AGENDA ITEM 10.d.

Academic Program Review Policy

RECOMMENDED DIRECTIVE: The Board of Regents hereby approves the revised policy on Academic Program Review to be effective fall semester of 2013.

DISCUSSION:
1. This policy was first approved November 1, 2001. It hasn't be evaluated fully until the College undertook the academic program prioritization process. The program reviews were used as the main data source for the prioritization process, but the program reviews didn't have some of the necessary information. Also, assessment at the college has evolved and changed the focus of program review. The instructional department conducts program assessment of student learning outcomes every year. Program review was originally written every year. The new recommendation is for program review to take place every 2 years. Program review includes 2 years of assessment of student learning outcomes, student achievement data such as retention, course completion, and graduation data as well as data on the viability of the program. This revision now describes the process that the instructional department is recommending to follow in regards to academic program review.
2. The Dean of Academic Programs revised the policy and presented the revisions to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee. This committee provided comments for improvement and recommended the policy to Executive Committee on February 25, 2013. Executive Committee reviewed the policy on February 27, 2013.
3. The procedures for this policy and content for a program review were based on the information needed for program prioritization and assessment of the program review process. Two of the main recommendations from the program prioritization process were to revise the program review document and to conduct program prioritization again in 2014.
4. Rationale for this recommendation is the Curriculum and Assessment Committee's efforts to align the entire process of assessment of student learning outcomes, program review, program prioritization, continuous improvement efforts, purposeful dialogue about student learning, planning and resource allocation.
5. The approval process follows the current participatory governance structure and is outlined in section 2 of this discussion.
6. The proposed implementation date for this policy is fall semester, 2013.
7. Should this policy be approved, all faculty members should have a better understanding of the role of program review in the process of continuous improvement at the College.

ACTION TAKEN: **VOTE:**

_____ Approved as presented   _____aye _____nay _____abstain

_____Approved w/ modifications

_____Disapproved

_____Deferred to a later meeting   **DATE:** _____

Policy on Academic Program Review

1.0 Policy
Program review at the College of Micronesia-FSM is to be part of the institution's overall planning and assessment process. Divisions and the state campuses are to evaluate a program according to its goals and learning outcomes as they relate to the College mission. The program review is completed every two years.

2.0 Purpose
The purpose of the academic program review is to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning. Secondly, academic program review is conducted to determine program sustainability and quality.

3.0 Application
The academic program review process applies to each academic program that utilizes college resources for its operation. Some examples are all degree and certificate programs, general education courses, and Achieving College Excellence (ACE) courses.

4.0 Responsibility
The President and Vice President of Instructional Affairs are responsible for the overall enforcement of this policy.

The Dean of Academic Programs and Director of Career and Technical Education are responsible for the implementation of this policy through the campus instructional coordinators and division chair faculty.

5.0 Procedure
I. The division/campuses program(s) provide the following information and data for review by the end of every other spring semester (2014, 2016, 2018…):

    A. **Program goals.** The program goals are broad statements concerning knowledge, skills, or values that the faculty members expect the graduating students to achieve.

    B. **Program history.** This section describes the history of the program. This includes the date and reason of implementation, significant milestones in the development of the program, and significant current activities.

    C. **Program description.** The program description describes the program, including its organization, relationship to other programs in the system, program design, degree(s) offered, and other significant features of the program, such as elements/resources for forward-looking new program contributions to the state's economy, or specialized program accreditation.

D. **Program admission requirements.** This section describes the requirements for admission into the program and other requisites.
E. **Program certificate/degree requirements.** This section specifies the requirements for obtaining a certificate/degree in the program, including specific courses, credits, internships, practical, etc.
F. **Program courses and enrollment.** This section lists courses offered in the program, including number of sections, course enrollment, section fill rates, and redundancy of courses across the institution.
G. **Program faculty.** This section reports the faculty of the program, including full-time and part-time faculty. The degrees held and rank are provided for the full-time and part-time faculty.
H. **Program indicators.** This section provides the data for analyzing the extent to which the program has achieved the established outcomes and criteria. This is the most important part of the program review. The data that will be collected and evaluated are the following:

1. Assessment of course student learning outcomes of program courses (TracDat reports for 2 years)
2. Assessment of program student learning outcomes (TracDat reports for 2 years)
3. Program enrollment – historical enrollment patterns, student credits by major
4. Average class size
5. Course completion rate
6. Student retention rate – (fall to fall for 2 year programs; fall to spring for 1 year programs)
7. Graduation rate – based on yearly numbers.
8. Students seat cost
9. Cost of duplicate or redundant courses/programs/services
10. Revenue generated by program – tuition, program-allocated (credits for 2 yrs x tuition), grant income.
11. Students' satisfaction rate
12. Alumni data
13. Employment data and employer feedback (employer survey)
14. Program added or cancelled at nearby regional institutions (PCC, GCC, Hawaii schools, UOG, CMI, NMC).
15. Transfer rate

J. **Analysis**
1. Findings – This section provides discussion of information discovered as a result of the evaluation such as problems or concerns with the program and what part of the program is working well and meeting expectation.
2. Recommendations – This section provides recommendations from the program on what to do to improve or enhance the quality of program and course learning outcomes as well as program goals and objectives. This section should also include suggestions that describe how the program might be able to create opportunities for a better program in the future. Some

examples are exploring alternate delivery mechanisms, forming external partnerships, or realigning with other programs.

II. Draft program reviews are shared with program faculty for dialogue and input.

III. The division chair finalizes program reviews to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CAC) for dialogue and review. Comments are to be noted in CAC minutes and recommendations for improvement sent to the Dean of Academic Programs, the Director of Career and Technical Education and the VPIA. These recommendations are to be used for improvement, planning and resource allocation.

IV. The VPIA informs the division chair of the results of the planning and resource allocation.

IV. The division chair posts the program review document on the College website for distribution to the College community.

6.0 Definitions

Student achievement – graduation rate, retention rate, course completion rate, transfer rate, employment rate.

Sources:

Existing COM-FSM Program Evaluation Policy
Academic Program Prioritization Process used at COM-FSM in 2011.