**COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW**

**INSTRUCTION GUIDE**

*Approved July 11, 2012*

*Revised for Fall 2021*

Purpose: Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) is a set of procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of academic programs through a systematic review. Its purpose is to address the quality, viability, and productivity of efforts in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service as appropriate to the institution’s mission. The review of academic programs shall involve analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Institutions must demonstrate that they make judgments about the future of academic programs within a culture of evidence.

*Board of Regents Policy Manual* §3.6.3 states:

*Each USG institution shall conduct academic program review on a periodic basis. Consistent with efforts in institutional effectiveness and strategic planning, each USG institution shall develop procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic programs to address the quality, viability, and productivity of efforts in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service as appropriate to the institution’s mission. Institutional review of academic programs shall involve analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, and institutions must demonstrate that they make judgments about the future of academic programs within a culture of evidence. Planning and conduct of academic program reviews shall be used for the progressive improvement and adjustment of programs in the context of the institution’s strategic plan and in response to findings and recommendations of the reviews. Adjustment may include program enhancement, maintenance at the current level, reduction in scope, or, if fully justified, consolidation or termination. (BoR Minutes, April 2010)*

*Except for programs requiring a formal accreditation review, an institution’s cycle of review for all undergraduate academic programs shall be no longer than seven (7) years, and for all graduate programs no longer than ten (10) years. Newly approved programs should automatically be reviewed seven years after launch. If successfully reviewed, the new program will then become part of the regular institutional cycle. If unsuccessful, the institution will present a plan of action to the System Office. Programs accredited by external entities may not substitute an external review for institutional program review, but material submitted as part of an external accreditation process may be used in the institutional review. Institutions may align program review cycles with required external accreditation review, so long as no program review cycle at any level exceeds ten (10) years. Institutions must also review career Associate degrees, Associate of Arts in a specific discipline/major, and Associate of Science in a specific discipline/major every five (5) years; review General Education every five (5) years; learning outcomes for each Area A-E of institutional core curricula must be approved by the Council on General Education. Institutions are also encouraged to review Learning Support programs. (BoR Minutes, April 2010; May 2016)*

In accord with BOR Policy, Valdosta State University both provides and collects data on all programs annually. This data is distributed and disseminated as follows:

* Through the Data Warehouse, Department Heads will be provided instructions how to retrieve data for each semester for all degree programs. Reports have been pre-built by the Data Warehouse team for Program Review.

According to the designated comprehensive program review (CPR) cycle, each program will complete this CPR document.

**CPR GUIDELINES:**

1. CPR should be an open process in which data is disseminated and discussed across departments. All departmental members should have the opportunity to view the data, to discuss its implications, and to make suggestions.
2. The CPR process should allow programs to discuss questions such as the following: Where do we need or want to go? What do we need to get there? What will happen if we are unable to get there?
3. Each program should evaluate its annual collected data in terms of the following criteria:
   1. Productivity:the number and contributions of graduates of an academic program and/or the number of students served through service courses in the context of the resources committed to its operation. (Additional measures of productivity might include counts of students who meet their educational goals through the program's offerings, including minors, certificates, or job enhancement, if such goals are part of the program's mission.)
   2. Viability:the use of such considerations as available resources, student interest, career opportunities, and contributions to the goals and mission of the institution, University System, and state to determine whether a program should be continued as is or modified (expanded, curtailed, consolidated, or eliminated). Viability considerations are independent of quality measures; i.e., a high quality program could lack viability, or a program in need of considerable improvement could have high viability
   3. Quality: measures of excellence. Quality indicators may include, but are not limited to, attainment of student learning outcomes, a comparison of program elements relative to internal and external benchmarks, resources, accreditation criteria, relevant external indicators of program success (e.g., license and certification results, placement in graduate schools, job placement, and awards and honors received by the program), and other standards.

**CPR TIMELINE:**

* In the fall of the designated year for CPR, the program should review the provided data from the previous four years or since the last CPR review.
* By the conclusion of fall semester, the program will have completed the attached program review analysis and shared results with the entire department.
* At the beginning of spring semester, the program will submit the CPR analysis with relevant appendices to the dean who will review and, if necessary, meet to discuss results.
* The dean will add his or her written recommendation and forward the CPR reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
* Before the end of spring semester, the Provost reviews recommendations and provides a response to the dean and to the program.

**TRANSMITTAL FORM**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Degree Program Name  (ex. BBA Accounting) | CIP Code | Department |
|  |  |  |
| **Review Year** | **Last Review Year** | Primary Contact  (name and email) |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Action | Responsible |
| September 15 | Attend CPR Orientation Meeting | Division of Academic Affairs |
| September 15-December 31 | Prepare CPR analysis;  Share results with program/department faculty;  Incorporate faculty feedback;  Submit final CPR analysis to Dean | Department Head, Program Coordinator, and/or Faculty CPR Committee |
| January 1- February 15 | Review CPR with department, if required;  Add Dean’s comments;  Send CPR to Provost’s Office | Dean |
| February 16- March 31 | Review CPR;  Meet with program representatives, if required;  Attach Provost’s recommendation | Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs |
| by April 15 | Upload CPR summary to USG | Division of Academic Affairs |

**CPR Analysis Summary  
Prepared by Department**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Degree Program: | Date Submitted: | Years of Data Examined: |
| For each of the five questions submitted, responses should be no more than one typed page (single-spaced with double spacing between paragraphs). A one page introduction outlining the recommendations from the last comprehensive review should be included as well as a one page conclusion summarizing the department’s vision for the next five years. Documentation to support conclusions should be attached as appendices and based on information from the data portal and other departmental sources. | | |
| 1. **What strengths does the program exhibit in productivity, viability, and quality?** | | |
|  | | |
| 1. **What weaknesses does the program exhibit in productivity, viability, and quality?** | | |
|  | | |
| 1. **What opportunities are open to the program?** | | |
|  | | |
| 1. **What threats does the program face?** | | |
|  | | |
| 1. **What action steps should the program pursue over the next five years?** | | |
|  | | |

**DEAN’S CPR RECOMMENDATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Degree Program: | | Date Submitted: | Years of Data Examined: | |
| 1. **Do you concur with the program’s evaluation of strengths in terms of productivity, viability, and quality?** | | | | |
| Yes  No | COMMENTS: | | | |
| 1. **Do you concur with the program’s evaluation of weaknesses in terms of productivity, viability, and quality?** | | | | |
| Yes  No | COMMENTS: | | | |
| 1. **Do you concur with the program’s evaluation of available opportunities?** | | | | |
| Yes  No | COMMENTS: | | | |
| 1. **Do you concur with the program’s identification of potential threats?** | | | | |
| Yes  No | COMMENTS: | | | |
| 1. **Do you concur with the program’s identification of action steps for the next five years?** | | | | |
| Yes  No | COMMENTS: | | | |
| **SIGNATURE** | | | | **DATE** |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**PROVOST’S CPR RECOMMENDATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Degree Program: | Date Submitted: | Years of Data Examined: | |
| **UNDERSTANDING THAT NO PROGRAMS CAN REMAIN AT the STATUS QUO, WHICH FUTURE action is recommended?** | | | |
| Program Enhancement: Add value to the existing program by expanding degrees, programs, or tracks.  Program Maintenance: Continue operations of the program with progressive improvements to address quality, viability, and productivity (i.e., new course delivery methods, recruitment and retention of additional students, etc.).  Program Reduction: Decrease size and/or scope of the program.  Program Consolidation: Investigate program/department merger partners.  Program Termination: Cease new student enrollment; enter student teach-out phase. | | | |
| **Comments** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **SIGNATURE** | | | **DATE** |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |