Academic Program Health

Reviewing Course, Department, and Program Vitality

NORTHLAND
COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Overview of Review Procedure

Overview

The Academic Program Health document serves to assess, guide, structure, and share program information to sustain healthy courses, departments, and programs for student success. Northland's mission emphasizes *transforming the lives of students and our communities through a welcoming, supportive, and integrated learning environment.* With guided program analysis, programs, departments, and individual courses alike, can gauge the strength and identify vulnerabilities needed to support the mission of the college.

The metrics and data review, provided by the Program Data Analysis Report, support the effectiveness and efficiency of Northland's courses, departments, and programs in its efforts for continuous improvement. This document should also support the interpretation of its data to recognize actions needed to persist in their vitality. It should also be individually reviewed by each program for acceptance of accuracy.

During the August in-service week each year, academic program faculty will receive information regarding metrics that represent the status of each program through a Program Data Analysis Report. The purpose of this information is to provide faculty and administration with trend data to make corrective actions to improve the health of their programs. Faculty, administration, and college support areas all share the responsibility of maintaining and sustaining vibrant and healthy academic programs.

The process outlined here supports academic programs that face challenges to their efficacy and long-term sustainability. This supportive process aims to improve the vitality of all academic programs with the outcome of maintaining those healthy programs while strengthening those programs that may have weak areas.

Metrics will be assessed with a positive (+), or negative (-) score. The explanations below will help decipher the assigned score. If the weaknesses indicate significant program issues, programs will meet with their Dean and develop a plan of action per the guidelines below. The outcomes of this process may include program modification, enhancement, modernization, or discontinuance. This process's work is not limited to specific academic years but is part of a continuous program management process.

Programs will fall into three levels of effectiveness: Green, Yellow, or Red.

- Programs in the **Green Level** score 5-6 positive notations in the program's analysis. These programs should continue with self-assessment as indicated in the analysis and program review process to maintain a healthy and effective program.
- Programs in the **Yellow Level** score 3-4 positive notations. Yellow-level programs should target their assessment and review processes towards noted weak areas to achieve a more efficient program (i.e., Green Level status).
- Programs in the **Red Level** score 0-2 positive notations. Red level programs have an "at-risk" health status and need immediate supportive action. These programs will initiate sustainability actions as outlined below.

The following metrics constitute information given in the Program Data Analysis Report. The six primary measures are intended as a barometer of program effectiveness. It is recognized these measures may carry different weight for each program. Those programs that are determined "at-risk" must carefully consider the impact of each of the measures as they uniquely apply to the program. Additional key program data and information is included in the report. These other key indicators in the report must also be given careful consideration, as well as factors not necessarily captured by the Program Data Analysis Report.

Individual course faculty, department leads, and program directors/leads will assess the criteria provided for accuracy. They may provide responses to the data to correct any inaccurate information that may be reflected in the analysis within 15 days of receiving.

In consultation with the President's Cabinet, all final decisions will be made by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Department/Program Dean. If a decision is made to discontinue a Course, Department, or Program, that decision will include plans to allow current students to complete their degree requirements, per Minnesota State System guidelines. This includes program alternatives through other area institutions.

Programs in the Green that are Healthy are Aiming to Sustain Maintenance Mode

Those programs in the Green Level (5-6), even though working in a maintenance mode, should continue to consider program metrics to determine program revisions and updates. Green level programs demonstrate a currently strong, healthy program.

As program metrics and data within the report drop from + to -, the program should assess these vulnerabilities. This reflection could be external or internal. It may have been limited to something outside of the program's control, maybe there's a simple resolution for support.

Programs in Yellow that Need to Target Assessment and Review Processes

Programs in the Yellow Level should carefully consider each of the measures in developing strategies to strengthen the overall program.

Programs that fall within the Yellow (3 and 4) meet with their supervising Dean in the fall term to review factors that affect the measure of the program's strength and health. This review should not be limited to only those six metrics on the Program Data Analysis Report but include other information from that report as well as other correlated components that may be impacting the program. Through review of such factors the program faculty and supervisor work to identify effective means of addressing weak areas and collaborating to implement viable plans to strengthen the program as a whole. Note that this supportive process may be informed by processes used for programs in the red level.

Programs in Red and Requiring Supportive Actions

Programs that fall within the Red (0-2) may be suspended or reduced. They will meet with their Dean in the fall term to review factors that affect the measure of the program's strength and health. The six metrics identified and scored on the Program Data Analysis Reports are intended to identify programs that may have significant factors that are constraining the program's health. This barometer of program health is also intended to identify specific areas for supportive actions. By early-October, the academic deans will meet with "at risk" programs to promote and foster program improvements within the academic year. The ultimate goal is to develop plans to help programs become more viable. However, in cases of budget restraints, some programs may need to be suspended on a shorter notice. The MSCF and Minnesota State System labor agreement requires layoff notices be delivered by November 1.

Considerations to note. If a decision is made to discontinue a course, department, or program, that decision will include plans to allow current students to complete their degree requirements, per Minnesota State System guidelines. This includes program alternatives through other area institutions. Program specific accepted students also need to be considered. The third consideration is that program suspensions could impact curriculum changes in other programs for current or future years. For these reasons it is recommended that the administration present program suspension recommendations to AASC no later than October of each year.

Programs requiring supportive actions may, in consultation with their Dean, pursue a more robust process to create and facilitate a plan to improve the program's health. Program Directors and faculty have a particular

responsibility to ensure that any action plans are followed through, especially as a program moves into the yellow or green ranges.

Examples of supportive actions.

- Gathering and reviewing other metrics to support the growth and health of the program relating to student success and student outcomes (in terms of employment and wages for occupational programs, and transfer value for transfer programs). The number of degrees awarded, etc.
- Input statements from courses, departments, or programs.
- Other factors that may include a program's relationships to Northland's Mission* and/or Strategic Action Plan and/or the Minnesota State System Strategic Framework and Equity 2030 initiative; impact on community engagement/service; additional information about student outcomes; faculty contributions to the program in scholarship and creative works; uniqueness in the state, awards or other program income generation; or any other factors relevant to the analysis.
- Courses could be reduced, for example from every semester to once each year
- The creation of a program sustainability committee may be formed. The Program Sustainability Committee review process could include a holistic look at the program, including relevant information from the Program Data Analysis Report, extenuating circumstances (e.g., significant equipment acquisitions, sabbatical expenses, accreditation requirements, lab and clinical limitations, etc.), regional economic and business environment, industry relationships and partnerships, secondary education and community relationships, and so forth.

  Sample membership of such a committee could include:

  1. Program Faculty Representatives
  2. Supervising Academic Dean
  3. Academic Coordinator
  4. Director of Enrollment Management and IR
  5. Chief Diversity Officer
  6. Dean of Student Affairs (or Delegated Representatives in Admissions and Advising)
  7. Additional faculty or staff as determined by program needs (e.g., Division Chair, Faculty Association Representative, Assessment and Program Review Committee Member, Academic Affairs and Standards Council Member, registrar, program specific advisors, etc.).
  8. Program Advisory Board Member

  **Northland's mission statement: "Northland transforms the lives of students and our communities through a welcoming, supportive, and integrated learning environment."*

  The Program Sustainability Committee would work as a team to develop and implement an action plan. Action plans will identify action items, responsible parties, and estimated timelines for completion. Responsibility for implementation is a collaborative effort of the sustainability committee with the goal of improving the health of the program. A variety of methods may be used, including but not limited to the following:

  1. Advisory committee recruitment
  2. Curriculum changes
  3. Consultation with current and former students for their input on how the program can be made more viable
  4. Examination of community, area business, and industry needs and relationships, including program contribution to the community and regional businesses
  5. In-depth look at successful programs similar in nature

6. Marketing methods that include program brochures, inclusion in media ads, etc
7. On-site visits to program area with possible hands-on activities
8. Personal recruitment sessions involving faculty, current students, and possible former students who have graduated from the program

The committee would meet regularly to create, review, modify, and implement action plans. Program faculty and administration determine the necessity for and number of meetings.

The implementation and outcomes of actions are evaluated by academic administration and program faculty during subsequent academic semester(s). Funds in addition to the program's standard operating budget may be made available through the academic dean or other areas if available and deemed warranted.

Course, Department, or Program Suspension or Discontinuance

If it becomes necessary to suspend or discontinue a course, department, or program, the administration will present a recommendation to AASC. As part of the recommendation, the administration will provide historical data of the course, department, or program and rationale based on established criteria. The recommendation and rationale will be presented in writing to faculty involved and AASC.

Faculty shall have adequate advance preparation time (at least one week) to review the rationale and be allowed time with AASC to provide a rebuttal, which also must be framed within the appropriate criteria. This may be done verbally or in writing.

Once the process has been followed, and if the college decides to pursue program suspension, the college will communicate the recommendation to the Minnesota State System Office and HLC to officially remove the program from the inventory.

Suspended programs and discontinued courses will not accept new students**.**

It should be noted that occasionally situations arise where program faculty resign, and an opportunity presents itself to suspend low enrollment programs where it would not be necessary to give layoff notices. These program situations will be brought to AASC as well and may follow different timelines.

Liberal Arts Program Criteria

Metrics for Program Health

Data used for the six key measures of liberal arts program health are listed below. A metric description, its benchmark for + or – referencing, information regarding its calculation, and/or resource are provided.

Metric 1: Course Completion rates for each semester

Course Completion rates for each semester: Comparing letter grades to Withdrawals or FN/FW. Benchmark is 80%, + if equal to or greater than 80%; - if equal to or less than 79%. This is found by pulling enrollment and grade inputs for all Liberal Arts courses each semester. Completion would be F and higher for the year.

Metric 2: Student Success Measure

Student Success Measure: Student Success is measuring the percentage of students who successfully passed the course. Minnesota State System Office has determined letter grades A, B, C and Passing are successful completions. Benchmark is 65%, + if equal to or greater than 65%; - if equal to or less than 64%. This is found

by pulling enrollment and grade inputs for all Liberal Arts courses. Comparing week two enrollments to students who received an A – C letter grade.

Metric 3: Minnesota State Instructional Cost Study

Minnesota State Instructional Cost Study: The number represents the college average costs per program divided by the Minnesota State average costs per program. A 2-year delay. Benchmark is 35% of disciplines within or below the band, + below the band or within 90 -110%, - if greater than 110%. This is a Minnesota State comparison of our programs to like programs across the state. A number greater than one indicates that our program is more expensive than the Minnesota State average. Performance within the band of 90%-110% are cost neutral within the Minnesota State Allocation formula. Programs above 110% result in a reduction in our state allocation. Programs below 90% result in an increase to our state allocation. Due to the system reporting process to calculate this metric, data lags by one to two years.

Metric 4: Student Enrollment FYE to Faculty FTE

Student Enrollment FYE to Faculty FTE: This number represents the ratio of full-time students to full-time instructors. Benchmark + is equal to or greater than 15, - if less than 15. This is found by taking the total number of credits produced by Liberal Arts courses and dividing by a full-time load of 30 credits then comparing to the FTE of all Liberal Arts courses.

Metric 5: Course Saturation Rates

Course Saturation Rates: Seats offered vs. seats sold. Benchmark is 75%, + if equal to or greater than 75%, - if equal to or less than 74%. This is found by dividing the fill rate by the capacity for all Liberal Arts courses.

Metric 6: Assessment and Program Review

Assessment and Program Review: Satisfactory Completion of Annual Assessment, ILOs, & Three-Year Review Plan. Assessment plans are completed each year. Benchmark: assessments completed +, assessments not submitted -; As three-year assessment is due: completed +, not completed or unsatisfactory completion -. This is found by verifying annual program assessment and ILO submission from 90% of faculty within satisfactory submission, including direct and indirect measures of student learning. Three-Year Review Plans are completed.

Other Key Data Included on Report (informational Items)

Other key data listed for the liberal arts program health are listed below. A data description, information regarding its calculation, and/or resources are provided.

Data 1: Total Awards

Data represents the total Associate of Arts degrees awarded in a fiscal year (summer, fall, spring). This is found by gathering all Associate of Arts degrees within a fiscal year, including Liberal Arts AA, and Liberal Arts Transfer Pathway AA.

Data 2: Student FYE

Data represents the total number of full-time students within the Liberal Arts Program based on credits sold. This is found by dividing the total number of credits produced by Liberal Arts courses by a full-time load of 30 credits.

Data 3: Trending Data

Data represents a comparison of the fiscal year FYE and degrees awarded to those awarded in the last X years. This is found by gathering FYE based on credit production, total AA degrees awarded, and total Liberal Arts Transfer Pathway AA degrees awarded in the last X fiscal years.

Data 4: Transfer Rates to 4-year Institutions

Data represents the percentage of AA degree or Transfer Pathway students that transfer to a 4-year institution after taking at least one semester at Northland. This is found by calculating the percentage of AA degree or Transfer Pathway students that have a record of attending a 4-year institution the following fiscal year.

Data 5: Success Rates by Modality

Data represents the Student Success Measure between course modalities. This is found by calculating the percentage of students who earned a C letter grade or higher in each media code used to classify Liberal Arts courses.

Data 6: Saturation Rate by Modality

Data represents the Course Saturation Rates between course modalities. This is found by calculating the saturation rate (seats sold by seats offered) for each media coded used to classify Liberal Arts courses.

Data 7: Course Demographics

Data represents demographic data of students in Liberal Arts courses in line with Equity 2030: generation status, race/ethnicity, family income (Pell Grant eligibility), and gender (sex). This is found by calculating the percentage of each category (listed below) that took at least one Liberal Arts course within a Fiscal Year.

- Generation status: assigned based on a student's application and FAFSA record. Minnesota defines a first-generation student as an individual with parents/guardians who have not taken any higher education. The Federal definition of a first-generation student is an individual with parents/guardians who did not earn a bachelor's degree.
- Race & Ethnicity: separated into IPEDs categories that equal to 100%. If needed, race/ethnicity categories can be disaggregated.
- Family Income: Low-income status will be determined if a student is eligible to receive funds from Pell. This can only be determined if students filed a FAFSA for the given Fiscal Year.
- Gender: The Minnesota State System measures gender on a binary scale. Student's self-identity as male or female. They have the option to not disclose their identity or select "Other."

Liberal Arts Program Data Analysis Table

The new table would be inserted here

Program Data Analysis

	Definitions	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021			Plus/Minus	
PROGRAM							FY18	FY19
Program FYE	3 year trend used							
Student FYE to Faculty FTE (College goal is 17 to 1)	Benchmark: 15. Program requirements considered.							
Percent Full by Section	Benchmark: 67%							
Revenue Divided by Expenses	Benchmark: Budget Tool Factored for Program							
Student Success Measure	Benchmark: 67% [Grads/(Capacity x % Full)]							
Assessment and Program Review Plan	Annual Assessment and Five Year Review							
Minnesota State Instructional Cost Study	Benchmark: 110% Data lags one year							
Score (out of 7)								
Actual Revenue over Actual Expense	Program Budget Tool							
# of Sections								
Average Section Size								
College % Full								
Faculty FTE								
Licensure or Exam Pass Rate								
Employment Placement Rate/Continuing Education								
Job Demand (Resource: ISEEK):								
Wage Outlook Information (state/national): (Resource: iSeek)								
Faculty Comments:								
				Please Return Signed Original to Academic Coordinator				
Faculty Signature		Date						

	Tuition Per FYE:	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
	General	$4,950	$4,950	$4,760	$4,577	$4,422	$4,410
	Health	$5,700	$5,700	$5,360	$5,176	$5,022	$5,010
	Aviation	$5,941	$5,941	$5,713	$5,493	$5,493	-
	Distance	$5,970	$5,970	$5,970	$5,970	$5,970	-
	CVOP	$8,674	$8,674	$8,340	$8,040		
	UAS	$9,000	$9,000	$9,000			

Career and Technical Education Program Criteria

Metrics for Program Health

Data used for the six key measures of Career and Technical Education program health are listed below. A metric description, its benchmark for + or – referencing, information regarding its calculation, and/or resource are provided.

Metric 1: Program FYE

Program FYE: This is a 3-year trend measuring the number of full year equivalent students generated by program courses. Benchmark is + for trending upward, - for trending downward. This is found by multiplying the number of students in the program courses by the credit value divided by 30 credits. Note that 30 credits represent a full-time equivalent student. (The data is pulled from the Program Cost Analysis Tool, by CIP Code.)

Metric 2: Student Enrollment FYE to Faculty FTE

Student Enrollment FYE to Faculty FTE: This number represents the ratio of full-time students to full-time instructors. Benchmark is 15, + if equal to or greater than 15, - if less than 15. This is found by dividing the total number of credits produced by CTE courses by a full-time load of 32 credits and compared to the FTE of all CTE courses.

Metric 3: Course Saturation Rate

Course Saturation Rate: The number represents the course saturation rate for program required courses. This will exclude non-required independent study courses. Benchmark is 75%, + for equal to or greater than 75%, - for equal to or less than 74%. This is found by dividing the fill rate by the capacity for all program required courses.

Metric 4: Graduation Rates

Graduation Rates: This number represents the total number of graduates who have completed the program in the prior year. Benchmark is 70%, + for equal to or greater than 70%, - for equal to or less than 69%. Data is collected through program director/leads and calculated per program according to accreditation guidelines. If programs do not have a larger accrediting body they report to, programs will be assessed according to Minnesota State guidelines.

Metric 5: Course Saturation Rates

Minnesota State Instructional Cost Study: The number represents the college average costs per program divided by the Minnesota State average costs per program. A 2-year delay. Benchmark + below the band or within 90 -110%, - if greater than 110%. This is a Minnesota State comparison of our programs to like programs across the state. A number greater than one indicates that our program is more expensive than the Minnesota State average. Performance within the band of 90%-110% are cost neutral within the Minnesota State Allocation formula. Programs above 110% result in a reduction in our state allocation. Programs below 90% result in an increase to our state allocation. Due to the system reporting process to calculate this metric, data lags by one year.

Metric 6: Assessment and Program Review

Assessment and Program Review: Satisfactory Completion of Annual Assessment, ILOs, & Three-Year Review Plan; Assessment plans are completed each year. Benchmark: assessments completed +, assessments not submitted -; As three-year assessment is due: completed +, not completed or unsatisfactory completion -.This is found by verifying Annual program assessment and one ILO from each faculty member submitted within satisfactory submission, including direct and indirect measures of student learning. Three-Year Review Plans are completed.

Other Key Data Included on Report (informational Items)

Other key data listed for the Career and Technical Education program health are listed below. A data description, information regarding its calculation, and/or resources are provided.

Data 1 : Accreditation Status

Data represents the current accreditation status of the program. The status will include the length of accreditation and when it is next due.

Data 2: Faculty FTE

Data represents the total number of full-time faculty within the program. Data will be measured based on academic coordinator reporting.

Data 3: Job Demand

Data represents the demand for jobs within the field and will be calculated based on JobsEQ-From Perkins/IR reporting.

Data 4: Wage Outlook Information-State

Data represents the wage outlook for jobs within the field in the state and will be calculated based on JobsEQ-From Perkins/IR reporting.

Data 5: Wage Outlook Information-National

Data represents the wage outlook for jobs within the field nationally and will be calculated based on JobsEQ-From Perkins/IR reporting.

Data 6: Loan Debt

Data will be available based on individual program accreditation requirements and if applicable.

Data 7: Graduate Entry-Level Earnings

Data represents the average wage graduates in the field are earning within a year after graduation. Data will be calculated based on self-reporting, exit surveys, and/or alumni surveys.

Data 8: Employment placement rate/continuing education

Data represents the number of students placed in the field after graduation and the number of students continuing education. Data will be calculated based on exit surveys and National Clearinghouse data.

Data 9: Licensure Exam Pass Rate

Data represents pass rates within 1-year post-graduation and is reported on how the program's accredited body regulates data processing if there is regulation. Data is gathered as reported by the program directors/leads.

Data 10: Program Demographics

Data represents demographic data of students in Career and Technical Program courses in line with Equity 2030: generation status, race/ethnicity, family income (Pell Grant eligibility), and gender (sex). This is found by calculating the percentage of each category (listed below) in the program within a Fiscal Year.

- Generation status: assigned based on a student's application and FAFSA record. Minnesota defines a first-generation student as an individual with parents/guardians who have not taken any higher education. The Federal definition of a first-generation student is an individual with parents/guardians who did not earn a bachelor's degree.
- Race & Ethnicity: separated into IPEDs categories that equal to 100%. If needed, race/ethnicity categories can be disaggregated.
- Family Income: Low-income status will be determined if a student is eligible to receive funds from Pell. This can only be determined if students filed a FAFSA for the given Fiscal Year.
- Gender: The Minnesota State System measures gender on a binary scale. Student's self-identity as male or female. They have the option to not disclose their identity or select "Other."

Career and Technical Education Academic Programs' Data Analysis Table

The new table will be inserted here to replace this one.

Program Data Analysis

	Definitions	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021			Plus/Minus	
PROGRAM							FY18	FY19
Program FYE	3 year trend used							
Student FYE to Faculty FTE (College goal is 17 to 1)	Benchmark: 15. Program requirements considered.							
Percent Full by Section	Benchmark: 67%							
Revenue Divided by Expenses	Benchmark: Budget Tool Factored for Program							
Student Success Measure	Benchmark: 67% [Grads/(Capacity x % Full)]							
Assessment and Program Review Plan	Annual Assessment and Five Year Review							
Minnesota State Instructional Cost Study	Benchmark: 110% Data lags one year							
Score (out of 7)								
Actual Revenue over Actual Expense	**Program Budget Tool**							
# of Sections								
Average Section Size								
College % Full								
Faculty FTE								
Licensure or Exam Pass Rate								
Employment Placement Rate/Continuing Education								
Job Demand (Resource: ISEEK):								
Wage Outlook Information (state/national): (Resource: iSeek)								
Faculty Comments:								
Faculty Signature		**Date**		**Please Return Signed Original to Academic Coordinator**				

	Tuition Per FYE:	*2014*	*2013*	*2012*	*2011*	*2010*	*2009*
	General	$4,950	$4,950	$4,760	$4,577	$4,422	$4,410
	Health	$5,700	$5,700	$5,360	$5,176	$5,022	$5,010
	Aviation	$5,941	$5,941	$5,713	$5,493	$5,493	-
	Distance	$5,970	$5,970	$5,970	$5,970	$5,970	-
	CVOP	$8,674	$8,674	$8,340	$8,040		
	UAS	$9,000	$9,000	$9,000			

Original Document 5/4/10
Revised 1/7/13
Reviewed 1/16/13 by SGC
Revised 8/15/14
Reviewed 9/10/14 by SGC
Reviewed 9/5/19 by SGC
Revised 9/18/19 by President's Council
Drafted work 6/12/2023
Revised 12/18/2024 by APR Committee
Revised 2/21/2025 by APR Committee