**Program Review Discussion - “Raising the rigor and broadening the scope” – after lunch**

Board policy 10.06B states “Each MAU will conduct assessments of all instructional, research, and service programs with respect to quality, efficiency, and contribution to mission and goals. “

University regulation provides the following list of required necessary elements for evaluation:

1. Centrality of the program to the mission, needs and purposes of the university and the unit;
2. Quality of the program, as determined by the establishment and regular assessment of program outcomes. Outcomes should be comprehensive, and indications of achievement should involve multiple measures and satisfy the properties of good evidence.
3. Demand for program services, as indicated by measures such as: credit hour production appropriate to the program's mission, services performed by the program in support of other programs, graduates produced, the prospective market for graduates, expressed need by clientele in the service area, documented needs of the state and/or nation for specific knowledge, data, or analysis, other documented need;
4. Program productivity and efficiency as indicated by courses, student credit hours, sponsored proposals and service achievements produced in comparison to the number of faculty and staff and the costs of program support;
5. Timeliness of an action to augment, reduce or discontinue the program;
6. Cost of the program relative to the cost of comparable programs or to revenue produced;
7. Unnecessary program duplication resulting from the existence of a similar program or programs elsewhere in the University of Alaska statewide system.

Questions

* Is broadening of scope needed? To date only academic certificate and degree programs have reported program review results to the Board. Has there been consistent MAU assessment of research, service or student affairs operations presented to the BOR? Should there be?
* Is greater rigor needed?
  + For academic programs should the BOR provide the MAUs with guidance on the expected number of graduates in a five year period (with exceptions for unique mission related programs, e.g., Yupik) to continue programs? An alternative approach would be to have basic data, such as the number of graduates in 5 years, in the hands of Regents during all program review presentations.
  + Should university regulations be more specific on the cost/efficiency information in program review? The Statewide Academic Council is currently discussing how best to assess cost and efficiency.
  + Should programmatic collaboration across MAUs be addressed in program review, perhaps in the unnecessary duplication element of regulation, and, if so, how?
  + Should occupational forecasts impact program review? Feds appear to be going this way with financial aid.
* Should the quality assessment of academic program review regulations address the the use of high impact teaching and learning practices to ensure that best current practices are being used?