

R411.1 Purpose: To provide policy and procedures for the review of existing programs in the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE). The primary purpose for conducting institutional program reviews is to improve the quality of education.

R411-2. References

- 2.1. Utah Code §53B-16-102, Changes in Curriculum
- 2.2. Policy and Procedures R220, Delegation of Responsibilities to the President and Board of Trustees
- 2.3. Policy and Procedures R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Changes, Discontinued Programs, and Program Reports

R411-3. Responsibility: The chief responsibility for reviewing existing programs is assigned to institutional faculty and administrators, and to institutional Boards of Trustees with accompanying Board of Regents' (Regents) oversight. Program review is accomplished through the combined efforts of presidents, vice presidents, provosts, deans, department chairs, and individual faculty so that meaningful change can occur.

R411-4. Review Procedure: Program reviews will be evaluated first by the institutional board of trustees, and then forwarded to the Commissioner of Higher Education and Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff for review by the Regents as an Information Item.

- 4.1. **Submissions:** Institutional Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) shall provide summaries of complete program reviews to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff. The summaries should include the reviewers, a program description, faculty and staff data, five year enrollment data, a five year financial analysis, program assessment, and the institution's response. See 0 for the template.
- 4.2. **Evaluations:** Program review summaries will be evaluated by the Commissioner's staff who may ask for further information. The staff will prepare program reviews as information items for the Regents' agendas.
- 4.3. **Other Information:** In addition to the completed program review template, institutional CAOs shall provide to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff copies of regional and specialized accreditation reports, including focused and interim reports, and other reports as requested.

R411-5. Review Schedule: To ensure a thoughtful and careful examination of each program in the USHE, the following review schedule should be followed as closely as possible. It is recommended that the timing of these reviews should be coordinated with regional and/or specialized accreditation review schedules whenever possible to avoid duplication of effort and/or expense.

- 5.1. **Doctoral Granting and Master's Universities:** All programs will be reviewed once every seven years.

¹ Approved July 15, 1980; amended September 13, 1983, March 20, 1984, April 11, 1986, November 17, 1989, July 27, 1990, May 29, 1998, October 27, 2005, and March 24, 2009.

5.2. All Other Institutions: All programs will be reviewed once every five years.

R411-6. Review Committees: Program reviews will be conducted in accordance with procedures developed by each institution consistent with its respective faculty governance system. Departments whose programs are under review shall prepare detailed written materials for review committees based on system and institutional criteria. Review committees for each program should be established that include the minimum of one external consultant, one internal consultant (not affiliated with the program). Additionally, Program Advisory Committee members may be used.

R411-7. Program Review Template: The template specifies the information to be supplied and provides the format to be used when submitting the review for the Regents.

7.1. General Formatting for Submissions

7.1.1. All submissions must be written in a formal style, using third person.

7.1.2. All submissions must be sent to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs staff as an electronic document in Microsoft Word format.

7.1.3. All submissions must use Arial Narrow 12-point font, single-spaced. Remove italics when using templates.

7.1.4. All submissions must have 1" margins.

7.2. Template: Information provided should be concise and cover the last five academic years.

Institution, Program Reviewed, and Date Reviewed

Reviewers: *(Add bullets as needed. Remove italics when using template)*

- *External Reviewer's Name, Affiliation*
- *Internal Reviewer's Name, Affiliation*
- *Other Reviewer's Name, Affiliation*

Program Description: *One to three paragraph description of the program. Remove italics when using template.*

Faculty & Staff: *Current counts of faculty and staff.*

Faculty	Tenure	Contract	Adjunct
Number of faculty with Doctoral degrees			
Number of faculty with Master's degrees			
Number of faculty with Bachelor's degrees			
Other Faculty			
Total			
Staff	Full-Time	Part-Time	Adjunct
Administrative			X
Secretarial/Clerical			X
Laboratory Aides/Instructors			X
Advisors			X
Teaching/Graduate Assistants			X
Other Staff			X
Total			X

Students: *One paragraph giving current data on market demand or the utility of the degree, how the program accommodates the market, and hiring patterns including local, state, and national trends. Remove italics when using template. "# of Grads Placed" includes job placement or continued education.*

AY	# of Majors	Undergrad Student FTE	Grad Student FTE	# of Faculty	FTE-to-Faculty Ratio	# of Grads	# of Grads Placed

Financial Analysis

Expense	AY	AY	AY	AY	AY
Instructional Costs					
Support Costs					
Other Expenses					
Total Expense	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Revenue	AY	AY	AY	AY	AY
Legislative Appropriation					
Grants					
Reallocation					
Tuition to Program					
Fees					
Total Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Difference	AY	AY	AY	AY	AY
Revenue-Expense	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Program Assessment: *Strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations from the reviewers. Remove italics when using template.*

Institution's Response: *Responses to review committee findings and recommendations. Remove italics when using template.*