description, five-year faculty/student data, five-year financial data, a program assessment, and the institution's response (see Program Review Template, Section 6).

¹ Approved July 15, 1980; amended September 13, 1983, March 20, 1984, April 11, 1986, November 17, 1989, July 27, 1990, May 29, 1998, October 27, 2005, March 24, 2009, and September 16, 2011.

4.3. Evaluations: Program review summaries will be evaluated by the Commissioner's staff, who may ask for further information. In addition to the completed program review template, institutional CAOs shall provide to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff copies of regional and specialized accreditation reports, including focused and interim reports, and other reports upon request. The staff will prepare program reviews as items for the Regents' General Consent Calendar.

4.4. Programs with Specialized Accreditation: If a program holds specialized accreditation from an organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or the U.S. Department of Education (as advised by the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity), an institution may choose to submit the specialized accreditation letter(s) and report(s) in lieu of conducting and submitting a program review as described herein.

R411-5. Review Schedule: To ensure a thoughtful and careful examination of each program in the USHE, the following review schedule should be followed as closely as possible.

5.1. Doctorate-granting and Master's Universities: All programs will be reviewed at least once every seven years, except where the specialized accreditation cycle for a program may be different.

5.2. All Other Institutions: All programs will be reviewed at least once every five years, except where the specialized accreditation cycle for a program may be different.

5.3. List of Scheduled Program Reviews: An annual list of scheduled program reviews is due to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff at the beginning of each September.

R411-6. Program Review Template: The template specifies the information to be supplied and provides the format to be used when submitting the review for the Regents.

Instructions:

- The Program Review Template should be used for those items identified as needing the Report Template in R411 and listed as possible items to check on the Cover/Signature Page below.
- A Report Template consists of a **Cover/Signature Page** and a **Five- or Seven-Year Program Review**.
- Prepare the Five- or Seven-Year Follow-Up Report per R411 instructions as a **Word document** (no PDF formats). When *descriptions of the content required for each section appear in this font color*, the descriptive italics are to be removed and replaced with the institutional content before the institution submits the proposal to the OCHE.
- Institutions providing evidence of specialized accreditation in lieu of conducting a Five- or Seven-Year Program Review should submit the Cover/Signature Page with the appropriate specialized accreditation letter(s) and report(s) attached.

- The CAO or his/her designated representatives should e-mail the completed Program Review material (including electronic signature) to academicaffairs@ushe.edu.
- The institution is responsible for maintaining a record of the submission as the OCHE Academic and Student Affairs office is not responsible for storing electronic copies of submitted reviews.

Cover/Signature Page – Program Review Template

Institution Submitting Review: *Name of Institution*

Program Title: *Name of Program*

School or Division or Location: *Name of School/Division Location*

Department(s) or Area(s) Location: *Name of Department/Area Location*

Institutional Board of Trustees' Approval Date: *MM/DD/YEAR*

Review Type (check one):

Regents' General Consent Calendar Items		
<i>R411 Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews</i>		
SECTION NO.		ITEM
4.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	Programs with Specialized Accreditation
5.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seven-Year Program Review
5.2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Five-Year Program Review

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:

I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this review to the Office of the Commissioner.

Signature

Date: *MM/DD/YEAR*

Printed Name: *Name of CAO or Designee*

Five- or Seven-Year Program Review
Higher Education Institution
Program
MM/DD/YEAR

Reviewers: (Add bullets as needed. Remove italics when using template)

- External Reviewer(s), Affiliation
- Internal Reviewer(s), Affiliation

Program Description: One- to three-paragraph description of the program. (Remove italics when using template).

Data Form: Faculty, student, and financial data for the past five years.

The following table in R 411 is designed to gather data about the institutional unit being reviewed. The table has been designed to present consistent data to Trustees and Regents who will receive the report. Institutions decide on the configuration of the unit to be reviewed, and in most cases, the review is at the department level. However, in some instances, the unit being reviewed provides services that are different from those provided by traditional academic departments. When providing data on such units, please offer an explanation that clarifies the purpose of the unit, preparation of faculty or staff who provide the service, attendance data on participants, cost of providing services, and any credential that may be offered to completers if this applies. With sufficient explanation, the data table can be adjusted for that purpose. Use this template and make appropriate changes to present a full picture of the unit that was reviewed.

R411 Data Table					
Department or Unit--					
	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX	2XXX
Faculty					
Headcount					
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
With Master's Degrees					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
With Bachelor's Degrees					
Full-time Tenured					

Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
Other					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
Total Headcount Faculty					
Full-time Tenured					
Full-time Non-Tenured					
Part-time					
FTE (A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition)					
Full-time (Salaried)					
Teaching Assistants					
Part-time (May include TAs)					
Total Faculty FTE					
Number of Graduates					
Certificates					
Associate Degrees					
Bachelor's Degrees					
Master's Degrees					
Doctoral Degrees					
Number of Students—(Data Based on Fall Third Week)					
Total # of Declared Majors					
Total Department FTE*					
Total Department SCH*					
*Per Department Designator Prefix					
Student FTE per Total Faculty FTE					
Cost (Cost Study Definitions)					
Direct Instructional Expenditures					
Cost Per Student FTE					
Funding					
Appropriated Fund					
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants of Contracts					
Special Fees/Differential Tuition					
Total					

Program Assessment: *Strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations from the reviewers. (Remove italics when using template.)*

Institution's Response: *Responses to review committee findings and recommendations. (Remove italics when using template.)*