

## **FINAL Program Evaluation Process 2019-2020 (January 14, 2020)**

<https://libguides.iwu.edu/petf> (password: petf)

Illinois Wesleyan University

The Board of Trustees has mandated a review of academic programs (see 9/19/19 email “The IWU Imperative”). The opportunities for faculty participation in creating the process, task force membership, procedures, and timeline are described below. The site listed above contains links and documents for Chairs and Directors to use in their analysis and narrative.

### **Faculty Participation in Creating the Program Evaluation Process**

Feedback from standing committees and faculty-at-large will play a central role in shaping the Program Evaluation Process. In order to collect and consider feedback on all elements of the review, including the process, timeline, datasets, evaluation criteria, and rubrics, Academic Affairs (AA) will share this document first with the Council for University Programs and Policy (CUPP) and Curriculum Council (CC). After feedback has been received and incorporated, AA will share the revised document with Chairs and Directors.

After AA incorporates feedback from the above entities, the document will be shared with all faculty and Cabinet. Faculty will have an opportunity to provide individual feedback on the draft of this report via a Qualtrics link sent by the Program Evaluation Task Force co-coordinators.

### **Program Evaluation Task Force, Membership**

The Program Evaluation Task Force (PETF) will consist of seven members and two coordinators, serving *ex officio* (*non voting*).

PETF membership will include three (3) members from the Council for University Programs and Policy (CUPP), three (3) members from the Curriculum Council (CC), and one (1) member elected from the faculty at-large.

### **Process for Evaluation and Key Criteria and Evidence to be used for Program Evaluation**

The PETF will engage in a holistic analysis, relying on both qualitative information provided by chairs/directors (in consultation with other program members) and quantitative information provided by Academic Affairs, the Office of Institutional Research, and Gray Associates (a higher education consulting firm). (See Appendix II for the Key Criteria, Indicators, Data Sources, and Questions for Chairs/Directors.)

*Qualitative data:* In their evaluation of these key criteria, the PETF will look closely at the Department Chairs/Directors analysis.

*Quantitative data:* Given the unique nature of curricular offerings, no single dataset will tell the full story of the contributions of any program. As a result, in addition to qualitative data, numerous datasets will be consulted. Gray Associates has been contracted to provide internal and external data. Chairs/directors will review their own data and report any concerns to the Associate Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Evaluation. Datasets to be used in the evaluation will be finalized and made available to faculty in January.

*Standing Committees:* Members of the PETF will regularly update CUPP and CC on the progress of the review.

*Department Chairs:* Chairs/directors will receive the last five years of departmental enrollments and completions and three years of financial reports along with Gray Associates' Program Evaluation System (external demand data) and Program Economics (internal data) and will be asked to provide additional information not found in those reports that they believe will be helpful to the PETF. (See Appendix I: Department Chair Analysis.)

*Student Participation:* Students, through a survey, will have opportunities to provide feedback on their majors and to share thoughts on new courses and programs they would like to see.

## **Evaluation Process**

For the purpose of this evaluation, program means major.

Each of the voting members of the PETF will use the evidence provided to independently rate the key criteria for each program on a scale of 1-4. These criteria, their respective weights in the rating, and descriptions of the scale can be found in Appendix III of this report.

After rating programs individually, the PETF will meet as a group to discuss their results. PETF members will meet and discuss when recusal is appropriate for each member. For example, members will recuse themselves for discussion of their major.

As a task force, they will make one of the following recommendations detailed in Appendix IV. These recommendations may apply to majors, departments, and schools:

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

The PETF recommendations will be communicated to CUPP and CC. CUPP and CC will bring the recommendations requiring a vote to the faculty (according to the procedure outlined in *The Faculty Handbook*). After the faculty vote, the president and the provost will meet with any affected programs to discuss the recommendation in detail. Any affected program will have 14 calendar days after the vote to write a formal response to the president and provost. The results of the faculty vote will be communicated to the Board of Trustees in May. This communication may be accompanied by brief (1,500 word, maximum) responses from CUPP/CC and the president and provost.

## **Timeline**

### *September, 2019*

- Academic Affairs drafts the Program Evaluation Process 2019-2020 document.
- Draft IWU document (with appendices) and McDaniel documents shared with CUPP and CC for feedback.

### *October, 2019*

- AA incorporates feedback from CUPP and CC by October 16.
- President communicates the revised documents to the entire tenured/tenure-track faculty in an email message “signed” by the president, provost, CUPP chair, and CC chair.
- A Qualtrics-based feedback process will be used to solicit feedback from faculty. The Qualtrics survey will be open for a period of 10 days.
- CUPP/CC will host feedback listening sessions with faculty to help gain a holistic sense of faculty perspectives.
- CUPP/CC review, incorporate feedback from faculty survey and listening sessions, and communicate the revisions to the president and provost.
- Members appointed to the PETF.
- Institutional Research, External Consultant, Registrar, and PETF establish data sets for assessment process and build those databases.

### *November, 2019*

- Institutional Research develops and distributes student survey questions/format.
- Chairs/directors encouraged to begin discussion of the Chair/Director Analysis with faculty.
- PETF, administrators, and select strategic planning work groups attend a two-day workshop on the Program Evaluation System by Gray Associates.

*December, 2019*

- Student survey results shared with the PETF.

*January, 2020*

- The president shares the final version of Program Evaluation Process with all faculty members.
- Programs begin their program reviews (deadline: 45 calendar days after the data are received). Each program receives their appropriate data sets. Additional data IF NEEDED can be requested through Jenny Hand or Stephanie Davis-Kahl.
- Gray Associates hosts a one-day workshop for chairs and directors regarding Program Economics data

*February, 2020*

- Forty-five calendar days after the data for qualitative analyses are received, all completed program analyses are due to PETF.
- PETF meets and voting members score program analyses.
- PETF meets and voting members discuss results, make committee-level recommendations, and develop accompanying rationale and observations.

*March, 2020*

- PETF communicates results to CUPP, CC, AA, and the president.
- CUPP and CC review PETF recommendations and, following the *Faculty Handbook*, bring recommendations requiring a vote to the full faculty.
- Faculty debate and discuss recommendations.

*April, 2020*

- Final faculty vote no later than 4/22/20.
- Affected programs have two weeks to respond to faculty vote.
- CUPP/CC and the president/provost have the option to prepare a faculty and an administrative response (1,500-word maximum, each) to the recommendations.

*May, 2020*

- The president and provost meet with programs prior to the Board of Trustees meeting (May 18 and 19) to discuss responses with those filing responses.
- The president and provost report recommendations and any faculty and/or administration responses to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

## APPENDIX I: Chair / Director Analysis

Please see the PETF website (<https://libguides.iwu.edu/petf> (password: petf)) for program evaluation documents and resources.

### Instructions for Writing the Analysis

**Deadline for submission of Chair / Director Analysis to the PETF: 45 calendar days after the final data sets have been shared with faculty (firm deadline will be communicated following the release of the final data sets)**

The Chair/Director Analysis is a critical component of IWU's academic review process. It gives programs an opportunity to provide information, insights, and context that the Program Evaluation Task Force cannot otherwise discern from the data.

**Your Chair / Director Analysis may be no longer than eight pages.** Documents should be double spaced, 12-point font, and 1-inch margins. If your program awards more than a single major or degree, you may (but, again, are not expected to), submit a supplementary analysis for each major/degree, each of which can be up to two pages in length. For the select number of academic units that house more than one major of unrelated/distinct content, separate eight-page documents for each major are permitted. If your majors/degrees share faculty, courses, and pedagogical practices, a single eight-page document with (if desired) the appropriate number of two-page analyses is required.

To develop your analysis, you may choose from among the questions found in the "Questions for Chair / Director" listed in the right-hand column of the "Program Evaluation." You may also choose to address areas not represented in those questions.

You do not need to answer every question. Focus instead on questions that provide the task force with the context or insight that you feel is important. If there is an area where your program clearly excels, consider telling that story. If there are areas that you are focusing on improving or areas where you would like to propose your program will grow and expand, explain your plans. If there are recent or planned retirements in your program, please communicate that to the task force.

An essential goal of program evaluation is the reinvestment of dollars to provide needed resources to existing programs and to create new programs. The task force is eager to read responses to the questions posed in the "Opportunities" section of the "Program Evaluation." The task force does not expect fully fleshed out proposals in your analysis. A recommendation for reinvestment means that the task force sees promise in your preliminary plans.

Before you begin writing, please meet with your program members to determine:

- The areas your colleagues believe should be the focus of the Chair / Director Analysis.
- Whether / how you will divide up the sections of your analysis.
- Who will write the analysis (or analyses).
- A deadline by which all faculty members will receive a draft of the analysis and a deadline for comment on that draft. All faculty members of the department should have an opportunity to see the analysis prior to submission.

Please know the task force recognizes and appreciates the short turnaround time for this analysis and encourages program members to divide the workload and begin drafting early so that the burden of drafting does not fall exclusively on the chair / director.

Please use this file-naming format for each analysis:

**Name of program\_Chair-Director\_Analysis**, for example:

English\_Chair-Director\_Analysis

Send the Chair / Director Analysis as an attachment to an email addressed to [instres@iwu.edu](mailto:instres@iwu.edu). Once submitted the PETF and Academic Affairs will move forward with the understanding that all members of the academic unit have reviewed the document and have reached a consensus unless the submission email indicates otherwise.

**Deadline for submission of Chair / Director Analysis to the PETF 45 calendar days after the final data sets have been shared with Chairs/Directors (firm deadline will be communicated following the release of the final data sets)**

**APPENDIX II: Program Evaluation: Criteria, Indicators, Data, and Questions for the Chair / Director**

The Program Evaluation lists the criteria that the PETF has developed to guide the evaluation of Illinois Wesleyan University’s major programs of study. Please include evidence to support the conclusions for each criterion.

<b>Key Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data Source(s)</b>	<b>Questions for Chair/Director Analysis</b>
<b>Program Mission</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mission of the academic unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative data from chairs/directors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to the <a href="https://www.iwu.edu/about/mission.html">IWU mission statement (https://www.iwu.edu/about/mission.html)</a>.</li> <li>• How does your program relate to IWU’s mission?</li> </ul>
<b>Five-Year Trends</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program 5-year completions</li> <li>• Program 5-year enrollment patterns at IWU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IWU internal data presented on Gray Associates Program Evaluation System (PES) Scorecard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What types of students is this program intended to serve?</li> <li>• Are there patterns for how students move into or out of the program?</li> <li>• What are your program’s current enrollments and completions? How have these been trending? Do these trends track with overall institutional enrollments or are changes more pronounced, countertrend, or static?</li> <li>• What insights can you provide on these trends?</li> <li>• Does this program face any particular risks or needs (e.g., accreditation issues, retiring faculty, obsolete facilities)?</li> </ul>

<p><b>External Demand</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National and state completion trends and competitive intensity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gray Associates PES (scorecard and competitor tabs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do your enrollment data compare to national and state trends for your major? What factors do you think play a role in enrollments, either positively or negatively?</li> <li>How does this compare to overall student demand metrics and median program sizes?</li> <li>How does this compare to how other institutions have been doing with this program?</li> <li>Are any other institutions having particular success with this program? What are they doing differently?</li> <li>What should we do, if anything, to increase enrollments or completions in this program? For example, are there capital investments that could increase recruitment in your program?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Program Outcomes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduate outcomes (according to Gray Associates PES)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gray Associates PES post graduate data (scorecard)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are our students going on to satisfying career paths? How do we know this?</li> <li>How does this compare to expected outcomes from the market data?</li> <li>Should we be preparing students for graduate school, direct-prep jobs, or generalist jobs? Are we doing that?</li> <li>What should we do, if anything, to improve student outcomes for this program?</li> </ul>



<p><b>Internal Demand</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional costs <b>per student credit hour (SCH)</b></li> <li>• Majors, minors, general education requirements, and / or other programs supported by academic unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gray Associates Program Economics (3 years) Table of Courses by Department</li> <li>• Qualitative data provided by program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide insights on your instructional costs per student credit hour based on the Gray Associates Program Economics.</li> <li>• Please include any information you feel would be useful related to the number of students taught including unique pedagogical approaches and disciplinary best practices.</li> <li>• Provide insight into courses that costs more per student credit hour than the IWU median (\$1030.00). Are these courses required?</li> <li>• Is there evidence of greater demand for specific courses (e.g., waitlists, student demand information from admissions, etc.) than you are able to meet in your program?</li> <li>• Is there anything you'd like to address regarding contact hours in relation to credit earned by students?</li> <li>• Please specify how your program contributes to the IWU general education and/or other majors or programs on campus.</li> </ul>
-------------------------------	--	--	---

<p><b>Financial Contribution of Program</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional cost</li> <li>• Student revenue</li> <li>• Overall contribution</li> <li>• Operating expenses</li> <li>• Steps taken for cost containment, if applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gray Associates Program Economics Scorecard (3 years)</li> <li>• Annual operating budget for past 3 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide insights into your program’s overall contribution and/or contribution per student credit hour (SCH) as determined by Gray Associates Program Economics.</li> <li>• Looking at the program contribution rank, where does your program fall? What context can you provide about your rank?</li> <li>• Please provide a brief justification of your departmental operating budget. If applicable, briefly explain any unusual lines in your budget that move beyond what would be standard operating budgets in other programs.</li> <li>• What cost-savings measures have you taken or could be taken to decrease your operating budget?</li> <li>• Is there a fundamental change in your program that could result in savings or an increase in net revenue?</li> <li>• What can you do to increase your net tuition revenue/contribution and/or decrease your cost per student credit hour?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Professional Activity in Program</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grants, articles, books, patents, student-faculty research, etc.</li> <li>• Existing community-business, educational, medical, civic, social agency partnerships</li> <li>• Professional credentials from approved state or national licensing agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative data provided by program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there professional activities or community partnerships happening in your program that you believe set you apart from programs at peer institutions?</li> <li>• Are there grant opportunities that your program can secure to substantially raise the profile of your program? What would be needed to secure the funding?</li> </ul>

<p><b>Strengths / Opportunities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for interdisciplinary programs</li> <li>• Opportunity to realign or strengthen program</li> <li>• Strengths of your program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gray Associates PES and Program Economics</li> <li>• Qualitative data provided by program</li> </ul>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please describe the strengths of your program. Of what are you most proud?</li> <li>• Address the “outside of the classroom” learning that your program supports (e.g., independent studies, Signature Experience, undergraduate scholarship, students engaged in professional development, advising student groups, etc.).</li> <li>• Consider explaining any concrete steps you have taken to build on your strengths over the past five years.</li> <li>• Do you have specific examples of how you have addressed challenges to your program(s)? What more still needs to happen?</li> </ul> <p>Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What new interdisciplinary opportunities might exist for your program? For example, are there courses instructors for your program could teach to support other majors? Are there courses instructors from other programs could teach to support your major?</li> <li>• What opportunities exist for new programs or courses to increase demand?</li> <li>• Can you see your program merging with another existing unit?</li> <li>• Can you see your program joining with another existing unit to create something altogether new and in high demand (with existing units ending as they now exist)?</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--

### APPENDIX III: Rubric for Evaluation of Key Criteria

Key Criteria	Weight	4	3	2	1
<b>Mission of Program</b>	Moderate impact	Exceptional relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission	Explicit relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission	Implicit relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission	No clear relationship between the mission of the program and the University's mission
<b>Five-Year Trends</b>	Moderate impact	In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of significant and sustained growth in enrollments and number of graduates	In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of growth in enrollments and number of graduates	In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of stability in enrollments and number of graduates	In relation to total University enrollment, 5-year trends show pattern of decreasing enrollments and number of graduates
<b>External Demand</b>	Moderate impact	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.	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.	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	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
<b>Program Outcomes</b>	Low impact	PES suggests near 100% job placement in chosen field and/or high starting salaries.	PES suggests most students find employment in satisfying career paths and/or high to moderately high mid-career salaries.	PES suggests students have minimal opportunities to find employment their chosen field and/or minimal salary increases by mid-career.	PES suggests poor outcomes on placement in satisfying career paths.
<b>Internal Demand</b>	Moderate impact	In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are <50% of median cost.	In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are between 51-60% of median cost.	In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are between 61-80% of median cost.	In relation to the median cost per student credit hour (\$1030), average course costs are >81% of median cost.

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

**APPENDIX IV: Criteria Guidelines for Final Recommendations**

No program will meet all the items listed underneath each of these areas, but these will be used as guides for the holistic recommendations made by the task force. The Rubric for Evaluation of Key Criteria (APPENDIX IV) will help guide the task force’s recommendations.

<b>Major:</b>		
<b>PETF Recommendation</b>	<b>Notes on Quantitative Data</b>	<b>Notes on Departmental Reports and Department Chair’s or Coordinator’s Analysis</b>
<p><i>Deletion of major/Program closure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• declining/low enrollment that differ from national trends</li> <li>• poor prospects for growth</li> <li>• poor interdisciplinary potential (Courses not needed in other majors)</li> <li>• program does not distinguish us from other area Liberal Arts schools</li> <li>• state and/or national trends show low interest in program</li> <li>• student concerns about perceived quality or relevance of major</li> <li>• negative or negligible contribution according to Gray Associates’ Program Economics</li> </ul>		

<p><b><i>Transformation/Reorientation/Consolidation</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• potential for growth with some realignment</li><li>• relatively low number of majors but valuable general education teaching</li><li>• interdisciplinary potential</li><li>• courses in subject needed to sustain other programs</li><li>• strong campus presence, service, or community impact</li><li>• admissions pipeline information or national enrollment trends shows promise if program focus is altered</li><li>• student concerns about relevance of existing program in its current form</li><li>• Negligible to modest contribution according to Gray Associates' Program Economics</li></ul>		
--	--	--

<p><b><i>Fine as is, no action needed</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• reasonable enrollment and attrition data</li><li>• stable program with adequate ratio full-time vs. part-time faculty</li><li>• program serves both a solid number of majors and the IWU mission</li><li>• admissions pipeline information and/or national enrollment trends suggest program is performing as expected</li><li>• student feedback indicates general satisfaction</li><li>• Moderate to modest contribution according to Gray Associates' Program Economics; no benefit to consolidation/transformation/reorientation</li></ul>		
--	--	--



<p><b><i>Strategic Investments</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• strong programs based on numbers of majors and/or market potential</li><li>• quality of existing program</li><li>• long-term viability of program</li><li>• admissions pipeline information and/or national enrollment trends suggest investment could increase enrollment</li><li>• Significant contribution according to Gray Associates' Program Economics</li></ul>		
--	--	--