I. Academic Program Review and Institutional Mission Development.

From 1982 to 1990, the Kansas Board of Regents and Regents universities reviewed every academic degree program within the Regents system at least once. Born in an era of fiscal constraint, the first cycle of program review resulted in the modification or discontinuance of over 180 degree programs and a documented savings to the State of Kansas of over $1 million. Equally significant, however, the campus-based program review initiated in 1991 was a critical feature of the study of the missions, roles and aspirations of the Kansas Regents universities. The mission study resulted in the modification, merger or discontinuance of an additional 182 programs or units, and reported reinvestments totaling approximately $18 million from FY 1994 - FY 1998. The first cycle of program review and the 1991 - 1993 mission study established a place for program review in the culture of Kansas higher education. Program review is critical to the self-knowledge and effective self-management of the six universities governed by the Kansas Board of Regents.

In 1997, the Regents universities face continued fiscal constraints and an array of additional challenges that include a profound need to improve faculty compensation; accommodate changes in the mix, preparation and volume of students enrolling in the universities; integrate new instructional technologies; and respond to increased accountability demands. In preparation for the new realities confronting Kansas higher education, the Board and universities implemented VISION 2020, a rubric for pursuing change in designated areas of university life. VISION 2020 is not a substitute for program review nor is it a vehicle to refine the missions and roles of the Regents universities. However, if properly crafted, program review and VISION 2020 can be complementary and mutually reinforcing.

Program review must support the efforts of the universities and the Board to respond to these new realities by increasing institutional flexibility and supporting campus plans to fulfill assigned institutional missions as well as the initiatives within VISION 2020. Program review most fully enables the universities to develop and refine their mission and roles within Kansas higher education. As such, it is also one of the most important activities to support the ability of the Board and the universities to align academic programs with institutional missions and priorities. Consistent with VISION 2020, program review is concerned with the improvement of curriculum and instruction and the use of faculty time and talent. Program review is inextricably bound to the allocation of resources within the Regents universities. Thus, an administrative review of academic programs occurs each year at the universities. Because of its focus on mission development and refinement, program review is linked to future actions to improve faculty salaries and revenue streams for technology enhancements.

Acknowledging these realities, the Council of Chief Academic Officers and the Council of Presidents reiterated their support for a new cycle of program review at their meetings in Hays, Kansas in September 1996. In response, the following outlines a new cycle of program review in the Kansas Regents system. It was approved by the Board of Regents on September 18, 1997.

II. Purposes and Goals for Academic Program Review.

The Board and Regents universities conceive program review as integral to the academic planning process
that occurs at both the institutional and system levels. Therefore, program review contains both institutional and system goals within a set of overarching purposes. Stated generally, program review is intended to improve the quality of the academic programs offered by the Regents universities. Program review also provides an important opportunity for faculty to reflect on educational practices and review the role of their programs in the context of the totality of programs offered by the Regents universities. This is accomplished by ensuring:

1. the highest possible level of academic program quality;
2. an appropriate differentiation of institutional missions and roles within the Regents system;
3. optimal effectiveness in the use of State and student resources; and
4. maximum responsiveness to the intellectual, cultural and workforce needs of the State.

Although the overarching purposes remain the same, the goals and operation of program review vary at the campus and system levels. A differentiation of goals implies that the campuses and the system have different responsibilities in the program review process. Goals for program review at the campus level include but are not limited to:

1. strengthening the quality and accessibility of academic programs by assessing existing program strengths and concerns;
2. augmenting institutional self-management by identifying and articulating academic program needs and campus priorities; and
3. identifying needs to reorganize academic programs, including modification, merger and discontinuance.

The Regents universities may specify or add to these campus goals for program review.

At the system level, the primary goals for program review include:

1. ensuring that program quality and program priorities are consistent with institutional missions and roles;
2. refining the scope of program offerings to optimize student access and use of resources; and
3. identifying viable opportunities for minimizing unjustifiable program duplication and supporting appropriate institutional cooperation.

III. The Program Review Process

A. A Common Program Data Base

Program review begins appropriately at each Regents university with the development and collection of data on each academic degree program. The common program review data base identifies the specific program information the universities will report to the Board. Attachment 6a to this document provides the instructions, operational definitions and reporting format for the elements in the program review data base that will be collected by each institution and reported to the Board. The common program review data base will follow the departmental structure of the Regents universities, as well as provide information about discrete academic programs. For the purposes of this review, programs are identified by their CIP code and degree level. The Regents universities will report the statistical information identified in Attachment 2 to the Board office no later than March 16 of each year beginning in 1998. Board of Regents staff will work with the Council of Chief Academic Officers to ensure that the database is consistent across universities and is updated annually.
B. The Program Review Schedule

All academic degree programs offered by the Kansas Regents universities will be reviewed at least once within an eight year cycle. Attachment 3 is a sample cycle for the review of academic programs over an eight year period. Programs are grouped by CIP codes assigned in the Board's Degree and Certificate Program Inventory.

C. The Program Review Process and Criteria

Each Regents university is charged with the review of its academic programs and the implementation of its own process and criteria for program review, within a systemwide framework of expectations for the review and a shared timeline for its various phases. Each Regents university is responsible for the design and implementation of its own program review process and schedule consistent with the timelines on Attachment 1. Each Regents university will submit its plan for program review for consideration by the Board at the March 1998 Board Meeting.

Although program review is ultimately focused on discrete academic programs, the larger context of institutional planning, management and budgeting of the university should be enhanced by the process. Thus, the development and implementation of a program review process should integrate the systemwide objectives for program review with the institutional environment for planning, management and budgeting. Each university will use the reviews to establish priorities for its academic programs and allocate resources among programs.

Each program will be examined by the university according to the criteria listed below.

1. Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and 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.

These criteria have relevance for all degree programs, regardless of discipline or degree level. However, the conceptualization, measurement, and application of these criteria in the review of academic programs will vary according to a variety of factors, including institutional mission and degree level. The Board is particularly concerned that the criteria are interpreted and applied appropriately to programs at different degree levels.

Institutional reviews of programs will not be limited to the statistical information outlined in Attachment
1 but may include student learning assessment data, evaluations and recommendations from accreditation reports, data on student post-collegiate experiences, data gathered from the core and institution-specific performance indicators, and/or information in national or disciplinary rankings of program quality. Specific and/or additional information that relate to these criteria and that are meaningful and appropriate for the institution can be developed by each Regents university. The universities may consider and implement separate review processes for graduate and undergraduate education. Examples of appropriate indicators for graduate programs might include the value and quality indicators listed in the policy statement on Academic Review of Graduate Programs, adopted by the Council on Graduate Schools.

Recognizing that the need for program review may vary by program, the Board and universities believe that the programs that demonstrate a greater need for review should be prioritized in the review process. Further, campuses may develop multistage review processes that permit more intense reviews of certain programs.

Board of Regents staff will review the database provided by the Regents universities and, by May 1 of each year, alert the chief academic officers to any questions, issues or problems that should be addressed through the institution's review process.

At the conclusion of the annual review each institution will develop and report to the Board of Regents a summary assessment of the program and recommendations for each program's future.

IV. Report and Recommendations to the Kansas Board of Regents

Upon the conclusion of the reviews according to the proposed timeline appearing on Attachment 1, each Regents university will provide the Board with an executive summary of its annual review and program by program recommendations. The Campus reports to the Board should aim for brevity and include the following:

A. 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;

B. A two-page summary assessment and institutional recommendations for each program reviewed; and

C. A one-page institutional estimate of the fiscal implications of the recommended program changes for each fiscal year from FY 2000 - FY 2005.

Institutional reports and recommendations for the 1998 reviews are due in the Board office on January 15, 1999. Campus reports will be summarized by Board of Regents staff, in consultation with institutional leadership, and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board's Academic Affairs Committee prior to consideration by the entire Board on February 18, 1999.
Activity for 1998 Cycle

1. Board of Regents Consideration of Proposal
   Completion Date
   September 18, 1997

2. Campus Collection of Statistical Overview Data
   Identified on Academic Affairs Pages 31 to 33.
   Completion Date
   September 1997 - March 16, 1998
   March 16, 1998

3. Campus Report of Statistical Overview Data to the
   Board Office
   Completion Date
   September 1997 - March 1998
   March 1998

4. Development of Campus Plans for Program Review
   Completion Date
   March 1998

5. Board consideration of Campus Plans and
   Schedules for Program Review
   Completion Date
   March 1998 - December 1998

6. Campus Reviews of Programs Identified for 1998
   Reviews
   Completion Date
   May 1, 1998

7. Board staff will notify chief academic officers of
   questions, issues or problems
   Completion Date
   January 1, 1999

8. Submission of Campus Reports and
   Recommendations to the Board of Regents
   Completion Date
   February 18, 1999

9. Consideration of Campus Reports and
   Recommendations by the Board of Regents

Activity for 1999 Cycle

1. Campus Report of Statistical Overview Data to
   Board Office
   Completion Date
   March 16, 1999

2. Campus Reviews of Programs Identified for 1999
   Reviews
   Completion Date
   March 1999 - December 1999

3. Submission of Campus Reports and
   Recommendations to the Board of Regents
   Completion Date
   January 1, 2000

4. Consideration of Campus Reports and
   Recommendations by the Board of Regents
   Completion Date
   February 17, 2000
PROGRAM REVIEW - STATISTICAL OVERVIEW
INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

1998 PROGRAM REVIEW

**Institution:** Self Explanatory.

**Department:** List the Department Name.

**Discipline:** In many instances, the discipline is the same as the department name. However, there are departments that have several disciplines within them. For instance, a Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work Department has three disciplines that should be listed under the discipline section.

**Section I: Departmental Data:** The data in this section is provided for each department unless requested by the Board of Regents to disaggregate the data into disciplines within a department.

**Part A: Departmental Instructional Expenditures.** Part A is completed to capture the total General Use Instructional expenditures for the department for FY 1993 to FY 1997. The General Use definition is the same as that used for the Kansas Cost Study which includes Sponsored Research Overhead funding. The expenditures are separated by Salaries/Benefits and Other Operating Expenditures (OOE). The third line is the total of Salaries/Benefits and OOE. The five year growth trend should be expressed in a percent of the present growth or decline in dollars for the five year period reported. The growth trend is calculated by subtracting FY 1993 Total Expenditures from FY 1997 Total Expenditures and dividing it by FY 1993 Total Expenditures. The Department General Use Instructional Expenditures as a percent of the Institution's General Use Instructional is calculated by dividing line three by the Institution's General Use Instructional Expenditures. The five year growth trend is the difference between the percent in FY 1997 and FY 1993 divided by FY 1993 percent.

**Part B: Student Credit Hour Production.** Part B should reflect the total student credit hours (SCH) generated by department for FY 1993 to FY 1997. Show the total number of SCH taught for the Summer, Fall and Spring semesters of each fiscal year requested. The student credit hour production should be reported by level and a total of all the levels. Line 6 is the percent of Undergraduate SCH produced by the department in relation to the Institution's Undergraduate SCH produced for FY 1993 to FY 1997. Line 7 is the percent of Graduate SCH produced by the department in relation to the Institution's Total Graduate SCH produced for FY 1993 to FY 1997. All percents should be reported to the nearest 100th (e.g. 2.05%).

\[\text{developed by CIRO December 13, 1993; updated by Board Staff February 18, 1997.}\]
Part C: Cost per Credit Hour. The general principles and definitions utilized in the Kansas Cost Study govern the departmental costs per credit hour identified in this item. For each fiscal year, report the cost per credit hour for each level from the HEGIS discipline in which the department is located.

Part D: Percent of Departmental SCH taken by the Department’s Undergraduates, Graduates, and Non-Departmental majors. Part D will show what percent of the SCH generated by the department is concentrated within the department or outside the department for Fall 1994 and Fall 1997. In other words, Part D is a means to identify those departments which provide a service to other departments and to the University. Report the percent of department SCH generated by Undergraduates majoring in the department and Graduates majoring in the department. The percent of SCH that has not been accounted for by the majors within the department should be reported under non-majors.

Part E: Department Faculty. Part E will show the size and demographics of the department from the faculty side based on actual appointees rather than budgeted. (1) Report the department total number (headcount) of instructional/research/public service personnel who are tenured or on tenure track which includes full-time and part-time personnel for Fall 1997 with 50% or more of their primary assignment in instruction. This is similar to the instructions used for the Board of Regents DBTF Report. (2) From the number reported in line 1, report the number and percent of faculty with terminal degrees. Also, define what is meant by terminal degree (if it is different than a PhD.) since some program areas have different standards for terminal degrees. (3) From the number reported in line 1, report the percent and number who have tenure. (4) Report the number and percent of full-time faculty within the department who are budgeted 100% in the Institution. (5) Calculate the five year growth trend (percent) in headcount using the number reported in line 1 and subtract from the total department headcount (full-time and part-time) in FY 1994 and divide by the FY 1994 total headcount. (6) report the full-time equivalent (FTE) of instructional faculty in the department.

Part F: Actual Instructional FTE. Part F is reflecting Faculty teaching loads for Fall 1994 and Fall 1997 reflecting actual appointments rather than budgeted. (1) Report the Department Instructional FTE of tenure/tenure track faculty. This would include all faculty who have 50 percent or more of their assignment in instruction. (2) Report the graduate teaching assistants (GTA) FTE who are assigned to each department. Designate the GTA FTE which are instructor of record and which are not instructor of record. Instructor of record is defined as those GTA’s who assign the grades for the class or who have total responsibility for the class from writing class notes, writing tests, evaluating classwork and assigning final grades. (3) Report all other instructional FTE within the department that does not fall in either line one or two and are contributing to the department. Adjunct faculty who are contributing would be counted as having 0.25 FTE in the department. (4) This is the sum of FTE (line 1 through 3). (5) Report the student credit hours (SCH) generated by the department tenure/tenure track faculty. (6) Report the SCH generated by GTA’s who are instructor of record. (7) Report the SCH generated by other instructional faculty. (8) This is the sum of SCH (line 5 through 7). Line 9 through 12 is the average SCH per FTE for each of the designated areas. For line 9, divide the SCH generated by Faculty by the Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty FTE. For line 10, divide SCH generated by GTA’s by the GTA instructor of record FTE. For line 11, divide SCH generated by Others by the Other FTE. Finally, line
Section II: Major Data: The data in this section is provided for each major. If a department has several majors, this section must be completed for each major.

Department: Type the name of the department which "houses" the specific major.

Discipline: Type the name of the major for which the following data is provided.

CIP Code: Type the Classification of Instructional Program Code to denote the discipline. This code is the same code used for IPEDS Completions Report.

Part A: Majors in the Discipline. List the declared majors in this department as of the Fall term 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997. Separate listings will be provided of undergraduates – (1) Freshmen and Sophomores are optional, and (2) Juniors, Seniors, and 5th Year Seniors; Masters; First Professional/Specialist; and Doctoral level students. Include only those undergraduates who have achieved at least a junior status. Count all declarations of the individual (i.e. all individuals working toward a major, including double major, can be counted more than once).

Part B: ACT Score. List the Average ACT Composite score, the lowest ACT score, the highest ACT score, the number reporting an ACT score, and the percent who have an ACT score for Jrs, Srs, and 5th year majors during the Fall 1995, Fall 1996, and Fall 1997 semester.

Part C: Degrees Conferred. List the degrees conferred for this discipline during Fiscal Years 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997 by type of degree. Degrees earned but not yet conferred should not be reported. If a student received two degrees at different levels, report each degree in its appropriate classification. If a student graduates with a major in two program specialties, report the degree in the field in which the degree was awarded. If a student actually receives two degrees based on two independent courses of study, report each degree under the appropriate program category. Exclude honorary degrees and awards. List the concentrations by degree level if a degree program confers a degree with several different concentrations/options.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part A: Departmental Instructional Expenditures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Salaries/Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other Operating Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Three Year Growth Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General Use Expenditures as a Percent of the INSTITUTION'S General Use Instructional Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Three Year Growth Trend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part B: Student Credit Hour Production:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lower Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upper Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduate 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Undergraduate SCH Produced as a Percent of INSTITUTION'S Total Undergraduate SCH Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Graduate SCH Produced as a Percent of INSTITUTION'S Total Graduate SCH Production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part C: Cost per Credit Hour:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lower Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upper Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduate 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Data will be provided at department level. Upon request from the Board, data will be disaggregated into disciplines.

Part D: Percent of Departmental SCH taken by:

1. Their Undergraduate Majors

2. Their Graduate Majors

3. Non-Majors
   (Reported every three years)

Part E: Department Faculty:

1. Total Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Headcount)

2. Total with Terminal Degree
   a) Terminal Degree defined as
      (If different from Ph.D.)

3. Total Tenured

4. Total Full-Time (Budgeted 100% in Institution)

5. Three-year Growth Trend in Headcount

6. Total Instructional Faculty FTE in Department
   (Definitions and Accounting Period as was used
   in the DBTF Report)

Part F: Actual Instructional FTE:

FTE:
1. Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty

2. Graduate Teaching Assistants
   a. Instructor of Record
   b. Not Instructor of Record

3. Other

4. Total FTE (1 to 3)

SCH:
5. SCH Generated by Faculty

6. SCH Generated by GTA's

7. SCH Generated by Others

8. Total

RATE (SCH per FTE):
9. Ave. SCH per Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty

10. Ave. SCH per GTA (I of R only)

11. Ave. SCH per Other Faculty
12. Ave. SCH per FTE
(Line 8/Line 4)
(Calculated every three years using approach developed for Fall 1990 Study)
(1) Data will be provided at department level. Upon request from the Board, data will be disaggregated into disciplines.
### DISCIPLINE/MAJOR DATA:

- **Department:**
- **Discipline:**
- **CIP Code:**

#### Part A: Majors in the Discipline:

1. **Freshmen/Sophomores (Optional)**
   - Fall 93: __________________
   - Fall 94: __________________
   - Fall 95: __________________
   - Fall 96: __________________
   - Fall 97: __________________

2. **Jrs., Srs., 5th Year**
   - __________________

3. **Masters**
   - __________________

4. **First Prof/ Specialist**
   - __________________

5. **Doctoral**
   - __________________

#### Part B: ACT Score of Undergraduate:

- **Jrs., Srs., 5th Year Majors**

1. **Avg. ACT Composite**
   - __________________

2. **Low ACT**
   - __________________

3. **High ACT**
   - __________________

4. **Number Reporting an ACT Score**
   - __________________

5. **Percent Reporting ACT Score**
   - __________________

#### Part C: Degrees Conferred (2)

1. **Associate**
   - __________________

2. **Baccalaureate**
   - __________________

3. **Masters**
   - __________________

4. **First Prof/ Specialist**
   - __________________

5. **Doctorate**
   - __________________

List of concentrations within the degrees:

(2) All degrees conferred including second majors.