

**GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF EXISTING
UNITS OF INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND PUBLIC SERVICE
AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS**

A. Major Assumptions

1. That primary responsibility for quality and, therefore, review of existing academic programs resides with the institutions and will be carried out in a manner compatible with institutional academic planning/review mechanisms and guidelines promulgated by the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). Each institution will determine the program review process that best meets its unique needs (e.g., specialized accreditation reviews, review committees, use of external reviewers, etc.). This process will be consistent with IBHE guidelines. To avoid redundancy, institutions have the discretion to use current findings from specialized program accreditations and other reviews as the basis of the program review process. To be current, a review must be no more than two years old.
2. That academic program review is a critical and constructive process whose essential elements are documentation of learning outcomes and identification of actions for program improvement.
3. That the IBHE, occasionally, may call for a review of programs on a statewide basis for the purpose of addressing matters of statewide priority, e.g., high-demand fields, disciplines undergoing substantial change, etc.
4. That increased institutional control over the review process entails increased institutional accountability.
5. That institutions are responsible to identify and review programs targeted for priority evaluation and take appropriate action to remedy problems revealed by the review process (e.g., improvement, suspension, or closure).
6. That “the Board of Higher Education is authorized to review, periodically, all existing programs of instruction, research and public service at the State universities and colleges and to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified.” (110 ILCS 205/7)

B. Program Review Schedule

Eight-year Cycle

1. Institutional program review will occur on an eight-year cycle, with the institution determining the schedule for individual programs. Since eight years is considered the maximum time period for reviewing an individual program, some programs may be reviewed more than once within this cycle.
2. As part of the review process, institutions will prioritize programs flagged due to quality, viability, and/or other concerns.

Three-year Cycle

1. Three years after approval **and** three years after implementation of a new program, *progress reports* will be provided to the IBHE. Programs not making progress towards achieving objectives stated in the original request for approval will submit a plan for improvement.
2. Programs in which state licensure requires specialized accreditation for students to obtain professional licensure, but which have not yet achieved accreditation, will undergo full review and report to the IBHE every three years until accreditation is achieved.
3. Programs flagged for attention or improvement by the institution will report every three years until the situation is corrected or resolved.
4. Programs with institution-determined temporary suspensions of enrollment will inform IBHE of the program's status every year until the situation is corrected.

C. Program Review Components

While the institution is responsible for developing its unique program review procedures, it is expected that those processes will include the following components:

1. A statement of program goals and intended learning outcomes;
2. An end- or near-end-of-program assessment of student learning, in addition to course-by-course assessment;
3. Multiple performance measures, if necessary, that reflect the uniqueness of academic programs and disciplines;
4. Feedback from key stakeholders (current students, alumni, employers, graduate schools, etc.);
5. Evidence of a formal feedback/improvement mechanism, i.e., that the program/unit has a regular review process in place, and that the results of this review process are used to improve curriculum, instruction, and learning;
6. Improvement to its capacity to efficiently and effectively deliver programs using technological innovation and comprehensive data systems; and
7. Findings and recommendations for improvement, suspension, or closure.

D. Reporting Process

1. Institutions will report on the outcomes of the program reviews in a "Summary of Annual Program Review Process."
2. Three years after implementation of a new program, a progress report will be provided to the IBHE.

3. Programs requiring specialized accreditation for students to sit for professional licensure, but which have not yet achieved accreditation, will provide a report every three years until accreditation is achieved.
4. Programs flagged for priority review by the institution for improvement require a short interim report, which may be submitted to the IBHE three years after being flagged and must address actions taken since the last program review. Interim reports on flagged programs should:
 - (a) Delineate actions taken to resolve the issues or improve the program;
 - (b) Identify areas for further action or improvement; and,
 - (c) Describe how the program will be monitored to ensure continued improvement until the next review.
5. Upon notification by letter to the IBHE by its president or chancellor, a college or university may:
 - (a) Suspend enrollment in a program for a period not to exceed five years, for any reason;
 - (b) The enrollment-suspension notification shall include an explanation of the reasons for the action and a brief remediation plan;
 - (c) Institutions will submit a brief progress report every year until the situation is resolved; and,
 - (d) Reinstate a suspended program through a letter of notification to the Board;
 - (e) The IBHE will consider a program terminated if no progress report is received each year or if no reinstatement notice is received within the five-year period.
6. Summary reports shall include:
 - (a) Description and assessment of any major changes in the program/disciplinary context e.g., (1) in the discipline or field; (2) student demand; (3) state need; (4) institutional context for offering the degree; (5) other elements appropriate to the discipline in question; and (6) other;
 - (b) Major findings and recommendations, including evidence of student learning outcomes and identification of opportunities for program improvement;
 - (c) Actions taken since the last review, including instructional resources and practices, and curricular changes; and,
 - (d) Actions to be taken as a result of this review, including changes in instructional resources and practices, curriculum, and assessment of student learning.

PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

1. **Reporting Institution** _____
2. **Program Reviewed** _____
3. **Date** _____
4. **Contact Person** _____
 - 4.1. **Telephone** _____
 - 4.2. **E-mail** _____
 - 4.3. **Fax** _____
5. **Major Findings and Recommendations**
 - 5.1 Description and assessment of any major changes in the program [e.g., (a) changes in the overall discipline or field; (b) student demand; (c) societal need; (d) institutional context for offering the degree; (e) other elements appropriate to the discipline in question; and (f) other].
 - 5.2 Description of major findings and recommendations, including evidence of learning outcomes and identification of opportunities for program improvement;
 - 5.3 Description of actions taken since the last review, including instructional resources and practices, and curricular changes; and
 - 5.4 Description of actions to be taken as a result of this review, including instructional resource and practices, and curricular changes.
6. **Outcome**
 - 6.1 Decision:
_____ Program in Good Standing
_____ Program flagged for Priority Review
_____ Program Enrollment Suspended
 - 6.2 Explanation