**Program Prioritization Task Force**

**October8, 2012**

1. **Minutes from 1 Oct. meeting**
2. **Blackboard / new materials / materials for website**
* Laura set up a Blackboard site for us. If the organizational system is not intuitive please let Vicki know – institutional folders, minutes, in the news, etc. Vicki will post any items to Blackboard– please send items to her. If you run across information from other institutions, send it to Vicki. Try to keep emails to a minimum unless something is pressing. The website is up on the provost page with minutes and the committee composition posted. When new items are posted to the website, we will inform campus via email.
* Timeline – it might be useful to imbed the timeline when email announcements go out. Vicki distributed a possible timeline reviewed last week. Vicki will modify the timeline to not give explicit dates and send to Anne to be posted. There is a need for other forums. It was suggested forums be inserted at the end of November/early December; one after the program profiles mid to late February; a couple after the public report in early to mid April. We will also have a student forum – Hannah will follow up with SGA about this.
* It was suggested we add a feedback mechanism to put the website like we did with 2020 Commission.Anne will follow up with this task.
1. **UNC / Peer / Regional Comprehensive comparisons**
	* Proposed assignments (see next page)

Is everyone in agreement withthe assignments Vicki sent out? If someone wants to change, let Vicki know. Sacramento is there as a peer institution (is not officially one of ourpeer institutions but had a phenomenal report/process) – other peer institutions are in process and we’ll communicate with some of them as we go.

* + Contacts (proposed) with each university/other contacts – we will start with the Provost and ask them for names of 2-3 members from their program prioritization committee. Vicki and Angi will send out names to committee. We discussed pros and cons of random contacts. While providing candor, we never know when wemay be talking to someone with a private agenda. It might provide a skewed perspective -so we will talk with those below as well as any colleagues you know.
		- Provost
		- Ask Provosts for 2-3 members from Prioritization committees
		- Staff Chair
		- Faculty Chair
		- Student Assembly Chair / Rep.
		- Other colleagues?
		- \* **Added post-meeting – suggested we speak with dept. or program heads also – those who put together reports.**

We should have names after fall break or sooner.

* Questions (proposed)
	+ - Describe the process (committee / prioritization) on your campus.
		- How did you define programs (or other units of review)?
		- What were your criteria?
		- What problems did you have with data, and how did you resolve those problems?
		- What went well?
		- What would you do differently if you could do it over?

We will add to these as the committee desires.

**Q:**Do we have liberty with our questions? Follow up questions?

**A:** It is okay to use the questions and have your own follow up questions.

It was suggested we deduce an understanding of what information the committee wants in order to identify what questions to ask. Different campuses defined “criteria” differently. That term may differ depending on who you talk to.

* How did your campus react?
* Did your chancellor follow through?
* What were the different ways you communicated to your campus?

Thoseof you who have campus peers, please go ahead and make those contacts. Or if you know someone at another institution, go ahead. Melissa suggested making contact with the IOPE staff – Melissa has a teleconference with her counter parts tomorrow (October 9) and will forward our questions to them and get their responses.

1. **Data availability – Melissa Wargo**

When we looked at the data chart from NC State – we thought ahead about what information would be available. Angi and Melissa havediscussed what data IOPE can provide to the committee. This might help to guide us regarding what information we can get. Angi shared the document from Melissa with the committee via email last week.

All usual data elements can easily be gotten. A major question for IOPE staff is having definitions beforehand; more frameworks will help with data mining. There are data that are simply not possible to get at the program level, but are available at the department level (e.g., faculty are not assigned to programs but to departments and may be assigned to multiple programs.) So depending on how you define what level you are looking at, it can be problematic.

SCH’s are assigned to a course prefix. We can tabulate SCH’s following course prefix or can have SCH’s follow the faculty (inter disciplinary teaching). We would not be able to tell you how many SCH’s are generated by a program. Faculty FTE are assigned a budgeted FTE which is completely disconnected from their workload FTE. We have a report that is a five year trend report – number of majors, degrees conferred, and faculty assigned. We can break this down by program. Discussion ensued. One example - we have lots of students that count themselves as nursing majors, but in reality only those that have been accepted into the program are nursing majors – this can be skewed in different ways. Do we want to look at pre majors or just accepted majors? The College of Business has hundreds of undeclared majors. Because of the undergrad core, they are not put into the major until they reach a certain threshold.

Do we want to look at financial ratios – cost per SCH, etc.? We can do this but this is not the strongest data set that we have. We utilize Delaware data rather than Banner – Delaware data does not match up to our financial accounts, but it does give us comparative data across the university and nationally. The data is by CIP code – some match up easily, some do not. Nursing is easy. Forensic Science and Criminal Justice are the same CIP code even though they are not the same. There are upsides and downsides using Delaware and our own internal data for instructional costs. We can trace transactional data in Banner with nursing majors and how they fall out if not accepted into the program.

We have a retention and graduation report that will tell us specifics to programmatic outcomes. We follow a freshman cohort through time. Manyfreshmen do not declare a major when they come in. We have tried to come up with a meaningful way to measure retention rate by program – this allows us to see how long it takes a student to complete a program. We can tell you how many students stayed at WCUand changed majors, etc.

We look at them in one, four and six year snapshots. After one year, how many students are retained at WCU, in the program, or not retained. A good thing about this report is that it picks up students who stop out.

After we decide on criteria, we’ll invite Melissa back to assist us. ECU uses Digital Measures for all of their annual reporting.

**Q:**Do we have anything in digital measures?

**A:** This is not used consistently, some departments don’t use it at all, some have a few faculty that use it and some departments use it in total. We would likely have to gather this information via survey. We were mandated to participate in the Delaware study, but just classroom activity, then it expanded into out of classroom activities. Delaware started another survey (GA mandated we participate in all Delaware studies) then about 4-5 years ago mandated participation in out of classroom activities. WCU purchased Digital Measures for this purpose. Then GA said this was no longer mandated so the impetus to do this on campus faded as well.

**Q:**Do we have official peer data?

**A:**We can request from our peers information that may not be in an official data set. Within IPEDS data we can get anything on the common data set, etc. Our official list of peers was updated last year – it is on our website. None of these are in our UNC system – GA mandated we could not use them.

**Q:** Regarding the depth of this study – is there any significance to depth that we go?

**A:**Do not go beyond 2007. In 2006 we switched to Banner and there was major college reorganization. We can get some information back to the 1960’s like enrollment data. Five years is a good handle.

1. **Discussion of program review criteria (preliminary)**

In our previous discussion we saidthe criteria should have broad purposes and not be overwhelmed with data. Having some standard data requirements would be helpful.

* Dickenson’s 10
* Weighting
* primary import to campus
* secondary import to campus
* instructional quality
* student success
* QEP
* Relationship to mission
* Potential – opportunity
* Trajectory
* Core discipline
* Fit with strategic plan/WCU and UNC
* Number of students
* Enrollment trends
* Program costs and revenues
* External demand
* Regional impact
* Percentage of students participating in undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning (instructional quality)
* Uniqueness (from an outside perspective)
* Endowed chair
* Faculty productivity (scholarly)

Discussion ensued regarding the organization ofthe above into broad categories – productivity, centrality, student success – scoring on criteria? Holistic assessment? ECU had a good score sheet. Sometimes the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Qualitative vs. quantitative. The committee might choose a pilot run before we choose our plan.

**Q:** In the Bain report, they conducted a parallel administrative program review, which in turn pointed out how many administrative programs were done away with – is there a committee addressing this?

**A:** Yes. It is being led by Dianne Lynch and Craig Fowler. They are looking at the same items we are. We did agree to do a comparable process next year for Academic Affairs administrative prioritization.

1. **Upcoming Academic Forum on Program Prioritization**

The Academic Forum is October 10th, 3:30-5:00, in the UC Theatre.

* Questions / preparation / suggestions

We will provide an overview of what we are doing to date. It might be helpful to the audience to hear some of the discussion we did last time – concerns, success measures, hurdles, and share the timeline. They need to know we haven’t made decisions yet and are still thinking about how we want this to go.

**Q:** Do we want to consideration doing college forums?

**A:** We might want to see what we need after Wednesday. The college representatives on the committee would do forums for their college. Discussion ensued.

We might want at some point to have a meeting at Biltmore Park. Maybe we can Skype them into forums.It is possible as we get further into the process, Angi and Vicki could meet with any of those that request a meeting. It is good to encourage deans and department heads to attend these events. We need to allow time for questions. We will share our list via PowerPoint. Angi’s overview and initial thoughts is ready as a handout. We will post meetings on the website.

1. **Conclusion**
	1. Questions / New items
	2. Discussion of assignments
	3. Next meeting date - October 22. Anne will send out a meeting request.
	4. Optional Webinar - 17 October, 1-2 @ UC Multipurpose, or see later, taped

Proposed institutional comparisons

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No pref / other | ECU | NCSU | UNC-G | Sacramento | TEAM |
| Angi Brenton | x |  |  |  |  | PROVOSTS / OTHER |
| Debra Burke | x |  |  |  |  | NCSU |
| Joan Byrd | x |  |  |  |  | UNCG |
| Tim Carstens | x | x |  | x |  | UNCG |
| Laura Cruz | x  |  |  |  |  | FAC SUPPORT |
| Chip Ferguson |  | x |  |  |  | ECU |
| Jannidy Gonzalez | x |  |  |  |  | UNCG |
| Georgia Hambrecht | x |  |  |  |  | SACRAMENTO |
| Bruce Henderson | x |  |  |  |  | NCSU |
| Mary Jean Herzog | x |  |  |  |  | FACULTY CHAIRS |
| David Hudson |  | x |  |  |  | ECU |
| David Kinner | x |  |  |  |  | NCSU |
| Jason Lavigne | x |  |  |  |  | STAFF CHAIRS |
| Brian Railsback | x |  |  |  |  | UNCG |
| Vicki Szabo | x |  |  |  |  | SACRAMENTO / OTHER |
| Hannah Wallis-Johnson |  | x |  |  |  | ECU |

Proposed comparative institutional assignments, w / peer or UNC system schools

UNCG – Railsback, Byrd, Gonzalez, Carstens

NCSU – Burke, Henderson, Kinner

ECU – Ferguson, Hudson, Wallis-Johnson

Sacramento – Szabo, Hambrecht