



PCCUA PROGRAM REVIEW

SELF-STUDY AND PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES

**THE PROGRAM GUIDELINES INCLUDE THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS, VIABILITY STANDARDS,
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS, AND THE EXTERNAL REVIEW FORM**

**ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
PCCUA
REVISED FALL 2025**

Program Review Institutional Self-Study Guidelines

The AHECB Existing Program Review Policy adopted in October 2008 requires the review of all academic programs every 7-10 years. A major component of the policy is an internal review (self-study) by institutions and an external review by consultants of programs that do not have program-specific accreditation/ licensure/certification. The institution's self-study, consultants' written evaluation, and the institution's response to the consultants' findings will be submitted to ADHE.

Purpose of the Program Self-Study

The program Self-Study is designed to examine the structure, effectiveness, and strengths and weaknesses of a specific program. Based on the outcome of the Self Study, the program leaders and others at the college are able to make decisions, identify opportunities, make improvements or modifications that result in better programming.

Purpose of the Program Review

The Program Review process is designed to allow external, unbiased reviewers to examine the Self Study, engage faculty and deans, and determine the findings of the Self Study. It also allows for an external expert to provide suggestions that would improve programming, which did not emerge in the Self-Study process.

The best way to begin the Self-Study process is to implement a systematic plan to address questions or standards that will need to be answered. It is important for the Self Study to be accurate, concise, and descriptive. Examples can provide useful evidence that a standard is being met. A program self-study is not written by one person; while there may be one editor, multiple faculty voices are required to accurately present the information. Some divisions have found it helpful to begin the Self Study with a SWOT analysis identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. This kind of analysis can be abbreviated, but it does provide an opportunity for program-side engagement and conversation before the Self-Study process begins.

The Program Review includes Self-Study, which is provided to the reviewers. PCCUA uses two reviewers. AA and AAS program reviews require a primary and secondary reviewer from institutions outside Arkansas. There is a review form, and the reviewers read the Self Study, and at least one of the reviewers must visit the campus, engage with faculty and deans, and ensure that all information in the Self Study is accurate. The reviewers write a review of the Self Study, providing evidence in the form of examples identified within the Self Study or the visit to verify the report findings.

PCCUA PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR 2025-26				
Cognate/Imbedded Program	AAS/AA/AS	TC	CP	Program Review Date
ASSOCIATE DEGREES				
Behavioral Health	x	x		2028-29
Business Administration/Business	x			2029-30 ACBSP
Business Management	x		x	2029-30 ACBSP
Construction Technology	x	x	x	2028-29
Criminal Justice	x		x	2033-34
Early Childhood Education	x	x	x	2034-35
General Technology	x			2029-30
Graphic Communications	x	x	x	2032-33
Health Sciences	x			2027-28
Information Systems Technology	x			2029-30 ACBSP
Medical Laboratory Technician	x			2025-26 NAACLS
Medical Office Technology	x			2029-30 ACBSP
Nursing - ADN	x			Fall 2025 ACEN
Occupational Therapy	x			2032-33
Associate of Arts in Teaching	x	x	x	N/A - DESE
General Education AA/AS	x	x		2033-34
TECHNICAL CERTIFICATES				
Advanced Manufacturing		x		2029-30
Cosmetology		x		2033-34
Phlebotomy		x		2025-26 NAACLS
Practical Nursing		x		2025 ASBN Report
Welding Technology		x		2028-29
Certificate of General Studies		x		2027-28
Note: The programs under TC are stand alone, all others are embedded in AAS programs listed under the Associate Degrees.				
CERTIFICATE OF PROFICIENCY				
Accounting			x	2029-30 ACBSP
Advanced Manufacturing			x	2029-30
Agri Mechanics & Equipment Tech			x	2030-31
CDL/Truck Driving			x	2025-26
Cyber Security			x	2029-30 ACBSP
EMT Technician			x	2027-28
Heavy Equipment Operations and Maintenance			x	2033-34
Horticulture Operations			x	2030-31
HVAC			x	2027-28
Law Enforcement			x	2033-34
Maintaining and Managing PCs			x	2029-30 ACBSP
Manicuring			x	2033-2034
Medical Coding			x	2029-30 ACBSP
Medical Profession Education			x	2033-34
Microsoft Operating Systems-Desktop Support			x	2029-30 ACBSP
Nursing Assistant			x	Summer 2026 OLTC
Program Coding and Mobile Development			x	2029-30 ACBSP
Welding				
Mild Steel Welding			x	2028-29
Inert Gas Welding			x	2028-29
General Welding Techniques			x	2028-29

When examining the Program Review Schedule there are acronyms identifying what the external accrediting agency reports the College may submit in lieu of the ADHE Program Review. The terms for the acronyms used are provided below.

ACBSP

Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs

NAACLS

National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences

DESE

Division of Elementary and Secondary Education

ACEN

Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing

ASBN

Arkansas State Board of Nursing

The Self-Study Process

The institutional self-study to be reviewed by external consultants should contain the following information.

Goals, Objectives, and Activities

1. Describe specific educational goals, objectives, and activities of the program.
2. Explain how the program serves the general education program and other disciplinary programs on the campus, if applicable.
3. Document market demand and/or state/industry need for careers stemming from the program.
4. Document student demand for the program.

Curriculum

1. Describe how program content parallels current thinking/trends in the field/trade (best practices, advisory committee recommendations, etc.).
2. Provide an outline for each program curriculum, including the sequence of courses.
3. State the degree requirements, including general education requirements, institutional, college or school requirements, and major requirements.
4. Indicate the semester/year the major/program courses were last offered. Exclude general education courses.

5. Provide syllabi for discipline-specific courses and departmental objectives for each course.
6. Outline the process for the introduction of new courses, including all internal curriculum review processes and the findings.
7. List courses in the proposed degree program currently offered by distance delivery.
8. Describe the instructor-to-student and student-to-student interaction for distance courses (prerequisite courses, lab requirements, examination procedures-online/proctored, instructor response to student assignments).

Program Faculty (full-time/adjunct/part-time)

1. Provide curriculum vitae or program faculty information form for all full-time program faculty. The vita or form should include the following: all degrees and institutions granting the degrees; field or specialty of degrees; number of years employed as program faculty at the institution; current academic rank, if applicable; professional certifications/licenses; evidence of quality and quantity of creative and scholarly/research activity; evidence of quality and quantity of service activities; evidence of professional activities and non-teaching work experiences related to courses taught; list of course numbers/course titles of credit courses taught over the past two academic years; and other evidence of quality teaching.
2. Indicate the academic credentials required for adjunct/part-time faculty teaching major/program courses.
3. Describe the orientation and evaluation processes for faculty, including adjunct and part-time faculty.
4. Provide average number of courses and number of credit hours taught for full-time program faculty for current academic year.

Program Resources

- Describe the institutional support available for faculty development in teaching, research, and service.
- Describe the professional development of full-time program faculty over the past two years, including the institutional financial support provided to faculty for the activities.
- Provide the annual library budget for the program or describe how library resources are provided for the program.
- Describe the availability, adequacy, and accessibility of campus resources (research, library, instructional support, instructional technology, etc.).
- Provide a list of the program equipment purchases for the past three years.

Instruction via Distance Technology

1. Summarize institutional policies on the establishment, organization, funding, and management of distance courses/degrees.
2. Summarize the policies and procedures to keep the technology infrastructure current.
3. Summarize the procedures that assure the security of personal information.

4. Describe the support services that will be provided to students enrolled in distance technology courses/programs by the institution and/or other entities:
 - Advising
 - Course registration
 - Financial aid
 - Course withdrawal
 - E-mail account
 - Access to library resources
 - Help Desk
5. Describe technology support services that will be provided to students enrolled in distance technology courses/programs by the institution and/or other entities.
6. Describe the orientation for students enrolled in distance technology courses/programs.
7. Summarize the institutional policy for faculty course load and number of credit hours taught, compensation, and ownership of intellectual property.

Majors/Declared Students

1. State the number of undergraduate/graduate majors/declared students in each degree program under review for the past three years.
2. Describe strategies to recruit, retain, and graduate students.
3. Provide the number of program graduates over the past three years.

Program Assessment

1. Describe the program assessment process and provide outcomes data (standardized entrance/placement test results, exit test results, etc.).
2. Describe program/major exit or capstone requirements.
3. Provide information on how teaching is evaluated, the use of student evaluations, and how the results have affected the curriculum.
4. Provide transfer information for major/declared students including the receiving institutions for transfer and programs of study.
5. Provide information for program graduates continuing their education by entering graduate school or by performing volunteer service.
6. Provide aggregate results of student/alumni/employer satisfaction surveys.
7. Describe how the program is aligned with the current job market needs of the state or local communities.
8. Provide job placement information for program graduates, including the number of graduates placed in jobs related to the field of study.

For undergraduate career and technical education programs only, provide the following:

- Names and location of companies hiring program graduates.
- Average hourly rate for program graduates.
- Names of companies requiring the certificate/degree for initial or continued employment.

Program Effectiveness (strengths, opportunities)

1. List the strengths of the program.
2. List the areas of the program most in need of improvement.
3. List program improvements accomplished over the past two years.
4. Describe planned program improvements, including a timetable and the estimated costs. Identify program improvement priorities.

Institutional Review Team

List the names/departments of the self-study committee chair and committee members.

When writing the Self Study, many deans and instructors provide Roman numerals or other numerical headings to keep the information organized. The Team may decide to use other headings. However, all questions related to the Self-Study must be addressed in the comprehensive PCCUA evaluation of the program.

POLICY FOR THE REVIEW OF EXISTING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

(Revised by ADHE in 2025)

Arkansas Code §6-61-214 requires that the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board (AHECB) review existing academic programs. The goals of the existing academic program review are as follows:

1. To establish a process for the statewide review of academic programs.
2. To identify certificate and degree programs not meeting the minimum standards of quality and establishing schedules for either resolving these concerns or removing the programs from the AHECB-approved program inventory.

Existing Academic Program Review Process

All certificate and degree programs offered by public colleges and universities in Arkansas will be reviewed through the Existing Academic Program Review Process. This review process includes the following parameters:

1. All active academic programs will be externally reviewed every 7-10 years. Each institution will submit its recommended program review cycle to ADHE. If changes in the review schedule are necessary, ADHE will be notified.
 - Accredited/licensed/state-certified programs will follow the usual review practices and schedule of the accrediting/approval body. The site team's written evaluation and institutional response will be sent to ADHE annually upon the due date published by ADHE. Accredited/licensed/state-certified

programs failing to maintain accreditation/certification/licensure will be subject to further review by ADHE.

- Academic programs that are not program-specific and accredited will be reviewed by external reviewers/consultants. Institutions will select a minimum of two reviewers affiliated with programs that are similar in mission and scope to the program under review.
 - Career and Technical Education (CTE) certificate and associate degree programs may allow one reviewer from a local or regional business or industry.
 - General education and transfer associate degree programs require a minimum of one reviewer from an Arkansas 4-year university.
 - Bachelor's and graduate degree programs require a minimum of two out-of-state reviewers.
- 2. At least one consultant is required to conduct a site visit and meet with program faculty, students, and administrators. Programs approved to be delivered online may conduct virtual site visits. Virtual reviewers must be able to virtually view

Individuals selected as consultants will be well-qualified and without bias toward institutions under review.

- 3. The institution will complete a comprehensive self-study that is reviewed by the program consultants. Components of the self-study will include, but not be limited to, information related to program need/demand, curriculum, faculty, resources, course delivery methods, student outcomes, and recent/planned program improvements.
- 4. The consultants will submit a written report of findings to the institution. Key information on continued program improvement will be included in the report submitted to ADHE. Specific contents of the consultants' reports will be determined by ADHE staff and Chief Academic Officers (CAOs).

Recommendations to the Coordinating Board

- 1. The consultant's written evaluation and institutional response will be sent to ADHE annually upon the due date published by ADHE.
- 2. Findings from academic program reviews will be reported annually to the AHECB. ADHE staff will recommend that the AHECB receive the consultants reports and acknowledge that the contents may be consulted as a resource when decisions must be made by the Board regarding institutional role and scope, budget requests, new program approval, and statewide funding issues. The staff may propose other general resolutions that address statewide issues.

3. A further resolution will encourage institutional administrators, faculty members, and boards of trustees to consider implementing the recommendations made by the consultants for program improvement.
4. If appropriate, a resolution will be offered concerning program deletions, modifications, and/or follow-up. A resolution recommending program deletions will place the program(s) on notice for removal from the AHECB-approved program inventory. At the end of the two-year notice period, those programs still not meeting minimum standards will be deleted from the approved program inventory. In extraordinary cases, documentation of legitimate extenuating circumstances may prompt the Coordinating Board to extend the notice period. State general revenue funds may not be used for the operation of a program beyond the termination deadline set by the Coordinating Board. ADHE will not include SSCHs generated by major courses of programs removed from the approved program inventory in its funding formula calculations.
5. The president, chancellor, or chief academic officer may respond to ADHE staff recommendations in writing or request a conference to discuss the recommendations prior to consideration by the Coordinating Board. The program closings and broader statewide issues that the Coordinating Board may wish to address. Any recommendations in the consultants' reports that are not included in the ADHE staff recommendations would pertain to matters of campus concern and, therefore, would represent suggestions to be considered locally.

ADHE Viability Standards

Beginning in 2010, ADHE staff will annually identify existing certificate and degree programs that do not meet AHECB program viability standards. New certificates and associate degrees will be identified for program viability standards after three years, and bachelor's degrees and above will be identified after five years.

1. The viability standards, based on a three-year average, are as follows:
 - An average of four (4) graduates per year for career and technical education certificates (CTE) and career and technical associate degree programs (AAS);
 - An average of four (4) graduates per year for bachelor's degrees in science, mathematics, engineering, foreign languages, middle school education, and secondary education programs for licensure in science and mathematics;
 - An average of six (6) graduates per year for transfer associate degrees (AA, AS, and AAT) and bachelor's programs;

- An average of four (4) graduates per year for master's, specialist, and first-professional programs; and,
- An average of two (2) graduates per year for doctoral programs.

Per policy, programs identified as below the viability threshold will have two (2) years to meet the threshold or will be removed from the AHECB-approved program inventory. The Board requested ADHE staff provide them with a list of programs that exceed the two (2) additional years after initially being identified as non-viable.

To determine which programs exceeded the two (2) additional years, ADHE staff utilize a report that includes a total of five (5) years, which would allow for the consideration of three (3) separate three-year averages. The report includes graduation counts, individual program averages, and program cognate averages for AY20 through AY24.

When applying the viability standards, ADHE staff consider the following as possible justifications for each program identified as not meeting the viability standards upon initial calculation based on AHEIS data. ADHE staff work with each institution to determine appropriateness within policy guidelines. ADHE staff determined the deletion of programs such as this would result in no discernible benefit to the institution or the state. Below are some common justifications to reclassify a non-viable program:

- Programs determined to be essential feeder programs for other programs, such as the Bachelor of Science in Physics, which heavily contributes and supports both engineering majors and general education coursework.
- Programs that share all or the majority of faculty and instructional resources with a (viable) department or program. This justification is often paired with cognate programs based on shared coursework.
- Programs whose coursework is supported primarily by courses existing in and for other programs. Often, these programs are embedded but have appropriately different CIP Codes and require manual cognate consideration.
- Programs that have specific accreditor requirements, state-wide consortium agreements, and ADHE exemptions.
- Programs that have state-level agreements, which are exempt from viability standards (e.g., Associate of Science in Business, Associate of Science in General Technology, Associate of Arts in Teaching, CJI Criminal Justice programs)
- Programs only offered on-demand and are not supported by full-time faculty or institutional resources. These programs are exclusively at the certificate level.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

- **What is the purpose of Academic Program Review?**
To establish a process for the statewide review of academic programs, and to identify certificate and degree programs not meeting minimum standards of quality or viability and establish schedules for either resolving these concerns or removing the programs from the AHECB-approved program inventory.

- **Is Review of Existing Academic Programs in the Arkansas Code?**
§6-61-214
<https://adhe.edu/data-publications/current-policies-academic-affairs>

- **Where can I find the AHECB policy for Review of Existing Academic Programs?**
AHECB Policy <https://adhe.edu/data-publications/current-policies-academic-affairs>

- **Which programs need to be reviewed? Which programs will be reviewed by external reviewers?**
All certificate and degree programs (both active and inactive) offered by public colleges and universities in Arkansas will be reviewed through the Existing Academic Program Review Process. Academic programs that are not program-specific, accredited will be reviewed by external reviewers/consultants. Certain programs with external accreditation will use that accreditation review in lieu of a separate program review. (Examples: Nursing, RN-ACEN, Medical Lab Technology-MLT-NAACLS, Business- ACBSP)

- **What is the frequency for external review of programs?**
AHECB policy states that institutions will schedule an external review of all existing academic programs every 7-10 years, beginning Fall 2010.

- **Who will pay for program reviews?**
The institution pays for the program review.

- **What documents must the institution prepare for the review? What information should be included in the institution's self-study report?**
The institution must prepare a self-study document for the review. Components of the self-study will include, but not be limited to, information related: program

need/demand, curriculum, faculty, resources, course delivery methods, student outcomes, and recent/planned program improvements.

- **When do I send the reviewers' report to ADHE?**
The reviewers' written evaluation and the institution's response will be submitted to ADHE within six weeks of receipt of the written evaluation.
- **When will the findings of the Academic Program Review be submitted to the AHECB?**
Findings from academic program reviews will be reported annually to the AHECB.
- **What will ADHE do with the findings?**
ADHE staff will recommend that the AHECB receive the reviewers' report and acknowledge that the contents may be consulted as a resource when decisions must be made by the Board regarding institutional role and scope, budget requests, new program approval, and statewide funding issues. The staff may propose other general resolutions that address statewide issues.
A further resolution will encourage institutional administrators, faculty members, and boards of trustees to consider implementing the recommendations made by the consultants for program improvement. If appropriate, a resolution will be offered concerning program deletions, modifications, and/or follow-up.
- **What recourse does the institution have to ADHE staff recommendations to the AHECB?**
The president, chancellor, or chief academic officer may respond to ADHE staff recommendations in writing or request a conference to discuss the recommendations before consideration by the AHECB. The discussions will be limited to those issues that concern the state's interests, i.e., program closings and broader statewide issues that the AHECB may wish to address. Any recommendations in the consultants' reports that are not included in the ADHE staff recommendations would pertain to matters of campus concern and, therefore, would represent suggestions to be considered locally.
- **When must an out-of-state reviewer be used? How many are required? What credentials/qualifications must they possess? Are there different guidelines for reviewers of CTE programs?**
Academic programs that are not program-specific, accredited will be reviewed by external reviewers. Institutions will select a minimum of two out-of-state reviewers affiliated with programs that are similar in mission and scope to the program under review. At least one reviewer is required to conduct a site visit and meet with program faculty, students, and administrators. Individuals selected as reviewers must be well-qualified and without bias toward the institution(s)

under review. The reviewers must hold appropriate academic credentials and/or professional licensure/certification and have experience with programs that are similar in mission and scope to the program under review.

For CTE programs, one reviewer should be a local industry expert (no affiliated with the institution) to conduct an on-site evaluation of the programs. The local reviewer for CTE programs may not hold an academic credential but must hold professional licensure/certification in the field. An out-of-state CTE faculty consultant/reader also must review the self-study documents, industry experts' recommendations, and program curricula. The out-of-state reviewer for CTE programs will not be required to come to Arkansas; however, the local and out-of-state reviewers must work together to prepare the external reviewer's report.

- **Does ADHE have to approve the reviewers used for external review of programs?**
No, the reviewer should not be a person who initially started the program or who has been involved in the operation of the program. The reviewer can be from a contiguous state and could even be someone with whom you have written an article or book as long as the person is professionally qualified to complete the review.
- **What information should be included in the reviewers' report?**
The external reviewers' template is only a guide. You may include more information in your report.
- **How will the report for accredited/licensed/state-certified programs be used?**
Accredited/licensed/state-certified programs will follow the usual review practices and schedule of the accrediting/approval body. Their report and your responses must be sent to ADHE within six weeks of receipt of the written evaluation.
- **To minimize costs, can institutions get together to employ out-of-state reviewers, e.g., for the Associate of Arts/Associate of Science transfer degrees?**
Yes, each institution participating in such an arrangement should submit their own reviewers' written evaluation and institution's response to ADHE within six weeks of receipt of the written evaluation.
- **Can I change my review schedule once it's submitted to ADHE?**
Yes, send an email to ADHE of your schedule change(s). The changes will be made to your review schedule and you will submit those changes to ADHE.

ADHE "Most Frequently Asked Question"



[Name of University/College]
EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT OF *[Name of Program]*
[External Reviewers' Names, Credentials, & Institution]
[Department Name]
[Review Date]
[Schedule of Next Review]
[Accreditor – If Applicable]

DEGREES/CREDENTIALS INCLUDED:

Award Type	Program Name	CIP Code	Degree Code
<i>e.g. BS</i>	<i>Computer Science</i>	<i>11.0201</i>	<i>1548</i>
<i>e.g. AS</i>	<i>Computer Science</i>	<i>11.0101</i>	<i>0122</i>
<i>e.g. CP</i>	<i>Information Technology</i>	<i>11.0103</i>	<i>9853</i>

External Reviewer's Signature

External Reviewer's Signature

ADHE Program Reviewers Report Template

This framework guides External Reviewers in evaluating academic programs for the Arkansas Division of Higher Education (ADHE). The insights gathered will inform ADHE's assessment of program viability, curriculum relevance, and resource alignment. This report should provide a comprehensive analysis, supported by specific examples, and should **not** include a direct recommendation on program continuation or discontinuation.

Reviewers are encouraged to provide detailed responses that go beyond simple affirmative or negative answers, offering nuanced perspectives and concrete evidence.

I. Evaluation of Program Goals, Objectives, Activities, Efficacy, and Strategic Alignment

- A. Are the defined program learning outcomes (PLOs) clearly articulated, appropriate for the credential level, and effectively assessed? Provide examples of how PLOs are measured and the evidence of student achievement.
- B. How do faculty and students contribute to the attainment of program goals and objectives? Illustrate with specific activities or initiatives.
- C. To what extent does the program curriculum address current and emerging workforce demands, industry trends, or prepare graduates for seamless articulation into advanced academic programs? Provide evidence of industry alignment or transfer success.
- D. Does the program demonstrate sufficient and sustainable student enrollment demand? Analyze enrollment trends and indicators of prospective student interest.
- E. Do key performance indicators (KPIs) such as course fill rates, student retention, and completion/graduation rates justify the current allocation of program resources? Provide relevant data points.
- F. How well is the program achieving its intended outcomes and its relevance within the broader educational and workforce landscape? Provide a brief summary.

II. Curriculum Analysis

- A. Is the program curriculum current and forward-thinking, effectively preparing students for present and future professional roles or further academic pursuits? Substantiate with examples of course content or program structure.
- B. Are there institutional mechanisms and agile processes in place to ensure the curriculum remains responsive to evolving industry standards and disciplinary advancements? Describe the curriculum review and update cycles.
- C. Are the program's exit requirements (e.g., capstone projects, comprehensive exams, portfolio reviews) appropriate benchmarks for demonstrating mastery of PLOs and readiness for next steps?

- D. Does the curriculum exhibit an appropriate balance of foundational knowledge and specialized focus, reflecting current best practices and incorporating contemporary issues and technologies within the field? Provide evidence of curriculum currency and pedagogical approaches.
- E. Does the program integrate experiential learning opportunities, industry exposure, or networking with professionals to enhance student career readiness? Describe these integrated experiences.
- F. Does the program actively promote and support interdisciplinary collaboration and initiatives? Provide examples of cross-listed courses, joint projects, or collaborative research.
- G. How does the program foster a learning environment where all students feel valued and respected? Describe how the program ensures broad access, provides appropriate support for all students, and promotes a sense of belonging.
- H. How does the program actively work to create an environment that supports equal opportunity and success for all students? Provide specific examples related to curriculum content, program activities, the assignment of student roles and responsibilities, the recognition of student achievement, and student recruitment efforts.

III. Academic Support

- A. Does the program provide high-quality and accessible academic advising and mentorship to guide students effectively? Describe the advising model and its impact.
- B. What strategies and support systems does the program utilize to enhance student retention and ensure timely progress towards degree completion? Provide examples of retention initiatives.

IV. Faculty Profile and Development

- A. Do program faculty possess the requisite academic credentials, industry experience, and/or professional certifications to effectively deliver the curriculum and mentor students?
- B. Are the processes for faculty onboarding, ongoing professional development, and performance evaluation clearly defined, fair, and geared towards fostering teaching excellence and scholarly activity?
- C. Is the faculty workload equitably distributed and aligned with institutional benchmarks and best practices, allowing for effective teaching, scholarship, and service?

V. Resource Allocation and Infrastructure

- A. Does the institution provide sufficient and sustainable operational support (financial, administrative, etc.) for the effective functioning of the program?

- B. Are the available resources, including faculty capacity, library and information services, technology infrastructure, and professional development opportunities, adequate to support program delivery and student learning?

VI. Program Performance and Future Outlook

- A. Identify and explain the program's key strengths and areas of excellence.
- B. Identify program areas requiring immediate attention and improvement within the next 12 months, and those targeted for improvement over the next 2-5 years.
- C. Based on your assessment of market/industry dynamics, identify potential areas for program innovation or new program development not currently recognized by the institution.

VII. Review of Digital and Hybrid Learning Modalities (*If Applicable*)

- A. Are the program's digital and hybrid course offerings delivered in accordance with best practices for online and blended learning environments?
- B. Does the institution have robust protocols in place to safeguard student data privacy and ensure the security of personal information within the digital learning ecosystem?
- C. Are appropriate technology support services readily available and effective for both students enrolled in and faculty teaching within digital and hybrid modalities?
- D. Are policies regarding student-faculty ratios and faculty workload in digital and hybrid courses consistent with best practices for ensuring meaningful interaction and support?
- E. Are institutional policies concerning intellectual property rights for materials developed for digital and hybrid courses clear and in accordance with current standards?

VIII. Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Community Engagement

- A. Are the expected faculty and student research and creative outcomes for the program clearly defined, assessed, and are the results disseminated or utilized?
- B. Are the program's outreach, service, and entrepreneurial initiatives clearly defined, effectively assessed, and are the outcomes documented and utilized?

IX. Local Context and Feedback

- A. How effectively is the program addressing regional workforce needs and/or preparing students for opportunities within the local area or for transfer to institutions relevant to local career pathways?
- B. What specific program modifications or enhancements are recommended to better serve the local community and economy?

X. Executive Summary

- A. Summarize the projected demand for program graduates/completers in the local, regional, and national labor markets over the next five years, based on your assessment.
- B. Provide a high-level summary of the program's overall quality, highlighting key findings from the review process. Include any feedback on the state program review process

X. Actions Taken in Response to the External Reviewers' Recommendations

In this section, please describe the actions that will be taken as a result of the review, if any, based on the recommendation from the external reviewers; note when the action will be completed and who is responsible for seeing that it is completed; and finally, list any resources that will be used to complete the action. Please add lines to the table as necessary.

Recommendation	Action	Timing & Responsible Person/Group	Resources

ACADEMIC PROGRAM VIABILITY

PROGRAM STATUS AND REMOVAL JUSTIFICATION CODES

ACADEMIC YEAR 2024-2025

PROGRAM VIABILITY STATUS	CODES	DEFINITIONS
NEW PROGRAM	A	New programs are not considered for viability. Associate and below programs are not considered for viability until after three (3) years of the "Program Approval Effective Date." Bachelor and above programs are not considered for viability until after five (5) years of the "Program Approval Effective Date."
VIABLE	V	Program meets viability standard.
EXEMPT	E	Program is exempt from the program viability standards, such as ADHE statewide initiated partnerships and General Education, Criminal Justice Institute partnership programs, AAT, General Technology, Liberal Arts.
NON-VIABLE	N	Program does not meet the viability standard.
NON-VIABLE WARNING	W1 W2	Program has been non-viable for one (1) or two (2), 3-year averages and will be labeled as W1 for non-viable, year 1; W2 for non-viable year 2.
NON-VIABLE – RECOMMEND FOR DELETION	D	Program has been non-viable for three (3) consecutive, 3-year averages and will be recommended for deletion from the AHECB Approved Degree Programs list.
REMOVAL JUSTIFICATION	CODES	DEFINITIONS
REDUCTION OF VIABILITY STANDARD	1	Institutions request a reduction in viability standards for programs crucial to the institution's role, scope, and mission. Evidence must be provided.
COGNATE SHARED COURSES (NOT CIP CODES)	2	Institution requests to cognate programs based on shared courses, even though the programs have different CIP codes. Cognate programs are considered one (1) program for viability purposes.
RECONFIGURATION RESTRUCTURE	3	CAO requests to reconfigure/restructure a program's curriculum to realign with industry/program needs. Must be completed within 3 AHECB meetings after a "non-viable" program label.
SHARED PROGRAM FACULTY	4	Faculty are shared between similar programs of study; therefore, no additional funds are needed for the non-viable program.
ON-DEMAND PROGRAM	5	Programs which are only offered periodically when either student and/or industry demand is sufficient to fully support the program offering.
INACTIVE INSTITUTION REQUEST	6	Institution requests to inactivate a program from their non-viable and/or approved degree program list.
DELETE INSTITUTION REQUEST	7	Institution requests to delete a program from their non-viable and/or approved degree program list.
FEEDER PROGRAMS SIMILAR PROGRAMS	8	Programs in which a substantial amount of coursework, within a certain discipline, is shared and supports other programs. (Ex. Physics is a feeder program within an Engineering program.)
OTHER	0	Institution consortia, Cosmetology Instructor Trainee programs, ADHE exemptions, Accreditor exemptions, etc.
HIGH DEMAND	9	Programs which are declared "high demand" by the Department of Workforce Services (DWS), state-wide regional workforce demands, and institutional high demands.