

**TITLE 128
UNIVERSITY OF WEST VIRGINIA
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
POLICY BULLETIN NO. 11
APPENDIX A**

TITLE: GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The following guidelines have been developed through a consultative process. The guidelines were reviewed 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. The guidelines were also reviewed by other appropriate advisory councils and committees and the Board of Trustees.

1.2 In approving these guidelines, the Board of Trustees reiterates two principles which are stated in Policy Bulletin No. 11.

1.2.1 Program review is a collaborative process which includes both board staff and institutional personnel at every stage, and

1.2.2 The self-study component of the review process is of major importance, especially institutional self-study evaluations.

SECTION 2. PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN EVALUATING PROGRAMS

2.1 The process of program review will include:

2.1.1 Submission of the appropriate "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" for each program under review during a given year:

2.1.2 A review of "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" by a process determined by the appropriate degree-level committee; and

2.1.3 An optional use of consultants in lieu of one of the program review committees or following the committee's review.

2.2 Criteria and standards for program evaluation:

2.2.1 Each degree-level committee will propose the criteria and the 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.

2.2.2 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. The report shall include the signature of the person preparing the report, the chief academic officer, and the president.

2.2.3 In completing the self-study report, the institution shall submit the information on assessment measures described in Section 4.1.3b of this policy for all programs being reviewed, including those with specialized accreditation.

For programs being reviewed in 1992-93 and 1993-94, the institution shall submit a report one year prior to the due date for submission of the self-study report which indicates the assessment instruments that comprise its assessment program. This information will be reviewed by the appropriate program review committee.

SECTION 3. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 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. Using the attached forms, these data will be reported to the institution by September 1 of the year in which programs will be evaluated. These data should be included in the institution's evaluation report. The institution shall have an opportunity to correct or amend the data provided.

3.2 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 Policy Bulletin No. 11 (Section 6) the institution will recommend one of a number of possible actions with respect to each program under review.

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

3.4 Staff analysis and committee review:

3.4.1 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 the various reports, and the board staff's analysis of each report. This information will be provided to the respective degree-level committee by March 1.

3.4.2 The degree-level committee will review the board staff's analysis and will provide a recommendation on each program to the institutional presidents by May 1, with a copy of the recommendation to the chairperson of the Academic, Research and Service Programs Committee of the University System Board of Trustees. Presidents will send copies to the academic vice president, department chairperson and/or dean, and the affected program faculty. The president or his designee shall consult in a timely fashion with affected faculty and administration in subsequent discussions relative to those reports requiring corrective action.

3.4.3 If there is no agreement between the institution's recommendation and the committee's recommendation, 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 thirty 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.

3.4.4 If additional information is not provided within thirty days, the decision of the committee shall be considered final. Within twenty days after receiving the additional information, the degree-level committee shall provide the institution with written notification of its final recommendation.

3.4.5 If the institution does not concur with the committee's final recommendation, the institution, within ten days, may request that the recommendations be reviewed by the appropriate Program Review Appeals Committee. The Program Review Appeals Committee shall provide the institution with written notification of its decision within thirty days. Notwithstanding an appeal by the institution, the decision of the Appeals Committee shall be final.

3.4.6 If the institution does not concur with the Appeals Committee decision, the institution, within ten days, may appeal the decision to the Board of Trustees.

3.4.7 When a recommendation to terminate or suspend a program becomes final, the institution shall submit the information required under the provisions of Administrative Bulletin No. 23 for board review and action.

3.5 Additional considerations:

3.5.1 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 Trustees.

3.5.2 The three "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" forms referred to in these guidelines may be revised, as necessary, by the appropriate degreelevel committee. The forms and any suggested modifications shall be subject to review, in turn, by the Trustees' Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, and by the Advisory Council of University Presidents.

3.5.3 The Board of Trustees' staff should be consulted for assistance in interpreting these guidelines and the "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" forms.

3.5.4 The institution's representative on the Trustees' 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.

**TITLE 128
INTERPRETATIVE RULES
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**SERIES 9
SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY**

128-9-1. General.

1.1. Scope. -- This interpretative rule defines sexual harassment, provides guidelines for filing sexual harassment complaints and explains what action will be taken against those found to have engaged in sexual harassment.

1.2. Authority. -- W. Va. Code 18B-1-6. A policy statement issued by the Office for Civil Rights of the U. S. Department of Education on the interpretation of the following: Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) interpretative guidelines issued in March, 1980; and subsequent federal court decisions on the subject of sexual harassment.

1.3. Filing Date. -- May 23, 1991.

1.4. Effective Date. -- June 22, 1991.

128-9-2. Sexual Harassment Rule.

2.1. It is the rule of the University System of West Virginia Board of Trustees to maintain a work and educational environment free from all forms of sexual harassment of any employee, applicant for employment, or student. Sexual harassment in any manner or form is expressly prohibited. It is the responsibility of institutions and the Central Office of the State College and University System to provide educational opportunities to create this free environment and to take immediate and appropriate corrective action when sexual harassment is reported or becomes known. Supervisors at every level are of primary importance in the implementation and enforcement of this rule.

128-9-3. Sexual Harassment Definition.

3.1. Sexual harassment is intended to be defined consistent with EEOC and United States Department of Education guidelines. Sexual harassment includes any unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

3.1.1. Submission to such conduct is an explicit or implicit condition of employment.

3.1.2. Submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as the basis for employment decisions
or:

3.1.3. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of:

3.1.3.1. Unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or educational performance, or:

3.1.3.2. Creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive work or educational environment.

128-9-4. Filing of Complaints.

4.1. Each institution and the Central Office of the State College and University Systems shall designate a formal grievance procedure for the handling of sexual harassment complaints and assure appropriate dissemination of information concerning it to faculty, staff, and students. Each campus shall designate a liaison person(s) who shall receive training in facilitating the informal resolution of complaints with the authority to conduct inquiries and report to the appropriate supervisory authority. In cases involving the president, the complaint shall be filed with the Chancellor of the University System of West

Virginia.

4.2. Employees. -- Any employee who feels he or she is being sexually harassed should contact his or her immediate supervisor. If this is not appropriate, employees should report such alleged misconduct to other designated personnel within that organization. Supervisors are to make every effort to ensure that such problems are resolved promptly and effectively.

4.3. Students. -- Any student who feels he or she is being sexually harassed should contact the appropriate dean or other designated person of the institution where he or she is a student.

128-9-5. Action to be Taken Against Perpetrators.

5.1. Any student, supervisor, agent or other employee who is found, after appropriate investigation, to have engaged in the sexual harassment of another employee or a student will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action. Depending on the circumstances, sanctions may include termination or expulsion.