**PROGRAMME REVIEW GUIDELINES**

Bermuda College is committed to providing the highest quality post secondary education for the people of Bermuda.  The Academic & Student Affairs Team recognizes that periodic programme reviews are essential and necessary to ensure quality academic programmes that meet the needs of Bermuda.  Programme reviews are intended to be a periodic self-examination that will contribute to Bermuda College’s strategic plan for the future and provide a mechanism for change.  The primary goal of a programme review is to provide a clear assessment of the programme’s strengths and weaknesses, and to develop a guide for the programme’s future direction.  An effective review; i.e. one that is most beneficial to the programme in planning for the future, is one that fully engages the administration, faculty, and key stakeholders from the initial review request to the final report that provides a clear plan for applying the results of the review to the implementation of accepted recommendations if deemed appropriate.

Programme reviews are intended to provide a standardized, overarching process of assessment and evaluation of the educational processes of an academic programme and harmonize with existing accreditation procedures.  To meet these goals and objectives, the review will encompass several stages and each programme review will usually require a full academic year to complete.  These are guidelines only.  Some of the material outlined in this document may not apply to a particular programme.  Some programme reviews may find it useful to include materials that are not listed here.  The programme review committee may adapt these guidelines as necessary to best meet their requirements.  Nonetheless, each programme review committee is expected to provide both a serious analysis of the current state of the programme based on data and information since the last programme review, and a plan based on that analysis that details the programme’s goals and aspirations, and plans for achieving those goals.  All decision made during a programme review should be based on measureable, transparent evidence that serves the needs of present and future students

# 1. INITIATING THE REVIEW

***Identify programs for review***

Programs will be reviewed at least once every five years. Some programs (notably those associated with rapidly changing technologies) may require reviews that are more frequent. The Vice President Academic & Student Affairs will receive requests from within the institution, from an affiliated institution of from a relevant external agency to review a programme more frequently than scheduled. By April 1st, the Vice President Academic & Student Affairs will compile a list of programs scheduled to be reviewed in addition to those deemed to require immediate review.

***Request of information from Office of Institutional Research (OIR)***

The OIR will be dedicated to gathering and initiating data related to our course and programme offerings. Enrolment levels, student performance rates and surveys of students, employers and affiliated institutions will be maintained by this office. Requests for specific data (internal records of enrolment and student success) should be made to this office.

The Vice President Academic & Student Affairs will forward a list of the programs to be reviewed to the OIR. The OIR will collate institutional data related to those programs and return these data to the relevant Dean by the end of September: Sources of data, since the last review may include:

Transfer rates of courses within programs

Employer satisfaction

Student satisfaction

Cost of the programme per student

Completion rate

Reports from alumni

Reports from affiliated institutions

Labour market analysis

Student GPA within the programme

Full-time vs Part-time

Faculty/student ratio within core subjects

**2. FORMING THE REVIEW BODY**

The Deans will form review teams for each of the programs reviewed by their divisions. These teams will ordinarily be comprised of faculty members who teach courses within the programme under review and must include an internal stakeholder not connected to the programme, and a member from the business and professional community to serve in an advisory capacity. The teams should be assigned and the information distributed to team members before the start of the Fall mid-semester break.

**3. REVIEW PROCESS**

Decisions regarding continuing, changing, suspending, or eliminating programs should include an evaluation of the above criteria taken together rather than independently. We do not recommend cut-offs for any of these measures, but instead rely on the judgment and the arguments provided by the review committee.

## **Relevance**

The criteria and data input to the relevance assessment will vary from division to division and even within areas of the division. Some data that may be useful to consider are:

Transfer data for courses and programs

Labour market analysis

Survey of community employers

Placement statistics for alumni

Articulation agreements

Each review should consider the appropriate measures of relevance and address any concerns that arise. The officer of institutional research should provide much of the data. If the data are not complete, it is the responsibility of the OIR to locate and supply the data.

## **Viability**

The central question asked here is whether it makes sense to retain the programme. Factors that may be considered are:

Cost per student

Importance of the programme to the college

Importance of the programme to the community

The availability of necessary resources (including faculty)

This decision requires an assessment of the tradeoffs between the cost of the programme and the benefit of the programme to the college and the community. An extremely important programme may tolerate a higher cost per student value than a less important programme. If resources are not available or are very difficult to obtain, the programme will be deemed less viable. If, however, the programme is vital to the community, we should seriously consider trying to offer it anyway.

***Quality***

There are several sources of data used to assess the quality of a programme:

Qualifications of the faculty

Access to suitable resources

Employer satisfaction

Surveys of student satisfaction

***Currency***

Programs should be compared to other comparable programs to ensure they are current. Programs that have direct applications to technology may also be compared to current technologies to assess the extent to which they are current. Small changes and adaptations to the environment will occur between reviews and these changes can be used as part of the assessment of currency.

***External Effectiveness***

The appreciation of the graduates by the institutions into which we feed is a good measure of how effective our programs are to the external world. The recipients of our graduates are primarily employers and other educational institutions. Sources of data for this judgment arise from:

Surveys of employer satisfaction

Transfer success

Alumni success

*These should be gathered by the OIR and made available to review committees.*

## **Uniqueness**

The review committee should examine the offerings of similar programs within the college and evaluate the extent of overlap. When different divisions are offering programs that extensively, overlap in content, audience, and external relevance we should consider streamlining our offerings. Keep in mind that very similar programs may have a different audience and this may justify separate programs.

***Articulation Agreements***

Whenever changes are suggested to programmes, the review committee must examine the impact of those changes on our existing and planned articulation agreements.

**4. DECISION**

***Consult with lecturers***

Decisions about course inclusion or deletion will affect lecturers so the Dean should discuss recommended changes with the relevant faculty. Not all relevant faculty will serve on the review team. In some cases, the faculty member may be asked to revise a course or teach a different course based on the review team’s recommendations. The faculty member who teaches the course may argue against the recommended changes or suggest alternatives.

***Decide upon specific additions, deletions or alterations***

The final division level decision rests with the relevant Dean. Ordinarily they will simply forward the review committee’s decisions to the Academic Council, but revisions to the committee’s suggestion may arise from consultation with lecturers. Deviations from the review committee’s recommendations should be discussed with the team and reasons for the revisions made explicit.

***Forward to Academic Council (or Programme & Curriculum Sub-committee)***

The institutional level decision rests with the Academic Council. The Council will review the recommendations and the justifications presented by the divisions and accept, send back for revisions, or reject the proposed changes. The Academic Council Chair will forward all recommendations to the Vice-President, Academic & Student Affairs and President for final approval.

*The implementation of the above rests with the Dean in consultation with respective faculty and/or departments.*

**PROGRAMME REVIEW TIMELINE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Function** | **Procedure** | **Time**  **Frame** | **Start Period (Example Date)** | **Responsibility for Initiating Action** | | |
| **VP ASA** | **Dean** | **Faculty** |
| **Initiating the Review** | 1. Identify the Programs requiring review by October 30 of each year 2. VP ASA requests information from {Officer of Institutional Research] 3. {Officer of Institutional Research} sends requested programme data to VP ASA 4. VP ASA forwards programme data to respective Deans | 3-5 Years or as needed | Fall  (Fall 2011) | X |  |  |
| **Forming the Review Body** | 1. Duties are assigned | Before end of Fall Semester | November (Fall 2011) |  | X |  |
| **Review Process**  (see [Form](file:///\\college.bm\fileprint\vp\VPs%20Docs\G1_Administration\BC_Programme%20Review\Program%20Review%20Instrument_091313.docx) of Guidelines) | 1. Assess the relevance of the programme to transferability, community needs, etc.) 2. Assess the viability of the programme 3. Assess the quality of the programme 4. Assess the currency of the programme 5. Assess the external effectiveness 6. Assess the uniqueness of the programme 7. Evaluate articulation relationships | Before end of Spring Semester | Spring– Jan-May (Spring 2012) |  | X | X  X  X  X  X |
| **Circulate Change Recommendations** | 1. Review to ASA and FA 2. Consults with lecturer(s) 3. Decides whether to add, delete, or alter courses 4. Accepts / Rejects changes | Before end of September | Fall (Fall 2012) | X | X | X |
| **Academic Council Actions** | 1. Forwards changes to Academic Council 2. Budget considerations considered | Before end of November | November (Nov 2012) | X |  |  |
| **Administrative Training** | 1. Makes changes to relevant components of the programme 2. Training staff/faculty 3. Produce outlines/syllabi as required |  | Spring/Summer (Mar-Aug 2013) | X | X | X |
| **Implementation** | 1. Programme changes implemented |  | Fall (Fall 2013) |  | X | X |

**Bermuda College  
Programme Review and Recommendation Form**(Complete this form for each programme that is under review)

Date:

Academic Division:

Academic Department:

Title of the Programme:

Timeline for Programme Review (Three Semesters)

Start Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ End Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. The accompanying guidelines list questions about centrality to mission, quality, faculty and physical resources, demand, cost, duplication, and consequences of deletion. After careful consideration of what is going well and or challenges in the existing programme, which of the following does the committee recommend?

\_\_\_\_\_ Retain the programme in its present configuration with low enrollments likely to continue.

\_\_\_\_\_ Retain the programme in its present configuration with specific steps to be taken to increase enrollments.

\_\_\_\_\_Actively investigate collaboration across disciplines in order to conserve programme resources and increase course enrollments.

\_\_\_\_\_ Discontinue the programme while assuring graduation for any currently enrolled students.

1. Explain the above response—either the rational for leaving the programme in its current configuration or specific proposed ways to increase enrollments and/or conserve resources.

Guidelines for Programme Productivity Review

In reviewing the programme consider the relevance of each heading and accompanying statements. A response to each statement may not be required, but address and expound on pertinent issues in your review.

1. **Centrality to Bermuda College’s Mission and Vision**

* Importance of programme to the mission of the institution.
* Relevance to the 5-year Academic Plan.
* Relevance to the Strategic Plan.

1. **Quality of the programme**

* Quality indicators and how they are used to assess the programmes.
* Completion rate and its significance to the programme.
* Is the programme accredited or has accreditation been sought?

1. **Faculty Involved**

* How many faculty members (full-time and adjunct) are teaching in this program?
* What is the average teaching load of the faculty in the department?
* What is the faculty/student ratio within the core subjects of the programme?
* What is the course success rate since the last programme review?
* What is the alumni success rate since the last programme review?
* Transfer data and placement of alumni

1. **Facilities/Equipment**

* Is available space adequate and appropriate for the programme?
* Is available equipment adequate and appropriate for the programme?

1. **Demand**

* Is the programme serving the predicted number of students?
* Are there courses in the programme that are essential supporting courses for other programmes?
* What are the job prospects for these graduates?

1. **Costs**

* What is the economic cost per student for the programme?
* Does the programme have under-enrolled courses?
* What is programme productivity as it is reflected in course enrollments?
* Would the department rather spend those dollars on other programmes/activities
* Could some programme options or concentrations be eliminated or expanded?

1. **Duplication**

* Can this programme’s objectives be accomplished equally well through another programme?
* Are courses in the programme duplicated in other programmes/departments?
* Could enrollment be increased by offering some courses through distance education?
* Is this programme distinctive to Bermuda College?

1. **Critical Mass**

* What would be the impact on students and/or departments or programmes if the programme under review were eliminated?

1. **Recommendation about the Program**

As a result of this review, make recommendations that address these major questions:

* Should the programme be continued as a separate degree programme? If continuation is recommended, provide a sound and compelling reason.
* If the recommendation is to continue the programme, can it be made more productive? If so, how?
* What steps would be taken to strengthen the programme and make it more productive? Should the programme be consolidated or merged with other existing programmes? If so, which ones?
* Should the programme be discontinued? If so, on what timetable? If the programme is discontinued, would there be any savings of funds or resources that could be reallocated to other programmes and activities of greater productivity or higher priority? If so, what would be the saving?

1. **Appendix**

* Data collection for 5 years.