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Our focus

A policy that:

- Advances Board and OUS goals through the array of high quality academic programs offered
- Provides the Board with strong quality assurance regarding academic programs while streamlining processes
- Serves as a mechanism for implementing the Board’s portfolio approach to managing OUS universities
- Connects to other program review functions
  - Regional and specialized accreditation
  - Internal institutional review of existing programs
- Clarifies roles and responsibilities of the Board, Provosts’ Council, and OUS universities
Our approach

- Assess existing OUS program review policies and materials
- Modify or adapt existing documents where appropriate and possible
- Eliminate unneeded elements to streamline the process and focus program review activity at the appropriate levels
- Fill in the gaps with new guidelines and tools
- Make policies and forms accessible via the Provosts’ Council website
Key elements in new program approval

- Program description
- Relationship to mission and goals
- Accreditation
- Need
- Outcomes and quality assessment
- Program integration/collaborations
- Financial sustainability
- External review (for graduate level programs)
- A process with clear decision points and accountability
Role of the campus

- Regional and specialized accreditation
  - Provide summary of NWCCU accreditation report to Chancellor and Provosts’ Council
  - Provide summaries of specialized accreditation reports to Provosts’ Council

- Program eliminations
  - Continue to report program eliminations to Provosts’ Council

- Existing program review
  - Continue current campus-level review
  - New policy: provide annual summary to Provosts’ Council
  - Maintain link to Provosts’ Council website
Role of the campus

- New program proposals
  - Develop and review with department, university curriculum committee, faculty senate, dean, and provost
  - Follow new policy guidelines and forms for submission to Provosts’ Council
  - Continue practice of seeking external review of graduate programs

- Five-year follow up review
  - Re-start former policy and practice of conducting follow-up reviews in the fifth year following Board approval of a new program
Role of the Provosts’ Council

- New policy – present an annual report to the Board on existing programs that would:
  - Summarize institution accreditation reports and recommendations, including highlights from specialized accreditation reports
  - Summarize results of all five-year follow up reviews
  - Provide highlights from campus reviews of existing programs
  - Identify program additions and eliminations

- Conduct reviews of new programs and make recommendations to the Board

CONTINUED...
Role of the Provosts’ Council

- Re-start policy of receiving and evaluating five-year follow up reviews from campuses
  - Recommend action to the Board regarding programs that did not meet required criteria
  - For programs that did meet criteria, include summary in the annual Provosts’ Council report to the Board

- Maintain Provosts’ Council website with academic program review information and links to institution-level program review
Academic Program Policies and Procedures

OUS and Institutional Academic Program Review

Careful initiation and continued review of academic programs are key to an institution's viability and reputation. Not only does such an approach provide a level of quality assurance to the public, it also contributes to the broader portfolio of the state's system of public universities.

The review process employed by the Oregon University System and its institutions serves to track the success of each program and identify its unique strengths. It provides a systematic way to improve programs by examining:

- Adequacy of resources needed to sustain a quality offering;
- Continued ability to address access and market demand;
- Currency of the curriculum within the evolution of the discipline or field; and
- Success of the program in terms of student learning.

usually conducted through a form of self-study or external accreditation, the process for the ongoing review of existing programs engages faculty, administrators, graduates, and community partners in a thoughtful exploration that parallels many of the same elements reviewed during the program's initial approval. Results help reaffirm an institution's commitment to a program area, confirm the program's linkage with the institution's mission and strategic plan, and provide useful data for the institution's planning cycle.

In Oregon, this process includes rigorous review and approval processes for all new programs and certificates, a five-year review of new programs approved by the State Board of Higher Education, and a systematic review of all existing programs carried out at the institution level. The latter process may vary across campuses but includes many similar components. Processes used to prepare for re-accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities or specialized professional program accreditations provide many of the essential components valued for program review and, during the appropriate cycle of an accreditation site visit, may substitute for a separate program review report.

Links to individual campus program review activities, policies and reports can be accessed through this website, along with a schedule of programs brought forward for review by the Provosts’ Council.

The roles and responsibilities of OUS institutions, the Provosts' Council, and the Board as well as flow charts showing the processes for initiation and review of new undergraduate and graduate programs are included here to guide institution administrators, department or program chairs, and faculty through the program development and review processes of the Provosts' Council and Board. Narrative guidelines and required forms may also be accessed at this site.
Policies and Processes

- Board Internal Management Directive (IMD) regarding academic program review
- Roles and responsibilities for academic program review
- Academic program approval process (flow charts)
  - New undergraduate programs
  - New graduate programs
- Policy and guidelines for new program proposals
- Program proposals in process

Forms and Reference Documents

- Institution forms
  - Proposal for a New Academic Program
  - Format for Board Docket Submission
  - Budget Outline
  - External Review of New Graduate Level Academic Programs
  - Five-year Follow-Up Review of a New Academic Program
  - Proposal for Delivery of an Existing Program to a New Location
- Glossary

Reports

- Provost’s Council annual report to the Board
  - Current report
  - Previous reports

Campus program review activities

- Eastern Oregon University
- Oregon Institute of Technology
- Oregon State University
- Portland State University
- Southern Oregon University
- University of Oregon
- Western Oregon University

Helpful links

- Regional accreditation (NWCCU)
- National Center for Education Statistics - Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)
Role of the Board

- Act on Provosts’ Council recommendations regarding new programs at each regular Board meeting
- Re-start Board consideration of **five-year follow up** reviews, focusing on programs that did not meet the required criteria
- Receive the annual report from Provosts’ Council, using it as an opportunity to discuss institution reviews and actions regarding **existing** programs
- Incorporate program review information into annual Board discussion of **institution goals**
Important changes with the new policy

- Connects new program proposals to Board and OUS goals as well as institution goals
- More closely connects existing campus-level activities not previously aligned with Board policy
- Emphasizes potential partnerships and collaborations
- Program need defined as more than employment market – includes ways program will meet educational attainment goals and civic/cultural demands of citizenship
- Indicators of successful outcomes extend to faculty research expectations as well as student learning
- Requires more information about program financial sustainability
Work left to do

- Make necessary changes in the Board’s IMD regarding academic program review
- Develop a **glossary** to more clearly define language used for programs, degrees, certificates, options, professional programs, etc.
- Construct a **searchable academic program database**, accessible from the Provosts’ Council website, that will:
  - Allow campus academic administrators and faculty to identify existing similar programs at any OUS institution
  - Allow prospective students to search for locations of programs of interest
  - Feed up-to-date program information to the OUS View Book
  - Facilitate the annual report from Provosts’ Council
- Identify an **organizational structure** that will support academic program review policy implementation