South Carolina
Commission on Higher Education

September 29, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Advisory Committee on Academic Programs

FROM: John Lane, DMA, Director of Academic Affairs

Consideration of Revisions to *Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity*

Background and Introduction

At the Commission meeting on November 6, 2014, Commissioners asked Academic Affairs staff to develop more robust metrics for program monitoring. In response, Academic Affairs staff presented information and suggested revisions to the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) at the January, April, and July 2015 meetings; consulted with higher education agency counterparts in several states; and discussed possible options with the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) at the February and June 2015 meetings. As a result, the Academic Affairs staff presented recommendations to include the following, which the Commission approved on September 3, 2015:

- improving the biennial productivity review by increasing the "satisfactory" threshold for program completers for baccalaureate degree programs;
- changing the criterion for satisfactory program productivity from meeting *either* enrollment *or* completion standards to meeting *both* enrollment *and* completion standards for all programs; and
- implementing a new program-specific review beginning with programs approved in Fall 2015 to assess programs within four to six years of implementation, with final specific review criteria to be agreed upon prior to the first reviews.

Then, at the September 10, 2015 ACAP meeting, Academic Affairs staff recommended the creation of a task force to revise the *Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity* to reflect the improvements and to develop policies and procedures for the new program-specific review. The staff convened a task force comprised of members of ACAP and their designees and the task force met on February 11, 2016, and April 1, 2016, to revise the *Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity*. At its May 19, 2016 meeting, ACAP favorably considered the revisions the task force recommended; these revisions were approved by CAAL on May 24, 2016, and the Commission on June 2, 2016. The task force then continued to develop the policies and procedures for the new program-specific

review by providing feedback electronically during the summer of 2016 about the proposed policies and procedures. Subsequently, the task force finalized the form with the criteria to be used for the review as well as developed a rubric (included in the policy) to be used to evaluate the programs. In addition, the task force recommended that the program-specific review coincide with the biennial program productivity review so that when a new program first becomes eligible for the program productivity review, it would undergo the more in-depth program-specific analysis at the same time. As a result, instead of creating a new policy for the more in-depth program-specific analysis, Commission staff recommend and the task force agreed that the new analysis be embedded in the *Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity.* The task force and Commission staff then made additional edits for clarity to *the Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity.*

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs approve the revisions to the *Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity* that includes the in-depth analysis of recently approved academic degree programs and the review form to be used to evaluate the programs.

Enclosures: Attachment I: Current Policy
Attachment II: Revised Policy with Changes Shown
Attachment III: Revised Policy

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity

Background and Rationale

In its enabling legislation, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education is charged with "examining the state's institutions of higher education relative to…programs and missions," including a review of program offerings with the objective of "reducing duplication, increasing effectiveness, and achieving economies" (§59-103-20 of the *South Carolina Code of Laws 1976 as amended*). Relative to academic programs at the public colleges and universities, the Commission meets this accountability mandate through the approval of new academic degree programs; by ensuring programs offered by the institutions are consistent with their mission; and by monitoring institutional compliance with statewide degree program productivity standards.

The Commission relies on student enrollment and completion data to help measure the effectiveness of existing academic degree programs for a number of reasons. Monitoring student enrollment and completion (degrees awarded) data in academic programs is one factor that may enable the Commission to determine if programs are meeting the needs of students and the state. Other factors may include the program's centrality to the institution's mission, program efficiency, whether the program performs a service function, and the program's ability to meet state workforce needs. The enrollment and completion data, along with other information about the program, can provide information about retention, persistence, and success of students. Therefore, enrollment and completion data could be an early indicator of low productivity, but the program may be considered viable after further scrutiny. In addition, degree program productivity information can be used strategically by institutions and the Commission to help review current programs and guide new program development. Likewise, knowledge, maintenance and use of rigorous productivity standards by the entire higher education community shows a willingness to engage in thoughtful self-evaluation of a core mission area.

Policies

For Commission purposes, academic degree program productivity is defined as the capacity of an academic degree program to enroll majors and award degrees (completion) relative to the criteria established by the Commission. The policies in this document pertain to degree programs offered at public four-year colleges and universities and research institutions only. The Commission maintains separate program productivity policies for degree programs at public two-year institutions.

For purposes of this policy, degree programs are defined as active baccalaureate, master's, specialist, doctor's – professional practice, and doctor's – research/scholarship[1].

1. The following table displays the standards used for measuring academic degree program productivity. Degree programs must meet both of these standards in order to comply with Commission policy.

---

[1] For example, an Ed.S. is a specialist degree program; Ed.D., D.N.P., J.D., Pharm.D., and M.D. are doctor's - professional practice programs; and a Ph.D. or DMA is a doctor's - research/scholarship program.

Academic Degree Program Productivity Standards
(Five-Year Average Benchmarks for Enrollment and Completion)

Degree Level	Major Enrollment	Completion (Degrees Awarded)
Baccalaureate	12.5	8
Master's/ Specialist/ Doctor's – Professional Practice	6	3
Doctor's – Research/Scholarship	4.5	2

2. The Commission will review institutional compliance with the program productivity standards on a biennial basis. Each degree program at each senior institution will be reviewed. Staff will use the Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS) and the Commission's *Academic Degree Program Inventory* as data sources.

3. For purposes of calculating compliance with program productivity standards, the following policies will apply: 1) different degree designations within the same major/six-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code (e.g., B.S./B.A., A.B./B.A., M.S./M.A.) will be counted together; and, 2) jointly offered programs will be counted at each institution offering the degree.

4. The Commission will review active degree programs only. Programs for which the Commission has received official institutional notification of termination will not be reviewed.

5. The Commission will begin review of new academic degree programs in the sixth year of operation for baccalaureate, doctor's - professional practice, and doctor's - research/scholarship programs and in the fourth year of operation for master's and specialist programs.

6. Enrollment and completion data for existing off-site and distance education programs will be counted together with appropriate on-campus programs.

7. Academic degree programs that meet both the enrollment and completion standards receive continuing approval status from the Commission.

8. Unless exempted by the Commission, academic degree programs that fail to meet the productivity standards detailed above are placed on probationary status for a maximum of six years, during which time institutions will be expected to enhance degree program enrollment and completion.

9. For programs placed on probation, institutions must provide a plan for meeting the degree program productivity standards within the six-year probationary period. If this improvement plan is not submitted by the institution by the date requested, the Commission will not accept any new program proposals or program modification proposals until the plan is received.

10. For programs recommended for termination, institutions must provide a plan for complying with the Commission's recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

11. The Commission may award exemptions to the academic program productivity standards for three program productivity review cycles, unless an institution decides to terminate the program during this time. In most cases, programs approved for exemption will be considered essential to the basic mission of the institution or deemed so unique in their subject matter <u>and</u> value to the higher education community in South Carolina as to make them essential. Programs that undergo curricular changes requiring Commission degree program modification approval will lose their exempt status and be reviewed in the next program productivity review.

Procedures

1. During the academic year in which a review occurs, the Commission will distribute to each institution the academic degree program productivity data specific to its array of active degree programs. These data will identify the programs complying with the program productivity standards, those programs failing to meet the standards, and those programs already on probationary status that failed to meet the standards after the six-year probationary period.

2. Institutions will then have the opportunity to respond in writing to program productivity data for those programs that fail to meet the standards. For each noncompliant program, within 30 calendar days of receiving the degree program productivity data, institutions must provide information for Commission staff to use to determine whether to place the program on probation, recommend termination of the program, or grant an exemption for the program. This information may address the following:
   a. The role of the program and its centrality to the institution's mission;
   b. The economic viability of the program, including costs and revenue generated by the program;
   c. Program efficiency or efficiency in the department/college supporting the program (e.g., sharing of faculty and other resources);
   d. The program's ability to meet state workforce needs, including but not limited to licensure/certification exam passage rates;
   e. Whether the program performs a service function (i.e., courses offered in the program are general education courses or the courses serve students from other majors; such an argument should be supported by data about credit hour generation);
   f. Whether the program is purposely designed for low enrollment (e.g., studio or performance programs or programs requiring significant field experience);
   g. Information about specialized accreditation status of applicable programs; or
   h. Any additional information about the viability of the program.

   Failure to provide this information will result in Commission staff making a recommendation based solely on enrollment and completion data.

3. Using the information provided by the institutions, Commission staff will prepare the program productivity report that will include staff recommendations for continuing approval for compliant programs and the following recommendations for noncompliant programs: probation, termination, or exemption.

4. The Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing will consider the biennial report on degree program productivity as drafted by the Commission staff. Pending a favorable recommendation, the Committee will then forward the report to the full Commission for consideration.

5. Pending a favorable review by the full Commission, recommendations for continuing approval status, probation status, and exemption will take effect immediately (i.e., from the date of the Commission meeting at which the report was approved).

6. For programs placed on probation, institutions must provide a plan for meeting the degree program productivity standards within the six-year probationary period. This report must be sent within 90 calendar days from the date of Commission action on initial probationary status. At the end of the probationary period, the Commission will recommend continuing approval status for programs meeting the program productivity standards and termination of programs that again fail to meet the standards. The Commission will remove programs from probation no sooner than the next degree program productivity review. In addition, subsequent reports will recognize any improvements made to programs on probation, including those that have made exceptional progress toward meeting the standards.

7. Programs granted an exemption will be exempt for three program productivity review cycles. When the program is again subject to program productivity review, Commission staff will inquire about any changes in the program that would affect its exemption status. If the reasons for initial exemption still apply, the program will again be recommended for exemption

8. The Commission will forward to the respective chief academic officer of the institution recommendations for the termination of programs that have failed to meet degree program productivity standards after the six-year probationary period. The Commission will request that institutions respond to the agency's executive director within 90 calendar days after a recommendation for termination to detail the institution's plan for complying with the Commission recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity

Background and Rationale

In its enabling legislation, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education is charged with "examining the state's institutions of higher education relative to…programs and missions," including a review of program offerings with the objective of "reducing duplication, increasing effectiveness, and achieving economies" (§59-103-20 of the *South Carolina Code of Laws 1976 as amended*). Relative to academic programs at the public colleges and universities, the Commission meets this accountability mandate through the approval of new academic degree programs; by ensuring programs offered by the institutions are consistent with their mission; and by monitoring institutional compliance with statewide degree program productivity standards.

Policies and Procedures for the Biennial Review of Existing Programs

The Commission relies on student enrollment and completion data to help measure the effectiveness of existing academic degree programs for a number of reasons. Monitoring student enrollment and completion (degrees awarded) data in academic programs is one factor that may enable the Commission to determine if programs are meeting the needs of students and the state. Other factors may include the program's centrality to the institution's mission, program efficiency, whether the program performs a service function, and the program's ability to meet state workforce needs. The enrollment and completion data, along with other information about the program, can provide information about retention, persistence, and success of students. Therefore, enrollment and completion data could be an early indicator of low productivity, but the program may be considered viable after further scrutiny. In addition, degree program productivity information can be used strategically by institutions and the Commission to help review current programs and guide new program development. Likewise, knowledge, maintenance and use of rigorous productivity standards by the entire higher education community shows a willingness to engage in thoughtful self-evaluation of a core mission area.

Policies

For Commission purposes, academic degree program productivity is defined as the capacity of an academic degree program to enroll majors and award degrees (completion) relative to the criteria established by the Commission. The policies in this document pertain to degree programs offered at public four-year colleges and universities and research institutions only. The Commission maintains separate program productivity policies for degree programs at public two-year institutions.

For purposes of this policy, degree programs are defined as active baccalaureate, master's, specialist, doctoral's – professional practice, and doctoral's – research/scholarship programs[1].

---

[1] For example, an Ed.S. is a specialist degree program; Ed.D., D.N.P., J.D., Pharm.D., and M.D. are doctoral's - professional practice programs; and a Ph.D. or DMA is a doctoral's - research/scholarship program.

1. The following table displays the standards used for measuring academic degree program productivity. Degree programs must meet <u>both</u> of these standards in order to comply with Commission policy.

Academic Degree Program Productivity Standards
(Five-Year Average Benchmarks for Enrollment and Completion)

Degree Level	Major Enrollment	Completion (Degrees Awarded)
Baccalaureate	12.5	8
Master's/ Specialist/ Doctor<u>al's</u> – Professional Practice	6	3
Doctor<u>al's</u> – Research/Scholarship	4.5	2

2. The Commission will review institutional compliance with the program productivity standards on a biennial basis. Each degree program at each senior institution will be reviewed. Staff will use the Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS) and the Commission's *Academic Degree Program Inventory* as data sources.

3. For purposes of calculating compliance with program productivity standards, the following policies will apply: 1) different degree designations within the same major/six-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code (e.g., B.S./B.A., A.B./B.A., M.S./M.A.) will be counted together; and, 2) jointly offered programs will be counted at each institution offering the degree.

4. The Commission will review active degree programs only. Programs for which the Commission has received official ~~institutional~~ notification of termination <u>prior to the commencement of the review</u> will not be reviewed.

5. The Commission will begin review of new academic degree programs in the sixth year of operation for baccalaureate, doctor~~'s~~<u>al</u> - professional practice, and doctor~~'s~~<u>al</u> - research/scholarship programs and in the fourth year of operation for master's and specialist programs <u>to allow time to collect initial program and completion data. The first time a program is subject to the biennial program productivity review, it will receive a more in-depth analysis to compare the program to the projections stated in the program proposal approved by the Commission (see the Policies and Procedures for the In-Depth Review of Recently Approved Academic Degree Programs on page 4).</u>

6. Enrollment and completion data for existing off-site and distance education programs will be counted together with appropriate on-campus programs.

7. Academic degree programs that meet both the enrollment and completion standards receive continuing approval status from the Commission.

8. Unless exempted by the Commission, academic degree programs that fail to meet the productivity standards detailed above are placed on probationary status for a maximum of <u>three biennial program productivity review cycles (</u>six years<u>)</u>, during which time institutions will be expected to enhance degree program enrollment and completion. <u>Programs will be recommended for termination if they fail to meet the productivity standards at the end of the six-year period.</u>

9. For programs placed on probation, institutions must provide a plan for meeting the degree program productivity standards within the ~~six-year~~ probationary period. If this improvement plan is not submitted by the institution by the date requested, the Commission will not accept any new program proposals or program modification proposals until the plan is received.

10. For programs recommended for termination, institutions must provide a plan for complying with the Commission's recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

11. The Commission may award exemptions to the academic program productivity standards for three program productivity review cycles, unless an institution decides to terminate the program during this time. In most cases, programs approved for exemption will be considered essential to the basic mission of the institution or deemed so unique in their subject matter <u>and</u> value to the higher education community in South Carolina as to make them essential. Programs that undergo curricular changes requiring Commission degree program modification approval will lose their exempt status and be reviewed in the next program productivity review.

Procedures

1. During the academic year in which a review occurs, the Commission will distribute to each institution the academic degree program productivity data specific to its array of active degree programs. These data will identify the programs complying with the program productivity standards, those programs failing to meet the standards, and those programs already on probationary status that failed to meet the standards after the ~~six-year~~maximum probationary period (six years).

2. Institutions will then have the opportunity to respond in writing to program productivity data for those programs that fail to meet the standards. For each noncompliant program, within 30 calendar days of receiving the degree program productivity data, institutions must provide information for Commission staff to use to determine whether to place the program on probation, recommend termination of the program, or grant an exemption for the program. This information may address the following:
   a. The role of the program and its centrality to the institution's mission;
   b. The economic viability of the program, including costs and revenue generated by the program;
   c. Program efficiency or efficiency in the department/college supporting the program (e.g., sharing of faculty and other resources);
   d. The program's ability to meet state workforce needs, including but not limited to licensure/certification exam passage rates;
   e. Whether the program performs a service function (i.e., courses offered in the program are general education courses or the courses serve students from other majors; such an argument should be supported by data about credit hour generation);
   f. Whether the program is purposely designed for low enrollment (e.g., studio or performance programs or programs requiring significant field experience);
   g. Information about specialized accreditation status of applicable programs; or
   h. Any additional information about the viability of the program.

   Failure to provide this information will result in Commission staff making a recommendation based solely on enrollment and completion data.

3. Using the information provided by the institutions, Commission staff will prepare the program productivity report that will include staff recommendations for continuing approval for compliant programs and the following recommendations for noncompliant programs: probation, termination, or exemption.

4. The Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing will consider the biennial report on degree program productivity as drafted by the Commission staff. Pending a favorable recommendation, the Committee will then forward the report to the full Commission for consideration.

5. Pending a favorable review by the full Commission, recommendations for continuing approval status, probation status, and exemption will take effect immediately (i.e., from the date of the Commission meeting at which the report was approved).

6. For programs placed on probation, institutions must provide a plan for meeting the degree program productivity standards within the six-year probationary period. This report must be sent within 90 calendar days from the date of Commission action on initial probationary status. At the end of the probationary period, the Commission will recommend continuing approval status for programs meeting the program productivity standards and termination of programs that again fail to meet the standards. The Commission will remove programs from probation no sooner than the next degree program productivity review. In addition, subsequent reports will recognize any improvements made to programs on probation, including those that have made exceptional progress toward meeting the standards.

7. Programs granted an exemption will be exempt for three program productivity biennial review cycles. When the program is again subject to program productivity review, Commission staff will inquire about any changes in the program that would affect its exemption status. If the reasons for initial exemption still apply, the program will again be recommended for exemption

8. The Commission will forward to the respective chief academic officer of the institution recommendations for the termination of programs that have failed to meet degree program productivity standards after the six-year probationary period. The Commission will request that institutions respond to the agency's executive director within 90 calendar days after a recommendation for termination to detail the institution's plan for complying with the Commission recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

Policies and Procedures for the in-Depth Analysis of Recently Approved Academic Degree Programs

The first time a program is subject to the biennial program productivity review, it will receive a more in-depth analysis to compare the program to the projections stated in the program proposal approved by the Commission. Similar to the beliefs of most professional accrediting agencies, the Commission regards program review as the single best means to ensure academic program quality. Program review also can facilitate program improvement, and assist in achieving the best use of institutional and state resources. The in-depth analysis for recently implemented programs allows institutions to demonstrate due diligence and explain to internal and external stakeholders how well newer programs are serving students, the

campus community, and the state. The analysis also provides an opportunity to examine the pertinent data associated with such programs so that any necessary changes or adjustments can be made to help guarantee the success and strength of the program in the future. Such an analysis allows institutions to identify and correct any potential issues with recently implemented programs. This analysis helps pinpoint a program's ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities, shed light on strengths and weaknesses, and determine future priorities so as to better serve students' and the state's needs.

Policies

These policies pertain to recently approved degree programs offered at all public colleges and universities.

1. The Commission will conduct the in-depth analysis of recently approved academic degree programs the first time they are subject to the Academic Degree Program Productivity Review (i.e., by the end of year six of implementation for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs and year four for master's and specialist programs[1]).

2. To complete the review, Commission staff will require data about program personnel, student performance, finances, curricular and other programmatic changes, programmatic assessment, and accreditation and licensure information (if applicable). Staff will also use the Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS) as a data source. Any discrepancies in data must be reconciled prior to the report being sent to the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing.

3. Recently approved academic degree programs will be reviewed only once for this in-depth analysis unless the programs are placed on probation as a result of the analysis.

4. Academic degree programs that receive "met" on all sections of the review receive continuing approval status from the Commission.

5. Academic degree programs that receive an "unmet" on any section of the analysis are placed on probationary status for a maximum of two biennial program productivity review cycles (four years). This probationary period is shorter than that of existing programs to ensure that new programs can be adjusted more rapidly to provide the best chance for success of the program.

6. For programs placed on probation, institutions must follow up in writing with a longer and more detailed explanation of the program's perceived weaknesses and provide a plan for meeting the program analysis metrics of the deficient section(s) within the probationary period. If this report is not submitted by the institution by the date requested, Commission staff will not accept any program proposals from that institution until the report is received.

---

[1] Associate degree programs are not reviewed as part of this report, Instead, the in-depth analysis of recently implemented associate degree programs will be included in the Annual Evaluation of Associate Degree Programs.

7. At the end of the probationary period, a follow-up analysis will be conducted of the deficient section(s) and if at that point there is insufficient improvement, the program will be recommended for termination.

8. For programs recommended for termination, institutions must provide a plan for complying with the Commission's recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

The following table displays the rubric used for reviewing academic degree program performance.

Academic Degree Program Review Rubric

Section of Review	Unmet	Met
Personnel	Actual full-time equivalent (FTE) exceeds projections without a qualifying rationale; projected new faculty were not hired; no supervisor identified; program has fewer faculty than originally reported; or qualifications appear suspect (i.e., some program administrators or faculty hold less than the highest terminal degree and have less than 18 hours of graduate coursework in field)	Program accurately projected FTE & has successfully maintained program at anticipated FTE levels; projected new faculty hired; full-time faculty teaching in program with sufficient faculty to deliver program; and program administrator and faculty all hold highest terminal degree in field, or can document a minimum of 18 hours of graduate coursework in the field. A rationale is provided for any increase or decrease in FTE when this number is compared to the original proposal approved by the Commission.
Student Enrollment and Performance	Actual enrollment is less than projected with no upward enrollment trend; graduate placement and employment prospects are not tracked or are poor with less than 60% of graduates finding employment or placement in graduate school; or placement trends are generally negative.	Actual enrollment matches or exceeds projections; enrollment numbers are increasing; initial graduate placements are tracked and available with 60%+ of graduates each year employed or placed in graduate school; and placement rates remain steady or increase over time
Finances: Actual Costs and Sources of Financing	Actual costs are much greater than projected; costs appear to be increasing over time while revenue decreases or remains flat; costs exceed funding for at least two of the years; funding trends	Actual costs are lower than or equal to projections and actual revenue outpaces costs; program is clearly self-sustaining over the long term;

6

	are negative; or insufficient justification given for program costs	and justification is provided for program costs
Curriculum and/or Other Programmatic Changes	Many and varied changes made in curriculum; unclear explanations for changes; or major changes have diverted the program from its original form	Very few and/or minor changes made to curriculum; no fundamental change from the original proposal; and if any changes are made, they are more than adequately justified
Programmatic Assessment	Assessment shows the program is not meeting its objectives; data is not reviewed regularly; or changes made to the program are not supported by the programmatic assessment data.	Assessment shows the program is meeting or exceeding its objectives; data is reviewed annually; and any improvements to the program are made based on the programmatic assessment data (connection is evident).
Accreditation	Accrediting body finds flaws in the program; accreditation has been unnecessarily delayed or no movement toward accreditation; or there is insufficient explanation of status or justification for lack of action	Accreditation is on track and on time; evidence of progress available; accrediting body supports program and is positive in its reviews; and status is clearly explained and progress is evident
Licensure/Certification Exam Passage Rates	Number of graduates becoming certified is low and unsatisfactory; the percentage of those who pass on the first try is less than the expectations or benchmarks set by the licensure/accrediting body; or program does not seem to prepare students well for certification	Number of graduates receiving certification is appropriate; the percentage of those passing on the first try meets the expectations or benchmarks set by the licensure/accrediting body; and program matches expectations

Procedures

1. To complete the in-depth program analysis, the Commission will distribute a form (see Appendix I) to each institution to assess recently approved academic degree programs subject to review that year. These data will be used to evaluate the programs by comparing the projections in the program proposal to the actual productivity of the program.

2. Using the information provided by the institutions, Commission staff will evaluate the programs according to the rubric identified in this policy. This evaluation will be included in the biennial program productivity report and will include staff recommendations for continuing approval for academic degree programs that receive "met" on all sections of the review and probationary status for academic degree programs that receive an "unmet" on any section of the review.

3. The Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing consider the biennial report on degree program productivity as drafted by the Commission staff. Pending a favorable recommendation, the Committee will then forward the report to the full Commission for consideration.

4. Pending a favorable review by the full Commission, recommendations for continuing approval status and probation status will take effect immediately (i.e., from the date of the Commission meeting at which the report was approved).

5. For programs placed on probation, institutions must submit a report explaining the unmet section(s) and providing a plan for meeting the section(s) within the probationary period. This report must be sent within 90 calendar days from the date of Commission action on initial probationary status. This information will be included in a subsequent report to be reviewed by the Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing and the full Commission. At the end of the probationary period, staff will request information about the unmet section(s) to conduct a follow-up review; this information about the follow-up review for unmet sections for programs on probation will be included in that year's program productivity report. If at that point there is insufficient improvement, the program will be recommended for termination. If the program has made sufficient improvement, staff will recommend continuing approval for the program.

6. For programs recommended for termination, Commission staff will contact the respective chief academic officer of the institution to request that institutions respond to the agency executive director within 90 calendar days to detail the institution's plan for complying with the Commission recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Program Review

For Recently Approved Programs

In accordance with the *South Carolina Commission on Higher Education Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity*, this *Program Review* is an assessment that compares a new, approved program's proposed productivity at the time of its application to its outcomes by the end of year six for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs and year four for associate's, master's and specialist programs. The assessment requests data about program **personnel, student performance, finances, curricular and other programmatic changes, programmatic assessment,** and **accreditation and licensure information** (if applicable) to better assess and assure quality programmatic delivery to students. Specific instructions accompany each section.

Name of Institution / Degree Name and Level

Date Program Approved by the Commission:
Proposed Program Implementation Date:
Actual Program Implementation Date:

If the actual implementation date differs from the proposed implementation date, provide an explanation for the change in implementation date.

Personnel

1. Provide information about the qualifications of faculty who oversee and/or teach primarily in the program to help the Commission compare projections for administration and faculty needed to support the program to the actual personnel supporting the program. List program supervisor positions first; highlight faculty identified in the original program proposal approved by the Commission; and place an asterisk (*) next to the rank of new faculty hired for the program following Commission approval. Add and delete rows as needed. N.B. Do not include faculty names.

Administration and Faculty Personnel				
Rank	Full- or Part-time	Courses Taught or To be Taught, Including Term, Course Number & Title, Credit Hours	Academic Degrees and Coursework Relevant to Courses Taught, Including Institution and Major	Other Qualifications and Comments (i.e., explain role and/or changes in assignment; if new faculty, provide hire date)

2. Identify and explain in detail any differences between the faculty listed in the program proposal approved by the Commission and the faculty currently teaching in the program. For example, if there are more or fewer faculty currently supporting the program than stated in the proposal, provide a rationale for this increase or decrease. N.B. Do not include faculty names when explaining the differences.

3. State the total projected and actual annual FTE needed to support the proposed program (i.e., the total FTE devoted just to the program for all faculty, staff, and program administrators). (N.B. provide FTE, not headcount)

Category	Projected FTE	Actual FTE
Administration		
Faculty		
Staff		

4. Explain any differences between the projected FTE needed to support the program and the actual FTE.

Student Enrollment and Performance

1. Provide the estimated enrollment from the original proposal and the actual enrollment in the program from the first year through year five.

Enrollment (Headcount)						
Year	Fall		Spring		Summer	
	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual
FY						
FY						
FY						
FY						
FY						

2. If enrollment projections were not met, explain the reasons why the projections were not met.

3. Provide available information/data for graduate placement rates, including employment and matriculation to graduate school.

Year	Total Number of Graduates	Graduates Employed	Graduates Matriculating to Graduate School	Other (Specify what "Other" is, for example, Military Commission)	Total Percent Employed, in Graduate School, or Other
FY					
FY					
FY					
FY					
FY					

4. Include any additional information about graduate placement rates, if applicable.

5. Describe the methods used to track these graduates.

Finances: Actual Costs and Sources of Finances

1. Identify projected and actual program costs and sources of financing associated with delivering the program.

Financial Support

	First Year of Implementation		Third or Fifth Year of Implementation[1]		Total for the First Three or Five Years of Implementation[2]	
Costs by Year						
Category	**Projected**	**Actual**	**Projected**	**Actual**	**Projected**	**Actual**
Program Administration						
Faculty and Staff Salaries						
Graduate Assistants						
Equipment						
Facilities						
Supplies and Materials						
Library Resources						
Other (Specify)						
Total						
Sources of Financing						
Tuition Funding						
Program-Specific Fees						
State Funding						
Reallocation of Existing Funds						
Federal Funding						
Other Funding (Specify)						
Total						
Net Total (i.e., Sources of Financing - Actual Costs)						

---

[1] Use the third year for associate's, master's and specialist programs and the fifth year for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs.
[2] Use the first three years for associate's, master's and specialist programs and the first five years for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs.

2. Since the program's implementation, explain instances where actual costs diverged from those projected, whether positive or negative.

3. Explain how the program has a negative or positive fiscal impact on the institution overall (i.e., is the program supported by the revenue of other programs, is it self-supporting, or does the revenue generated by the program support other programs at the institution?).

Curriculum and Other Programmatic Changes

1. Attach a current copy of the program curriculum. Describe any changes from the Commission-approved version of the curriculum provided in the proposal and the rationale for these changes. Include increases and decreases in credit hours; course additions, deletions, or modifications; the addition, deletion, or modification of any clinicals, field experiences, internships, or capstone courses; etc.

2. Identify any other changes made to the program since its implementation and explain the rationale for these changes (e.g., changes to the admissions requirements, mode of program delivery, instruction sites, etc.).

Programmatic Assessment

1. Provide the results of the programmatic assessment for the past three years (attach reports if available). Include results for all evaluation measures identified in the proposal originally approved by the Commission; if evaluation measures have changed, explain the changes while providing the results of the new evaluation measures.

2. Describe how often and by whom the programmatic assessment data is reviewed.

3. State whether changes have been made to the program as a result of this assessment; and, if so, describe the changes.

Accreditation (if applicable)

1. Describe the program's accreditation status, including an explanation of delays in seeking or earning programmatic accreditation. Also, attach any reports or recommendations received from the accrediting body regarding the program.

Licensure/Certification Exam Passage Rates (if applicable)

1. Provide information about licensure/certification exam passage rates.

Licensure/Certification Exam Name: _____

Year	Total Number of Graduates	Passage Rate
FY		
FY		
FY		
FY		
FY		

N.B. Repeat this table if there are multiple licensure/certification exams applicable to the program.

2. Identify the expectations or benchmarks in passage rates set by the licensure/accrediting body. Also include the source of this information.

3. Include additional information about Licensure/Certification Exam Passage Rates, if applicable.

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity

Background and Rationale

In its enabling legislation, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education is charged with "examining the state's institutions of higher education relative to…programs and missions," including a review of program offerings with the objective of "reducing duplication, increasing effectiveness, and achieving economies" (§59-103-20 of the *South Carolina Code of Laws 1976 as amended*). Relative to academic programs at the public colleges and universities, the Commission meets this accountability mandate through the approval of new academic degree programs; by ensuring programs offered by the institutions are consistent with their mission; and by monitoring institutional compliance with statewide degree program productivity standards.

Policies and Procedures for the Biennial Review of Existing Programs

The Commission relies on student enrollment and completion data to help measure the effectiveness of existing academic degree programs for a number of reasons. Monitoring student enrollment and completion (degrees awarded) data in academic programs is one factor that may enable the Commission to determine if programs are meeting the needs of students and the state. Other factors may include the program's centrality to the institution's mission, program efficiency, whether the program performs a service function, and the program's ability to meet state workforce needs. The enrollment and completion data, along with other information about the program, can provide information about retention, persistence, and success of students. Therefore, enrollment and completion data could be an early indicator of low productivity, but the program may be considered viable after further scrutiny. In addition, degree program productivity information can be used strategically by institutions and the Commission to help review current programs and guide new program development. Likewise, knowledge, maintenance and use of rigorous productivity standards by the entire higher education community shows a willingness to engage in thoughtful self-evaluation of a core mission area.

Policies

For Commission purposes, academic degree program productivity is defined as the capacity of an academic degree program to enroll majors and award degrees (completion) relative to the criteria established by the Commission. The policies in this document pertain to degree programs offered at public four-year colleges and universities and research institutions only. The Commission maintains separate program productivity policies for degree programs at public two-year institutions.

For purposes of this policy, degree programs are defined as active baccalaureate, master's, specialist, doctoral – professional practice, and doctoral – research/scholarship programs[1].

---

[1] For example, an Ed.S. is a specialist degree program; Ed.D., D.N.P., J.D., Pharm.D., and M.D. are doctoral - professional practice programs; and a Ph.D. or DMA is a doctoral - research/scholarship program.

1. The following table displays the standards used for measuring academic degree program productivity. Degree programs must meet <u>both</u> of these standards in order to comply with Commission policy.

Academic Degree Program Productivity Standards
(Five-Year Average Benchmarks for Enrollment and Completion)

Degree Level	Major Enrollment	Completion (Degrees Awarded)
Baccalaureate	12.5	8
Master's/ Specialist/ Doctoral – Professional Practice	6	3
Doctoral – Research/Scholarship	4.5	2

2. The Commission will review institutional compliance with the program productivity standards on a biennial basis. Each degree program at each senior institution will be reviewed. Staff will use the Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS) and the Commission's *Academic Degree Program Inventory* as data sources.

3. For purposes of calculating compliance with program productivity standards, the following policies will apply: 1) different degree designations within the same major/six-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code (e.g., B.S./B.A., A.B./B.A., M.S./M.A.) will be counted together; and, 2) jointly offered programs will be counted at each institution offering the degree.

4. The Commission will review active degree programs only. Programs for which the Commission has received official notification of termination prior to the commencement of the review will not be reviewed.

5. The Commission will begin review of new academic degree programs in the sixth year of operation for baccalaureate, doctoral - professional practice, and doctoral - research/scholarship programs and in the fourth year of operation for master's and specialist programs to allow time to collect initial program and completion data. The first time a program is subject to the biennial program productivity review, it will receive a more in-depth analysis to compare the program to the projections stated in the program proposal approved by the Commission (see the Policies and Procedures for the In-Depth Review of Recently Approved Academic Degree Programs on page 4).

6. Enrollment and completion data for existing off-site and distance education programs will be counted together with appropriate on-campus programs.

7. Academic degree programs that meet both the enrollment and completion standards receive continuing approval status from the Commission.

8. Unless exempted by the Commission, academic degree programs that fail to meet the productivity standards detailed above are placed on probationary status for a maximum of three biennial program productivity review cycles (six years), during which time institutions will be expected to enhance degree program enrollment and completion. Programs will be recommended for termination if they fail to meet the productivity standards at the end of the six-year period.

9. For programs placed on probation, institutions must provide a plan for meeting the degree program productivity standards within the probationary period. If this improvement plan is not submitted by the institution by the date requested, the Commission will not accept any new program proposals or program modification proposals until the plan is received.

10. For programs recommended for termination, institutions must provide a plan for complying with the Commission's recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

11. The Commission may award exemptions to the academic program productivity standards for three program productivity review cycles, unless an institution decides to terminate the program during this time. In most cases, programs approved for exemption will be considered essential to the basic mission of the institution or deemed so unique in their subject matter and value to the higher education community in South Carolina as to make them essential. Programs that undergo curricular changes requiring Commission degree program modification approval will lose their exempt status and be reviewed in the next program productivity review.

Procedures

1. During the academic year in which a review occurs, the Commission will distribute to each institution the academic degree program productivity data specific to its array of active degree programs. These data will identify the programs complying with the program productivity standards, those programs failing to meet the standards, and those programs already on probationary status that failed to meet the standards after the maximum probationary period (six years).

2. Institutions will then have the opportunity to respond in writing to program productivity data for those programs that fail to meet the standards. For each noncompliant program, within 30 calendar days of receiving the degree program productivity data, institutions must provide information for Commission staff to use to determine whether to place the program on probation, recommend termination of the program, or grant an exemption for the program. This information may address the following:
    a. The role of the program and its centrality to the institution's mission;
    b. The economic viability of the program, including costs and revenue generated by the program;
    c. Program efficiency or efficiency in the department/college supporting the program (e.g., sharing of faculty and other resources);
    d. The program's ability to meet state workforce needs, including but not limited to licensure/certification exam passage rates;
    e. Whether the program performs a service function (i.e., courses offered in the program are general education courses or the courses serve students from other majors; such an argument should be supported by data about credit hour generation);
    f. Whether the program is purposely designed for low enrollment (e.g., studio or performance programs or programs requiring significant field experience);
    g. Information about specialized accreditation status of applicable programs; or
    h. Any additional information about the viability of the program.

    Failure to provide this information will result in Commission staff making a recommendation based solely on enrollment and completion data.

3. Using the information provided by the institutions, Commission staff will prepare the program productivity report that will include staff recommendations for continuing approval for compliant programs and the following recommendations for noncompliant programs: probation, termination, or exemption.

4. The Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing will consider the biennial report on degree program productivity as drafted by the Commission staff. Pending a favorable recommendation, the Committee will then forward the report to the full Commission for consideration.

5. Pending a favorable review by the full Commission, recommendations for continuing approval status, probation status, and exemption will take effect immediately (i.e., from the date of the Commission meeting at which the report was approved).

6. For programs placed on probation, institutions must provide a plan for meeting the degree program productivity standards within the six-year probationary period. This report must be sent within 90 calendar days from the date of Commission action on initial probationary status. At the end of the probationary period, the Commission will recommend continuing approval status for programs meeting the program productivity standards and termination of programs that again fail to meet the standards. The Commission will remove programs from probation no sooner than the next degree program productivity review. In addition, subsequent reports will recognize any improvements made to programs on probation, including those that have made exceptional progress toward meeting the standards.

7. Programs granted an exemption will be exempt for three program productivity biennial review cycles. When the program is again subject to program productivity review, Commission staff will inquire about any changes in the program that would affect its exemption status. If the reasons for initial exemption still apply, the program will again be recommended for exemption

8. The Commission will forward to the respective chief academic officer of the institution recommendations for the termination of programs that have failed to meet degree program productivity standards after the six-year probationary period. The Commission will request that institutions respond to the agency's executive director within 90 calendar days after a recommendation for termination to detail the institution's plan for complying with the Commission recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

Policies and Procedures for the in-Depth Analysis of Recently Approved Academic Degree Programs

The first time a program is subject to the biennial program productivity review, it will receive a more in-depth analysis to compare the program to the projections stated in the program proposal approved by the Commission. Similar to the beliefs of most professional accrediting agencies, the Commission regards program review as the single best means to ensure academic program quality. Program review also can facilitate program improvement, and assist in achieving the best use of institutional and state resources. The in-depth analysis for recently implemented programs allows institutions to demonstrate due diligence and explain to internal and external stakeholders how well newer programs are serving students, the

campus community, and the state. The analysis also provides an opportunity to examine the pertinent data associated with such programs so that any necessary changes or adjustments can be made to help guarantee the success and strength of the program in the future. Such an analysis allows institutions to identify and correct any potential issues with recently implemented programs. This analysis helps pinpoint a program's ability to respond to future challenges and opportunities, shed light on strengths and weaknesses, and determine future priorities so as to better serve students' and the state's needs.

Policies

These policies pertain to recently approved degree programs offered at all public colleges and universities.

1. The Commission will conduct the in-depth analysis of recently approved academic degree programs the first time they are subject to the Academic Degree Program Productivity Review (i.e., by the end of year six of implementation for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs and year four for master's and specialist programs[1]).

2. To complete the review, Commission staff will require data about program personnel, student performance, finances, curricular and other programmatic changes, programmatic assessment, and accreditation and licensure information (if applicable). Staff will also use the Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS) as a data source. Any discrepancies in data must be reconciled prior to the report being sent to the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing.

3. Recently approved academic degree programs will be reviewed only once for this in-depth analysis unless the programs are placed on probation as a result of the analysis.

4. Academic degree programs that receive "met" on all sections of the review receive continuing approval status from the Commission.

5. Academic degree programs that receive an "unmet" on any section of the analysis are placed on probationary status for a maximum of two biennial program productivity review cycles (four years). This probationary period is shorter than that of existing programs to ensure that new programs can be adjusted more rapidly to provide the best chance for success of the program.

6. For programs placed on probation, institutions must follow up in writing with a longer and more detailed explanation of the program's perceived weaknesses and provide a plan for meeting the program analysis metrics of the deficient section(s) within the probationary period. If this report is not submitted by the institution by the date requested, Commission staff will not accept any program proposals from that institution until the report is received.

---

[1] Associate degree programs are not reviewed as part of this report, Instead, the in-depth analysis of recently implemented associate degree programs will be included in the Annual Evaluation of Associate Degree Programs.

7. At the end of the probationary period, a follow-up analysis will be conducted of the deficient section(s) and if at that point there is insufficient improvement, the program will be recommended for termination.

8. For programs recommended for termination, institutions must provide a plan for complying with the Commission's recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

The following table displays the rubric used for reviewing academic degree program performance.

Academic Degree Program Review Rubric

Section of Review	Unmet	Met
Personnel	Actual full-time equivalent (FTE) exceeds projections without a qualifying rationale; projected new faculty were not hired; no supervisor identified; program has fewer faculty than originally reported; or qualifications appear suspect (i.e., some program administrators or faculty hold less than the highest terminal degree and have less than 18 hours of graduate coursework in field)	Program accurately projected FTE & has successfully maintained program at anticipated FTE levels; projected new faculty hired; full-time faculty teaching in program with sufficient faculty to deliver program; and program administrator and faculty all hold highest terminal degree in field, or can document a minimum of 18 hours of graduate coursework in the field. A rationale is provided for any increase or decrease in FTE when this number is compared to the original proposal approved by the Commission.
Student Enrollment and Performance	Actual enrollment is less than projected with no upward enrollment trend; graduate placement and employment prospects are not tracked or are poor with less than 60% of graduates finding employment or placement in graduate school; or placement trends are generally negative.	Actual enrollment matches or exceeds projections; enrollment numbers are increasing; initial graduate placements are tracked and available with 60%+ of graduates each year employed or placed in graduate school; and placement rates remain steady or increase over time
Finances: Actual Costs and Sources of Financing	Actual costs are much greater than projected; costs appear to be increasing over time while revenue decreases or remains flat; costs exceed funding for at least two of the years; funding trends	Actual costs are lower than or equal to projections and actual revenue outpaces costs; program is clearly self-sustaining over the long term;

	are negative; or insufficient justification given for program costs	and justification is provided for program costs
Curriculum and/or Other Programmatic Changes	Many and varied changes made in curriculum; unclear explanations for changes; or major changes have diverted the program from its original form	Very few and/or minor changes made to curriculum; no fundamental change from the original proposal; and if any changes are made, they are more than adequately justified
Programmatic Assessment	Assessment shows the program is not meeting its objectives; data is not reviewed regularly; or changes made to the program are not supported by the programmatic assessment data.	Assessment shows the program is meeting or exceeding its objectives; data is reviewed annually; and any improvements to the program are made based on the programmatic assessment data (connection is evident).
Accreditation	Accrediting body finds flaws in the program; accreditation has been unnecessarily delayed or no movement toward accreditation; or there is insufficient explanation of status or justification for lack of action	Accreditation is on track and on time; evidence of progress available; accrediting body supports program and is positive in its reviews; and status is clearly explained and progress is evident
Licensure/Certification Exam Passage Rates	Number of graduates becoming certified is low and unsatisfactory; the percentage of those who pass on the first try is less than the expectations or benchmarks set by the licensure/accrediting body; or program does not seem to prepare students well for certification	Number of graduates receiving certification is appropriate; the percentage of those passing on the first try meets the expectations or benchmarks set by the licensure/accrediting body; and program matches expectations

Procedures

1. To complete the in-depth program analysis, the Commission will distribute a form (see Appendix I) to each institution to assess recently approved academic degree programs subject to review that year. These data will be used to evaluate the programs by comparing the projections in the program proposal to the actual productivity of the program.

2. Using the information provided by the institutions, Commission staff will evaluate the programs according to the rubric identified in this policy. This evaluation will be included in the biennial program productivity report and will include staff recommendations for continuing approval for academic degree programs that receive "met" on all sections of the review and probationary status for academic degree programs that receive an "unmet" on any section of the review.

3. The Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing consider the biennial report on degree program productivity as drafted by the Commission staff. Pending a favorable recommendation, the Committee will then forward the report to the full Commission for consideration.

4. Pending a favorable review by the full Commission, recommendations for continuing approval status and probation status will take effect immediately (i.e., from the date of the Commission meeting at which the report was approved).

5. For programs placed on probation, institutions must submit a report explaining the unmet section(s) and providing a plan for meeting the section(s) within the probationary period. This report must be sent within 90 calendar days from the date of Commission action on initial probationary status. This information will be included in a subsequent report to be reviewed by the Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing and the full Commission. At the end of the probationary period, staff will request information about the unmet section(s) to conduct a follow-up review; this information about the follow-up review for unmet sections for programs on probation will be included in that year's program productivity report. If at that point there is insufficient improvement, the program will be recommended for termination. If the program has made sufficient improvement, staff will recommend continuing approval for the program.

6. For programs recommended for termination, Commission staff will contact the respective chief academic officer of the institution to request that institutions respond to the agency executive director within 90 calendar days to detail the institution's plan for complying with the Commission recommendation within a mutually agreed upon phase-out period.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Program Review

For Recently Approved Programs

In accordance with the *South Carolina Commission on Higher Education Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity*, this *Program Review* is an assessment that compares a new, approved program's proposed productivity at the time of its application to its outcomes by the end of year six for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs and year four for associate's, master's and specialist programs. The assessment requests data about program **personnel, student performance, finances, curricular and other programmatic changes, programmatic assessment,** and **accreditation and licensure information** (if applicable) to better assess and assure quality programmatic delivery to students. Specific instructions accompany each section.

Name of Institution / Degree Name and Level

Date Program Approved by the Commission:
Proposed Program Implementation Date:
Actual Program Implementation Date:

If the actual implementation date differs from the proposed implementation date, provide an explanation for the change in implementation date.

Personnel

1. Provide information about the qualifications of faculty who oversee and/or teach primarily in the program to help the Commission compare projections for administration and faculty needed to support the program to the actual personnel supporting the program. List program supervisor positions first; highlight faculty identified in the original program proposal approved by the Commission; and place an asterisk (*) next to the rank of new faculty hired for the program following Commission approval. Add and delete rows as needed. N.B. Do not include faculty names.

Administration and Faculty Personnel				
Rank	Full- or Part-time	Courses Taught or To be Taught, Including Term, Course Number & Title, Credit Hours	Academic Degrees and Coursework Relevant to Courses Taught, Including Institution and Major	Other Qualifications and Comments (i.e., explain role and/or changes in assignment; if new faculty, provide hire date)

2. Identify and explain in detail any differences between the faculty listed in the program proposal approved by the Commission and the faculty currently teaching in the program. For example, if there are more or fewer faculty currently supporting the program than stated in the proposal, provide a rationale for this increase or decrease. N.B. Do not include faculty names when explaining the differences.

3. State the total projected and actual annual FTE needed to support the proposed program (i.e., the total FTE devoted just to the program for all faculty, staff, and program administrators). (N.B. provide FTE, not headcount)

Category	Projected FTE	Actual FTE
Administration		
Faculty		
Staff		

4. Explain any differences between the projected FTE needed to support the program and the actual FTE.

Student Enrollment and Performance

1. Provide the estimated enrollment from the original proposal and the actual enrollment in the program from the first year through year five.

Enrollment (Headcount)						
Year	Fall		Spring		Summer	
	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual
FY						
FY						
FY						
FY						
FY						

2. If enrollment projections were not met, explain the reasons why the projections were not met.

3. Provide available information/data for graduate placement rates, including employment and matriculation to graduate school.

Year	Total Number of Graduates	Graduates Employed	Graduates Matriculating to Graduate School	Other (Specify what "Other" is, for example, Military Commission)	Total Percent Employed, in Graduate School, or Other
FY					
FY					
FY					
FY					
FY					

4. Include any additional information about graduate placement rates, if applicable.

5. Describe the methods used to track these graduates.

Finances: Actual Costs and Sources of Finances

1. Identify projected and actual program costs and sources of financing associated with delivering the program.

Financial Support

Costs by Year						
	First Year of Implementation		Third or Fifth Year of Implementation[1]		Total for the First Three or Five Years of Implementation[2]	
Category	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual
Program Administration						
Faculty and Staff Salaries						
Graduate Assistants						
Equipment						
Facilities						
Supplies and Materials						
Library Resources						
Other (Specify)						
Total						
Sources of Financing						
Tuition Funding						
Program-Specific Fees						
State Funding						
Reallocation of Existing Funds						
Federal Funding						
Other Funding (Specify)						
Total						
Net Total (i.e., Sources of Financing - Actual Costs)						

---

[1] Use the third year for associate's, master's and specialist programs and the fifth year for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs.
[2] Use the first three years for associate's, master's and specialist programs and the first five years for baccalaureate, doctoral, and first professional programs.

2. Since the program's implementation, explain instances where actual costs diverged from those projected, whether positive or negative.

3. Explain how the program has a negative or positive fiscal impact on the institution overall (i.e., is the program supported by the revenue of other programs, is it self-supporting, or does the revenue generated by the program support other programs at the institution?).

Curriculum and Other Programmatic Changes

1. Attach a current copy of the program curriculum. Describe any changes from the Commission-approved version of the curriculum provided in the proposal and the rationale for these changes. Include increases and decreases in credit hours; course additions, deletions, or modifications; the addition, deletion, or modification of any clinicals, field experiences, internships, or capstone courses; etc.

2. Identify any other changes made to the program since its implementation and explain the rationale for these changes (e.g., changes to the admissions requirements, mode of program delivery, instruction sites, etc.).

Programmatic Assessment

1. Provide the results of the programmatic assessment for the past three years (attach reports if available). Include results for all evaluation measures identified in the proposal originally approved by the Commission; if evaluation measures have changed, explain the changes while providing the results of the new evaluation measures.

2. Describe how often and by whom the programmatic assessment data is reviewed.

3. State whether changes have been made to the program as a result of this assessment; and, if so, describe the changes.

Accreditation (if applicable)

1. Describe the program's accreditation status, including an explanation of delays in seeking or earning programmatic accreditation. Also, attach any reports or recommendations received from the accrediting body regarding the program.

Licensure/Certification Exam Passage Rates (if applicable)

1. Provide information about licensure/certification exam passage rates.

   Licensure/Certification Exam Name: _____

Year	Total Number of Graduates	Passage Rate
FY		
FY		
FY		
FY		
FY		

N.B. Repeat this table if there are multiple licensure/certification exams applicable to the program.

2. Identify the expectations or benchmarks in passage rates set by the licensure/accrediting body. Also include the source of this information.

3. Include additional information about Licensure/Certification Exam Passage Rates, if applicable.