Provosts' Perspectives on Academic Program Review

Kansas Board of Regents Meeting

Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee

Pittsburg State University

April 19, 2023

Agenda

1. <u>Purpose</u> of Academic Program Review

2. <u>Process</u> for Academic Program Review

3. <u>Focus areas</u> for Academic Program Review

1. Purpose of Academic Program Review

Purpose of KBOR Academic Program Review – as stated by Regents

- To ensure that each state university appropriately addresses low-enrolled programs

- To ensure that each state university makes appropriate adjustments based on student demand, capacity of programs, and costs

- To review and adjust as appropriate the number and blend of programs in KBOR system

- Align institutional data with KBOR's current (6) criteria for academic program review
  - As Provosts we will recommend changes to enhance and improve criteria for your consideration.

1. Purpose of Academic Program Review

Purpose of KBOR Academic Program Review – as proposed by Provosts

- Push responsibility for regular program review to institutions and make process responsive and meaningful

- Identify opportunities for program growth as well as for program elimination

- Strengthen system as a whole by providing KBOR-coordinated consultation for program development, alignment, and collaborations

- Simplify and align reporting burden so it better addresses needs for program review from campuses, KBOR, and external stakeholders

- Provide stories Regents and State officials need in clear ways that can be messaged beyond KBOR to support higher education in Kansas

- Recognize and celebrate success of institutions, programs, and faculty/staff

2. Process for Academic Program Review

Academic Program Review (Two institutions per year/Four-year cycle)
Each year two state universities present an academic portfolio review that describes process and provides examples of how the process was successful over the last three years. Tell story of major successes of the institutional program portfolio review process at a board meeting, providing full range of review highlights, to complement yearly reports. In Year 4, the process would be reviewed for refinements.

Adjustment of KBOR Minima Report (Annual report)
KBOR Academic Affairs Staff continue to generate annual minima report for institutional response.
Provosts recommend _removal_ of following elements from these reports:
1) Programs institutions have indicated are no or low cost and /or that provide some value to the institution
2) Programs embedded in other programs (e.g., MA degree pathways/offramps to PhD in same area)
3) Update minima criteria

Institutional Academic Portfolio Review Process Report (Bi-Annual report)
Each year KBOR requests brief written summary of program review process to ensure institutions pay attention to key areas for program health: academic and disciplinary innovation, program growth, student demand, market / industry need, etc.
1) Summary of institution's review process
2) Examples of review process in action (results and actions taken):
   - sample set of high performing programs or academic innovation success stories
   - sample of struggling programs (if they exist) with plans for revitalization, merger, discontinuance, or other pathway

3. Focus areas for Academic Program Review

1. **Market demand for program** – *KBOR should identify one data source to use as a benchmark, and individual institutions will add information relevant to specific programs (such as agreements with particular employment sectors for programs to address unique needs)*
Institutions could provide types of data such as:
   a. Labor market data (in particular whether demand is likely to grow)
   b. Value for our students (i.e., give students the degrees and credentials they most need)
   c. Student residency and local competition (account for broader reach of online programs)

2. **Student demand and accessibility**
Institutions could provide types of data such as:
   a. Student demand/yield data (including whether Kansas would lose students to other states by not having programs)
   b. Enrollment trends
   c. Articulation agreements, delivery modes, intra-institutional collaborations, etc.

3. **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution**
Institutions could provide types of data such as:
   a. How program serves institutional mission, state and region
   b. Program specialization and unique aspects of program (*e.g. address program duplication with rationale for programs offered at other institutions by explaining distinctive characteristics that support need for another program*)
   c. If undergraduate program is aligned with graduate program, link to graduate program enrollment and support for research mission (*e.g. research-oriented graduate programs do not capture faculty effort in SCH or normal faculty load as currently defined*)

3. Focus areas for Academic Program Review

4. **Quality of program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students**
   Institutions could provide types of data such as:
   a. Time to degree and median hours to degree
   b. First destination survey data (placement data)
   c. Student retention, persistence, and completion – for all students in program, not only first time, full time freshmen
   d. Graduation rates - for all students in program, not only first time, full time freshmen
   e. DFW course rates within program

5. **Service program provides to discipline, university, and beyond**
   Institutions could provide types of data such as:
   a. Curricular needs and dependencies:
      - SCH generated in General Education
      - Use of program courses as service courses for other degree programs
   b. Program comparisons with other KBOR institutions for data in 4a-b and 4d-e (above)
   c. Opportunities for program collaboration across institutions

6. **Program cost-effectiveness and productivity**
   Institutions could provide types of data such as:
   a. SCH/FTE by instructor type
   b. Faculty workload by instructor type (Note: Research 1 faculty spend 40% FTE on research)