

Comprehensive Program Review

Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Comprehensive Program Review Instructions

History

The Comprehensive Program Review template was developed as a summative reporting vehicle for academic program review. This reporting vehicle is for use by University System of Georgia (USG) institutions and the system office in order to ensure adherence to Board of Regents Policy 3.6.3 Comprehensive Program Review and to enable consistency in executive level reporting to the Board of Regents, the system as whole, and external constituents. The assessments provide the institution and the university system, as a whole, with performance measures and benchmarks upon which to determine if programmatic threshold criteria are being met in terms of academic program inputs and outcomes, fiscal sustainability, access for workforce preparedness, degree and major investment planning, cost reduction, constituent transparency, the stewardship of state resources, and critical decision-making concerning the overall academic health of institutions and their respective programs. The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs requested a task force be formed with representatives from the institutional sectors to design and recommend a reporting template to be used by all USG institutions. The subcommittee on Comprehensive Program Review began its work on July 6, 2015 and completed its charge on June 1, 2016. The taskforce membership was comprised of a cross-section of vice presidents for academic affairs and institutional research personnel, comprehensive program review committee membership reflected the varied sectors of the university system and perspectives concerning academic program assessment. The goal of the reporting vehicle was to provide both standardization of reporting along with institutional flexibility and consideration of such factors as mission, program variability, level of degree and major, student and institutional inputs and outcomes, and academic unit composition.

Parameters

The reporting vehicle does not supplant institutional academic program review processes. Institutional processes are to remain intact. It is intended that the reporting vehicle becomes a standardized form that all institutions use to submit to USG. For any sections of the reporting vehicle that do not apply to specific academic programs (e.g., institution only awards associate and baccalaureate level degrees and majors), please indicate not applicable (“NA”) in spaces provided throughout the document. Consistent with academic program reviews, the attached reporting vehicle is a succinct representation of the institution’s demonstration that it has assessed an academic program and made decisions about its future within a culture of evidence. Academic program reviews will be used for continuous improvement and the adjustment of programs within an institution’s mission, strategic plan, and sector within the university system. Definitions and potential sources for indicators/measures of quality, viability, and productivity are found on successive pages within this document.

Comprehensive Program Review

Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Unit of Analysis

The academic program is the unit of analysis. Data resources involve a combination of university system reports, research and policy analysis databases and reports, academic unit data, institutional data from Banner, ADP/PeopleSoft, and other student and academic information systems, institutional assessments, unit self-studies, and/or external reviews. The metrics include qualitative and quantitative measures of progress that provide an institutional context, environmental scan, academic and geographic indicators, and factors specific to the discipline, degree, major, and institution. Information used in preparation for regional and disciplinary accreditation reports as well as external funding agencies and federal agencies may also be replicated where applicable in the reporting vehicle. It is preferable that the final narrative summary of the comprehensive program review be succinct and simultaneously provide enough detail for institutional context such that the result is contained to a maximum of ten (10) pages. Narrative sections are included throughout the document within categorical indicators of productivity, viability, and quality to provide institutional flexibility in relating contextual and disciplinary narratives when discussing programmatic health. The institutional provost/vice president for academic affairs (or designee) has the final signature/sign-off on completed academic report summaries for comprehensive program review.

Accessibility and Final Institutional Approval

The reporting vehicle can be downloaded from the SharePoint – new program review team site (reference url: https://sharepoint.bor.usg.edu/team_sites/academicaffairs/npr/SitePages/Home.aspx) for which access is available to each provost/vice president for academic affairs and her/his designee. The document is available in a downloadable, write-able format. The blank form itself will be available in the SharePoint folder entitled “Forms/Supporting Documents for Institutions.” In addition, to further assist the provost/vice president for academic affairs in sharing the information with academic deans and department heads, the blank form will be available on the public academic programs website at the following url: http://www.usg.edu/academic_programs/changes underneath the section entitled “Program & Curriculum Changes.” Upon completion and appropriate signature, the provost/vice president for academic affairs (or designee) will fill out corresponding institutional identification information (e.g., name of institution, name of academic program, date, etc. in drop-down boxes) and submit the document to SharePoint as an attachment. It is recommended that the document be completed, reviewed, scanned as a .pdf, and then provided as an attachment to the comprehensive program review site. The mechanism for submitting and attaching documents/files is similar to that used for uploading new programs.

Comprehensive Program Review Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Reporting Vehicle

Institution:

Academic Program Name:

CIP Code: _____ **College or School and Department:** _____

Date of Last Internal Review:

Outcome of Previous Program Review (brief narrative statement): Current Date

Program Reviewed at the Institution for this report:

Indicators of Measures of Quality:			
<i>Student Input – Undergraduate Programs</i>	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Standardized Test Scores (if applicable), for undergraduate programs -- ACT or SAT – Choose the standardized examination used and indicate in the space provided below: Number of Students Reported (Total N):			
Freshman Index (as applicable)			
Other - Institutions may substitute other measures of quality (e.g. entry scores or GPA into a degree program such as nursing, business, education) as appropriate. Please briefly discuss what the measure(s) are and how they are defined.			
Institutional Indicators of Quality- Student Input (campus determined). Please define what Indicators are used and how they are interpreted.			
<i>Student Output – Undergraduate Programs</i>	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Average Exit scores or Pass Rate on national/state exams for licensure (as appropriate) Also indicate the number of students reporting scores for the test(s) (Total N):			
Average Graduating Major GPA or Cumulative GPA for the Academic Year. Please indicate which GPA is used: Also indicate the number of students reporting scores for the test(s) (Total N):			
Employment rates of graduates (if available)			
Admission into graduate programs (if available)			
Institutional Indicators of Quality – Student Output (campus determined). Please identify what Indicators are used and how they are defined.			

Comprehensive Program Review
Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Student Input- Graduate Programs	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Average Graduate and/or Undergraduate GPA admitted and enrolled. Also, indicate the number of students reported (Total N).			
Standardized Test Scores (if applicable), for graduate programs --- GRE, GMAT, LSAT, MCAT - Choose the standardized examination and indicate in the space provided below. Also, indicate the number of students reporting scores for the test(s) (Total N):			
Institutional Indicators of Quality- Student Input (campus determined). Please define what Indicators are used and how they are interpreted.			
Student Output – Graduate Programs	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Average Exit Scores on National and State Licensure and/or Certification Exams OR Average Pass Rate (as appropriate) Specific Exam: Also, indicate the number of students reporting scores for the test(s) (Total N):			
Graduating Major or stand-alone degree GPA scores <i>Indicate whether Major GPA or Cumulative Graduation GPA is used:</i> Indicate the number of students reported (Total N).			
External Quality Assurance (e.g., professional accreditation, surveys, market rankings)			
Institutional Indicators of Quality- Student Output (campus determined). Please define what Indicators are used and how they are interpreted.			
Narrative Section: Describe additional details as deemed appropriate (the box is expandable).			

Comprehensive Program Review
Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Faculty	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Number of Terminally Degreed Faculty in the Department (regardless of whether the faculty teach in the program)			
Number of Non-terminally Degreed Faculty In the Department (regardless of whether the faculty teach in the program)			
Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Total amount of sponsored research funding awarded for the academic year			
Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Other External funds for program support. Provide the total amount for the academic year.			
Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Number of peer-reviewed publications for the academic year.			
Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Number of faculty research fellowships awarded in the academic year.			
Institutional Indicators of Faculty Quality- Output (campus determined) Please define what Indicators are used and how they are interpreted.			
External Quality Assurance (e.g. professional accreditation surveys; market rankings) Please define what Indicators are used and how they are interpreted.			

Comprehensive Program Review
Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Narrative Section: Describe additional details as deemed appropriate (*the box is expandable*).

Curricular Alignment and Currency to the Discipline as well as Workforce/Occupational Need and Demand
Narrative Section: Describe additional details as deemed appropriate (*the box is expandable*).

Comprehensive Program Review
Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Indicators of Measures of Viability:			
<i>Internal Demand for the Program</i>	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Number of students who completed an application to the program (if an applicable process is in place)- Institution determines the milestone for reporting purposes (e.g. point in time formal applications are reviewed and acceptances are granted)			
Number of students who are admitted to the program --- Institution determines the milestone for reporting purposes (e.g., formal admittance to a degree program)			
Number of students in the degree program --- Institution determines the milestone for reporting purposes			
Standard Faculty Workload for the degree program (example: 3/3, 4/3, etc.)			
Number of Faculty (tenured/track and non-tenured) supporting the degree program within the department			
Number of Faculty (tenured/track and non-tenured) supporting the degree program outside the department			
Number of Full-Time faculty teaching in the program			
Number of Part-Time faculty teaching in the program			
Narrative Section: Describe additional details as deemed appropriate (the box is expandable).			

Comprehensive Program Review
Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Indicators of Measures of Productivity:			
<i>Time to Degree</i>	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Undergraduate student time to degree (average, in years) for non-transfer students graduating in the academic year (AY)			
Undergraduate student time to degree (average, in years) for transfer students graduating in the academic year (AY)			
Institution specific factors impacting time to degree. Describe additional details as deemed appropriate.			
Graduate student time to degree (average, in years) graduating in the academic year.			
Institution specific factors impacting time to degree Describe additional details as deemed appropriate.			
<i>Graduation - Only provide data for the level of program being reviewed.</i>	AY 2013	AY 2014	AY 2015
Number of degrees awarded in the program for the academic year.			

Comprehensive Program Review
Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Provost/VPAA Categorical Summation:

Check any of the following to categorically describe action(s) the institution will take concerning this program.

Program MEETS Institution's Criteria

_____ Program is critical to the institutional mission and will be retained.

_____ Program is critical to the institutional mission and is growing or a high demand field and thus will be enhanced.

Program DOES NOT MEET Institution's Criteria

_____ Program will be placed on a monitoring status.

_____ Program will undergo substantive curricular revisions.

_____ Program will be deactivated.

_____ Program will be voluntarily terminated.

_____ Other (identify/add text): _____

Comprehensive Program Review

Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Contextual Closing Narrative: In the space provided below (*and can be expanded*), provide a summative narrative concerning the academic program. The final statement, among other points, includes information concerning the academic program's achievements, benchmarks of progress, and areas of distinction, challenges, and aspirations, in addition to plans for action. Please share how comprehensive program review results were used for continuous improvement. The closing statement also is an opportunity to highlight shifting trends and market forces that might impact program demand (1,500 word limit).

Provost/VPAA Signature and Date: _____

----- OR -----

Provost/VPAA's Designee Signature and Date: _____

Comprehensive Program Review

Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

Definitions, Guidelines, and Examples

INDICATORS OF MEASURES OF QUALITY

Note/Caveat: Examples of each of the measures are provided below. These are examples only. Other sample indicators may be identified by the institution.

Student Input – Undergraduate Programs

***Standardized Test Scores (if applicable), for undergraduate programs**

For test score reporting, please use the highest score utilized for admission. Provide the average score for all students admitted in the program for the academic year.

For the SAT, use either the SAT Combined score (if available) or sum the student's Verbal and Math score before averaging. If the institution is using the new SAT score, please convert to the old score.

<https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/pdf/higher-ed-brief-sat-concordance.pdf>

For ACT, please use the ACT Composite score.

Note on GED: If reporting GED Scores, please provide the GED Total Score.

Freshman Index

Provide an average FI for students admitted to the program for the academic year.

Defined: From the Academic & Student Affairs Handbook, the Freshman Index (FI) is computed as the following:

FI = 500 x (HSGPA) + SAT Verbal/Critical Reading + SAT I Math (or)

FI = 500 x (HSGPA) + (ACT Composite x 42) + 88

External Quality Assurance (e.g., professional accreditation surveys; market rankings) -

Examples:

Programmatic/Disciplinary Accreditors

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CSSE)

National Research Council

In providing these data, please discuss what metric(s) are used and how they adequately reflect the quality of the program. Provide definitions and context for comparison as necessary.

Institutional Indicators of Quality – Student Input (*campus determined*)

Examples:

Number of students and distribution

Average ability of students and distribution

Standard testing measures

Incoming Grade Point Average/Entering GPA Score (GPA used in entry to the program)

In providing these data, please discuss what metric(s) are used and how they adequately reflect the quality of the program. Provide definitions and context for comparison as necessary.

Comprehensive Program Review ***Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions***

Student Output – Undergraduate Programs

Exit scores on national/state exams for licensure (pass rate or number of passing students, as appropriate)

Graduating major or Cumulative GPA scores (*campus determined*)

Major GPA is calculated using grades earned in courses designated as 'major' courses. Major courses are determined by the academic department and are directly associated with the field of study. <<<<< ***Either / Or*** >>>>>

Cumulative GPA at Graduation is calculated using the grades earned in all courses taken while the student is enrolled.

Employment rates (if available). When providing, include the time period (i.e. 45% employment rate 1-year post-graduation, 78% employment rate 5 years post-graduation). Also, note the graduating cohort (i.e. employment rate, 1-year post-graduation for **AY 2012** graduates reported in AY 2013).

Entry into graduate programs (if available). When providing, include the time period (i.e. 5% in graduate study 1-year post-graduation, 22% in graduate study 5 years post-graduation). Also, note the graduating cohort (i.e. graduate study rate, 1-year post-graduation for **AY 2012** graduates reported in AY 2013).

Institutional Indicators of Quality – Student Output (*campus determined*)

Examples:

- Completion and continuation rates
- Completer satisfaction
- Employer satisfaction
- Attrition Rates
- Starting Salaries
- Stakeholder Satisfaction
- Undergraduate student learning outcomes and competencies

In providing these data, please discuss what metric(s) are used and how they adequately reflect the quality of the program. Provide definitions and context for comparison as necessary.

Student Input – Graduate Programs

Entering GPA Score

Provide the Average GPA (Graduate and/or Undergraduate) of students admitted and enrolled in the program for the academic year as appropriate to the degree level. Report the Entering GPA average that is appropriate to the program (i.e. Undergraduate GPA for Master's program, Graduate GPA for Doctoral program). Please use the GPA that was reported and used for admission. Provide the average score for all students in the program.

Comprehensive Program Review

Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

***Standardized Test Scores (if applicable), for graduate programs --- GRE, GMAT, LSAT, MCAT -**

The average test score for a particular test utilized for admission should be reported for that academic year. For test score reporting, please use the highest score utilized for admission. Also, please include subject test score averages for those tests which report them (i.e. GRE). Include the number of test takers for each test.

Institutional indicators of Quality – Student Input (campus determined) -

Examples:

- Number of students and distribution
- Average ability of students and distribution
- Standard testing measures

In providing these data, please discuss what metric(s) are used and how they adequately reflect the quality of the program. Provide definitions and context for comparison as necessary.

Student Output – Graduate Programs

Exit scores on national/state exams for licensure (pass rate or number of passing students, as appropriate)

Graduating major or Cumulative GPA scores (*campus determined*)

Major GPA is calculated using grades earned in courses designated as 'major' courses. Major courses are determined by the academic department and are directly associated with the field of study. <<<<< ***Either / Or*** >>>>>

Cumulative GPA at Graduation is calculated using the grades earned in all courses taken while the student is enrolled.

External quality assurance (e.g., professional accreditation, surveys, market rankings)

Institutional Indicators of Quality – Student Output (campus determined)

Examples:

- Completion and continuation rates
- Completer satisfaction
- Employer satisfaction
- Attrition Rates
- Starting Salaries
- Graduate student learning outcomes and competencies

In providing these data, please discuss what metric(s) are used and how they adequately reflect the quality of the program. Provide definitions and context for comparison as necessary.

Comprehensive Program Review ***Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions***

Faculty

Number of Terminally Degreed Faculty in the Academic Department where the program resides.
Include all faculty, whether supporting the program or not.

Number of Non-Terminally Degreed Faculty in the Academic Department where the program resides.

Include all faculty, whether supporting the program or not.

Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Amount of sponsored research funding awarded during the academic year.

Provide the dollar amount of new sponsored research funding awarded for the academic year by faculty in the academic program.

Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Other external funds for program support awarded during the academic year.

Provide the dollar amount of new external funding awarded for the academic year by the academic program.

Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Number of peer-reviewed publications published by the program faculty during the academic year.

Undergraduate or Graduate programs: Number of faculty research fellowships awarded to the program faculty during the academic year.

Institutional Indicators of Faculty Quality – Output (*campus determined*)

Examples:

Meet the requirements of the parent institution for undergraduate education

Meet the requirements of the parent institution for graduate research and doctoral education

In providing these data, please discuss what metric(s) are used and how they adequately reflect the quality of the program. Provide definitions and context for comparison as necessary.

Comprehensive Program Review ***Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions***

INDICATORS OF MEASURES OF VIABILITY

Note/Caveat: Examples of each of the measures are provided below. These are examples only. Other sample indicators may be identified by the institution.

Internal Demand for the Program

Number of students who submitted a completed application to the degree program (*if an applicable process is in place*) for the academic year

Number of students who are admitted to the program for the academic year

Number of students enrolled in the degree program for the academic year

Enrollment by Program Report- Enrollment metrics are available per program at the following system office web link:

http://www.usg.edu/assets/research/documents/enrollment_reports/srpt407a_fall2011_fall2015.pdf

Faculty workload

The standard workload of faculty teaching in the program. Do not attempt to average the workload; instead, provide the most common workload (i.e. 3/3 or 4/3).

Number of faculty (tenured/track and non-tenured) supporting the degree program within the academic unit.

This number should be equal to the number of faculty within the department/academic unit that actually teach courses within the program under review. For example, a department has 10 faculty; however, only four of the faculty regularly teach courses in the program under review. Four faculty should be reported in this case.

Number of faculty (tenured/track and non-tenured) supporting the degree outside the academic unit.

This number will be equal to the count of faculty outside the program's home department/unit which regularly teach in the program. Three Sociology Department faculty who regularly teach courses in the Master of Social Work program would be an example.

Total number of full-time faculty teaching within the program

This number will be equal to the total number of all full-time faculty, regardless of home department, teaching courses in the program.

Total number of part-time faculty teaching within the program

This number will be equal to the total number of all part-time faculty, regardless of home department, teaching courses in the program.

Comprehensive Program Review Instructions, Reporting Vehicle, and Definitions

INDICATORS OF MEASURES OF PRODUCTIVITY

Note/Caveat: Examples of each of the measures are provided below. These are examples only. Other sample indicators may be identified by the institution.

Time to Degree

Undergraduate student time to degree

The average time required to complete an undergraduate program of study in terms of years to graduation. Provide data separately for both non-transfer and transfer students who graduated from the program. Provide data for those students who graduated in the academic year noted in the form.

Count each semester as .33 of a year. For example, a student starts in a program Fall 2010 and graduates Spring 2012. This student's ***time to degree*** is 1.66 years (5 semesters X .33).

Institutional specific factors impacting time to degree (institution to provide narrative details)

Graduate student time to degree

The average time required to complete a graduate program of study in terms of years to graduation. Provide data for those students who graduated in the academic year noted in the form. Count each semester as .33 of a year.

Institution specific factors impacting time to degree (institution to list or provide narrative details)

Graduation

Provide a count of all degrees awarded in the program for the academic year.

Degrees Conferred Report – Degrees conferred/completion metrics are available per program at the following system office web link:

http://www.usg.edu/assets/research/documents/deg_conferred/srpt602_p_rpa_fy2016.pdf