

WEST VIRGINIA  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
KEN HECHLER  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DIVISION

Form #5

Do Not Mark In this Box

FILED

1992 JAN 31 AM 11:05

OFFICE OF WEST VIRGINIA  
SECRETARY OF STATE

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

AGENCY: STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM BOARD OF DIRECTORS TITLE NUMBER: 131

CITE AUTHORITY: West Virginia Code 18B-1-6, 18B-1-8

RULE TYPE: PROCEDURAL  INTERPRETIVE

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

AMENDMENT TO AN EXISTING RULE: YES , 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 March 2, 1992

John F. ...

TITLE 131  
STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
POLICY BULLETIN NUMBER 11  
SERIES 11

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	11

**TITLE 131  
PROCEDURAL RULE  
STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM OF WEST VIRGINIA  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
SERIES 11  
POLICY BULLETIN NO. 11**

**TITLE:     PROGRAM REVIEW**

**SECTION 1.   GENERAL**

- 1.1   Scope - This rule establishes the policy on review of academic programs.
- 1.2   Authority - West Virginia Code 18B-1-6, 18B-1-8
- 1.3   Filing Date -
- 1.4   Effective Date -
- 1.5   Repeal of Former Rule - Repeals and Replaces Board of Regents' Policy Bulletin No. 11, effective October 22, 1988.

**SECTION 2.   BASIS OF PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS**

- 2.1   Chapter 18B, Article ~~26~~ 1, Section 8 of the West Virginia Code requires that the ~~Board of Regents~~ State College System Board of Directors "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 state institutions of higher education under its jurisdiction." 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 a 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 Regents'~~ the board's 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 may will differ significantly from those applied to graduate baccalaureate programs.
- 3.4 The review process should be independent of any accreditation procedure, but may build upon accreditation self-studies and evaluations when they are illuminating.
- 3.5 The program review process must be accomplished within the limits of available staff and resources.
- 3.6 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'~~ Directors' planning efforts.
- 3.7 A readily ~~available~~ 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 ~~state colleges and universities~~ institutions in the State College System. The process will consist of three (~~3~~) levels of activity: an annual audit, program review by the Board of ~~Regents~~ Directors (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 and subsections.

- 4.1.1 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.
- 4.1.2 Program Review by the board ~~of Regents~~ - The purpose of the ~~Board of Regents'~~ board's review, conducted on a regular five-year ~~(5)~~ 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 ~~of higher education in the State College 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 twenty-four ~~(24)~~ months may be used to provide the base-line data for the review, with any necessary updating of factual information.
- 4.1.3 Institutional personnel, external consultants, and the staff ~~of the Board of Regents~~ will may 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-Chancellor~~ will select approximately twenty percent ~~(20%)~~ of all programs for review each year. For each program identified for review, the ~~college or university~~ institution will submit a self-study statement addressing the following items:
- 4.1.3.a 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~~ shall assess the program's past ability and future prospects to attract students and sustain a viable, cost-effective program.

- 4.1.3.b Adequacy - The institution ~~should~~ shall assess the quality of the program. A valuable (but not the sole) ~~criteria~~ criterion 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~~ 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 institutions 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.
- 4.1.3.c 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 ~~should~~ shall also be addressed.
- 4.1.3.d Consistency With Mission - The program ~~should~~ shall be a component of, and appropriately contribute to, the ~~institution's~~ fulfillment of ~~its~~ the institutional and system missions. The ~~college or university~~ review 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 intrainstitutional 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 should be stated.

- 4.1.4 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 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 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 Regents will appoint the following program review committees from among nominations by the presidents 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 colleges and the community college components, and branch college divisions of the four-year colleges, the four-year colleges without community college components, 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 (2) universities, the four-year (4) colleges, one (1) of the community colleges, and board staff. four-year colleges, the community colleges, 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. The committee shall also review any graduate or professional degree programs at institutions within the system.

- 5.1.3 ~~Graduate and Professional Degree Committee~~ This committee will consist of representatives of the two (2) universities and the two (2) graduate colleges, and board staff.
- 5.2 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)~~ two program review committees listed in subsections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 ~~and 5.1.3~~ 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 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's ~~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 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 correction 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; or
  - 6.1.5 Identification of the program as a program of excellence.
- 6.2 ~~....~~ If it the institution recommends discontinuance of the program, then the provisions of Administrative Bulletin No. 23 will apply.

- 6.3 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 a narrative. The institution will also make all supporting documentation available to the board upon request.
- 6.4 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.
- 6.4.1 The committee may make recommendations that go beyond those above. ~~They~~ Recommendations may deal with statewide perspective regarding needs. The committee may request additional information and may recommend continuance on a provisional basis and request progress reports.
- 6.5 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 which will be comprised of the members of the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee. The Program Review Appeals Committee shall provide a written statement of its decision to the appealing institutions.
- 6.5.1 The decision of the appropriate Appeals Committee may be appealed to the board. ~~of Regents.~~
- 6.5.2 The procedures for an appeal are explained in greater detail in Appendix A of this Policy Bulletin.

## TABLE 1

### MEMBERSHIP OF PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEES

Program Review Appeals Committee	Associate Degree Committee	Baccalaureate Degree Committee
	(Associate Degree Programs, Vocational)	(Bachelor's Degree Programs and Associated Certificates)
10 - One representative from each college (representatives on the Academic Advisory Committee).	2 - Community Colleges	
	6 - One representative from each four-year college having community college division	8 - Four-year Colleges
	2 - One representative from each four-year college without a community college division	2 - Community Colleges
1 - Director of Academic Affairs (Chair)	1 - Board Staff (Chair)	1 - Board Staff (Chair)
11 Members	11 Members	11 Members

# POLICY BULLETIN NUMBER 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 and 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 State College System Board of Regents.
- 1.2 In approving these guidelines, the board ~~of Regents~~ 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, ~~which are conducted independently of any accreditation procedures, but which may build upon self-studies and 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 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 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.

2.3 Institutional review and recommendation:

- 2.3.1 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. These data will be reported to the institution using the attached forms. These data will be provided 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.
- 2.3.2 In addressing each of the items listed on the "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.
- 2.3.3 Institutional program review reports should be submitted to the chancellor ~~Board of Regents~~ by January 15 of the year in which programs are being evaluated.

2.4 Staff analysis and committee review:

- 2.4.1 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 all ~~or portions of~~ the various reports, and the staff's analysis of each report. ~~This information will be provided to the respective degree-level committee by March 1.~~

- 2.4.2 The degree-level committee will review the ~~board~~ staff's analysis and will provide a recommendation on each program to the institutional presidents by ~~April~~ May 1. 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.
- 2.4.3 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 ~~(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 consultants~~ who may conduct institutional follow-up visits.
- 2.4.4 If additional information is not provided within thirty ~~(30)~~ days, the decision of the committee shall be considered final. Within twenty ~~(20)~~ days after receiving the additional information, the degree-level committee shall provide the institution with written notification of its final recommendation.
- 2.4.5 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 Program Review Appeals Committee. The Program Review Appeals Committee shall provide the institution with written notification of its decision within thirty ~~(30)~~ days. Notwithstanding an appeal by the institution, the decision of the Appeals Committee shall be final.
- 2.4.6 If the institution does not concur with the Appeals Committee decision, the institution, within ten days, may appeal the decision to the board. ~~of Regents~~
- 2.4.7 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.

### SECTION 3. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 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~~
- 3.2 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 State College System Academic Affairs Advisory Committee and ~~by the Advisory Council of Public College and University Presidents.~~
- 3.3 ~~The Board of Regents~~ staff should be consulted for assistance in interpreting these guidelines and the "Institutional Program Evaluation Report" forms.
- 3.4 The institution's representative on the State College System 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.

# FORM #1

## STUDENT and COST DATA BY MAJOR FOR FALL \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Program	Students Enrolled Fall (Year)					FTE Students	FTE Faculty	Instructional Dollars	Cost Per FTE Student
	Full-Time	Part-Time	In-State	Out-Of-State					
				U.S.	Foreign				

**FORM #2**

**FIVE-YEAR SUMMARY OF  
DEGREE PRODUCTIVITY OF PROGRAMS UNDER REVIEW  
(Last Five Years)**

Level of Program	Degree	Title of Program	Number of Degrees Awarded					TOTAL
			(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)	Year 5)	

**TITLE 131  
STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
POLICY BULLETIN NUMBER 11  
SERIES 11**

Policy Bulletin Number 11, Program Review, establishes review procedures for academic programs. The revisions add to the program adequacy provisions measures to assess student performance and program quality. References pertaining to a graduate and professional degree committee are deleted and the Baccalaureate Degree Committee's responsibilities have been increased to include review of any graduate or professional degree programs.



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)

OFFICE OF WEST VIRGINIA  
SECRETARY OF STATE

DEC 7 8 51 AM '92

FILED

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

SECRETARY OF STATE

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

TO: Marie Carter

AGENCY: Board of Directors

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: 131 Board of Directors

\* 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: Marie Carter

TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING: Assistant to the Chancellor

DATE: 11/12/92

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