

TITLE 128
INTERPRETIVE RULE
WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF REGENTS

SERIES 11
POLICY REGARDING PROGRAM REVIEW

*obsolete
v4/d Dec 1, 1982
to Oct 22, 1988*

§128-11-1. General.

1.1. Scope. -- This rule establishes the policy on review of academic programs.

1.2. Authority. -- W. Va. Code §18-26-8

1.3. Filing Date. -- October 1, 1982

1.4. Effective Date. -- December 1, 1982

§128-11-2. Introduction.

2.1. Basis of program review process.

Section eight, article twenty-six, chapter eighteen of the West Virginia Code requires that the Board of Regents "Review at least every five (5) years, all academic programs offered at any state college or university. The review shall address the viability, adequacy and necessity of the programs in relation to the master plan." The purpose of this document is to delineate the framework and steps in the program review process.

For the purpose of this document, a "Program" is defined as a curriculum or course of study in a discipline speciality that leads to a certificate or degree. Each major within a program (but not each track or optional subfield) is considered a separate program.

2.2. Assumptions used in developing the review process:

(a) Program review is most effective when it is conducted on a regular cycle and when some indicators are examined on an annual basis.

(b) Program review is a collaborative process which includes both Board of Regents' staff and institutional personnel at every stage.

(c) A rational and comprehensive program review process requires differentiation among levels of

degrees. The process, criteria and standards for associate degree programs may differ significantly from those applied to graduate programs.

(d) The review process should be independent of any accreditation procedure, but may build upon accreditation self-studies and evaluations when they are illuminating.

(e) The program review process must be accomplished within the limits of available staff and resources.

(f) A continuous auditing process allowing for early identification of programs that need particular scrutiny is required to permit changes to be anticipated, appropriate intervention to take place, and corrective action to be accomplished within normal institutional and Board of Regents' planning efforts.

(g) A readily available computerized data base should be available to support the program review process.

§128-11-3. Program review levels.

3.1. The program review process will provide for a review and evaluation of all programs leading to a certificate or degree at the state colleges and universities. The process will consist of three (3) levels of activity: An annual audit, program review by the Board of Regents (in accordance with a five-year (5) cycle), and special program reviews. The purposes, process, criteria and possible outcomes of each of these review levels are presented in the following sections:

(a) Annual audit. -- The purpose of the annual audit by the staff of the Board of Regents will be to analyze the data collected on all programs in the system by using the computerized data base and, as needed, institutional reports. Programs will be reviewed in terms of productivity in credit hours, course enrollments, numbers of majors, numbers of degrees

awarded, cost and related information. The results of the annual audit will provide a continuous monitoring mechanism and will serve to alert both the institutions and the Board of Regents that specific programs may require further review.

(b) Program review by the Board of Regents. -- The purpose of the Board of Regents' review, conducted on a regular five-year (5) cycle, will be to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the viability of, adequacy of, and necessity for each academic program, consistent with the mission of each institution of higher education. This review process will build on the data of the annual audits and will include additional information about each program. Comprehensive institutional self-studies conducted in compliance with accreditation or institutional processes and completed within the previous twenty-four (24) months may be used to provide the baseline data for the review, with any necessary updating of factual information.

Institutional personnel, external consultants, and the staff of the Board of Regents will be involved in establishing the criteria, standards and process of evaluation, and in interpreting the information resulting from the review. To ensure that each program is reviewed at least once every five (5) years, consistent with statutory requirements, the Board of Regents will select approximately twenty percent (20%) of all programs for review each year. For each program identified for review, the college or university will submit a self-study statement addressing the following items:

(1) Viability. -- Viability is tested by an analysis of unit cost factors, sustaining a critical mass and relative productivity. Based upon past trends in enrollment, patterns of graduates and the best predictive data available, the institution should assess the program's past ability and future prospects to attract students and sustain a viable, cost-effective program.

(2) Adequacy. -- The institution should assess the quality of the program. A valuable (but not the sole) criteria for determining the program's adequacy is accreditation by a specialized accrediting or approving agency recognized by the federal government or the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. The institution should evaluate the preparation and performance of faculty and students, and the adequacy of facilities. An objective analysis of the program's curricular strengths and quality should be presented,

and plans to correct deficiencies should be described.

(3) Necessity. -- The dimensions of necessity include whether the program is necessary for the institution's service region, and whether the program is needed by society (as indicated by current employment opportunities, evidence of future need, rate of placement of the programs' graduates). Whether the needs of West Virginia justify the duplication of programs in several geographic service regions also should be addressed.

(4) Consistency with mission. -- The program should be a component of, and appropriately contribute to, the institution's fulfillment of its mission. The college or university should indicate the centrality of the program to the institution, explain how the program complements other programs offered at the institution, and state how the program draws upon or supports other programs. Both intra-institutional and interinstitutional aspects of the program should be addressed. The institution should state the effects (positive or negative) that discontinuance of the program might have upon the institution's ability to accomplish its mission.

(c) Special program review. -- The Board of Regents may request at any time that special program reviews be conducted for a given purpose. Formal strategies for conducting such reviews will be developed, consistent with the purpose of the review.

§128-11-4. Criteria and standards for evaluation.

4.1. The criteria, standards and indicators of viability, adequacy and necessity will vary among fields and among levels of degree programs. The same criteria and standards obviously do not apply to associate degree programs, baccalaureate degree programs, and graduate programs. To assist the Board in developing the criteria and standards for evaluation, the Chancellor of the Board of Regents will appoint the following four (4) program review committees from among nominations by the president. (See Table 1 for the proposed membership of each committee).

(a) Evaluation advisory committee. -- This committee (consisting of one (1) representative of each state college and university, and Board staff) will propose the criteria, standards, procedures and schedules of reviews. The Evaluation Advisory Committee, to which the three (3) degree level committees specified below will report, will coordinate the activi-

ties of the three (3) committees. The schedules of reviews will provide for a review of courses in which no degree program is offered at the institution. The policies proposed by the Evaluation Advisory Committee will be reviewed by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee and the Advisory Council of Public College and University Presidents, which, consistent with Board procedures, will make a recommendation to the Board of Regents.

(b) Associate degree committee. -- This committee will consist of representatives of the community colleges and the community college components and branch college, external consultants selected by the Board of Regents' staff and Board staff. The committee will review associate degree programs, vocational programs and related certificates.

(c) Baccalaureate degree committee. -- This committee will consist of representatives of the two (2) universities, the four-year (4) colleges, one (1) of the community colleges; external consultants selected by the Board of Regents' staff and Board staff. The committee will include two-plus-two programs in its review and may advise the Associate Degree Committee on the criteria and standards for associate degree programs that are designed to prepare students to transfer to baccalaureate degree programs.

(d) Graduate and professional degree committee. -- This committee will consist of representatives of the two (2) universities and the two (2) graduate colleges, external consultants selected by the Board of Regents' staff and Board staff.

4.2. Because approximately twenty percent (20%) of all programs must be evaluated each year and specific disciplines will be selected for review each year, the three (3) program review committees listed in Subsections (b), (c) and (d) may be augmented by the appointment of specialists in appropriate fields. Such specialists may be external consultants or faculty from the participating institutions. When specific standards or criteria for one (1) discipline are developed, the leaders of those programs at the institutions should be consulted and invited to comment prior to application of the measures.

§128-11-5. Possible outcomes.

5.1. Institutional recommendation. -- The Board of Regents' five-year (5) cycle of program review will result in a recommendation by the institution for action relative to each program under review. The in-

stitution will recommend one (1) of the following options for each program reviewed:

(a) Continuation of the program at the current level of activity, with or without specific action;

(b) Continuation of the program at a reduced level of activity (for example, reducing the range of optional tracks) or other corrective action;

(c) Identification of the program for further development as an area of need or of excellence;

(d) Development of a cooperative program with another institution, or sharing of courses, facilities, faculty and the like; or

(e) Discontinuance of the program in accordance with Administrative Bulletin No. 23.

For each program, the institution will provide a brief rationale for the observations, evaluation, and recommendation. The institution also will make all supporting documentation available to the Board upon request.

5.2. Board of Regents' staff recommendation. -- The Board staff will review the recommendation from the institution and will develop a recommendation for action to be submitted to the Board, together with the institutional recommendation for each program that has been reviewed. The Board may use outside consultants to assist in this phase of the program review process, and the consultants may conduct institutional follow-up visits as a part of the review process.

If the Board staff's recommendation conflicts with that of the institution, a written justification will be provided, along with an opportunity for institutional response. The Board staff's justification, any subsequent institutional response, and the consultants' report will accompany the staff recommendation submitted to the Board.

ED. NOTE: As permitted by West Virginia Code subsection (g), section seven, article two, chapter twenty-nine-a the Appendix to this Series 11 rule is omitted from this publication. The Appendix is titled "Guidelines for Conducting Program Evaluations" along with the forms and instructions. This Appendix is available from the Secretary of State or the Board of Regents.

POLICY BULLETIN NO.

11

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

Series 11
The following guidelines were initially developed by the Evaluation Advisory Committee, one of four committees appointed by the Chancellor of the West Virginia Board of Regents to assist the Board in developing the criteria and standards for evaluating programs in accordance with ~~Policy Bulletin No. 11~~. The guidelines were amended by the degree-level program review committees (the Associate Degree Committee, the Baccalaureate Degree Committee, and the Graduate and Professional Degree Committee), which are charged with establishing the criteria and standards to be followed in evaluating programs at the several degree levels.

In approving these guidelines, the Board of Regents reiterates two principles which are stated in ~~Policy Bulletin No. 11~~: (1) program review is a collaborative process which includes both Board staff and institutional personnel at every stage, and (2) the self-study component of the review process is of major importance, especially institutional self-study evaluations which are conducted independently of any accreditation procedures, but which may build upon accreditation self-studies and evaluations. *Series*

II. PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN EVALUATING PROGRAMS

A. The process of program review will include:

1. Submission of the appropriate "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" for each program under review during a given year (the program review committees will develop three forms, one for each degree level);
2. A review of each "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" by a process determined by the appropriate degree-level committee; and
3. An optional use of consultants following the committee's review, either before or after presentation of a staff recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Policy Bulletin No. 11, Appendix A (continued)

B. Criteria and standards for program evaluation:

1. Each degree-level committee will propose the criteria and issues to be addressed by institutions which offer programs at the particular degree level. These criteria and issues will be specified in an "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" form.
2. The Evaluation Advisory Committee will review the proposals of the three degree-level committees and will recommend the policies to be followed in evaluating programs.
3. In accordance with ^{Series} ~~Policy Bulletin No.~~ 11, the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee and the Advisory Council of Public College and University Presidents will review the recommendations of the Evaluation Advisory Committee, and (consistent with Board procedures) the Presidents will make a recommendation to the Board of Regents for the Board's endorsement.
4. Each program evaluation report shall address the criteria and issues listed on the "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" form. The report will be prepared by the institution and approved by the President.

C. Institutional review and recommendation:

1. For the programs under review during a given year, the Board staff will provide each institution with information (from data periodically furnished by the institution) about student enrollments, degrees awarded, faculty, and the cost of instruction. These data will be reported to the institutions using the attached forms. These data will be provided to the institution by September 1 of the year in which programs are to be evaluated. These data should be included in the institution's evaluation of a program and, as appropriate, in the evaluation report. The institution shall have an opportunity to correct or amend the data provided.
2. In addressing each of the items listed on the "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" form, the institution should focus on both qualitative and quantitative information. In accordance with ^{Series} ~~Policy Bulletin~~ No. 11, the institution will recommend one of a number of possible actions with respect to each program under review.

3. Institutional program review reports should be submitted to the Board of Regents by January 15 of the year in which programs are being evaluated.

D. Staff analysis and committee review:

1. Following submission by the institutions of the completed program evaluation reports during a given year, the Board staff will present to the respective degree-level committee (a) an analysis of the reports, including (as necessary or if requested to do so) all or portions of the various reports, and (b) the Board staff's recommendation, based upon its analysis of each report. This information will be provided to the respective degree-level committees by March 1.
2. The degree-level committee will review the Board staff's analyses and will provide advice concerning the staff's recommendations. This review by degree-level committees will be completed by April 1.
3. If there is not agreement between the institution's recommendation and the Board staff's recommendation, or if there is not a consensus between the degree-level committee and the Board staff, then information about such disagreement or lack of consensus, together with necessary explanatory material, will be furnished to the institution for comment or additional information to be provided within 30 days. To assist in this phase of the review process, the Board staff (in consultation with the institution) may employ outside consultants, who may conduct institutional follow-up visits.
4. Prior to submitting a recommendation to the Board of Regents, the Board staff will provide a summary of actions taken by the three degree-level committees to the President of the appropriate institution and the institution's designated program representative. If the institution does not concur with the Board staff's recommendation to the Board of Regents, the institution within ten days may request that the recommendations be reviewed by the Evaluation Advisory Committee. The recommendation of the Evaluation Advisory Committee will then be included with the Board staff's written justification, any subsequent institutional response, and any consultants' report which may accompany the staff recommendation to the Board.

E. Additional considerations:

1. The academic programs scheduled for review in a given year include active programs and courses in which no degree program is offered at the institution. All programs which have been officially suspended are excused from evaluation; prior to reactivation of a suspended program, however, all information required by Administrative Bulletin No. 23 must be submitted to the Board of Regents.
2. The three "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" forms referred to in these guidelines may be revised, as necessary, by the appropriate degree-level committee and the Evaluation Advisory Committee. The forms and any suggested modifications shall be subject to review in turn by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee and the Advisory Council of Public College and University Presidents.
3. The Board of Regents' staff should be consulted for assistance in interpreting these guidelines and the "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" forms.
4. The institution's representative on the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee shall have responsibility for monitoring completion of the "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" in accordance with Policy ~~Bulletin No. 11~~ and these guidelines.

Approved: West Virginia Board of Regents
December 6, 1983

Revised: September 11, 1984

STUDENT AND COST DATA BY MAJOR FOR FALL 1983

TITLE OF PROGRAM	STUDENTS ENROLLED FALL 1983						FTE FACULTY	INSTRUC-TIONAL DOLLARS	COST PER FTE STUDENT
	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME	IN-STATE		OUT-OF-STATE				
			U. S.	FOREIGN	FTE STUDENTS				

FORM #2

FIVE-YEAR SUMMARY OF DEGREE PRODUCTIVITY OF PROGRAMS UNDER REVIEW, 1984-85

LEVEL OF PROGRAM	DEGREE	TITLE OF PROGRAM	NUMBER OF DEGREES AWARDED						
			1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	TOTAL	

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT
(CERTIFICATE AND ASSOCIATE, BACCALAUREATE,
GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS)

Institution: _____ Date: _____

Program (Degree and Title): _____

Note: The total report should be no longer than 10 type-written pages. Unless otherwise specified, data should be provided as of the census date for Board of Regents' data files for Fall 1981 through Fall 1984, excluding summer sessions. Accreditation reports and institutional program evaluation processes and reports should be accepted and supplemented, as necessary, to provide a complete response. For the 1984-85 review cycle, the institution should submit 15 copies of each report to the Central Office no later than January 15, 1985.

- I. Program Description/Overview--Provide a brief (one page or less) description/overview of the program. Any unique aspects of the program should be noted.

Program Evaluation

- A. Adequacy--Assess the overall quality of the program, specifically in terms of the program's strengths and weaknesses. Where appropriate, attach the report to, or use the criteria of, a specialized accrediting or approving agency which is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Evaluate the information provided below. Present an objective analysis of the program's curricular strengths and quality, and describe plans to correct any deficiencies.

1. Faculty--In summarized form evaluate the adequacy of faculty (full-time and part-time, including teaching assistants and research assistants). Specify the proportion of effort spent in the program. Include the following:
 - a. academic training and preparation
 - b. Research activity, scholarly productivity, or professional development
 - c. Teaching effectiveness
 - d. Community/public service
 - e. Faculty development efforts

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT (Continued)

2. Students--Evaluate the students (both majors and non-majors) enrolled in the program. Include the following:
 - a. Academic ability at entrance into program (if available)
 - b. Achievements (knowledge or skills) at completion of program
 - c. Accomplishments of graduates
 - d. Judgments about quality of program
 - e. What is the success rate of students on State or national qualifying exams? (if applicable)
 - f. How successful are program graduates in finding jobs in their field of study?
 3. Resources--Evaluate the resources available to support the program. Include the following:
 - a. Financial support (State funds, grants and contracts, private funds, student financial aid)
 - b. Library collections
 - c. Facilities, including laboratory equipment
 - d. Computer facilities
 - e. Clerical support services
 - f. Unusual costs associated with the program
 4. Instructional Program Indicators --Present qualitative and quantitative indicators that may affect the program (for example, class size, faculty course loads, attrition rates, outcome measures, and impact on cognate programs).
- B. Viability--Assess the program's past ability and future prospects to attract students and sustain a viable, cost-effective program. Base the assessment upon past trends in enrollment, patterns of graduates, and the best predictive data available.
1. What is the current enrollment pattern (that is, number of applications compared with number admitted)? What are the projected enrollments?
 2. Is there a critical mass of students?

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT (Continued)

- NOTES: 1. For graduate and professional degree programs, specialized professional accreditation will be accepted as demonstration of adequacy of a program, provided each such degree program is subject to a qualitative evaluation in that accreditation process. Any degree program not so evaluated will not be considered excused from the usual institutional program evaluation with respect to adequacy. Any deficiencies identified in a report from a specialized professional accrediting agency should be addressed as part of the program evaluation. The program should specify action taken or plans in progress to ensure continued specialized professional accreditation.
2. All doctoral programs at West Virginia University, other than (1) those identified as first professional degrees (that is, programs in Dentistry, Law, and Medicine) or (2) those accredited by specialized professional accrediting agencies in accordance with an accreditation review process which specifically addresses the adequacy and viability of the doctoral program, will be required to follow a program evaluation process and report issues of adequacy in keeping with guidelines approved by the West Virginia University Graduate Council. For cooperative doctoral programs, approval by Marshall University and the West Virginia College of Graduate Studies is required prior to application of the West Virginia University Graduate Council guidelines.
3. Is the program cost-effective? (The definition of critical mass and assessments of cost-effectiveness will be determined by each institution, based on discipline, specialization, concerns, and comparisons with comparable institutions.)
4. How viable is the program in meeting the needs of the institution's service region?
- C. Necessity--Is the program necessary for the institution's service region? Is the program needed by society (as indicated, for example, by current employment opportunities, evidence of future need, and rate of placement of graduates of the program)? If a similar program is available in another

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT (Continued)

geographic region of the State, justify such program duplication.

1. What is the current placement record of graduates? What trends can be identified which would alter the placement record?
 2. Are there similar programs available throughout the State? If so, justify program duplication in terms of:
 - a. Differences in curriculum of the program;
 - b. Unique geographic service area responsibilities;
 - c. Other benefits to the institution and region (for example, revenue generated through external grants or contracts).
 3. How has the institution determined its response to these questions about necessity?
 4. Given the resources available for the program, what is the maximum number of students that could be accommodated in the program?
 5. In the case of a specialized program, is it available through the Academic Common Market? If so, where?
- D. Consistency with Mission--How does the program contribute to fulfillment of the institution's mission? Indicate the centrality of the program to the institution, explain how the program complements other programs offered at the institution, and state how the program draws upon or supports other programs. Address both intra-institutional and inter-institutional aspects of the program. State the effects (positive and negative) that discontinuance of the program might have upon the institution's ability to accomplish its mission.
1. How central is the program to the institution's mission?
 2. How central is the program to the unit's mission?
 3. In what ways is the program integrated with other programs? (Address how the program draws upon or

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT (Continued)

supports other programs at the unit, institutional, and, if appropriate, inter-institutional level.)

4. What would be the effects (positive or negative) of discontinuance of the program upon the institution's and unit's ability to accomplish their missions?

III. Institutional Recommendation:

- A. What is the President's recommendation for action with respect to the program? Recommend one of the following options:
 - a. Continuation of the program at the current level of activity, with or without specific corrective action;
 - b. Continuation of the program at a reduced level of activity (for example, reducing the range of optional tracks) or other corrective action;
 - c. Identification of program for infusion of funds to correct insufficient resource support;
 - d. Identification of the program for further development, e.g., increase in enrollment and/or site availability;
 - e. Identification of the program as one of excellence with or without additional support recommended;
 - f. Development of a cooperative program with another institution, or sharing of courses, facilities, faculty, and the like; or
 - g. Discontinuance of the program in accordance with Administrative Bulletin No. 23 (either termination or suspension for a stated period).
- B. Please provide a brief (one paragraph) explanation/amplification in support of your recommendation in III.A. (optional).

INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT (Continued)

C. Certification:

- a. Identification of institutional program representative:

Name and Title: _____

- b. Signatures of chief academic officer and chief executive officer:

Vice President or
Academic Dean

President

Date

Date

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF REGENTS

950 Kanawha Boulevard, East / Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Telephone 304 348-2101

*Title 128
Interpretive Rule*

~~POLICY BULLETIN NO. 2~~

Series 11

Section 1. General

- 1.1 Scope- *This rule establishes the policy on program review of academic programs.*
- 1.2 Authority- WV Code 18-26-8
- 1.3 Filing Date- Oct 1, 1982
- 1.4 Effective Date- Dec. 1, 1982

Section 2

I. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Basis of program review process:

Chapter 18, Article 26, Section 8 of the West Virginia Code requires that the Board of Regents "Review, at least every five years, all academic programs offered at any State college or university. The review shall address the viability, adequacy and necessity of the programs in relation to the master plan." The purpose of this document is to delineate the framework and steps in the program review process.

For the purpose of this document, a "program" is defined as a curriculum or course of study in a discipline speciality that leads to a certificate or degree. Each major within a program (but not each track or optional subfield) is considered a separate program.

2.2 B. Assumptions used in developing the review process:

- A. Program review is most effective when it is conducted on a regular cycle and when some indicators are examined on an annual basis.
- B. Program review is a collaborative process which includes both Board of Regents' staff and institutional personnel at every stage.
- C. A rational and comprehensive program review process requires differentiation among levels of degrees. The process, criteria, and standards for associate degree programs may differ significantly from those applied to graduate programs.
- D. The review process should be independent of any accreditation procedure, but may build upon accreditation self-studies and evaluations when they are illuminating.
- E. The program review process must be accomplished within the limits of available staff and resources.
- F. A continuous auditing process allowing for early identification of programs that need particular scrutiny is required to permit changes to be anticipated, appropriate intervention to take place, and corrective action to be accomplished within normal institutional and Board of Regents' planning efforts.
- G. A readily available computerized data base should be available to support the program review process.

Section 3 ← II. PROGRAM REVIEW LEVELS

3.1 The program review process will provide for a review and evaluation of all programs leading to a certificate or degree at the State colleges and universities. The process will consist of three levels of activity: an annual audit, program review by the Board of Regents (in accordance with a five-year cycle), and special program reviews. The purposes, process, criteria, and possible outcomes of each of these review levels are presented in the following sections:

Policy Bulletin No. 11 (continued)

A. Annual audit: The purpose of the annual audit by the staff of the Board of Regents will be to analyze the data collected on all programs in the system by using the computerized data base and, as needed, institutional reports. Programs will be reviewed in terms of productivity in credit hours, course enrollments, numbers of majors, numbers of degrees awarded, cost, and related information. The results of the annual audit will provide a continuous monitoring mechanism and will serve to alert both the institutions and the Board of Regents that specific programs may require further review.

B. Program review by the Board of Regents: The purpose of the Board of Regents' review, conducted on a regular five-year cycle, will be to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the viability of, adequacy of, and necessity for each academic program, consistent with the mission of each institution of higher education. This review process will build on the data of the annual audits and will include additional information about each program. Comprehensive institutional self-studies conducted in compliance with accreditation or institutional processes and completed within the previous 24 months may be used to provide the base-line data for the review, with any necessary updating of factual information.

Institutional personnel, external consultants, and the staff of the Board of Regents will be involved in establishing the criteria, standards, and process of evaluation, and in interpreting the information resulting from the review. To ensure that each program is reviewed at least once every five years, consistent with statutory requirements, the Board of Regents will select approximately 20 percent of all programs for review each year. For each program identified for review, the college or university will submit a self-study statement addressing the following items:

1. Viability: Viability is tested by an analysis of unit cost factors, sustaining a critical mass, and relative productivity. Based upon past trends in enrollment, patterns of graduates, and the best predictive data available, the institution should assess the program's past ability and future prospects to attract students and sustain a viable, cost-effective program.
2. Adequacy: The institution should assess the quality of the program. A valuable (but not

the sole) criteria for determining the programs' adequacy is accreditation by a specialized accrediting or approving agency recognized by the Federal government or the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. The institution should evaluate the preparation and performance of faculty and students, and the adequacy of facilities. An objective analysis of the program's curricular strengths and quality should be presented, and plans to correct deficiencies should be described.

3. Necessity: The dimensions of necessity include whether the program is necessary for the institution's service region, and whether the program is needed by society (as indicated by current employment opportunities, evidence of future need, rate of placement of the programs' graduates). Whether the needs of West Virginia justify the duplication of programs in several geographic service regions also should be addressed.
4. Consistency with mission: The program should be a component of, and appropriately contribute to, the institution's fulfillment of its mission. The college or university should indicate the centrality of the program to the institution, explain how the program complements other programs offered at the institution, and state how the program draws upon or supports other programs. Both intra-institutional and interinstitutional aspects of the program should be addressed. The institution should state the effects (positive or negative) that discontinuance of the program might have upon the institution's ability to accomplish its mission.

C. Special program review: The Board of Regents may request at any time that special program reviews be conducted for a given purpose. Formal strategies for conducting such reviews will be developed, consistent with the purpose of the review.

Section 4 III. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

- 4.1 The criteria, standards, and indicators of viability, adequacy, and necessity will vary among fields and among levels

of degree programs. The same criteria and standards obviously do not apply to associate degree programs, baccalaureate degree programs, and graduate programs. To assist the Board in developing the criteria and standards for evaluation, the Chancellor of the Board of Regents will appoint the following four program review committees from among nominations by the president. (See Table 1 for the proposed membership of each committee.)

A. Evaluation Advisory Committee: This committee (consisting of one representative of each State college and university, and Board staff) will propose the criteria, standards, procedures, and schedules of reviews. The Evaluation Advisory Committee, to which the three degree-level committees specified below will report, will coordinate the activities of the three committees. The schedules of reviews will provide for a review of courses in which no degree program is offered at the institution. The policies proposed by the Evaluation Advisory Committee will be reviewed by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee and the Advisory Council of Public College and University Presidents, which, consistent with Board procedures, will make a recommendation to the Board of Regents.

B. Associate Degree Committee: This committee will consist of representatives of the community colleges and the community college components, and branch college, external consultants selected by the Board of Regents' staff, and Board staff. The committee will review associate degree programs, vocational programs, and related certificates.

C. Baccalaureate Degree Committee: This committee will consist of representatives of the two universities, the four-year colleges, one of the community colleges; external consultants selected by the Board of Regents' staff; and Board staff. The committee will include two-plus-two programs in its review and may advise the Associate Degree Committee on the criteria and standards for associate degree programs that are designed to prepare students to transfer to baccalaureate degree programs.

D. Graduate and Professional Degree Committee: This committee will consist of representatives of the two universities and the two graduate colleges, external consultants selected by the Board of Regents' staff, and Board staff.

4.2 Because approximately 20 percent of all programs must be evaluated each year and specific disciplines will be selected for review each year, the three program review committees

listed in subsections B, C, and D may be augmented by the appointment of specialists in appropriate fields. Such specialists may be external consultants or faculty from the participating institutions. When specific standards or criteria for one discipline are developed, the leaders of those programs at the institutions should be consulted and invited to comment prior to application of the measures.

Section 5. *IV.* POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

5.1 *A.* Institutional recommendation:

The Board of Regents' five-year cycle of program review will result in a recommendation by the institution for action relative to each program under review. The institution will recommend one of the following options for each program reviewed:

- A.* Continuation of the program at the current level of activity, with or without specific action;
- B.* Continuation of the program at a reduced level of activity (for example, reducing the range of optional tracks) or other corrective action;
- C.* Identification of the program for further development as an area of need or of excellence;
- D.* Development of a cooperative program with another institution, or sharing of courses, facilities, faculty, and the like; or
- E.* Discontinuance of the program in accordance with Administrative Bulletin No. 23.

For each program, the institution will provide a brief rationale for the observations, evaluation, and recommendation. The institution also will make all supporting documentation available to the Board upon request.

5.2 *B.* Board of Regents' staff recommendation:

The Board staff will review the recommendation from the institution and will develop a recommendation for action to be submitted to the Board, together with the institutional recommendation for each program that has been reviewed. The Board may use outside consultants to assist in this phase of the program review process, and the consultants may conduct institutional follow-up visits as a part of the review process.

Policy Bulletin No. 11 (continued)

If the Board staff's recommendation conflicts with that of the institution, a written justification will be provided, along with an opportunity for institutional response. The Board staff's justification, any subsequent institutional response, and the consultants' report will accompany the staff recommendation submitted to the Board.

Adopted: West Virginia Board of Regents
December 1, 1982

TABLE 1
 PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP OF PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEES

Evaluation Advisory Committee	Associate Degree Committee (Associate Degree Programs, Vocational Programs, and Related Certificates)	Baccalaureate Degree Committee (Bachelor's Degree Programs and Associated Certificates)	Graduate and Professional Degree Committee (Master's, Doctoral, and First Professional Degree Programs)
16 One representative from each college and university	3 Community Colleges 1 Potomac State College of West Virginia University 4 Four-year Institutions having Community College Components	2 Marshall University 3 West Virginia University 4 Four-year Colleges	2 Marshall University 4 West Virginia University 2 West Virginia College of Graduate Studies 1 West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine 2 External Consultants
1 Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Chair)	2 External Consultants 1 Director of Community College and Vocational Education (Chair)	1 Community College 2 External Consultants 1 Director of Planning and Educational Research (Chair)	1 Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (Chair)
17	11	13	12

ED. NOTE: AS PERMITTED BY WV CODE 29A-2-7(g) THE APPENDIX TO THIS SERIES .11 RULE IS OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLICATION. THE APPENDIX IS TITLED " GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING PROGRAM EVALUATIONS" ALONG WITH THE FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS. THIS APPENDIX IS AVAILABLE FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE OR THE BOARD OF REGENTS.