

Program Evaluation Task Force

Spring 2020

Procedures Document

Membership of the Program Evaluation Task Force (PETF)

The Program Evaluation Task Force consists of nine total members: Two Co-Coordinators from the Administration, the Associate Dean of Curricular and Faculty Development (*ex officio*, non-voting member) and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Evaluation (*ex officio*, non-voting member); three members from the University Council on University Programs and Policy (voting members); three members from the Curriculum Council (voting members), and one at-large member, elected by the Faculty (voting member).

Quorum for Conduct of Work of the PETF

A quorum for **review** of programs will represent five (5) of the seven (7) voting members and at least one (1) of the co-coordinators.

A quorum for **voting** on programs will represent five (5) eligible voting members of the Task Force.

Voting Recusal Procedures

Faculty members must recuse themselves from discussion and voting on programs in their home department.

Faculty members must recuse themselves from discussion and voting on programs in which their spouse/partner teaches.

Faculty members do not need to recuse themselves from discussion and voting on programs for which they have served on a steering committee or teach electives.

In an abundance of caution, faculty members may choose to recuse themselves from discussion and voting on any program for which they do not believe that they can be objective.

Executive minutes will record recusals.

Procedures for Reviewing Submissions from Academic Units

All members (including *ex officio*, non-voting members) will read and review each submission. Individuals will score the program using the rubric from the *Process Document* (Appendix I), but scores will not be tallied or shared at the initial review stage. Instead, discussion will take place of the program with strengths and weaknesses articulated based on the evidence provided in the academic unit's submission and the Gray Associates data.

Once discussion is complete, a preliminary vote on a recommendation on the program will be taken. The outcome of this vote is not binding at this stage. The PETF recognizes that it will necessarily need to norm and review the preliminary voting before a final recommendation is determined.

All discussion of programs will take place in *executive session*. Executive minutes of those sessions will be taken and archived in The Ames Library, but those minutes will not be shared with the Faculty or Administration.

Procedures for Voting on Programs

1. Procedures for Preliminary Recommendation on Programs

Non-voting members will lead the parliamentary/voting procedure. Non-voting members will not bring motions. Only voting members will vote.

Votes will not be secret.

A PETF member will make a motion to place a program into one of four categories as outlined in our *Process Document*:

- Deletion of major/Program closure
- Transformation/Reorientation/Consolidation
- Fine as is, no action needed

- Strategic Investments

Any motion will require a second. Discussion will continue, followed by a vote. A simple majority (four) of voting members (seven) is required for a motion to pass. If absence/recusal leads to an even number of voters and a tie, then discussion continues until there is a majority.

The vote/recommendation will be supported by a written rationale, i.e., each program will be placed into one of the four categories, but also each program will receive a statement that explains the rationale of the Task Force for placing the program into that category along with specific recommendations relating to the future of the program.

2. Procedures for Final Recommendation on Programs

Non-voting members will lead the parliamentary/voting procedure. Non-voting members will not bring motions. Only voting members will vote.

The Program Evaluation Task Force upon completion of the preliminary voting on all programs will review all preliminary recommendations before making final recommendations that will appear in its *Report*.

The PETF will review the preliminary votes/categorizations and rationales for all the programs.

If a voting member of the task force believes a program has been miscategorized, the member may make a motion to change the categorization. If this motion is seconded, following discussion, a vote to recategorize will take place. A similar process will be followed should a voting member want to edit/amend the evidentiary statement that accompanies the recommendation of the vote.

The PETF will then finalize the votes/categorizations for all programs.

One of four categories as outlined in our *Process Document*:

- Deletion of major/Program closure
- Transformation/Reorientation/Consolidation
- Fine as is, no action needed
- Strategic Investments

The final rationales will constitute the majority of the Report of the Program Evaluation Task Force.

Report of the Program Evaluation Task Force

Per the *Process Document*, the *Report* of the PETF will be provided to CUPP, CC, Academic Affairs, and the President.

The *Report* will include the task force's recommendation accompanied by a rationale that explains the recommendation using the Template (Appendix II) for each program.

Upon completion and delivery of the *Report*, the PETF will disband.

Appendix I
Rubric to Evaluate Chairs/Directors Analyses

Program Name: _____

Submitted by: _____

Key Criteria	W	4	3	2	1
Mission of Program	M	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission	<input type="checkbox"/> Explicit relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission	<input type="checkbox"/> Implicit relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission	<input type="checkbox"/> No clear relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission
Five-Year Trends	M	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of significant and sustained growth in enrollments and number of graduates	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of growth in enrollments and number of graduates	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of stability in enrollments and number of graduates	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of decreasing enrollments and number of graduates
External Demand	M	<input type="checkbox"/> External demand for the program is exceptional based on 5-year trends of national and state enrollments and completions; Gray Associates PES suggests ongoing demand; potential students are being turned away.	<input type="checkbox"/> External demand for the program has been moderate or increasing based on 5-year trends of national and state enrollments and completions; PES suggests demand will be sustained.	<input type="checkbox"/> External demand for the program has been flat based on 5-year trends of national and state enrollments and completions; PES suggests demand will not be increasing	<input type="checkbox"/> External demand for the program has been declining based on 5-year trends of national and state enrollments and completions; PES suggests that demand will continue to decrease
Program Outcomes	L	<input type="checkbox"/> PES suggests near 100% job placement in chosen field and/or high starting salaries.	<input type="checkbox"/> PES suggests most students find employment in satisfying career paths and/or high to moderately high mid-career salaries.	<input type="checkbox"/> PES suggests students have minimal opportunities to find employment their chosen field and/or minimal salary increases by mid-career.	<input type="checkbox"/> PES suggests poor outcomes on placement in satisfying career paths.
Internal Demand	M	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are <50% of median cost.	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are between 51-60% of median cost.	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are between 61-80% of median cost.	<input type="checkbox"/> In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are >81% of median cost.

Financial Contribution	H	<input type="checkbox"/> Contribution (revenue generated relative to instructional cost) of program is high.	<input type="checkbox"/> Contribution (revenue generated relative to instructional cost) of program is moderate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Contribution (revenue generated relative to instructional cost) of program is low.	<input type="checkbox"/> Contribution (revenue generated relative to instructional cost) of program is negative.
Professional Activity in Program	M	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty demonstrate extensive contributions to campus, surrounding communities, or their profession	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty demonstrate strong contributions to campus, surrounding communities, or their profession	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty demonstrate expected contributions to campus, surrounding communities, or their profession	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty demonstrate few contributions to campus, surrounding communities, or their profession
Strengths / Opportunities	M	<input type="checkbox"/> Concrete opportunities for significant increase in enrollment or efficiency through initiatives such as new programs or interdisciplinary activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Probable opportunities for moderate increase in enrollment or efficiency via new programs or interdisciplinary opportunities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Potential opportunities for increase in enrollment or efficiency.	<input type="checkbox"/> No opportunities for increasing enrollment or efficiency.

Notes on Quantitative Data:

Notes on Departmental Reports and Department Chair's or Coordinator's Analysis

PETF Recommendation

☐	☐	☐	☐
<p><i>Deletion of major/Program closure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • declining/low enrollment that differ from national trends • poor prospects for growth • poor interdisciplinary potential (Courses not needed in other majors) • program does not distinguish us from other area Liberal Arts schools • state and/or national trends show low interest in program • student concerns about perceived quality or relevance of major • negative or negligible contribution according to Gray Associates' Program Economics 	<p><i>Transformation/Reorientation/Consolidation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential for growth with some realignment • relatively low number of majors but valuable general education teaching • interdisciplinary potential • courses in subject needed to sustain other programs • strong campus presence, service, or community impact • admissions pipeline information or national enrollment trends shows promise if program focus is altered • student concerns about relevance of existing program in its current form • Negligible to modest contribution according to Gray Associates' Program Economics 	<p><i>Fine as is, no action needed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasonable enrollment and attrition data • stable program with adequate ratio full-time vs. part-time faculty • program serves both a solid number of majors and the IWU mission • admissions pipeline information and/or national enrollment trends suggest program is performing as expected • student feedback indicates general satisfaction • Moderate to modest contribution according to Gray Associates' Program Economics; no benefit to consolidation/transformation/reorientation 	<p><i>Strategic Investments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strong programs based on numbers of majors and/or market potential • quality of existing program • long-term viability of program • admissions pipeline information and/or national enrollment trends suggest investment could increase enrollment • Significant contribution according to Gray Associates' Program Economics

Appendix II. Template for Program Recommendations in the PETF *Report*

Name of Program:

Recommendation of the PETF regarding program:

- Deletion of major/Program closure
 - Transformation/Reorientation/Consolidation
 - No action needed
 - Strategic Investment
-

Rationale for Recommendation: