

WEST VIRGINIA
SECRETARY OF STATE
KEN HECHLER
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DIVISION

orm #5

Do Not Mark In this Box

FILED
JUL 28 AM 11:15
STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

**NOTICE OF AGENCY ADOPTION OF A PROCEDURAL OR INTERPRETIVE RULE
OR A LEGISLATIVE RULE EXEMPT FROM LEGISLATIVE REVIEW**

AGENCY: UNIVERSITY OF WV BOARD OF TRUSTEES TITLE NUMBER: 128

CITE AUTHORITY: WV Code 18B-1-8

RULE TYPE: PROCEDURAL _____ INTERPRETIVE X

EXEMPT LEGISLATIVE RULE _____
CITE STATUTE(S) GRANTING EXEMPTION FROM LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

AMENDMENT TO AN EXISTING RULE: YES X, NO _____

IF YES, SERIES NUMBER OF RULE BEING AMENDED: 11

TITLE OF RULE BEING AMENDED: PROGRAM REVIEW

IF NO, SERIES NUMBER OF NEW RULE BEING ADOPTED: _____

TITLE OF RULE BEING ADOPTED: _____

THE ABOVE RULE IS HEREBY ADOPTED AND FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE. THE
EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS RULE IS _____ Sept. 27, 1991

Jo Ann Raines
by *Judy Cooper*

TITLE 128
INTERPRETATIVE RULE
UNIVERSITY OF WEST VIRGINIA
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SERIES II
POLICY BULLETIN NO. 11

TITLE: POLICY REGARDING PROGRAM REVIEW

SECTION	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1	GENERAL	3
2	BASIS OF PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS	3
3	ASSUMPTIONS USED IN DEVELOPING THE REVIEW PROCESS	4
4	PROGRAM REVIEW LEVELS	4
5	CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION	7
6	POSSIBLE OUTCOMES	8
APPENDIX A		11

TITLE 128
UNIVERSITY OF WEST VIRGINIA
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
POLICY BULLETIN NUMBER 11

Policy Bulletin Number 11 establishes a policy on review of academic programs for institutions under the jurisdiction of the University of West Virginia Board of Trustees. Revisions to the policy strengthen the current program review process by providing greater emphasis on institutional assessment of programs; allowing for an expanded role for external reviewers, and; using a new self-study reporting format which provides further and more specific information.

TITLE 128
INTERPRETATIVE RULE
UNIVERSITY OF WEST VIRGINIA
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SERIES II
POLICY BULLETIN NO. 11

TITLE: POLICY REGARDING PROGRAM REVIEW

SECTION 1. GENERAL

- 1.1 Scope - This policy establishes the policy on review of academic programs.
- 1.2 Authority - West Virginia Code Chapter 18B 1-6, 18B-1-8
- 1.3 Filing Date -
- 1.4 Effective Date - August 23, 1991
- 1.5 Repeal of Former Rule - Revises and Replaces Policy Bulletin Number 11, dated October 22, 1988.

SECTION 2. BASIS OF PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

- 2.1 Chapter 18B, Article 1, Section 8 of the West Virginia Code requires that the Board of Trustees "review, at least every five years, all academic programs offered the state institutions of higher education under its jurisdiction. The review shall address the viability, adequacy and necessity of the programs in relation to its master plan." The purpose of this document is to delineate the framework and steps in the program review process.
- 2.2 For the purpose of this document, a "program" is defined as curriculum or course of study in a discipline specialty that leads to a certificate or degree. Each major within a program (but not each track or optional subfield) is considered a separate program.

SECTION 3. ASSUMPTIONS USED IN DEVELOPING THE REVIEW PROCESS

- 3.1 Program review is most effective when it is conducted on a regular cycle, and when some indicators are examined on an annual basis.
- 3.2 Program review is a collaborative process which includes both Board of Trustees' staff and institutional personnel at every stage.
- 3.3 A rational and comprehensive program review process requires differentiation among levels of degrees. The process, criteria, and standards for associate degree programs will differ significantly from those applied to graduate programs.
- 3.4 The program review process must be accomplished within the limits of available staff and resources.
- 3.5 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 Trustees' planning efforts.
- 3.6 A readily accessible computerized data base should be available to support the program review process.

SECTION 4. PROGRAM REVIEW LEVELS

- 4.1 The program review process will provide for a review and evaluation of all programs leading to a certificate or degree at the institution in the University of West Virginia System. The process will consist of three levels of activity: an annual audit program review by the Board of Trustees (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.

4.1.1 Annual Audit - The purpose of the annual audit by the staff of the Board of Trustees 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 Trustees that specific programs may require further review.

4.1.2 Program Review by the Board of Trustees - The purpose of the Board of Trustees' review, conducted on a regular five-year cycle, will be to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the viability of, adequacy of, necessity for each academic program, consistent with the mission of each institution in the University System. 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.

Programs that are accredited by specialized accrediting or approving agencies (for disciplines for which such agencies exist) recognized by the Federal Government and/or the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation shall be considered to have met the minimum requirements of the Board of Trustees' review process with respect to adequacy. For programs so accredited or approved, institutions shall submit: the comprehensive institutional self study conducted in compliance with the accreditation or approval process, a copy of the letter containing the conferral of accreditation or approval and a documented statement from the chief academic officer regarding program consistency with mission, viability and necessity.

4.1.3 Institutional personnel, external consultants, and the staff of the Board of Trustees 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 Trustees will select approximately 20 percent of all programs for review each year. For each program identified for review, the institution will submit a self-study statement addressing the following items.

- 4.1.3a 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 shall assess the program's past ability and future prospects to attract students and sustain a viable, cost-effective program.

- 4.1.3b Adequacy - The institution shall 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 shall 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. When describing a program's adequacy the institution shall indicate the measures used to assess student performance and program quality. An institution is expected in its self-study to indicate the ways it evaluates the effectiveness of the program and how those results are used to plan for improvements of the program and effect curricular change.

- 4.1.3c 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 shall also be addressed.

- 4.1.3d Consistency With Mission - The program shall be a component of, and appropriately contribute to, the fulfillment of the institutional and system missions. The review should indicate the centrality of the program to the institution, explain how the program complements other programs offered, and state how the program draws upon or supports other programs. Both intrainstitutional and interinstitutional aspects of the program should be addressed. The effects (positive or negative) that discontinuance of the program might have upon the institution's ability to accomplish its mission should be stated.
- 4.1.4 Special Program Review - The Board of Trustees 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 5. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

- 5.1 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 and professional programs. To assist the board in developing the criteria and standards for evaluation and to assist the board in the review process, the chancellor of the Board of Trustees will appoint the following program review committees from among nominations by the president of the respective institutions. (See Table 1 for the membership of each committee.) On June 1 of each year, the chancellor shall notify the president of each institution of the representatives on these committees and offer the opportunity to renominate existing members or nominate new members.
- 5.1.1 Associate Degree Committee - This committee will consist of representatives of the community college component of Marshall University, and the regional campuses of West Virginia University (WVU at Parkersburg and Potomac State College) and board staff. The committee will review

associate degree programs, vocational programs, and related certificates.

5.1.2 Baccalaureate Degree Committee - This committee will consist of representatives of the two universities, 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 of associate degree programs that are designed to prepare students to transfer to baccalaureate degree programs.

5.1.3 Graduate and Professional Degree Committee - This committee will consist of representatives of Marshall University, West Virginia University, the University of West Virginia College of Graduate Studies, the West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine, and the board staff.

5.2 Because approximately twenty 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 5.1.1, 5.1.2, and 5.1.3 may be augmented by the appointment of specialists in appropriate fields. Such specialists at the direction of the chancellor, may also exercise the review function ordinarily provided by one of the program review committees. Specialists may be external consultants or faculty from the participating institutions. When specific standards or criteria are developed, appropriate advisory councils and committees should be consulted and invited to comment prior to application of the measures.

SECTION 6. POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

6.1 Institutional Recommendation - The Board of Trustees' five-year cycle of program review will result in a recommendation by the institution for action relative to each program under review. The institution is clearly obligated to recommend continuation or discontinuation for each program reviewed. If recommending continuation, the institution should state what it intends:

6.1.1 Continuation of the program at the current level of activity, with or without specific action:

- 6.1.2 Continuation of the program at a reduced level of activity (e.g., reducing the range of optional tracks) or other corrective action;
 - 6.1.3 Identification of the program for further development; or
 - 6.1.4 Development of a cooperative program with another institution, or sharing of courses, facilities, faculty, and the like;
 - 6.1.5 If it recommends discontinuance of the program, then the provisions of Administrative Bulletin No. 23 will apply;
 - 6.1.6 For each program, the institution will provide a brief rationale for the observations, evaluation, and recommendation. These should include concerns and achievements of the program. The institution may also recognize this as a program of excellence and provide narrative. The institution will also make all supporting documentation available to the board upon request.
- 6.2 Committee Recommendation - The appropriate Program Review Committee, along with board staff, will review the recommendation from the institution and will develop a recommendation for action. Outside consultants may be used 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.
- 6.2.1 The committee may make recommendations that go beyond those above. They may deal with statewide prospective regarding needs. The committee may request additional information and may recommend continuance on a provisional basis and request progress reports.
- 6.3 Appeals Committee and the Appeals Process - Any disagreement between a final recommendation of a Program Review Committee and the recommendation of the institution may be appealed to the Program Review Appeals Committee. For programs other than Health Sciences, the Program Review Appeals Committee will be comprised of the members of the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees that represent West

Virginia University, Marshall University, and the University of West Virginia College of Graduate Studies and board staff. For Health Science Programs (these will be determined by the institution), the Program Review Appeals Committee will be comprised of the Health Sciences Chief Academic Officers of West Virginia University, Marshall University, and the West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine and board staff. One additional member will be a University of West Virginia Academic Affairs Advisory Committee member from either WVU/Parkersburg or Potomac State. The appropriate Program Review Appeals Committee shall provide a written statement of its decision to the institutions.

- 6.3.1 The decision of the appropriate Appeals Committee may be appealed to the Board of Trustees.
- 6.3.2 The procedures for an appeal are explained in greater detail in Appendix A of this Policy Bulletin.

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 degree-level 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.

POLICY BULLETIN NUMBER 11

As filed, Policy Bulletin Number 11 does not appear to have additional financial impact upon the University System.



KEN HECHLER
Secretary of State

MARY P. RATLIFF
Deputy Secretary of State

A. RENEE COE
Deputy Secretary of State

CATHERINE FREROTTE
Executive Assistant

Telephone: (304) 558-6000
Corporations: (304) 558-8000

WILLIAM H. HARRINGTON
Chief of Staff

JUDY COOPER
Director, Administrative Law

DONALD R. WILKES
Director, Corporations

(Plus all the volunteer
help we can get)

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

SECRETARY OF STATE

Building 1, Suite 157-K
1900 Kanawha Blvd., East
Charleston, WV 25305-0770

TO: Pam Stillhammer

AGENCY: Board of Trustees

FROM: JUDY COOPER, DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DIVISION

DATE: October 21, 1992

THE ATTACHED RULE FILED BY YOUR AGENCY HAS BEEN ENTERED INTO OUR COMPUTER SYSTEM. PLEASE REVIEW, PROOF AND RETURN IT WITH ANY CORRECTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO CORRECTIONS, PLEASE SIGN THIS MEMO AND RETURN IT TO THIS OFFICE. YOU WILL BE SENT A FINAL VERSION OF THE RULE FOR YOUR RECORDS.

PLEASE RETURN EITHER THE CORRECTED RULE OR THIS FORM WITHIN TEN (10) WORKING DAYS OF THE DATE YOU RECEIVED THIS REQUEST. CALL IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

SERIES: 11 TITLE: 128 Board of Trustees

* THE ATTACHED RULE HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND IS CORRECT.

SIGNED: _____

TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING: _____

DATE: _____

* THE ATTACHED RULE HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND NEEDS CORRECTING. THE CORRECTIONS HAVE BEEN MARKED.

SIGNED: Pamela G. Steelhammer

TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING: Assistant to the Chancellor

DATE: November 13, 1992

NOTE: IF YOU ARE NOT THE PERSON WHO HANDLES THIS RULE, PLEASE FORWARD TO THE CORRECT PERSON.

NOTE: Please remove the appendix (pages 5, 6, 7). These pages were inadvertently filed.