

3.7 ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

3.7.1 Purpose

OSRHE will systematically review all academic programs and determine the extent to which those programs are achieving their intended outcomes.

The results of institutions' review of educational programs in connection with this policy will be used at the campus level to make determinations about the quality and efficiency of instructional programs. The program reviews may also be used to assist the State Regents in decision making.

Program reviews may be consolidated up to their major fields of study.

3.7.2 Program Review Standards

The review will encompass all levels of degree programs. All degree programs in the State System are scheduled for review on a five-year cycle unless the institution's Chief Academic Officer requests an alternative cycle based on the unique needs of a program.

Programs that are independently accredited may submit their program accreditation documents to fulfill the policy requirement for program review. These documents should be electronically sent to OSRHE staff in a timely manner.

At the core of the review process is the selection of criteria to be used in the evaluation. Both qualitative and quantitative criteria must be included in the review process. Careful collection and analysis of data is essential to the review process. The various criteria may be weighted differently for each program depending upon its objectives; the evaluation should make clear the relative weight given to the criteria by the institution.

3.7.3 Program Review Criteria

Analysis and assessment of program reviews should be determined from an institutional perspective using the Program Review Criteria or external accreditation standard criteria. The outcome of the qualitative and quantitative program review analysis shall be used to improve program quality and student learning as outlined in this policy. This section is designed to provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate the differences existing among Oklahoma's public institutions while ensuring their program review processes meet consistent measures. Recommendations may include: modifying, suspending, or deleting programs, as set forth in this policy.

These reviews should support but not duplicate HLC standards. Reviews created for the HLC may be submitted as supplemental material.

The minimum criteria listed below are designed to facilitate the analytical evaluation of the present goals and objectives, activities, outcomes, strengths and identify areas of improvement for the program.

A. Program Viability

Program viability refers to the activities and arrangements for insuring its continuing effectiveness and efficiency. To maintain its viability and relevance, a program must plan for the continuous evaluation of its goals, clientele served, educational experiences offered, educational methods employed, including the effective incorporation of technology, and the use

of its resources. This vital principle or force can best be observed by examining the past and present initiatives to ensure the viability of the faculty, students, and program.

1. Program Objectives and Goals

Objectives should be written so that the need they address is clear; program outcomes can be assessed; and program clientele are specified. Program objectives and goals are extremely important not only because they guide the activities of the program but also because they provide the context for program assessment and planning.

2. Quality Indicators

Quality indicators may vary by institutional mission; however, institutions should measure the efforts and quality of their programs by: faculty quality, ability of students, achievements of graduates of the program, curriculum, academic resources, access to information technology resources including efficiencies and improved learner outcomes through appropriate use of this technology and appropriate use of instructional technology to achieve educational objectives, special services provided to the students and/or community, and other critical services. As appropriate, institutions should evaluate the program against industry or professional standards utilizing internal or external review processes. Institutions must provide specific documentation of student achievement. The documentation should include programs outcomes assessment data consistent with the State Regents' *Student Assessment Plan* policy. Program quality may also be reflected by its regional or national reputation, faculty qualifications, and the documented achievements of the graduates of the programs. This includes a program self-review that provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

If the program is delivered in an online modality, the documentation should include distance education quality standards listed in State Regents' Policy 3.17.

3. Minimum Productivity Indicators

The following are considered to be the minimum standards for degree program productivity (averaged over five years). Programs not meeting these standards may be identified for early review as low producing programs. Institutions will be notified of programs not meeting either one of the two standards listed below and other quantifiable measures in this section.

a. Degrees conferred:

Associate in Arts and	
Associate in Science	5
Associate in Applied Science	5
Baccalaureate Level	5
Master's Level	3
Doctoral Level	2

b.	Majors Enrolled:	
	Associate in Arts and	
	Associate in Science	25 head count
	Associate in Applied Science	17 head count
	Baccalaureate Level	12 head count
	Master's Level	6 head count
	Doctoral Level	4 head count

4. Other Quantitative Measures

- a. The number of courses taught exclusively for the major program for each of the last five years and the size of classes for each program level listed below:

Associate in Arts and Associate in Science
 Associate in Applied Science
 Baccalaureate Level
 Master's Level
 Doctoral Level

- b. Student credit hours by level generated in all major courses that make up the degree program for five years.

- c. Direct instructional cost for the program for the review period.

- d. The number of credits and credit hours generated in the degree program that support the general education component and other major programs including certificates.

- e. If available, information about employment or advanced studies of graduates of the program over the past five years.

- f. If available, information about the success of students from this program who have transferred to another institution.

The comprehensive support function of the courses supporting the degree program may be used to determine whether an early program review is warranted.

5. The State Regents hold the authority to assess current programs with the aim of evaluating their pertinence, caliber, and necessity at any time.

3.7.4 Low Productivity Review Process

Academic programs that do not meet the minimum productivity standards listed in this policy will be identified and reported to the institutions for further analysis by the institution. Institutions may ask for exceptions under the conditions listed below.

A. Exceptions for Low Producing Programs

Continuation of low producing programs may be justified because of the subject matter, the students served, the educational methods employed, and the effect of the program's achievements on other institutions or agencies. These programs may be maintained at an institution if acceptable justifications are made. Exceptions for low productivity will

be considered on the basis of adequate data and narrative to support the rationale to allow an exception to productivity requirements and other exceptions as noted below:

1. Liberal Arts and Sciences Programs. These liberal arts and sciences programs support the general education component and other degree programs, (e.g., Math, English, etc.).
2. Offline Programs. Programs scheduled for deletion or suspension.
3. Restructured Programs. These programs have undergone or are expected to undergo significant modifications to the curriculum that will increase the programs' viability and are expected to meet minimum productivity within a given time period.
4. Special Purpose Programs. The programs are designed to meet the special needs of the state and its constituents (e.g., Native American Studies, grant-funded programs).
5. Data Discrepancies or Data Interpretations. These programs appear on the low productivity report due to verifiable factual errors and can be verified by the submission of accurate data.
6. No Cost/Justifiable Cost Programs. Programs that require no additional cost or justifiable costs are not expected to meet minimum standards for productivity as listed in this policy.
7. Collaborative Programs. Programs offered collaboratively by more than one institution, where the combined productivity for both institutions meets the minimum productivity standards.

B. Reporting

Programs identified for low productivity that are not granted an exception as allowed by 3.7.4.A must identify one of three plans of action as outlined below to increase productivity.

1. Grow the program. Institutions must provide a plan that outlines strategies for enhancing program productivity.
 - a. Institutions shall provide an annual status report on the strategies outlined in the plan.
 - b. Failure to bring the program to minimum productivity standards by the fifth year will require the institution to sunset the program.
2. Collaborate. Institutions must develop and submit plans to collaborate in innovative ways with other State System institutions.
 - a. Institutions shall provide an annual status report on the strategies outlined in the plan.
 - b. Failure to bring the program to minimum productivity standards by the fifth year will require the institution to sunset the program.
3. Sunset the program. Institutions must provide documentation of a plan to suspend or delete the program.

3.7.5 Program Review Reports

Although the length of a written evaluation can be expected to vary with the complexity of the program under consideration, a comprehensive analysis and assessment should be possible within ten or fewer pages. Each program review report must be submitted to the institutional governing board prior to submission to the State Regents and use the Program Review Form available of the OSRHE website. Programs with external accreditation can submit their self-assessments digitally instead of using the Program Review Form. If there's a significant risk of losing the accreditation, the institution must provide the site team's report, any notices from the accrediting organization, and proof that the governing board has been informed.

A. State Regents' Review and Action

Upon review of the self-study or other program materials the staff may request additional information and will provide an annual summary of low producing programs to the State Regents.

B. Conducting the Review Process

Each institution will conduct program review processes and modify internal procedures to improve program review process effectiveness.

Approved October 23, 1985. Revised January 26, 1996; September 5, 1997; January 29, 1999; June 23, 2011; September 7, 2023; December 5, 2024.