**Program Prioritization Task Force Meeting**

**October 29, 2012**

**Present – Angi Brenton, Vicki Szabo, Brian Railsback, Hannah Wallis-Johnson, Jannidy Gonzalez, Debbie Burke, Bruce Henderson, Laura Cruz, Tim Carstens, Chip Ferguson, Georgia Hambrecht, Mary Jean Herzog, Dave Kinner**

**1 – Discuss progress on assigning / contacting comparative institutions**

UNC-G should be up and running. Sacramento has replied with a list of contacts – seven names but only two of us - some of those of you may want to contact Sacramento instead – please let Vicki know; nothing from ECU yet. Some of you have completed your discussions; we will hold off sharing that discussion until more are completed. We have no official names from NC State. Over the weekend Angi visited with Warwick Arden of NC State. They have two simultaneous processes – one just looking at efficiency and effectiveness (enrollment and financials) and will have a report from that process shortly; other process to strategically look at new programs being offered (GA only allows institutions to have three new programs in the queue). They previously have not had any strategic process for looking at new programs that will be offered. They are developing a process where the program does a brief executive summary and sends it through a university-wide review panel who uses criteria to determine its priority to the university. They send their recommendations to the provost. Only when it is approved at both levels is it sent back to the program for full proposal development.

We will get back to you ASAP with contact names. At the Faculty Assembly, program prioritization came up in a lunch meeting along with other issues. One person there from UNCG shared that their process was great, another shared that they thought it was not. The process basically got rid of programs that had been inactive for a long time. They provided no specifics as to method.

**2 – Briefly discuss webpage / communications**

We wanted your feedback on the webpage. It is based much on the way UNG did their website. We have received no feedback yet. We want to make this as accessible and usable as possible. It was suggested the inclusion of a feedback button to make it easier for individuals to access and realize this is interactive. We will look into making this change.

**3 – Criteria and Indicators: return to Quality, revisit others**

Last time we began a discussion of quality then turned our attention to indicators of productivity and centrality. Angi reviewed the updated list based on last week’s discussion. We are trying to find a way to get to cost by program, still not certain how they define program.

Angi asked for comments on productivity measures, things to add, change, etc. Discussion ensued. It was suggested adding contact hours with students in addition to student credit hours. Discussion ensued regarding inclusion of service under productivity. This is an evaluation of programs, not individual faculty – how would this reflect on the work of the program? The task force agreed to look at an aggregate of this information – also include grants and publication in aggregate form. Discussion ensued regarding how to measure this. Could each criterion include qualitative and quantitative measures? The task force agreed conceptually they want to include these items – will defer how we will measure to next steps.

Angi reviewed the updated list regarding centrality with the group. Discussion ensued regarding duplicity of programs and inclusion of this data. We need to know if we have a unique focus, pedagogy, etc. Discussion ensued regarding moving Performance Based Funding data under productivity.

Last week we ran into challenges in our discussion of quality – are we judging quality of inputs (ACT, GPA, how are faculty teaching) or output (pass rates on national exams, placement rates, student awards, graduate school acceptance)? Quality of instruction is very difficult to assess or measure. UNCG and ECU talked about outputs. We may choose to include yield rates, something about student profile, and student quality incoming measures. The task force would like to include use of part time faculty. We may also need to include pure numbers of faculty and possibly number of different courses taught by faculty (many classes can be taught by the same faculty in a small program). We may also possibly include how many special topics classes are taught in a graduate program. Discussion ensued regarding the inclusion of turnover/stability of faculty.

Items to include:

* Turnover/stability
* Number of faculty in a program
* Accreditation
* Percentage of students participating in QEP/engagement type activities including undergraduate/graduate research, service learning, internships, placements, study abroad, etc.
* Quality measures of entering students (profile of entering students)
* Yield rates
* Student/faculty departmental honors
* Number of students supported by funds provided by the department (grants, fundraising, etc.)
* Number of applicants

Angi will update this discussion and circulate by email. Please respond back to the whole group with any comments. We will include Melissa in order to determine the practicality of our direction. She will meet with us in two weeks.

**4 – Discussion of units / programs (see attachment, Chancellor's report excel file for an additional view of programs / units of review; do not worry about data included at this point)**

We will postpone this discussion to next Monday – please bring both documents with you. Vicki and Angi will try to work through this list before next meeting in an attempt to collapse or eliminate programs that have shifted, etc.

**5 – Review narrative statements for task force / webpage**

After the last meeting, the task force asked for a short speech to define the purpose of the task force. Angi reviewed the narrative with group. Discussion ensued. The second document provides the purpose with greater detail. Vicki reviewed with the group. Discussion ensued. If you have further changes, please indicate those in track changes and send them back. The shorter document will be for our use, not on the webpage. Vicki’s longer document will go on webpage after feedback.

Angi will follow up with Mimi Fenton about adding a graduate student.

Our next meeting is Monday, November 5, 2012, 12:30-2:00.

**6 – Possible data workshop w/ Melissa Wargo and Larry Hammer** – TBA. – This will take place on November 12, 2012, 12:30-2:00.