

**SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
SCP-3620**

**SUBJECT:** Policy Regarding Program Review

**REFERENCE:** Title 135, Procedural Rule, West Virginia Council for Community and Technical College Education, Series 10, *Policy Regarding Program Review*

**ORIGINATION:** October 8, 2001

**EFFECTIVE:** May 16, 2019

**REVIEWED:** November 2018

**SECTION 1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To delineate the responsibilities of Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College and its Board of Governors in the review of existing academic programs.

**SECTION 2. SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY**

- 2.1 The Board of Governors of Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College has the responsibility to review at least every five years all programs offered at Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College (the “College”) and in the review to address the viability, adequacy, necessity and consistency with the mission of the programs to the institutional master plan, the institutional compact and the education and workforce needs of the responsibility district. Additionally, the Board of Governors (the “BOG”) as part of the review is to require the College to conduct periodic studies of graduates and their employers to determine placement practices and the effectiveness of the education experience. West Virginia Council for Community and Technical College Education (the Council) has the responsibility for review of academic degree programs, including the use of institutional missions as a template to assure the appropriateness of existing programs and the authority to implement needed changes.

**SECTION 3. DEFINITIONS**

- 3.1 Program - Curriculum of course of study in a discipline speciality that leads to a certificate or degree.
- 3.2 Viability - Tested by an analysis of unit cost factors sustaining a critical mass and relative productivity. Based upon past trends in enrollment, patterns of graduates and the best predictive data available, the College shall assess the program’s past ability and future prospects to attract students and sustain a viable, cost-effective program.
- 3.3 Adequacy - Assessment of the quality of the program. The College shall evaluate the preparation and performance of the faculty and students, and the adequacy of facilities. A valuable (but not the sole) criterion for determining the program’s adequacy is accreditation by specialized accrediting or approving agencies recognized by the Federal Government or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

- 3.4 Necessity - The dimensions of necessity include whether the program is necessary for the College's service region and whether the program is needed by society (as indicated by current employment opportunities, evidence of future needs and rate of placement of the programs' graduates). Whether the needs of West Virginia justify the duplication of programs in several geographic service regions, shall also be addressed.
- 3.5 Consistency with the Mission - The program shall be a component of, and appropriately contribute to, the fulfillment of the institutional and system missions. The review should indicate the centrality of the program to the College, explain how the program complements other programs offered and states how the program draws upon or supports other programs. Both institutional aspects of the program should be addressed. The effects (positive or negative) that discontinuance of the program might have upon the College's ability to accomplish its mission should be addressed.

#### **SECTION 4. POLICY**

- 4.1 The program review process will provide for a review and evaluation of all programs leading to a certificate or degree at the College. To ensure that each program is reviewed at least once every five years, consistent with statutory requirements, approximately 20 percent of all programs will be selected for review each year. The process must allow for early identification of programs that need particular scrutiny to permit changes to be anticipated, appropriate intervention to take place and corrective action to be accomplished within normal institutional planning efforts.
- 4.2 The purpose of the reviews will be to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the viability of, adequacy of and necessity for each academic program, consistent with the mission of the College. Comprehensive institutional self-studies conducted in compliance with accreditation or institutional process and completed within the previous sixty (60) months may be used to provide the base line data for the review, with any necessary updating of factual information or interim reports to the accrediting body. Individual programs that are accredited by specialized accrediting or approving agencies recognized by the Federal Government and/or the Council on Higher Education Accreditation shall be considered to have met the minimum requirements of the review process with respect adequacy.

#### **SECTION 5. BACKGROUND OR EXCLUSIONS**

- 5.1 None.

#### **SECTION 6. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

- 6.1 None.

#### **SECTION 7. RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 7.1 The College will draft, in accordance with the Board of Governors guidelines, a self-study. The BOG then will submit annually by May 31 to the Chancellor for review by the Council a report of the results for each program reviewed. The Program Review Summary Report shall contain the following information:
- 7.1.1 Program title and degree;
  - 7.1.2 Year of last review;
  - 7.1.3 Documentation of continuing need;

- 7.1.4 Assessment information related to expected student learning outcomes and the achievement of the program objectives;
  - 7.1.5 Plans to improve the quality and productivity of the program; and
  - 7.1.6 Five-year trend data on enrollment and degrees awarded.
- 7.2 Responsibilities of the College's Chief Academic Officer: In accordance with the other provisions of this policy, the Chief Academic Officer shall:
- 7.2.1 With approval of the BOG, designate the programs, constituting approximately 20 percent of all programs, to be reviewed during a given year;
  - 7.2.2 Make available a readily accessible computerized data base and other support for the program review process;
  - 7.2.3 Submit, for programs deemed to have met the minimum requirements with respect to adequacy by virtue of special accreditation or approval, the comprehensive institutional self-study conducted in compliance with the accreditation or approval process, a copy of the letter containing the conferral of accreditation or approval and a documented statement regarding program consistency with mission, viability and necessity;
  - 7.2.4 Oversee compilation each year of any self-study to be presented by the College to the BOG;
  - 7.2.5 Oversee compilation each year of the Program Review Summary Report to be provided to the Council by the BOG; and
  - 7.2.6 Ensure compliance with this policy, the Council's Policy Regarding Program Review and any guidelines issued by the Council regarding the program review process.
- 7.3 Program Review Process: The program review process will utilize a collaborative process that includes faculty, students and administrators and must be accomplished within the limits of available staff and resources. Institutional personnel, and perhaps external consultants and BOG staff, will be involved in establishing the specific criteria, standards and process of evaluation for each review and in interpreting the information resulting from the review, bearing in mind that the program review process requires differentiation among levels of degrees. The program review process will be carried out objectively, and persons external to the College will participate in the review. The review will include information obtained from students currently enrolled in the program, graduates of the program, and employers of graduates of the program.
- 7.4 The Academic Affairs Unit is ultimately responsible for preparation of the self-study and a recommendation for action to be presented to the BOG, but the program review process shall include:
- 7.4.1 Program faculty;
  - 7.4.2 Dean of School;
  - 7.4.3 Management Council for Academic Affairs and Student Services (MCAS);

7.4.4 Executive Council;

7.4.5 President's Cabinet.

7.5 Special Program Reviews: Either the Council or the BOG may request at any time that special program reviews be conducted for a given purpose. Formal strategies for conducting such reviews will be developed, consistent with the purpose of the review.

7.6 Institutional Recommendation: The BOG's five-year cycle of program review will result in a recommendation by the College for action relative to each program under review. The College is clearly obligated to recommend continuation or discontinuation for each program reviewed.

7.6.1 If recommending continuation, the College will state whether it intends:

7.6.1.1 Continuation of the program at the current level of activity, with or without specific action;

7.6.1.2 Continuation of the program at a reduced level of activity (e.g., reducing the range of optional tracks) or other corrective action;

7.6.1.3 Identification of the program for further development; or

7.6.1.4 Development of a cooperative program with another institution, or sharing of courses, facilities, faculty and the like.

7.6.2 If the College recommends discontinuance of the program, then the provisions of the Council's policy on approval and discontinuance of programs will apply.

7.6.3 For each program, the College will provide a brief rationale for the observations, evaluation and recommendation. These should include concerns and achievements of the program. The College will also make all supporting documentation available to the Council upon request.

7.7 Committee Recommendation: The appropriate Academic Dean will develop a recommendation for action and present it to the BOG for action and referral to the Council.

7.8 The Executive Council may make recommendations that go beyond those also. The council may request additional information and may recommend continuance on a provisional basis and request program reports.

7.9 Appeals Committee and the Appeals Process: Any disagreement between a final recommendation of the Academic Dean and the recommendation of the academic unit may be appealed to the College's Chief Academic Officer.

## **SECTION 8. CANCELLATION**

8.1 None.

## **SECTION 9. REVIEW STATEMENT**

9.1 This policy shall be reviewed on a regular basis with a time frame for review to be determined by the President or the President's designee. Upon such review, the President or President's designee may recommend to the Board that the policy be amended or repealed.

## SECTION 10. SIGNATURES

---

Board of Governors Chair	Date
--------------------------	------

---

President	Date
-----------	------

**Attachments:** None.

**Distribution:** Board of Governors (12 members)  
www.southernwv.edu

**Revision Notes:** February 2014 - Revisions reflect no substantial changes in procedure or documentation requirements. Revisions provide clarity and reflect changes in management responsibilities or titles.

November 2018 - Revisions reflect the removal of date-specific requirements and updated the program review process to reflect the current organizational structure. The Council practice does not expect said conditions. The Council directs the program review requirements.