UAM OPERATING PROCEDURE 620.1
RE: Academic Program Review Guidelines

January 1, 1985

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES

The University of Arkansas - Monticello is committed to establishing and maintaining excellent academic programs. An essential element in maintaining program excellence is the monitoring of existing programs. This process involves an internal process and at times involves an external review component. The following document describes a periodic academic program review process to be employed at the University.

Program Review Committee

The major functions of the Program Review Committee are to: (1) review the program reports prepared by academic units; and (2) make suggestions regarding program development, direction, improvement, modification, or deletion.

The Program Review Committee will consist of one representative from each academic unit. Each academic unit will suggest to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs its nominee for committee membership. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will appoint members of this Committee and will designate the chair of the Committee. Initial terms will be staggered, and subsequent terms will be three years so that one-third of the members will be new appointees each year. Members will be eligible to serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will notify academic units of expired terms at the beginning of each academic year.

Programs to be Reviewed

All degree programs will be reviewed through the Academic Program Review Guidelines according to the ten-year schedule given in Exhibit A. The programs will first be reviewed by the academic unit and then by the Program Review Committee. Accredited, certified, or licensed programs that meet degree productivity guidelines will not be subject to further review by the campus or ADHE unless specifically requested. Designated cognate programs are also exempt from further review by the campus or ADHE unless specifically requested.

Any program can be reviewed at any time upon the request of the academic unit head, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, or the Arkansas Department of Higher Education.
Data

Some specific data will be generated annually to assist in the preparation of program review documents and to provide an annual summary of activity within each academic unit. Each term, Academic Affairs will provide “Status Report” information to each academic unit. After each graduation, the Registrar’s Office will provide a list of graduates along with their major and minor fields of study to each academic unit. Each semester, the Registrar’s Office will also provide a list of majors and minors, by class level, for each academic unit as of the census day for that semester. Accrediting agencies or organizations must be recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Academic units will take the information received from the above sources and file an Annual Report with Academic Affairs by August 1. This report will include the following:

Graduates
- Number of majors/minors
- Job placement of majors
- Special honors/recognitions

Enrollment Data
- Majors/minors by discipline by class level
- Course enrollments by term
- Faculty SSCH/credit hours/contact hours by term

Procedure

Academic Unit. For each program scheduled for review, the head of the academic unit is responsible for supervising a self study and preparing and submitting a report to the Program Review Committee. Faculty of the unit will assist in this process. October 15 of the academic year in which a program is scheduled to be reviewed is the deadline for submission of the academic unit reports to the campus Program Review Committee. The report to the Program Review Committee should be designed to provide an adequate description of the program being reviewed. The report must include, but is not limited, to the following components:

Faculty
- Faculty credentials and the percentage of each faculty’s time devoted to the program.

Curriculum
- Currency of curriculum, frequency of course offerings.

Resources
- Adequacy of library resources, facilities, and equipment.

Enrollment
- Majors/minors by discipline by class level, course enrollments by term, faculty SSCH/credit hours/contact hours by term.

Student Outcomes
- Assessment of student learning, number of graduates by major/minor, placement of graduates, student and employer satisfaction.
**Program Improvement**

Plan to remove program deficiencies to meet minimum standards. For accredited, certified, or licensed programs that meet productivity guidelines, the items to be presented to the Program Review Committee will consist of the documents prepared for the accreditation and the resulting feedback from the accrediting agency. If the critical components of faculty, curriculum, resources, enrollment, student outcomes, or program improvement are not included in the accreditation documents, they are to be added before submission to the Program Review Committee.

**Program Review Committee.**

Each year, subcommittees of the Program Review Committee will be formed to evaluate the review documents prepared by the academic units that have programs to be reviewed that year. Faculty within a discipline being reviewed may not serve on the subcommittee reviewing that discipline; however, members of an academic unit may serve on the subcommittee reviewing a major or discipline other than his/her own from that unit.

A subcommittee will review and analyze the report prepared by the discipline. When needed, the subcommittee will meet with the faculty and/or unit head of the discipline to gather additional information or to clarify points within the report. Following its examination of the review by the academic unit, the subcommittee will prepare a summary report for the overall Program Review Committee.

The subcommittee reviewing a program will make a report to the overall Program Review Committee. If appropriate, the Program Review Committee may also seek information or clarification from the faculty and/or unit head of the discipline. The overall committee will make a report of its findings to the unit head and to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by **January 15.**

**Academic unit head.** The unit head may file an informational report with both the Program Review Committee and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the purpose of supplementing, clarifying, or refuting committee findings, provided that notice of intent to file must be provided within ten (10) days and actual filing within thirty (30) days of the date cited on the report of the Program Review Committee.

**Administration.** For each program reviewed, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will make recommendations for action to the Chancellor within sixty (60) days of the date cited on the report of the Program Review Committee. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will share this information with the unit head of the program reviewed. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will submit a report to ADHE every two years on those programs reviewed in the two-year period. Based upon a review of the information in the report, ADHE staff will determine which programs, if any, need to be reviewed by out-of-state consultants.

**Other.** If a recommendation of the Program Review Committee and/or the consultants and/or the Administration is to delete, suspend, or significantly expand or modify any program, then UA Board Policy 405.5 will be followed.
ADHE Process for the Review of Existing Academic Programs

The campus procedure for program review must be consistent with the stated procedure in the ADHE Existing Program Review document. The ADHE document also contains information on consultants and how recommendations are made to the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board. A copy of the ADHE document is given in Exhibit B.
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See EXHIBIT A below
EXHIBIT A
TEN-YEAR SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMS TO BE REVIEWED

2008-2009  UAM- College of Technology-McGehee
Agriculture

2009-2010  Criminal Justice
Education (undergraduate and graduate) (every 7 years)
Music
Music Education*
Nursing (every 8 years)
UAM-College of Technology-Crossett (every 5 years)

2010-2011  Accounting
Business Administration
Computer Information Systems
Military Science

2011-2012  Forestry Resources (undergraduate and graduate)
Spatial Information Systems
Wildlife Management
Health and Physical Education/Wellness

2012-2013  Mathematics

2013-2014  History*
History and Social Studies*
Political Science

2014-2015  Criminal Justice
Psychology
Social Work
UAM-College of Technology-Crossett (every 5 years)

2015-2016  Biology
Chemistry*
Natural Science*

2016-2017  English
Art
Speech
Education (undergraduate and graduate) (every 7 years)

2017-2018  Associate of Applied Science
Associate of Arts
Associate of Applied Science in General Technology
Bachelor of Applied Science
Nursing (every 8 years)

*Denotes programs believed to be cognates. (Cognate programs “borrow” courses from other certificate and degree programs of the institution and are marginal in cost.—ADHE Guidelines)
EXHIBIT B
EXISTING PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENT (ADHE)

GOALS AND PROCESS FOR THE REVIEW OF EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Goals for the Review of Existing Certificate and Degree Programs
1. To establish a process of institutional review of academic programs.
2. To identify certificate and degree programs that do not meet minimum standards of quality or cost effectiveness and establish schedules for either resolving these concerns or phasing out the programs.

Process for the Review of Existing Certificate and Degree Programs

Institutional Review

1. The institutional academic program review plan will include a 10-year schedule for reviewing certificate and degree programs approved by the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The plan must consist of the following components: 1) person(s) responsible for the oversight of the review plan (CAO, dean, etc.); 2) 10-year schedule of review; 3) letters from accrediting, certifying or licensing agencies or organizations verifying the status of certificate and degree programs; and 4) description of the program review process, including but not limited to the following program review components (a. Faculty: faculty credentials, FTE; b. Curriculum: currency of curriculum, frequency of course offerings; c. Resources: adequacy of library resources, facilities, and equipment; d. Student Outcomes: assessment of student learning, placement of graduates, student and employer satisfaction; e. Program Improvement: plan to remove program deficiencies to meet minimum standards).

2. All certificate and degree programs will be reviewed through the Institutional Academic Program Review Plan. Accredited, certified or licensed programs that meet degree productivity guidelines will not be subject to further review by ADHE. Accrediting agencies or organizations must be recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

3. Institutions will submit their Academic Program Review Plans to ADHE for review and approval by the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB).

4. Upon approval of the Academic Program Review Plan by the AHECB, institutions will submit biennial reports to ADHE on any program reviewed during the two-year period. The biennial report will indicate any significant findings and the implementation plan for program improvement. The report also must include letters from accrediting, certifying or licensing agencies or organizations on the current status of any programs reviewed by these agencies or organizations during the two-year period. Information included in the biennial report, such as student placement, number or majors, faculty FTE or change in program accreditation or licensure status, may initiate further review of academic programs by ADHE.
5. The biennial report will include a list of certificate and programs reviewed, the year of the review (1998-99, 1999-2000), the composition of the program review committee, and a summary of the review process, including significant findings and the program improvement plan. Modifications to the institutional academic program review plan also should be included in the biennial report.

6. The ADHE staff will discuss the biennial reports with chief academic officers before preparing an agenda item for consideration by the Coordinating Board. ADHE staff may make recommendations concerning institutional follow-up or further review by ADHE. Institutions will comment on any ADHE staff recommendations prior to consideration by the Coordinating Board.

**ADHE Review**

1. Biennially, ADHE staff will identify certificate and degree programs not meeting AHECB degree productivity guidelines for the past five years. These guidelines are: an average of three graduates a year over a five-year period for certificate, associate and bachelor’s programs, two a year for master’s programs, and one a year for doctoral programs.

2. Low productivity certificate and degree programs that remain on the program review inventory after cognate programs have been designated will be subject to further review by ADHE.

*Cognate* programs “borrow” courses from other certificate and degree programs of the institution and are marginal in cost. Cognate programs, therefore, are exempt from further review. Each institution will submit to ADHE a list, with justification, of the certificate and degree programs that the institution believes are cognate programs. The Director of ADHE will inform the campus president or chancellor of the programs that will be designated as cognate programs.

3. A 10-year schedule will be developed for the review of low productivity certificate and degree programs. Also, programs that were identified through the campus biennial report as warranting further ADHE review, will be added to the schedule. The schedule will take into account the number of programs in the same CIP Code and when the program was last reviewed by ADHE. A Board of Trustees resolution on program deletion must be submitted to ADHE at least 90 days prior to the date of the scheduled review for the program to be excluded from the ADHE review. No new students may enroll in deleted programs, but current students may continue enrollment until program completion.

4. Institutions will submit information on student placement (job placement, transfer and graduate study) and other program review findings and actions to ADHE. Based upon the review of this information, ADHE staff will determine which programs, if any, need to be reviewed by out-of-state consultants.
5. ADHE staff will notify chief academic officers of programs to be reviewed by out-of-state consultants and request names of prospective consultants. Professional organizations also will be contacted for names of prospective consultants. Individuals who have attended, have been employed or have served as a consultant for any Arkansas institution should not be nominated and will not be selected as a consultant.

6. ADHE staff will contact prospective consultants.

7. Institutions will be given the opportunity to comment on whether the prospective consultants are appropriate to conduct the review.

8. ADHE staff will select consultants. Two to four out-of-state consultants will review each program area. Should more than one review team be required for a program area, at least one consultant or ADHE staff member will participate on both review teams.

9. Individuals selected as consultants will be well-qualified, representative of different types of institutions, and without bias toward institutions under review. Consultant must agree not to communicate with institutions under review until the review process has been completed.

10. Institutions will be informed when the consultant are selected.

11. Consultant orientation materials will be shared with chief academic officers prior to each review for comment.

12. Institutions will submit to ADHE additional information for review by the out-of-state consultants: program curriculum, course syllabi, faculty vitae, FTE faculty, professional activities of faculty for last three (3) years, description of facilities and instructional equipment, and any other information deemed necessary by the consultants at the beginning of the review process and agreed upon by ADHE staff.

13. Consultant will review institutional reports, then write their initial reports.

14. Institutions will comment on the initial reports. If still pertinent following report revision, comments will be included in the final report to the Coordinating Board.

15. After reviewing comments from the institutions, the consultants may request further information, including a campus visit, before writing their final report.

16. Consultants’ final report will be mailed to the institutions. Institutions will comment on the final report.

Report and Recommendations to Coordinating Board

1. Consultants’ final report will be mailed to the Coordinating Board.

2. ADHE staff recommendations will be prepared for consideration by the Coordinating Board.
3. ADHE staff will recommend a general resolution that has the Board receive the consultants’ report and acknowledge that the contents may be consulted as a resource when decisions must be made by the Board regarding institutional role and scope, budget requests, new program approval, and statewide funding issues. The staff may propose other general resolutions that address statewide issues.

4. A further resolution will encourage institutional administrators, faculty members, and boards of trustees to consider implementing the recommendations made by the consultants for program improvement.

5. Finally, if appropriate, a resolution will be offered concerning program closings, modifications or follow-up. A resolution recommending program closings will place the program(s) on notice for deletion. At the end of the two-year notice period, those programs still not meeting minimum standards will be recommended for termination. In extraordinary cases, documentation of legitimate extenuating circumstances may prompt the Coordinating Board to extend the notice period. General revenue funds may not be used for the operation of a program beyond the termination deadline set by the Coordinating Board unless the General Assembly specifically approves such funding.

6. Institutions will comment on ADHE staff recommendations prior to consideration by the Coordinating Board.

7. The president, chancellor or chief academic officer may respond to ADHE staff recommendations in writing or request a conference to discuss the recommendations. The discussions will be limited to those issues that concern the state’s interests, i.e., program closings and broader statewide issues to which the Coordinating Board may wish to address. Any recommendations in the consultants’ report that are not included in the ADHE staff recommendations would pertain to matters of campus concern and, therefore, would represent suggestions to be considered locally.

8. Upon approval by the Coordinating Board, the consultants’ report and the Coordinating Board’s resolution will be distributed to boards of trustees, presidents, chancellors, and chief academic officers of state colleges and universities under review.

EXISTING PROGRAM REVIEW - INSTITUTIONAL PLAN
Submission Date: June 1, 1998

I. Provide the name and position title of person(s) responsible for oversight of institutional academic program review.

II. Indicate the ten-year institutional academic program review schedule--1998-99-2007-08.

III. Provide letters from accrediting, certifying or licensing agencies or organizations verifying the status of certificate and degree programs, including the effective dates.
IV. Describe the institutional program review process, including but not limited to the following program review components:

1. Program Faculty--Provide information on the number of FTE faculty and faculty credentials (including field or specialty of degrees and length of time employed at the institution).

2. Program Curriculum--Provide information on the number of hours required in the major, total number of semester hours required to complete the program, and recommendations of advisory and curriculum committees.

3. Program Resources--Provide information on the adequacy of instructional equipment/technology and library holdings, including on-line availability and accessibility of databases.

4. Student Outcomes--Provide information on how student learning will be assessed (standardized tests, portfolio assessment, etc.). Provide information on the placement of students (advanced study, employment within field or related field, upgraded skills for promotion, etc.) Provide information on student and employer satisfaction (exit interview or survey conducted annually, biennially, etc.; student employed in field and feels academic preparation was sufficient, employer satisfied with student’s academic preparation and job performance).

5. Program Improvement--Describe the plan to remove identified program deficiencies.

EXISTING PROGRAM REVIEW - INSTITUTIONAL BIENNIAL REPORT TO ADHE
Submission Date: November 1 (beginning in 2000)

1. Indicate the program(s) reviewed during the two-year review period.

2. Provide synopses of significant findings. (For example: the curriculum should be upgraded/updated, too few majors to justify program continuation or employer dissatisfaction).

3. Describe the plan for program improvement, including the timeline for implementation.

4. Provide a letter on the status on any program reviewed by an accrediting, certifying or licensing agency or organization during the two-year review period.

5. Provide information on the number of majors, student placement, FTE faculty and change in program accreditation, certification or licensure status.

6. Indicate the composition of the program review committee(s). (Number of committee members and position title.)

7. Indicate any modifications to the institutional academic program review plan.
See letter for ADHE below
MEMORANDUM

TO: Presidents and Chancellors
FROM: Lu Hardin
DATE: August 3, 2001
SUBJECT: Existing Program Review Biennial Report 2000

At the regular quarterly meeting of the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board on July 20, 2001, the Board approved the revised guidelines for the Existing Program Review Biennial Report. The resolution follows:

RESOLVED, That the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the revised guidelines for the Existing Program Review Biennial Report effective immediately.

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Coordinating Board instructs the Director of the Arkansas Department of Higher Education to distribute the revised reporting guidelines to the presidents, chancellors, and chief academic officers.

Please get in touch with Dr. Steve Floyd if you have questions concerning this Board action.

c: Chief Academic Officers
EXISTING PROGRAM REVIEW BIENNIAL REPORT 2000

In February 1998, the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board revised the existing program review process requiring each college and university to develop an institutional program review plan that included a 10-year program review schedule. The Board approved the institutional plans in April and July of 1998. The new review process required institutions to submit the first biennial report on the programs reviewed in 1998 - 2000. The institutional report includes a synopsis of significant findings and a plan for program improvement, including the timeline for implementation.

Some of the reviews recommended curricular modifications, equipment upgrades, enhanced student recruitment activities, additional faculty, and program termination. A few reviews concluded that the programs met or exceeded expected standards and no special plans for improvement were necessary. Several programs with specialized accreditation and licensure were reviewed during the two-year period. Documentation was provided on these reviews and the program accreditation/licensure status. Institutional program reviews conducted in 1998 - 2000 are listed on pages 34-5 through 34-9. A few institutions did not schedule any reviews during the two-year period due to preparation for North Central Association visits, relatively new program offerings, and changes in academic administration. Since 1998, new chief academic officers (CAGs) have been employed at 17 institutions. During this transition period, it was necessary for some CADs to revise the program review schedule.

Although the institutional biennial reports included the plan for program improvement, the status of the improvements accomplished during the two-year review period was not reported. ADHE staff has identified the program improvements that were scheduled for completion during 1998 - 2000 and will request that a status report on these activities be submitted in the 2002 biennial report. The staff proposes that the biennial report guidelines be revised to clarify existing statements and to include a new statement on reporting the status of program improvements.

The following resolution is presented for Board consideration:

RESOLVED, That the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the revised guidelines for the Existing Program Review Biennial Report effective immediately.
Agenda Item No. 34

July 20, 2001

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Coordinating Board instructs the Director of the Arkansas Department of Higher Education to distribute the revised reporting guidelines to the presidents, chancellors, and chief academic officers.

See Agenda Item No. 34 below
1. Indicate the program(s) reviewed during the two-year review period.
   *(2000-02, 2002-04, ...)*

2. Provide synopses of significant findings.
   (For example: the curriculum should be upgraded/updated, too few majors to justify program continuation or employer dissatisfaction).

3. **Describe the plan for program improvement, including the timeline for implementation**

4. Provide the status of program improvements implemented or accomplished during the two-year reporting period.

5. Provide the following information:
   - number of student majors
   - student placements
     *(number placed in their field/number pursuing advanced degrees)*
   - full-time faculty and FTE faculty for each program
   - change in program accreditation, certification or licensure status

6. Indicate the composition of the institutional ad hoc program review committee(s).
   *(Number of committee members and position title.)*
   - **If no person on the program review committee has expertise in the field under review, please explain how the significant findings were verified.**

7. Indicate any modifications to the institutional academic program review plan.

8. Provide a letter on the status of any program reviewed by an accrediting, certifying or licensing agency or organization during the two-year review period.

*Proposed changes are in bold and italics.*