Program Prioritization Task Force Minutes

November 26, 2012

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

1. Ongoing discussion of criteria and indicators

Brian distributed a handout for task force review regarding the program profile process. It is still a two stage process but with more information than we were considering in our previous draft (5-6 criteria that could all be generated by OIPE). This process would require all departments to do some report writing. Discussion ensued regarding this proposal.

It would require a narrative on the recent history of program and context of the program (1 page) within the last five years. Every single program would be required to produce this – all have had cuts in the last five years. If we give a pass based on that, we would be giving a pass on all. Are there some that have had disproportionate cuts than others? Discussion ensued.

Do we want to leave in duplication? Angi suggested offering uniqueness (both could be included in the summative statement). Discussion ensued regarding the main differences between Brian’s proposal and the original proposal.

The only additions are brief context of history, percentage of courses taught and cost. Stage 2 would be more the “why” questions and more narrative. It was suggested adding bringing in additional resources, grants, etc – if this cannot be obtained through reports, it could be included in the initial narrative. The two summative statements would be a total of 500 words for both. Discussion ensued. Angi will incorporate revisions we made and also indicate that we will look at Delaware profiles then send it back out to the task force for feedback.

How do we do assessment? Angi outline four possible methods:

1. Points for each criteria (weighting systems maybe)
2. Points for broader indicator areas
3. Total assessment (100 point scale), holistic, ordinal
4. Evaluate programs and assign them to categories (sorting)- nominal

Are there other possible ways to do this? Is this for Phase I or Phase II? Discussion ensued. Some task force members like the minimum standard with initial triggers that tells us whether a program is above or below the average; if we go with expanded qualitative statements, others do not want to use a cut score but something more evaluative. Discussion ensued.

The quantitative data could drive how we look at the narratives. It was suggested we share the hard data with programs before they provide narratives to the task force so it gives them an opportunity to dispute data if desired.

Test cases – if we get all the data from OIPE then we do not need to have programs volunteer but can take a more random sampling.

Phase II would consist of qualitative information and personal conversations with program directors – this is for the high and low rated programs. A conversation is preferred to a written rebuttal. We need to be very selective regarding programs that are recommended for additional resources since these resources are extremely limited. Discussion ensued regarding a second stage of reports.

The task force agreed they should not review quantitative data until departments review and approve the numbers - they can send their narratives at the same time. This gives them the best opportunity to provide their best case before we begin to review. They will have two weeks to review. The task force may wish to meet with department heads and program directors prior to numbers going out. For the forum in January, we will have Melissa there in anticipation of the release of numbers. They need to know how they can dispute the numbers or change things. The point is to listen because the task force may choose to alter something after. However, we can give Melissa a heads up and can tweak as needed after.

We will send out an updated timeline. It will be good to show how data was calculated, how each number will be used, where it came from, etc. We have got to find a common date upon which all will be evaluated. We need a clear written statement on how these will be calculated. The forum is January 16th. We will have a week to generate data, one to two weeks to look at data and write narrative, with a deadline of February 16th to submit reports. If we have everything between February 1st and 15th, the task force will have a month to review.

1. Program / unit analysis – (Master list programs)

We will review programs at our next meeting.

1. Moving forward

Angi will do one last compilation of profile and discuss issue of teams vs. all reviewing. We will discuss this at our last meeting (Monday, December 3, 12:30-2:00, UC Dogwood Room )of the semester next week. We will then be ready to send out to campus.

A draft of the email to campus is on back of agenda – please provide feedback to Vicki.