**Program Prioritization Task Force Minutes**

**October 22, 2012**

**Present: Dave Hudson, Hannah Wallis-Johnson, Bruce Henderson, Joan Byrd, Debra Burke, Brian Railsback, Tim Carstens, Mary Jean Herzog, Chip Ferguson, Laura Cruz, Georgia Hambrecht, Jason Lavigne, Angi Brenton, Jannidy Gonzalez, Dave Kinner**

1. Thoughts on Webinar –

The webinar was not as helpful as we would have liked. There is another webinar this Thursday. We will purchase it with a 30 day option to watch. For those of you who couldn’t come, it did share intriguing analytics that came out of the Delaware Study, providing bubble access graphs, more efficient – may be something we may want to access at some point. It was mostly quantitative, not qualitative except for one metric.

Comments from Forum –

It was well attended. People asked good questions. Those of you who spoke on the panel did a really good job. It was an interesting mix of representation by college/unit. There still seems to be a lot of concern as to how this will be different from the last process. Discussion ensued.

Did task force member gain any new insights?

* We want to add a graduate student to the committee.
* There is not an effort in program review to standardize criteria because that is not the purpose of the review. However they are not totally unrelated.
* We need to continue to remind people that committee members are not there to advocate for their college/area.
* It was suggested we have clarity regarding the purpose of this task force when asked by others. Angi intends to write a 3-4 sentence statement as to our purpose to put on our website. Angi will send that out to task force today or tomorrow for input.
* It might be helpful to discuss the strategic plan – likely we will visit that when we discuss centrality.
* It might be good to state the outcomes we wish for in addition to the purpose statement. So far have identified 4 – 1) programs we will invest in; 2) programs that need to continue as they are; 3) some that could be more efficient if refocused, right sized, etc; and 4) some that may need to be discontinued.
* Anything we can do to provide continuous input is important.
* If we are going to mirror the strategic planning process, should we not also have core values? It might be important to articulate those. Discussion ensued.
* Angi suggested we need to know the criteria we are going to use as soon as possible so programs can begin getting that information to us. While the program profiles are being put together we can determine how we are going to weight the criteria. This could actually go either way. Discussion ensued.

1. Criteria

Angi and Vicki took the brainstorming completed at the last meeting and pulled them into three areas of quality, centrality and productivity as a starting place for us.

Angi reviewed the list under quality.

* Under instructional quality we will have to determine how the task force will operationalize this.
* Student quality – for undergraduate programs we could look at cumulative GPA, or entering GPA
* Student success measures – retention, graduation or pass rates on national exams, employment, number of students that go on to grad school.

Angi distributed the ECU document and reviewed with the group. Discussion ensued.

* Student quality is incoming measures; student success is more outcome measures.
* Grade distribution can be gamed, can be worrisome
* SAE’s can be problematic; folks who teach on line have much lower SAI rates than others – this t0o can be problematic.
* QEP comes into play here. All departments had to provide a QEP report as to how measures were met. Could the QEP score these for us? There is an overall QEP report that will go to SACS – it does not break it out by program. The QEP is a work in progress so we need to be careful how much weight it has. Some of the measurements in the QEP may be helpful.
* Performance Based Funding Model (PBF) – 6 year graduation rates, degree efficiency (degrees over total students), one year retention rates. Campus specific measures – 4 year graduation rate, transfer graduation rate, cost per degree, alumni giving. Discussion ensued.
* We are looking for preponderance of evidence.
* All departments have CRD’s that are based on a triangulated model – these are different for each department with no consistency.
* Need to add accreditation

Angi reviewed the list under productivity.

* trends in enrollment – majors and SCH’s
* look at number of full time faculty in addition or SCH per faculty
* departmental questionnaire including a spot for commentary
* ratio of SCH per faculty; cost per degree/SCH; peer data comparisons (have to be sure our data definitions are the same)
* advisement (undergraduate and graduate are separate)
* retention – 4 and 6 year rates per program – looking at more nuanced report
* Can we look at when students change majors, what majors most students gravitate towards? This could help in looking at resource allocation; percentage of degrees per major compared to like institutions (Delaware?) Larry Hammer may be able to assist us greatly. We will invite both Larry and Melissa to talk with us.

Final list includes - Enrollment trends and patterns, graduation patterns rates, program retention, costs and revenue, ratios – cost per student, SCH, degree, SCH per faculty, advisee s per faculty, teaching loads, service loads. Does faculty productivity stay here or go under quality? Revenue – development? Grants, contracts?

Angi reviewed the list under Centrality.

* Core discipline – is it central to education? Can you have a university without this?
* 2020 vision/UNC tomorrow (new one) – how do we see this fitting with the priorities of the 2020 vision?
* Interconnectedness of program or support of other programs or liberal studies
* Regional impact or external demand – if program ended how would it affect our region?
* Duplication or uniqueness of program.

Angi will make revisions and send this back out to the committee to look at.

1. Program Inventory
2. Follow up discussion on campus calls –

Angi is working on NC State and ECU regarding contacts. Angi has sent messages, have affirmation they wish to help but have not heard back. The committee asked that we send the questions out again.

Assignments for next meeting–

* Look at quality – what quality measures can we look at that are measurable and we can get at.
* We took off the website a list of all majors and concentrations. We need to come up with a program inventory. Look through these prior to our next meeting, particularly those that you know more about – star those that we really need to discuss. Then we can sort through as to how we want to review these.

We are going to have to decide how to deal with new programs. They will have no data. The real problem will be with programs that only have 2-3 years of data. With programs less than five years old, we might want to have them turn in their Appendix C (Program Proposal) to see how they compare with their peers. It would be important to study the history of new programs and why they came to be. This is to be an iterative process so new programs will not have a pass for always.