

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED RAMP GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW*

The results of program reviews provide the basis for internal decisions on productivity improvements, formulation of program development plans, and budget development. The program review process should be guided by campus priorities and informed by statewide analyses.

The primary focus of the review process is the improvement of the quality and productivity of individual academic programs and units of research and public service, and assures that each unit continues to be consistent with the university's priorities. The program review process is the principal mechanism for promoting program effectiveness, improving quality, and contributing to public accountability. As a result of program reviews, actions are taken at the campus level to remedy concerns and problems identified including curricular revisions, resource adjustments, program restructuring, and program elimination. The primary responsibility for initiating and conducting program reviews rests with the universities.

The Board of Higher Education has statutory responsibility to "review periodically all existing programs of instruction, research and public service at state universities and to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified." Further, the program review process is an important component of the priorities, quality, and productivity initiative at both the institutional and state levels. From a state perspective, the review of academic units includes the following elements:

- The review schedule provides for the submission of the results of reviews of similar programs by all universities at the same time.
- A statewide analysis, coordinated with the review schedule, defines statewide issues, examines capacity in fields of study across universities, and provides comparative information for institutional reviews of individual programs.
- Universities conduct program reviews according to campus-developed procedures and submit the results of reviews to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
- The results of program reviews are analyzed by the staff and recommendations on the educational and economic justification of selected programs are included in the staff's annual Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (P·Q·P) report and recommendations.

The following sections describe these elements and provide guidelines and reporting requirements.

1. Program Review Schedule

A schedule for submission of the reviews of academic programs is provided in Table 1. Research and public service centers should be reviewed at the same time as related instructional programs. Summaries of reviews of academic programs should be submitted on July 1st.

The program review schedule calls for the submission of program review reports for groups of programs on specified dates. However, institutions may conduct reviews within a reasonable period (e.g., up to three years) prior to the submission date in order to coordinate reviews with accreditation and other evaluations.

Program Review Schedule

	CIP	Discipline Codes	Statewide Analysis Distributed
Submission July 1996	13G 22 25	Education: Graduate Programs Law & Legal Studies Library Sciences	July 95
Submission July 1997	49 47 15 01,02,03 19,20 30 38 42 24	Transportation Mechanics & Repairers Engineering Technology Agriculture & Natural Resources Home Economics Multi-Interdisciplinary Studies Philosophy & Religion Psychology Liberal Arts & Sciences, General Studies	July 96
Submission July 1998	52 08 16	Business Marketing Foreign Languages	July 97
Submission July 1999	44 43 45	Public Administration & Services Protective Services Social Sciences & History	July 97
Submission July 2000	09,10 31 05 50	Communications & Com Technologies Parks, Recreation, Leisure, & Fitness Studies Area Studies Visual & Performing Arts	July 98
Submission July 2001	04 14 11 40	Architecture & Design Engineering Computer & Info Sciences Physical Sciences	July 99
Submission July 2002	51 12 26	Health Professions & Related Sciences Personal and Miscellaneous Services Biological Sciences	July 2000
Submission July 2003	13UG 23 27	Education English Language & Literature/Letters Mathematics	July 2001

2. Statewide Analysis

Board of Higher Education staff will develop a statewide analysis of trends and identify statewide issues in each program area. This report will be provided to institutions one year prior to the date that university submissions are due. Table 1 also shows the schedule for distribution of the statewide analysis. This analysis will examine enrollment and degrees granted trends, student characteristics, program costs, occupational demand, and other measures appropriate to the disciplines being examined. The primary purpose of this analysis is to provide a statewide context for at least the later stages of the review process as each campus makes decisions about the recommendations resulting from their reviews of individual programs. Universities will be asked to incorporate responses to statewide issues in their program review submissions. The staff analysis may also include recommendations for expansion or reduction of certain types of programs on a statewide (not campus specific) basis.

3. Review Guidelines

Program review systematically and thoroughly examines both qualitative and quantitative aspects of an instructional program including *curriculum, students, faculty, support services*, student demand, occupational demand, centrality in relation to instructional mission, program breadth, ~~success of graduates~~, program costs, and program quality and productivity. The review process should provide for broad involvement of faculty from both within and outside the program and department, as well as the involvement of students and academic administrators. The process also should provide for examination of the program at multiple levels within the institution. The process may involve advisory committees and consultants or evaluators external to the institution. *Appropriate data, benchmarked to institutional or statewide reviews, should be used.* Program review is expected to result in specific improvements in the quality and productivity of a program and provide the opportunity to strengthen and up date even the programs of highest quality.

4. Reporting Requirements for Review of Instructional Programs

Summaries of the results of the reviews of instructional programs should be submitted on July 1st of each year according to the following guidelines:

A brief summary (~~one or two pages~~) (*three to four pages*) should be submitted for each program reviewed. These summaries should focus on the conclusions of reviews and on the actions taken to improve the quality and productivity of the program. *Data and benchmarks should be reported to support conclusions as appropriate.* Program reviews should address the following questions, and the key findings and recommendations in each of these areas should be the substance of the summary submitted to the Board of Higher Education.

Curriculum:

- *Are course requirements for the degree up to date? Do they ensure general and specialized learning and training appropriate to the field, level of the degree, and the objectives of the program?*
- *To what extent are course and degree requirements structured to afford students diverse opportunities to prepare for future career roles? Are externships and other workforce educational experiences appropriate to the program and of high quality?*

- *How does the curriculum develop academic capabilities such as writing, problem-solving, statistical analysis, and computer/technology skills in a way appropriate to the field, level, and objectives of the program?*
- *Is the curriculum coherent? Are the program's core courses appropriate to program objectives? Are program requirements interconnected so as to support each other? Is an appropriate culminating experience(s) and product(s) required?*

Students

- *Are there multiple admissions criteria that seek to admit students from a variety of backgrounds and educational and work experiences? How do criteria recognize student motivation for learning and seek "goodness of fit" between student goals and those of faculty and the program?*
- *To what extent do students invest time and energy in their own and others' learning through active participation in formal and informal learning activities?*
- *How are high standards for academic performance set and maintained? How is student academic performance measured and periodically monitored for progress throughout the program? Are key student intellectual skills and abilities appropriate to the discipline periodically assessed with progress and deficiencies communicated back to students?*
- *Are part-time and full-time students afforded comparable opportunities and subject to the same expectations?*
- *What is the typical time needed to complete the program and how does student time to degree compare with rates of progress at similar programs at the institution and at comparable institutions?*
- *When applicable, how do students or graduates perform on licensure or certification exams or on other standardized tests?*
- *Do current students and alumni report satisfaction with the program?*
- *Do graduates of the program report appropriate rates of job placement and/or success in subsequent education? Do they achieve their academic and career objectives?*

Faculty

- *Are faculty effectively communicating to students the purposes, content, and practices of the program? Are faculty serving as advisers and mentors to students in ways that are appropriate to the program's objectives, level, and discipline?*
- *To what extent are faculty in the program encouraged and supported to develop techniques and strategies that promote faculty/student and student/student contact and involvement, and enhance student learning?*
- *How are faculty background, training, and scholarship suited to the program? Does faculty scholarship support multiple program goals—for example, research and pedagogy objectives for doctoral programs?*
- *Are measures appropriate to the field, level, and program objectives used to evaluate faculty quality and productivity? Are multiple measures used to evaluate faculty instruction, including student and faculty evaluation?*
- *Does the diversity of faculty background and experience, and the mix of faculty by rank, tenure status, and part-time/full-time status support program goals and objectives?*
- *Do faculty make appropriate use of computer software and instructional technologies?*

Support Services

- *Are library holdings, laboratories, equipment, and space adequate and up to date? Are advising and other student support resources appropriate to support a productive and quality program?*
- *Do the program's computer hardware and software systems appropriately meet instructional needs and enhance student learning? Are computer training and support staff available to faculty?*

Student Demand

- *Do the credit hours, enrollments, or degree production of this program differ significantly from statewide or institutional averages?*
- *Has there been a significant increase or decline in credit hours, enrollments, or degree production of this program?*
- *Is there a continuing need for the program based on student demand?*
- *At the baccalaureate level, is student demand for general education courses met in order to ensure timely degree completion?*

Occupational Demand

- *What are the occupational objectives of students enrolled in the program?*
- *Do state employment projections in occupations related to the program show adequate job openings for graduates?*
- *Is there a continuing need for the program based on occupational demand? Have appropriate adjustments in capacity been made?*

Centrality to Instructional Mission

- *Is the program central to the instructional mission of the university?*
- *To what extent does the program provide instructional support to students and faculty in other programs and for general education?*

Breadth

- *Is there sufficient student interest and demand for all courses, specializations, options, and minors offered as part of the program? Are faculty and resources allocated productively?*

Costs

- *Has there been a significant increase or decrease in the unit costs of the program?*
- *Do the costs of the program deviate significantly from statewide average costs in the discipline? Can a deviation be corrected within existing resources?*

Quality and Productivity

- *What are the unique strengths of the program? How are these strengths reflected in the curriculum and the activities of students and faculty? What particular contributions does the program make to the achievement of institutional priorities and statewide goals and objectives for higher education.*
- *What steps have been taken to improve the quality and productivity of this program? What investment and/or cost savings (annual and five-year projection) resulted from the review of this program?*
- *What resources are needed to implement the changes and improvements resulting from program review? How will these resources be provided?*

~~• Is the program achieving its objectives? Are faculty qualified and productive? Is the curriculum consistent with program objectives and up to date? Are academic support resources (including library, laboratory, and equipment/materials adequate and up to date? Are high standards for student performance maintained? Do students achieve their academic and career objectives?~~

Responses to identified statewide issues may be incorporated into the summary of each program reviewed or may be submitted as a separate section

5. Reporting Requirements for Reviews of Public Service and Research Units

Summaries of the results of the reviews of research and public service units should be submitted on July 1st of each year according to the following guidelines:

A brief summary (one or two pages) should be submitted for each unit reviewed. These summaries should focus on the conclusions of reviews and on the actions taken to improve the quality and productivity of the unit. Reviews of public service and research units should address the following questions, and the key findings and recommendations in each of these areas should be the substance of the summary submitted to the Board of Higher Education.

Demand: Is the demand for the research/public services provided by the unit in balance with the unit's capacity to carry out research/public service? Is there a need for the unit based on external demand and support?

Quality: Is the unit achieving its objectives? Are faculty and staff making significant contributions to the development and/or application of knowledge or to the delivery of services?

Centrality: Is the unit central to the mission of the university? Does the research/public service provided by the unit contribute to instruction of or service to students? Does the research/public service provided by the unit contribute to institutional, regional, or statewide priorities?

Productivity: What steps have been taken to improve the productivity of this unit? Are similar research or public service activities conducted by other units? Are there opportunities for improving collaboration among units or consolidating units? What investment and/or cost savings (annual and five-year projection) resulted from the review of this program?

* Proposed new language is in italics.