

Prepared by Office of Planning and Policy.  
This update replaces Policy E5.202  
dated June 1983.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I

---

EXECUTIVE POLICY - ADMINISTRATION

---

June 1987

P 1 of 10

E5.202 Review of Established Programs




I. INTRODUCTION


This Executive Policy directs implementation of Sections 5-1a(3) and 5-2a of the Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies. The following objectives, policies, and guidelines provide for the systematic monitoring, review, and evaluation of established academic programs at the University of Hawai'i. The Vice President for Academic Affairs at Manna and Chancellors are called upon to develop implementing procedures and schedules as appropriate for their campuses.

II. OBJECTIVES

The Objectives of this executive policy are:

- 
1. To provide for a periodic examination by faculty and administration of the extent to which established academic programs are meeting their stated objectives and the extent to which these program Objectives are still appropriate to the campus, Unit and University missions.
  2. To specify the unit of analysis for the review of established programs.
  3. To establish guidelines and procedures for the preparation and processing of reviews of established programs.
  4. To assure the administration and Board of Regents that appropriate follow-up activities are undertaken in response to concerns addressed by the review.

III. POLICIES

1. Definition of established program. For the purposes of program review, an established program is any one or set of degree/certification programs and/or areas of instruction that are judged by the campus to be sufficiently interrelated in objectives, clients served, resources used, or other components to justify a common identification for purposes of evaluation. (Appendix A suggests guidelines for identifying appropriate groupings for review.)
- 

2. Review requirement and schedules. All degree/certificate programs that have been approved by the Board of Regents as Continuing programs and all instructional areas that utilize substantial University resources are subject to review at least once every five years on a schedule to be developed by the campus and submitted by either the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or Chancellors to the Office of the President. Completed reviews will be kept on file in the offices of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or Chancellors, and shall be available upon request by the President or other universitywide offices.
  
3. Content and method of review. The review of established programs begins with a self-study. A quantitative profile of program activity and resource indicators is prepared Centrally and transmitted to the responsible program personnel for analysis and inclusion in the review document (see Appendix B). The program submits a review document including at least the following information. Appendix C details specific guidelines to Consider in the program evaluation.
  - a. A statement of the program objectives. Where appropriate this should be taken from the program proposal on which establishment of the program was based.
  - b. An assessment of whether or not the program is meeting its objectives and a summary of the evidence used to reach this Conclusion. Where appropriate, this should include evidence related to continuing need for the program and, in the case of graduate programs, should specifically address the criteria for evaluation of graduate programs provided in Board policy. (Appendix C includes these criteria.)
  - c. A discussion of unusual features or trends in the quantitative program profile, if any.
  - d. An identification of any present or potential problems that the program personnel believe warrant attention and a plan for addressing those problems that falls within the program's jurisdiction.



Each Unit establishes its own internal procedures for carrying out the self-study (method, participants, etc.) and for any review requirements beyond those specified above. Appropriate faculty and student input must be assured.

In reviewing established programs, maximum use is made of self-study materials prepared in conjunction with accreditation requirements. Review schedules are prepared accordingly. A self-study completed as part of an accreditation review or external program approval process may be submitted in lieu of the

report required above (e.g., professional school accreditation self-studies or self-studies completed by the College of Education, UHM, in conjunction with state approval of teacher education programs). Such reports should be supplemented by the information specified above (a-d) where this is not included in the self-study.

4. Review follow-up. If the basic review required above indicates a need for a more thorough examination of specific issues or problems, the appropriate administrative office, as identified in the Unit procedures, directs follow-up activities or further study as necessary. When Completed this follow-up includes recommendations for addressing the problems identified in the program review process and is shared as appropriate with affected parties.
5. Processing of reviews. Each Unit establishes its own internal procedures for conducting, processing and transmitting reviews of established programs to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or Chancellors' offices. Completed program reviews, including quantitative program profiles as outlined in Appendix B. are retained by Chancellors and the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa. These offices are responsible for providing feedback to the programs under review on key issues raised during the review process. By July 30 of each year the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa and Chancellors report to the President on program reviews completed during the previous year (7/1- 6/30). This report includes a summary list of the reviews completed and attaches a brief (one page) report on each review (see Appendix D). This report summarizes the major conclusions and recommendations of the program review and indicates the actions taken or planned to address significant problems, if any.
6. Special reviews. A special review of a program may be undertaken at any time as deemed necessary by the faculty or administration. The Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or a Chancellor may, if he determines it appropriate, stop-out the admission of new students to a program undergoing a special review for a period of not more than two years. A stop-out in excess of two years requires the recommendation of the President for Board approval. Such a program shall be identified as "stopped-out" with an appropriate explanation in reports, publications, and the like. Students already admitted to a program at the time of the stop-out shall be permitted to complete their studies.

Prior to the effective date of a program stop-out, the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or the Chancellor provides an information item to the President including:

- a. The period of the planned stop-out; and
- b. The purposes of the stop-out -- why the action is deemed necessary, and what will have to happen in order to justify a reopening of program admissions.

During the final semester of the stop-out the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or the Chancellor shall inform the President of results of the review. Specifically, the results of the review shall indicate whether the program will begin admitting new students, recommend Board action to extend the stop-out, terminate the program, or terminate in conjunction with a related new program proposal. In the last case, the requirements for new program proposals apply (see Executive Policy E5.201).

Information on the timing of program stop-outs and reactivations should be forwarded to the Office of the President as early as possible. The Office of the President will retain a record of stop-outs. m e campuses assume primary responsibility for informing students, including new applicants, of stop-out actions. University admissions documents will be adjusted in as timely a fashion as possible. Stopped-out programs will be retained in the University's official curricula listing, with appropriate notation.



Those few programs that regularly have alternate year program admissions will not be considered stopped-out in those years in which students are not accepted. On a case-by-case basis the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa and Chancellors provide an information item to the President regarding their decision to place programs into an alternate year admission pattern. Establishing triennial or longer admission patterns requires Board action.

## Appendix A

### Guidelines for Grouping Instructional Activities for Review

1. Where different levels of degrees or certificates are awarded utilizing the same faculty and other resources, they should normally be reviewed as one program (e.g., a B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in Philosophy are reviewed as the "Philosophy program"; a C.A. and A.S. in Automotive Technology form the "Automotive Technology program").
2. Different levels of academic certification approved by the BOR at different times should be consolidated into one program review after the most recent addition receives its approval for continuation following the provisional cycle. (For example, if a B.A. and M.A. in English are offered and a Ph.D. is approved some years later, the Ph.D. must be reviewed and justified separately at the end of its provisional cycle. Thereafter, however, reviews of the "English program" would include the B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. levels within one review.)
3. Where degrees or certificates which serve separate objectives overlap substantially in resource utilization, they may be reviewed together at the discretion of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or the Chancellor, provided that the review evaluates the extent to which each of the separate objectives is being met (e.g., Business Education programs which initially share a common core of courses, then diverge for specializations leading to different C.A.'s and A.S. degrees, may be reviewed together).
4. The Community College A.A. degree must be reviewed as a program. m e component disciplines which make up the degree may be reviewed as part of the A.A. review or as separate programs at the option of the campus.
5. The Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa and Chancellors may also identify for review instructional program activities which do not lead to a Board approved degree or certificate, if such reviews are deemed to serve the general objectives of the Board of Regents policy on review of established programs.

## Appendix B

### Quantitative Indicators for Program Reviews

The following data are provided for each of the past five years. Wherever possible, data are broken down by the level of instruction (e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate or C.C., C.A., A.S.).

1. Number of majors
2. Student semester hours (SSH) taught, fall semester
3. FTE course enrollment (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduate-level and by 12 for graduate-level courses)
4. Crossover data
5. Number of classes (sections) offered, fall semester
6. Average class size (total student registrations divided by number of classes offered)
7. FTE faculty
8. Student-faculty ratio (FTE course enrollment divided by FTE faculty)
9. Number of degrees earned by major or number of graduates (annual)
10. Budget allocation
11. Cost per SSH

Program \_\_\_\_\_ Unit/Campus \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Year	Level	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)			(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
		# Majors	Fall SSH Taught	FTE Course Enrollment	(a) %own Majors	(b) %within College	(c) %all Others	# Classes	Avg Class Size	FTE Faculty	Student Faculty Ratio	Degrees or Graduates	Budget Allocation	Cost Per SSH
(a)														
(b)														
(c)														
(d)														
(e)														

## Appendix C

### Guidelines for Assessment of Provisional and Established Programs

The self-study addresses the questions below. Parenthetical materials suggest the kinds of information that may be relevant in answering each question. The specific information included in self-studies varies with program circumstances.

1. Is the program organized to meet its objectives?

(Discussion of curriculum, requirements, admissions, advising and counseling, and other aspects of the program, with reference to its objectives.)

2. Are program resources adequate?

(Analysis of number and distribution of faculty, faculty areas of expertise, budget and sources of funds, and facilities and equipment.)

3. Is the program efficient?

(An assessment of productivity and cost/benefit considerations within the overall context of campus and University "mission" and planning priorities. Include quantitative measures comparing, for example, SSH/faculty, average class size, cost per SSH, cost per major with Other programs in the college, on the campus and, as appropriate, similar programs on other UH campuses.)

4. Evidence of program quality.

(A qualitative assessment of the program in relation to competing demands for resources by new programs and continuing programs. Accreditation or other external evaluation, student performance [e.g., on external exams], satisfaction, placement and employer satisfaction, awards to faculty and students, faculty publication record, evaluation of faculty, etc.)

5. Are program outcomes compatible with the objectives?

(Analysis of numbers of majors, graduates, SSHs offered, service to non-majors, employment of graduates, etc., in relationship to objectives.)

6. Are program objectives still appropriate functions of the college and University?

(Relationship to University mission and development plans, evidence of continuing need for the program, projections of employment opportunities for graduates, etc.)



In the case of graduate programs, attention should be given to the following need factors.

- a. The direct relevance of the contribution of the field of study to the professional, economic, social, occupational and general education needs of Hawai'i.
- b. A "national needs factor" that emphasizes the direct relevance of the contributions of the field of study to national needs and where Hawai'i and the University have unique or outstanding resources to respond with quality.
- c. An "international needs factor" that emphasizes the direct relevance of the contributions of the field of study to international needs and where Hawai'i and the University have unique or outstanding resources to respond with quality.
- d. An educational needs factor that indicates the direct relevance of a field of study to basic educational needs for which there is a demand by Hawai'i's population.
- e. The relevance of a field of study as a necessary supporting discipline for quality programs identified by the above criteria.

APPENDIX D

REVIEW OF ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS  
SUMMARY REPORT

CAMPUS	PROGRAM TITLE	CREDENTIALS OFFERED	DATE REVIEW COMPLETED
--------	---------------	------------------------	--------------------------

(Attach a brief - one page -- report for each review.)