

GLENVILLE STATE COLLEGE POLICIES

ACADEMIC POLICY 26

PROGRAM REVIEW

26.1. General

1.1. Scope - This policy delineates the responsibilities of the GSC Board of Governors and the Higher Education Policy Commission in the review of existing academic programs.

1.2. Authority - W. Va. Code §18B-1-6, 18B-1B-4 and 18B-2A-4; HEPC Series 10

1.3. Effective Date – June 7, 2006

1.4. Repeal of former rule - Repeals and replaces Series 11 of Title 131 Procedural Rule of the Board of Directors of the State College System of West Virginia effective October 20, 1993; This policy supersedes any or all previous GSC policies in reference to program reviews.

26.2. Basis of Program Review Process

2.1. W. Va. Code §18B-1B-4, 18B-2A-4, and HEPC Series 10 delineate responsibilities for the review of academic programs. The Board of Governors has the responsibility to review at least every five years all programs offered at Glenville State College and in the review to address the viability, adequacy, necessity, and consistency with the institutional mission, the institutional compact, and the education and workforce needs of the State. Additionally, the Board of Governors, as part of the review, is to require the College to conduct periodic studies of graduates and their employers to determine placement practices and the effectiveness of the education experience.

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 degree.

26.3. Assumptions Used in Developing the Review Process

3.1. A rational and comprehensive program review process requires differentiation among levels of degrees.

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

3.3. 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 planning efforts.

3.4. A readily accessible computerized data base should be available to support the program review process.

26.4. Program Review Levels

4.1. The program review process will provide for a review and evaluation of all programs leading to a degree at the institution. The Board of Governors will constitute a committee or committees to review appropriate programs during a given year.

The institution will draft, in accord with this policy, a self-study. The Board of Governors will report to the Chancellor, by May 31, the results of the program reviews conducted each academic year. The Higher Education Policy Commission, through its staff or other appropriate entities, shall review annually the program review actions reported by each institution. The Commission may modify any institutional action consistent with its authority for review of academic programs.

4.1.1. Program Review by the Institutional Board of Governors - The purpose of the appropriate Board 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 the institution. Comprehensive institutional self-studies conducted in compliance with accreditation or institutional processes and completed within the previous 60 months may be used to provide the base line data for the review, with any necessary updating of factual information or interim reports to the accrediting body.

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 Higher Education Accreditation shall be considered to have met the minimum requirements of the 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. In preparing the institutional self-study, each institution will utilize a collaborative process which includes faculty, students and administrators.

4.1.2. Program Review by the Higher Education Policy Commission - The Higher Education Policy Commission has the responsibility for review

of academic programs including the use of institutional missions as a template to assess the appropriateness of existing programs and the authority to implement needed changes. The reports on actions resulting from program review at each institution shall be reviewed by the staff of the Commission. The review will focus on the appropriateness of the institutional action, particularly as the actions relate to adequacy, viability, necessity and consistency with institutional mission for each program. The Commission staff may request a copy of the self-study or other supporting materials, if deemed essential. If the Commission staff concludes that the institutional program review action should be modified, the staff shall consult with the president or designee to reach consensus on the appropriate steps. Should a consensus and agreement not be reached, the matter would be referred to the Commission for resolution.

4.1.3. Institutional personnel, external consultants, and the Board of Governors will be involved in establishing the criteria, standards, and process of evaluation, and in interpreting the information resulting from the review. It is the responsibility of the institution to assure that the program review process is carried out objectively and that persons external to the academic unit in which the program is housed and/or external to the institution participate in the review. To ensure that each program is reviewed at least once every five years, consistent with statutory requirements, the Board of Governors will select approximately 20 percent of all programs for review each year. For each program identified for review, the institution will develop a self-study statement addressing the following items.

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

4.1.3.2. Adequacy - The institution shall assess the quality of the program. A valuable (but not the sole) criterion for determining the program's adequacy is accreditation by a specialized accrediting or approving agency recognized by the Federal Government or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. The institution shall evaluate the preparation and performance of faculty and students, and the adequacy of facilities.

4.1.3.3. 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 shall also be addressed.

4.1.3.4. Consistency With Mission - The program shall be a component of, and appropriately contribute to, the fulfillment of the institutional mission. 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 institutional 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 - Either the Higher Education Policy Commission or the Board of Governors 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.

26.5 Institutional Program Review Procedures

5.1 The program review process provides for a 5-year review and evaluation cycle of all programs leading to a degree at the College. The basic evaluative criteria for the Program Review process are defined in the GSC Program Review Instructional Booklet. The five-year cycle of review and evaluation of academic programs will adhere to the following procedures at Glenville State College:

1. The academic division in which the program is housed will develop a self-study document per directions in the Program Review Instructional Booklet.
2. This self-study document will be presented to members of the external Program Advisory Board for review and comments. Input from the Advisory Board will be integrated into the self-study document as appropriate.
3. The self-study document will be forwarded to the campus-wide Program Review Panel.
4. The recommendations of the Program Review Panel will be forwarded via the Vice-President for Academic Affairs to the College Leadership Council.
5. The self-study document, along with comments from the College Leadership Council, will be presented to the Glenville State College Board of Governors via the College President.

The GSC Governing Board will submit a report of results for each of the reviewed programs to the Higher Education Policy Commission. The Program Review Summary Report will include:

- program title and degree;
- year of last review;
- documentation of continuing need;
- assessment information related to expected student learning outcomes and the achievement of the program's objectives;
- plans to improve the quality and productivity of the program; and
- five year trend data on enrollment and degrees awarded.

26.6. Possible Outcomes

6.1. Institutional Recommendation - The Board of Governors' 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 shall 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 Higher Education Policy Commission policy on approval and discontinuance of academic programs 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 will also make all supporting documentation available to the Commission upon request.

6.2. Committee Recommendation - The Institutional Program Review Committee will develop a recommendation for action and present it to the Board of Governors for action and referral to the Policy Commission.

6.2.1. The committee may make recommendations that go beyond those also. 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 the Institutional Program Review Committee and the recommendation of the academic unit may be appealed to an Institutional Program Review Appeals Committee.

Approvals:

President

Chair of the Board