

CONCORD UNIVERSITY
Revised Process and Format for Program Reviews

The purpose of the Program Review is to provide both a format and methods for institutional review and evaluation of degree-granting programs. The WVHEPC mandates that “each institution shall perform an evaluation of all academic programs at least once every five years and provide a report on the status of these programs to the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission in a format determined by the Commission. The evaluation shall consist of, but not limited to, the following priority core components: external demand; quality of outcomes; and delivery costs” (WVHEPC Series 10, Section 4.1).

All program reviews must be submitted to the Director of University Assessment by November 1.

1. History, Development, Expectations

This criterion aims to determine why the program was first started, and how its mission may have changed since its inception.

- A. A narrative overview of program (including information for any options or tracks), its mission, unique characteristics, educational learning goals, etc. How has the program evolved over the years? In what ways has it adapted to meet changes in the environment and context in which it operates.
- B. Recommendation and Rationale. Report any changes in the curriculum that have been made since the last program review and provide the rationale for these changes. Recommend either the continuation of current requirements or appropriate changes to the degree major curriculum. This recommendation will be accompanied by a rationale which references external standards and demonstrates that the recommended curriculum maximizes the academic excellence of the degree.

2. Internal Demand

The criterion assesses the demand for the program by the internal community, e.g., registered students from other programs, employees or other University programs, and current program and minor enrollment.

- A. Describe the level of support that is provided to other degree programs (service courses, non-majors, general education)
- B. Provide your forecast for future demand for the program and why.
- C. Complete the table below. (Note: not all academic programs are expected, or required, to deliver service or general education courses)

Internal Demand Metrics	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
Credits Delivered to Non-Majors					
Credits Delivered to General Education					
Credits Delivered by the Minor – if applicable					
Number of Students Enrolled (fall headcount)					
Credit Hours Generated by Program					
Number of Majors					
Number of Minors					

Data can be found in CAPS

3. External Demand

This criterion assesses the demand for the program by the external community, e.g. students (incoming or prospective), employers, visitors, governmental/agencies or the local community.

- A. What external factors affect the demand for the program and what are the expected changes to these if any in the near term? Factors could include government policy demands, geographical advantages, legislative requirements, competition from other institutions or industry/economic drivers.
- B. Describe the job market/demand for your graduates. Use sources such as the BLS or professional organizations.

4. Quality of Program Inputs

This criterion looks to measure the quality of a program's inputs, such as employees, students, curricula, and assessment of student learning.

- A. Curriculum – a summary of degree requirements and commentary on significant features of the curriculum. The goal of this element of the program review is to ensure that Concord University course requirements for each degree program meet or exceed national standards.
- B. Complete the table below with information related to current Department faculty status. Include the number of faculty in each appropriate section.

Tenured Faculty	Tenure-Track	Non-Tenured	Adjuncts	Part-Time

- C. Assessment summary
 - Summarize principal elements of the assessment plan based on programmatic and University missions. The plan must include elements to assess student learning and programmatic outcomes.
 - Provide information on
 - Educational goals of the program
 - Measure of evaluating success in achieving goals
 - Identification of the goals which are being successfully met and those which need attention as determined by an analysis of the data
 - Indicate how the mastery of essential skills is integrated into the departmental assessment plan and how student achievement is being measured.
 - Provide information on procedures for using assessment data to improve program quality. Include specific examples of program changes based on program assessment data
 - Identify data-driven plans for future program improvement, including a timeline
 - As appropriate, provide information on a quantitatively based means of assessing the knowledge and skills of graduates against a national benchmark or a benchmark established by the institution.
- D. Previous reviews
 - Review last program review action and indicate corrective actions implemented since the last review
- E. Strengths
 - Identify and describe strengths of the program. Describe any institutional and departmental plans in this area

F. Weaknesses

- Identify weaknesses of the program. Describe institutional and departmental plans for removing weaknesses
- Include plans for improvements, including timeline

5. Quality of Program Outcomes

This criterion seeks to measure the quality of the program’s outputs, such as retention, graduation, and job/graduate school placement rates.

Complete the tables below.

Metrics	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
Retention Rate in Program (after 30 hours) (%)					
Graduation Rate (after 30 hours) (%)					
Placement Rate (job or grad school) 6 Months After Graduate (%)					
Total Graduates in Program					

Data can be found in CAPS

Placement Metrics	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
Placement Rate (job or grad school) 6 Months After Graduate (%)					
Placed in Job Related to Major					
Placed in Graduate School					
Placed in Job Outside of the Major					

Describe the goals of the program in relation to program outcomes, such as retention, graduation, and job/graduate school placement.

6. Delivery Cost

This criterion provides the delivery cost of an academic department.

This data will be provided by Institutional Research. Refer to the document ‘Department Cost Report’ for a full breakdown of delivery cost calculations. A single cost is calculated for each faculty member, then that cost is spread among the departments based on the percentage of course load taught in each department. 5-year data and University-wide averages will be provided.

7. Essentiality – Impact

This criterion measures the summative effect of all other criteria. This criterion also provides an opportunity to record any relevant program information not already inventoried.

- A. Describe the benefits to the university in offering this program.
- B. What role does this program play in achievement of the mission of the University?
- C. How essential is the program to the institution?

Procedure for evaluation

- Programs/departments notified by Provost of program review(s) due next academic year, by May 1
- From Department Chair to faculty for comment with comments submitted to Department Chair, October 1
- From Department Chair to Assessment Director for Committee review, November 1
- From Assessment Director back to Departments with comments, December 1
- From Departments back to Assessment Director with corrections, January 15
- Completed Program Review Evaluations and Recommendations to Provost from Assessment Director, February 15
- Plan of Improvement from Provost to Department Chairs, as needed, March 15
- Recommendations from Provost to Board of Governors agenda and Academic Affairs BOG Sub-Committee, April 1
- From Board of Governors Acad. Affairs Sub-Committee to full BOG April 15
- From Provost to HEPC by May 31



CONCORD
UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM REVIEW
INSTITUTIONAL RECOMMENDATION

PROGRAM _____

DATE _____

- _____ 1. Identification of programs to be developed or expanded due to demand;
- _____ 2. Programs that will be improved through advancements in efficiency, quality, productivity, and focus
- _____ 3. Programs considered for consolidation or discontinuation based on cost of delivery and degree of relevance and impact

If the program is recommended for discontinuance, the provisions of Higher Education Policy Commission policy on approval and discontinuance of academic programs will apply. (SERIES 11 [§133-11-8.])

NOTE: 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. All supporting documentation should be available to the Commission upon request.

Signature of person preparing the full report

Date

Signature of the person summarizing the report

Date

Signature of Chief Academic Officer

Date

Signature of Board of Governors Representative

Date

Review Scoring Rubric

The purpose of the scoring rubric is to assure a high level of inter-rater reliability. Members of the assessment committee should rate academic programs based on the data provided.

Criterion	Minimal/Limited	Moderate	Extensive/Significant
<p>History, Development, and Expectations <i>This criterion aims to determine why the program was first started, and how its mission may have changed since its inception.</i></p>	Program does not demonstrate the ability to adapt to the changing needs of the University.	Program demonstrates an ability to meet and adapt to the needs of the University and its internal and external stakeholders.	Program demonstrates the ability to adapt to the needs of the University and its internal and external stakeholders, and demonstrates exceptional ability to anticipate change and build for the future.
<p>Internal Demand <i>The criterion assesses the demand for the program by the internal community, e.g., registered students from other programs, employees or other University programs, and current program and minor enrollment.</i></p>	Internal demand for the program and its support for other programs are limited.	The internal demand for the program and its support for other programs is moderate.	Internal demand for the program and its support for others programs is extensive/significant.
<p>External Demand <i>This criterion assesses the demand for the program by the external community, e.g. students (incoming or prospective), employers, visitors, governmental/agencies or the local community.</i></p>	External demand for the program is limited; program does not address external expectations.	External demand for program is moderate; program shows some ability to monitor, meet, anticipate, and/or promote changes in external expectations.	External demand for program is extensive; program shows ability to monitor, meet, anticipate, and/or promote changes in variety of external expectations.
<p>Inputs <i>This criterion looks to measure the quality of a program's inputs, such as employees, students, curricula, and assessment of student learning.</i></p>	Quality of program inputs is minimal, insufficient, and/or does not contribute to overall program quality.	Quality of program inputs is moderate, sufficient and contributes to overall program quality.	Quality of program inputs is extensive and contributes greatly to overall program quality.
<p>Outcomes <i>This criterion seeks to measure the quality of the program's outputs, such as retention, graduation, and job/graduate school placement rates.</i></p>	Quality of program outcomes are evaluated using limited or ineffective measures; program is unable to achieve quality outcomes; program shows no ability to improve outcomes.	Quality of program outcomes are evaluated using sufficient measures; program is able to achieve at least some quality outcomes, but may need to improve consistency; program shows ability to plan for improvement of outcomes.	Quality of program outcomes are evaluated using extensive, detailed measures; program shows consistent ability to meet, exceed, and improve quality outcomes; external validation is evident.
<p>Delivery Cost <i>This criterion provides the delivery cost of an academic department.</i></p>	Delivery costs far exceed similar programs.	Delivery costs are in line with similar programs.	Delivery costs are substantially lower than similar programs.
<p>Impact <i>This criterion measures the summative effect of all other criteria. This criterion also provides an</i></p>	There is minimal evidence presented; evidence suggests	There is moderate evidence presented; evidence suggests the program has impact to the University.	There is extensive evidence presented; evidence suggests the program has high impact and/or is critical to the University.

<i>opportunity to record any relevant program information not already inventoried.</i>	program has minimal impact to the University.		
--	---	--	--