PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES

AND INSTRUCTIONS
In cooperation with the state universities, the Board maintains a program review cycle and review process that allows the universities to demonstrate that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. All degree programs are reviewed on an eight-year cycle, with reviews focusing on a variety of indicators of program quality.

A. Program Review Definitions and Quantitative Minima Criteria

1. Definitions

   Even though KBOR uses the term “program review”, the technical term is discipline.

   **Program** – In the Policy manual “Program” means an academic plan that is approved by the appropriate governing board and leads to an award, for example, a degree or a career/technical certificate.

   KBOR staff definition - an academic series of courses that are combined and named as a major. As examples, the BA in music is a program, the BS in Music is a program, and MS in Music is a program.

   **Discipline** - may consist of one or more programs that are related and combined for institutional program review purposes, e.g., Music BA and Music BS.

   **Department** - primarily used by universities to designate a grouping of programs for funding and governance reasons.

2. Quantitative Minima Criteria

   Indicators of quality include – but are not limited to – quantitative criteria known as minima indicators. Academic disciplines which fail to meet these minimum criteria will be identified. The nature of system-wide guidelines means that some disciplines may fail to meet a stated criterion, while at the same time maintaining exceptional quality and/or serving a crucial role within the university.

   a. Criteria for Undergraduate Programs

   Undergraduate programs failing to meet any one or a combination of the following thresholds will be identified/highlighted according to the process and criteria established by the Board and university.

   1. **Number of Majors** - baccalaureate programs should have an annual average of 25 or more junior, senior, and 5th year majors, computed over the most recent five year period.

   2. **Number of Graduates** - baccalaureate programs should have an annual average of 10 or more graduates, computed over the most recent five year period.

   3. **Number of Faculty FTE to Deliver the Program** - baccalaureate programs should have an annual average of three or more faculty FTE with a doctorate
or appropriate terminal degree to deliver instruction in the major, computed over the most recent five year period.

4. **Average ACT Score** - baccalaureate programs with an annual average ACT Score of 20 or more, computed over the most recent five year period.

**b. Criteria for Master’s Programs**

Master's programs failing to meet any one or a combination of the following thresholds will be identified/highlighted according to the process and criteria established by the Board and university.

1. **Number of Majors** – Master's programs should have an annual average of 20 or more majors, computed over the most recent five year period.

2. **Number of Graduates** – Master's programs should have an annual average of five or more graduates, computed over the most recent five year period.

3. **Number of Faculty FTE to Deliver the Program** – Master’s programs offered in departments that also offer the baccalaureate should have an annual average of an additional three faculty FTE with a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree (for a total of six) to deliver instruction in the graduate major, computed over the most recent five year period. Master’s programs offered in departments that do not offer the baccalaureate should have a minimum of three faculty FTE with a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree to deliver instruction in the graduate major, computed over the most recent five year period.

**c. Criteria for Doctoral Programs**

Doctoral programs failing to meet any one or a combination of the following thresholds will be identified/highlighted according to the process and criteria established by the Board and the University.

1. **Number of Majors** - Doctoral programs should have an annual average of five or more majors, computed over the most recent five year period.

2. **Number of Graduates** - Doctoral programs should have an annual average of two or more graduates, computed over the most recent five year period.

3. **Number of Faculty FTE to Deliver the Program** - Doctoral programs offered in departments that also offer the baccalaureate and master’s should have an annual average of an additional two faculty FTE with a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree (for a total of eight) to deliver instruction in the graduate major, computed over the most recent five year period. Doctoral programs offered in departments that do not offer the baccalaureate should have a minimum of five faculty FTE with a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree to deliver instruction in the graduate major, computed over the most recent five year period.
B. Program Review Instructions

As part of program review, institutions submit the following information to Board staff: program review summary table, institutional overview, program narrative, fiscal implications and an update on programs previously reviewed. Submit materials by February 15th to Sherry Farris at sfarris@ksbor.org. Institutions are also required to submit information to KHEDS by February 15th.

1. Program Review Summary Table

A program review summary table was sent by Board staff. For all programs, complete the column labeled “recommendation.” Use only one of the following options: Continue, Additional Review, Enhance or Discontinue.

Fill out the columns labeled “explanatory code” and “1 sentence explanation of recommendation” as outlined below.

The “explanatory code” column should only be completed for programs that did not meet at least one minima criterion. To complete the “explanatory code” column in the program summary table, use the same coding as was used in the KHEDS minima tables. (See codes in 6a of this document.) Leave this column blank for programs that met all minima criteria.

Complete the column labeled “1 sentence explanation of recommendation” for programs that were recommended for additional review, enhancement or discontinuance in the “recommendation” column. Do not provide an explanation where the recommendation was “continue.”

2. Institutional Overview of Program Review Process

Please include a five-page institutional overview describing the review process, how data sources were used to shape program recommendations and the most significant program changes or recommendations resulting from the program review. Please adhere to the page limit.

3. Program Narrative

Also include a summary assessment and institutional recommendation for each program identified for review during the review period. Limit the assessment and recommendation to a total of two pages. Please note the assessment and recommendation includes all degrees within a program. Each program will be examined by the university according to the criteria listed below. Please adhere to the page limit.

Each program will be examined against the following criteria:

1. Centrality to the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;
2. The quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty;
3. The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;
4. Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program;
5. The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and
6. The program’s cost-effectiveness.

4. Fiscal Implications

A one-page estimate of the fiscal implications of recommended program changes for each fiscal year from FY 2008 – FY 2012 should be sent to Board staff. The one page is for all recommended program changes and is not one page per recommended change. Please adhere to the page limit.

5. Update on Programs Previously Reviewed

Provide a brief update on programs identified during the AY 2008-2011 for additional review, enhancement or discontinuance.

6. KHEDS Submission

Institutions are required to submit information to KHEDS as part of program review. Most data for the Minima Report and Data by Academic Department under Program Review in KHEDS are pulled from the AY KSPSD Completions data and the Fall KSPSD Enrollment data. However, there are several areas of these reports institutions need to complete.

a. Minima Report

To help ensure program/discipline improvement and accountability the following coding system are used to complete the Code/Status section of the minima report located in the Program Review section of KHEDS. Programs that do not meet one of the minima criteria are highlighted in the minima report. Institutions should categorize these programs in the Code/Status section of the minima tables according to one of the nine categories below; however, up to two categories per program may be used. The Code/Status section is only used at the discipline level. Disciplines meeting all minima criteria do not need codes.

i. Academic Support Program (ASP): Academic support programs provide coursework and other academic support for other majors within the University. Many of these programs may fail to meet criteria for majors or degrees conferred.

ii. Research Support Program (RSP): Many programs, especially at the graduate level, are closely tied to the research enterprise and to the mission of the institution. These programs are necessary for institutional success.

iii. Interdisciplinary and Coordinated Programs (ICP): Interdisciplinary programs are generally characterized by a significant contribution in donated faculty time from affiliated departments. As such, interdisciplinary programs may have few students or faculty, but nonetheless reflect an institutional attempt to maximize the efficient use of resources. Similarly, some programs are cooperative ventures between two or more units. For example, some students preparing to
become French instructors at the secondary level, may be enrolled in Education or French, depending on the campus and specific program.

iv. Service Support Program (SSP): Many programs are closely tied to the service mission of the institution and are necessary to support that mission.

v. Graduate Feeder Program (GFP): These programs may have low counts since Students completing both the masters and Ph.D. or the Ph.D. directly from the bachelors are not counted as masters students. They are counted in the highest degree level rather than double counted.

vi. Discontinued Programs (DP): These programs are in the process of being phased out. Some students, however, may still be enrolled in the programs and progressing toward graduation.

vii. Monitoring Program for Improvement (MPI): These programs were initially triggered for additional review and have undergone a review process specified by the respective institution. The programs continue to be monitored by the institution and retain this code until (a) their regular review; (b) their discontinuance by the institution; (c) their reclassification; or (d) their attainment of minima criteria.

viii. Additional Review (AR): Programs in this category will be screened by the institution and a recommendation will be made regarding the need for further review by Board staff.

ix. New Programs (NP): New programs include those that have been initiated within the past five years. Many of these programs are still building enrollment.

An optional comments section is available in the Minima Tables for programs that did not meet at least one minima criterion. If a university has a comment that provides additional information beyond the explanatory codes used, the university has the option to complete the comments section for that program. Do not complete the comments section for programs meeting all minima criteria.

b. Data by Academic Department

Institutions should complete Section 1, Part E: Departmental Faculty and Section 2, Part B: ACT Scores of Undergraduate Jrs., Srs., 5th Year Majors.

If no programs are scheduled for review this cycle, skip items 1 through 3, and complete items 4, 5 and 6. Please also include a paragraph that explains why no programs are being reviewed.