



2. an appropriate differentiation of institutional missions and roles within the Regents system;
3. optimal effectiveness in the use of state and student resources; and
4. maximum responsiveness to the intellectual, cultural and workforce needs of the state.

Although the overarching purposes remain the same, the goals and operation of program review vary at the campus and system levels. A differentiation of goals implies that the campuses and the system have different responsibilities in the program review process.

Program review begins at the campus level, where its goals include but are not limited to:

1. strengthening the quality and accessibility of academic programs by assessing existing program



### **Programs Requiring Additional Review or Monitoring for Improvement**

The annual program review process includes both review of individual programs on the regular 8-year cycle, and analysis of the program data provided by campuses to KSPSD. Based on these reviews, some programs will be identified for additional review, while others may be recommended for elimination. In each case, Board staff will consult with staff at institutions and report to the Board on the status of such programs.

#### Programs Selected for Additional Review or Monitoring

Based on review of both qualitative reports and of these data, Board staff and/or institutions will identify areas of possible concern and consult with institutions to determine what, if any, steps should be taken to resolve problem areas. Institutions may find that some programs require additional review, beyond that provided by the regular review cycle. In addition, some programs may require monitoring for a period of time to assess their progress in rectifying problems identified in the regular program review. Guidelines for prompting additional review or monitoring include minimum data criteria in specific categories. Academic programs which fail to meet any one of these minimum criteria may be targeted for intensive reviews in addition to the regularly scheduled self-study.

Specific data minima that potentially trigger additional review are provided to institutions annually by Board staff. Guidelines are annually reviewed by the Board's Data, Research, and Planning and Academic Affairs staff.

In addition to programs identified by the minima ta

3. A one-page institutional estimate of the fiscal implications of any recommended program changes.

Board staff will develop its required annual program review report on information provided by the institutions on each program, analysis of data in the minima tables, and consultation with the institutions.