

ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL  
Minutes of February  
3 p.m., Altgeld 315

Present: Coller, Douglass, Falkoff, Goldenberg, Gordon, House, Jaffee, Klonoski, Li, Molnar, Olson, Parker, Subramony and Winkler

Guests: Derryl Block- Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences, Collan Davidson- Student Association-Graduate Student, Beverly Henry- Associate Dean for Academic Fairs in the College of Health and Human Sciences, Sherrill Morris- Chair of Allied Health and Communicative Disorders, John Siblik- Professor and Director of the School of Art, Jan Strom- Chair of Nursing and Health Services, Steve Wallace-Associate Director of Assessment Services

The meeting was called to order at 3:05p.m

No announcements

**There were three items posted on Blackboard for review and approval. The first is for the major in M.S. in Rehabilitation Counseling. If someone from the College of Health and Human Sciences could please describe the program and the rationale behind it.**

Currently, Rehabilitation Counseling is a specialization in Communicative Disorders. The need to formally recognize Rehabilitation Counseling as a distinct master's degree evolved from changes in the field. It's my understanding that years ago the emphasis in Rehabilitation Counseling had a large emphasis on communication, deafness rehabilitation, that kind of thing. But over the past decade, the scope of practice for Rehabilitation Counseling has really diverged from other specializations within the M.A. in Communicative Disorders. The current Rehabilitation Counseling specialization has not had a single course, student or faculty in common with the other specializations in the M.A. in Communicative Disorders. Furthermore, the specialization in Speech Language Pathology and the specialization in Rehabilitation Counseling are accredited by separate accreditation bodies. The labor demand for these areas is separate with no overlap and there is all evidence that these areas will continue to diverge reinforcing the need to prepare students for very different careers. With a primary focus on graduate studies in Rehabilitation Counseling, students can be academically prepared for a career in state vocational rehabilitation programs, private rehabilitation, and vocational rehabilitation. For these reasons, we are requesting to have these programs separated. There are no costs that are anticipated with this program, the faculty are separate and existing resources will continue to be directed as they are now.

**All of the university approvals thus far have been granted. We are the last step before it goes to the Board of Trustees and then this would go to the Illinois Board of Higher Education as a split, reasonable moderate extension of the current degree.**

And I would just add a quick comment which is to the students who are focuses on Rehabilitation Counseling, they are a little confused about being in a Master's of Art in Communicative Disorders,

so if we are thinking about visibility and attracting strong graduate students, it makes much more sense to them that it's not a specialization within an M.A. degree that they are going for, but rather that it is comparable with other programs. In any case, I know sometimes this group is concerned about appearances from the student's perspective, this makes more sense.

**So once this is approved, there is also a process under foot to remove that specialization so students would be directed towards the M.S. Rehabilitation Counseling?**

(Nod yes)

**Is that why it's considered a split?**

**Right, because right now it's an M.A. in Communicative Disorders, but we are going to request to split it to an M.A. in Communicative Disorders and M.S. in Rehabilitation Counseling.**

**Is the Communicative Disorders currently housed in CHHS also?**

Yes.

**So they are both there? And the same chair would advise both degrees?**

Yes.

**It was moved to approve the request, seconded and passed unanimously.**

**The next item for approval is the new School of Nursing and once again I will turn to Dean Block to say a few words about it.**

I also have Jan Strom here, who is the Chair for Nursing and Health Studies. So, right now the college has three schools and one department and Nursing and Health Studies is one of those three schools. This includes Nursing, Public Health and Health Education. We are seeking approval for a new School of Nursing in the College of Health and Human Sciences. So therefore, Nursing would break off as its own school and Public Health and Health Education would stay in the old school. This is part of a reorganization in the college that would move the college from three schools to five schools. Right now it is three schools and the Department of Military Science. With the number of students, programs and specifically accrediting programs, with only three schools, administratively, it is very difficult. This is the first step in a multi-stage movement to have five schools in the college. We have consultants and other external people as well as approval down the line within the university. There is the thought that this reorganization will benefit students and faculty, making the administration of accredited programs more manageable. It would give the pre-health students better academic experience and they would have more options for continuing education. As part of that reorganization the first step is for Nursing to be its own school. The School of Nursing will be the fourth school in the college and would house the undergraduate and graduate nursing programs. This would help us recruit faculty, who are often quite confused at the structure that we have and it would give us better positioning to recruit and retain the Nursing faculty and students. This is the proposal. This does have a cost associated with it because we would be adding a school which would include an additional chair and adding administrative support. The cost of this would be starting out at approximately \$177,000 for the first year, but because we could increase our student enrollment,

especially in the RN to BSN program, it's estimated that by year four the cost would be less than \$100,000. We anticipate in year five/six, we would break even.

**It was moved to approve the request and seconded.**

**Any questions?**

**What happens to Public Health and Health Education?**

They will be in another school. They will be in the old Nursing/Health Studies, so we could call that Health Studies. And as part of the reorganization, we will propose that the Medical Laboratory Sciences and Nutrition be moved over to that school. But that is not part of this proposal. This is the first step, and the reason we have had to go with this step first is in Illinois to make a new school, you have to go to the IBHE. We have one of the largest Nursing programs in the state.

**Can you tell me the four schools again?**

There are two steps, so with the first step, there will be the new School of Nursing and the School of Health Studies. We also have the School of Allied Health and Communicative Disorders and the School of Family, Consumer, and Nutrition Science. There is also a second stage of reorganization that is yet to come. All of these changes are taking place to encourage growth within our programs.

**Why is this being done prior to program prioritization?**

This process started well before program prioritization and was approved by the Provost's Office well before program prioritization. This change is very needed. Our Nursing program is very large and successful and it seemed like it would be harmful to try to stop it. Additionally, we have many Nursing positions that we are having a problem filling and hope that this will help to alleviate that some. Students and donors both currently believe they are in the School of Nursing, not the School of Nursing and Health Studies. Since the 1960's, it has always been the School of Nursing and it wasn't until about 8 years ago as a cost cutting exercise that the two were merged.

**Other questions or comments?**

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.**

**Our next item is approval in the B.S. in Art. We currently have a B.A. in Art and this is a creative opportunity for us to have a B.S. in Art. Materials were posted on Blackboard, but I will ask Barbara Jaffe if she wouldn't mind saying a few words about why this would be a good time to add this program.**

The School of Art and Design has long had a B.A. in Art, which is a comprehensive degree. This is distinct from the professional degree of B.F.A. in Art and the B.S.Ed. in Art Education. The professional degrees really focus on the content within the degree program with the Studio Art classes. The B.A. is the alternative for students that want a liberal arts education with a focus on Art. This was kind of a lightbulb that went off over my head one day. I noticed that there are programs within the College of Liberal Arts and Education that have a split option between their B.A. and B.S. And the difference in that context is an emphasis on the humanities on the one hand and the sciences on the other hand. It seemed to me that this template would fit for the School of Art and Design as well. In fact, our students do tend to move along that spectrum between a humanistic approach and a more science and technology based approach. I think it is a straight forward proposal. The two degrees, the B.A. and the B.S., would both be options for the Art major. They are nearly identical except for the difference in foreign language on the one hand and some

science on the other. We do not anticipate any new resources because we are splitting the degree that already exists. What we are anticipating is students choosing between these two options. The B.A. has been growing over the last few years, but we feel this would just enhance that. So there would be no necessary hiring or anything along those lines.

**This has gone through all the internal approval processes. The APC is the last step before we go to the Board of Trustees. Typically we would also need to get approval with the IBHE, but in this case, I think there is a good chance that we will only need to apply for a Reasonable Moderate Extension (RME).**

**John did you want to add anything?**

Only that this does allow us to serve students who might have an interest more so in say exploring and finding some interdisciplinary approaches to things such as technology. I think it will serve our student body better.

**It was moved to approve the request and seconded.**

**Discussion and questions?**

**Is it common in other Art programs to have the B.A. and the B.S?**

It is, Illinois State University has a B.S. in Art and at one time our university did have a B.S. degree.

**The B.S. in Art was at NIU?**

Yes, but I can't tell you what happened to it.

**What are some of the careers that students move on to when they have a B.S. in Art degree? Does that prepare them in a different way as they enter the world of work?**

Well, I think that one of the areas that I see as a potential here, is we have a lot of students who would like to be involved in an area of study that kind of falls under the umbrella of graphic design. The visual communication program is highly competitive and there are a very limited number of seats in that program. I see this as a change in serving our students in a way that we can't do right now based on resources that we have in the design area. I'm hopeful it will give students a sense of belonging within the school that they currently may not feel like they have.

**I'm thinking in terms of student learning outcomes, will these be differentiated enough between the B.A. and the B.S? Or are you looking at these being very similar?**

That is an extremely good question. And I will say that we do have work to do when it comes to assessment, particularly in the B.A. tract. This does give us an opportunity to come to a better process so that we can serve that major better. I feel that this move is creating a lot more attention to this major in the last year or two. This will be the piece that helps to move it more towards better assessment.

**How does this affect the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditation? Is this something that you will need to report to them or is it something we wait to report in the next cycle?**

That is a question that I hadn't thought about. As far as reporting that to them, I always feel like those kind of reporting items have more to do with HLC new degree reporting, I guess it's the state board, but we are not really offering a new degree, it's a split degree.

**Any more questions? With none heard, let's move forward to voting.**

**Item was passed unanimously.**

**There are two follow up reports on the consent agenda. The B.S. in Chemistry and the B.S., M.S. and Ph.D. in Physics. In both cases, they were asked to do more with assessment and Chris Parker worked with both of them and they have given us reports now that have moved significantly beyond where they were, which is why they are on the consent agenda. I'd like to take a vote on them, unless people feel like they weren't really able to see them due to the problems with Blackboard today. In which case, this item can be tabled until our next meeting.**

I can only speak for myself, but I have not seen them.

**Blackboard was down pretty much the whole day, so I understand that.**

**If people do not feel comfortable voting, they can be moved to our next meeting. If we would like to have these two items moved to the next meeting, can I get a motion?**

**Item was motioned, seconded and passed unanimously.**

**The last thing that we have, I hope is going to be interesting and fun for us to start talking about. When the agenda committee got together, we talked about the idea of moving forward with transforming program review. So I have a short presentation I'm going to share with you right now.**

**A number of people have helped to work on this. Steve Wallace, Ritu Subramony, Jeff Reynolds, Sarah Leis, Chris Parker, and Jeanne Essex have all helped to move this forward. We really want to think of ways to make program review better for everyone. The agenda for today, I would like to talk to you just a bit about:**

- **Context for Change**
- **Window of Opportunity**
- **Starting Point – Today**
- **Next Steps – Remainder of Spring Semester 2016**
- **Questions, Discussion, Suggestions**

**So the context for change, you probably remember what we gave you in the notebook at the beginning of the year, information on a program review process task force in 2013 and their recommendations. Some of these have been implemented, some are still waiting. That is the background to what I am talking about today for this window for change. Another piece of background, don't think it stopped in 2013, in 2015 Chris Parker did both a program review survey and focus groups on this topic, and we saw even more people wanting a change to happen in the program review process. This is one piece of the context for change, the second piece is we all just went through program prioritization in 2015-2016. I feel like we have some momentum going and that we have some understanding of data**

informed decision making and the alignment that is going to come out of that with the five year budget. So we can jump on that band wagon, and build on some of that momentum to change our program review process. The last thing that you should know is that the Illinois Board of Higher Education has basically told us that if we give a proposal to them for a combined process of program review and program prioritization that they are willing to consider that as we move forward. One of the things that I have heard quite a bit about when I have gone and talked about program prioritization is, if we have to do that every five years, why do we also need to do program review? So we may be able to come up with a single process that hits both goals. That is the window of opportunity that APC has right now. We hope to develop a new, single process that is:

- Mission aligned and contributes to the overall university program portfolio
- Data-informed and peer (internal and external) reviewed- annually and on a five year cycle
- Linked to resources through a five year budget
- Meaningful and used by the programs
- Satisfies needs of external (IBHE, accreditation) and internal ( BoT, programs) stakeholders

#### 2013 PRPTF Core Principles

- Core principle
  - ✓ Opportunity for meaningful reflection
  - ✓ Continuous improvement
  - ✓ Accountability
- Alignment
  - ✓ Aligned with institutional goals and strategic planning
  - ✓ Meet IBHE and HLC minimum requirements
  - ✓ Aligned with disciplinary accreditors' guidelines
- Effectiveness
  - ✓ High-quality data
  - ✓ Analysis and reflection on data
  - ✓ Some external review
- Efficiency
  - ✓ Timely, clear and faculty-friendly
  - ✓ Efficient in reducing reporting burden for faculty and staff

We have extremely long program review reports. Even with making changes to streamline each year, they are still extremely long. This is just not sustainable going forward with people having so many other things that they have to do. It's not sustainable to the people writing them and not to the people reading them.

Can I ask a question? One of the things that I keep thinking about when thinking of combining the two processes, does that mean that all 225 programs are going to be reviewed every 5 years, like they did this year? This just concerns me.

So that is what the senior leadership is telling us. They want the program prioritization review done every three to five years. I've pushed back on it happening every three years because there just isn't enough time to really evaluate outcomes from that short of a time

interval. But maybe program prioritization will happen over a two year process or a one year process instead of a four month process like the task forces are currently doing.

So, what would be the role of this task force in the program prioritization/program review process? If this only happens once every five years, what does the APC do in the mean time?

So this is what we need to figure out. The APC is responsible for monitoring the continuous improvement and quality of academic programs. So how do we fit into that when program prioritization is a permanent part of the campus culture? This is what this group needs to begin to figure out this spring.

These are the recommendations that came out of 2013 PRPTF.

- ✓ Streamline the process
- ✓ Align process with programmatic accreditation
- ✓ Enable programs to complete full program reviews using annual reviews, accreditation reports, and limited additional data and reporting
- ✓ Adopt Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and request plans for programs to address gaps (there have been a lot of changes with the deans, so these may need to be reviewed)
- ✓ Post KPIs in an accessible online “dashboard”
- ✓ Provide feedback to programs on annual KPIs and request plans from programs to address gaps
- ✓ Provide recommendations to EVPP and CFO regarding program resources per annual reviews and full program reviews

In 2015, surveys on program reviews went out and we thought about the process of program review, three is basically neutral and barely any of the responses is rated above a three. People were unhappy with the program review process and they are still unhappy with the process. It's not very efficient, people don't find it terribly useful, they don't think it's leading to a lot of change, and it doesn't seem to be aligned with resource allocation. Likewise, Chris Parker also conducted focus groups where people said, make program review more efficient, we need timely available data, we need to shorten the process, we need to clarify why we are doing it, what is it for, what are the internal and external audiences that we have to report to, and we need to focus on the idea of continuous improvement and the importance of external reviews. When people come in for the external reviews for the Ph.D. programs, we realize that these external reviewers make a huge difference. So what we can do with the rest of this semester, is to start to think about, first of all, the current program review process and templates and how we might want to change those. Secondly, we need to set a template and process for the next group coming through. We kind of gave the people coming through in 2016-2017 a pass. We normally call them in December and say hey, you're up next. We didn't do that this year because they were all involved with program prioritization. So for those group of people, we need to figure out what we are going to have them do for this coming year. We are going to look at best practices and this is something our staff can put together for all of you for program review, program prioritization and even those things that overlap for the two. Again, the KPIs are not for us to select, but looking at the associated data, thinking about what might be most helpful and then posting them on an online dashboard is something we can all talk about. And then finally, we need some type of proposal for the IBHE for a long term process. I would like to get us moving towards that by the end of the semester. I think I put that in

our schedule by the end of the semester. It might be that there is still more vetting needed for that proposal in the fall and getting it through all the shared governance committees. So, first of all, revising the current program review template process, basically what do we need to do to keep moving forward, both for what NIU needs and the IBHE needs. We actually want you to take a look at the templates, come back on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, with ideas for how we can change those templates. We also want to do that with the process. How can we change the process? We can look at that on February 22, have discussions and conversations, maybe go out and make some more changes and then hopefully finalize it by March 21, 2016. This is all in the new schedule you've been given. Just so you know, you have the templates, but you might not know the generic process that we have always gone through. In November we have the kick-off meeting for anyone that coming through program review. Their programs are typically due in March. This year was a little different. June and July there are the summer meetings where there are meetings with the Office of the Provost staff and others. In August, revisions of the program review are due, and then as you all know very well, September through December they meet with the subcommittees and then with the full APC. Then there are more changes that are done and turned in by March. And then in May and through August is when we ultimately provide the finding to the Board of Trustees and to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. This is almost a two year process and we think we can get this cut down a bit. So how can we change the templates, how can we change the process? That is for all of you to decide. And I'm going to turn it over for just a second, and if you don't mind saying a word Marc, since you were the one that was really excited about the templates and rolling up our sleeves and getting started working on this. Can you say a few words about what you are envisioning?

I think merging these two makes a lot of sense. And it's funny, the task force stuff seems almost like ancient history now. A lot of observations are still relevant. I have long liked the idea of going through the template that we are asking people to use and figuring out where we can cross questions out and add things like, please keep your answers to 200 words or less. We've often seen in reading these reports sometimes you get an answer to a question that will go on for five pages when the program was able to answer that question in a paragraph. So there is a lot that can be done there, but as you were talking, it occurred to me that, do we really want to be modifying templates at this point without knowing how we will be potentially merging the processes? However, since we need program review stuff for next year and this merger is going to take time, maybe at we can at least think about how we can chop the program review document down to size with an eye towards asking for the kinds of information that the merged document might need.

**I think one of the other things that we don't know yet and this might be what Rebecca was getting at, we don't know how well the Program Prioritization Process has worked because it isn't done. So we are not going to know at this point, what we want to keep versus what from program review we need and where the overlap is, but we do know that we don't want to be asking people to do both.**

You know, it seems to me, it was over a year ago, at some meeting, I asked Provost Freeman, what was the difference between program review and program prioritization, do you remember that? Didn't she say at the time, that program review measured each program against external peers whereas program prioritization measured each program against every other program on campus?

**Exactly, that is true. Program review is very much about continuous improvement, but often times doesn't have high stakes and program prioritization we know will have high**



**stakes. I think we are at a point where people are beginning to realize we have to figure out a way to maybe create a brand new process that will allow us to do both. So, it's not that they aren't still different because they are, but can't ask people to do this and that.**

After having done both in the past year, I am 100 percent with you. But one of the things that I noticed when we were working on the criteria, we were looking at different programs and what they did for program prioritization, I did notice that there are programs out there that did seem to fold these two things together by doing something like program review and asking each department to competitively rank their programs within that unit. So initiating the program prioritization process, which actually looked like it made a lot of sense and people know in their own programs.

**I remember that question too and the answer was that we are not using an RCM model. The idea is that if you have all of your money at your level, you can divide it however you want and you can be responsible for the outcomes, but if you're constantly getting money from a centralized source, then you don't have that same level of responsibility for the good and the bad. And I don't know, this would be a question for Al Phillips and the senior leadership, of whether we will be moving to RCM or not. At this point, we are not using an RCM model. So this is why she was hesitant about that, if your set of programs is different than this set of programs, well how does the money ever move across? The money would stay within a set college or unit.**

So you're prioritizing within a specific unit.

**Exactly. So that works if you are doing an RCM model, so if you are basically responsible for the money, but if the senior leadership is saying, I think that some of that money needs to come from there and go there, then you are no longer at that level.**

So we are talking about program review and about program prioritization. And then, the way that I understand it, there is a third level that includes program accreditation, which is again, completely different. And if the program does require accreditation, than they are based on an independent schedule separate from the other two?

**Yes.**

And the accrediting bodies do not care about other internal schedules that NIU has set for other processes? So how do we bring all of these things together? I have no idea.

**Absolutely, Ritu, do you want to say a bit about what you have done to align program review and program accreditation cycles?**

Right. So our office had gone and gotten in touch with all of the colleges and the programs, starting at a higher level and then going down into a program level, that have accreditation. And we said to them that program review needs some sort of an external input, so do you want us to schedule program review in such a way, that it will align with accreditation? Keep in mind, that some accreditations are every five years, to seven years, to eight years and up to ten years. Our cut off was ten years. So the idea was that accreditation and the site visit with the self-study, would provide the external review that would roll into program review. So the program would have their external review and would then be able to add a couple of things and roll all of that over into program review. We had a whole master sheet where we tried to figure all of this out, but I don't know,

moving forward, how that would be. What I would say to the programs, is that every one that is accredited, they will tell you, accreditation is what drives us. Program Review doesn't drive us. We talk about quality, but accreditation is a clear motivation right there.

**Go to the next slide for a moment. I believe there is something relevant on that slide. So this is a possibility for 2016-2017. An interim process that we could all consider. People just went through a lot of work to do program prioritization narratives. That could be one part of their program review. If they have accreditation results, that could be another part of their review. And then third, anything else that we decide from the template or that we need for the Illinois Board of Higher Education purposes. We could create an interim template for them and modify the program review process and let them not have to write an eighty page document for us to look at. It's a thought. Maybe the best way to explain this. What I am really trying to do is figure out how we can make these processes friendlier to the people that are involved in them and also the processes more aligned with one another. And you are absolutely right that the third process is accreditation. And you are right, they don't care about other internal schedules that may exist. If they are in a five year or a ten year, they don't care what year we are on. But we can probably find a way to work with that within this group and within the Office of the Provost, so that they are not writing extensive reports every year. And the way to do that is to get small, key metrics, with red, green and yellow ratings. If they are red, then we would ask, what's going on? Their response may be word limited. We don't want people to write twenty pages, but maybe two pages about what they are going to do about a specific metric that is out of range.**

I'm just going to add one more thing to what you just said. From the accreditation point of view, Chris and I had gone and met with CHHS. We met with several of the people from their curricular committee and anyone else that wanted to come. And one of the things that we heard from that college, was that accreditation was the driver and help us develop systems where we can build up our evaluation and assessment, so that when our self-study is due, we look good. So this is a process where we could potentially help a program with some sort of annual review where they are getting feedback and can close the loop, which would build them up to their accreditation cycle.

Do we know what the KPIs are?

**Again, in 2013 a set of KPIs was approved by the Council of Deans for academic program. And they involved instruction and enrollment and to a lesser degree, research and service and engagement. However, these were approved by the deans back in 2013. We have new individuals in these roles. We would need to go back to the COD. Jeff, can you talk about some of the KPIs?**

Enrollment, FTE student, headcount, important to VPA, student credit hour obviously, because dollars follow the credit hour, we never go to the point of any tuition link before, outcome measures, faculty measures in terms of HR staffing and overall staffing in support staff, so you get the programmatic costs in there. But as Carolinda mentioned, it was all the usual stuff that you see in program review documents up to now. And obviously back then, it did get a little myopic, as the folks on the tasks forces are experiencing now, with research and scholarship. It's harder to benchmark it and count it. It's a lot of different stuff where you feel like you're in an apple orchard and everything else is vegetables. It's like, what am I comparing this to? Service, which is important, but let's take that off for now. And then engagement, which was a hot topic back then. Enrollment degrees, credit hours, admissions, diversity, and an effort to embed State Performance Issues.

Are data measures on per faculty member or dollar of investment or what? You begin to have non-relevant counts. The issue is that there is often not the same standard across programs. You can have FTEs and all that, but how does twenty faculty compare to three? You would use the ratio.

Additionally, when you are looking to standardize things, you are looking at your own historical norms. We are benchmarking some of those measures against where those specific programs had been along the way. But our growths and our declines have been uneven. So some of them will be benchmarked against state wide data. Each specific variable had its' own benchmark context is the way that I remember it.

It seems to me that if someone wants to combine these, whatever these are, KPIs and program review and program prioritization and I don't know how you're going to combine accreditation. Maybe we should take all three of those things, program review, program prioritization and these KPIs and say where is there overlap, what do we think is good and what do we think is bad? Maybe approach it from that process. So what things are necessary, what can stay and what can go?

**We have slides that talk about this. We took them out, but we can bring them back in. They talked about what is in program review versus program prioritization versus the KPIs from back in 2013. But with the council of deans being so changed since then, we don't know exactly what the KPIs will be. What I am trying to get us to do, is a little bit higher level, is to determine how these things will fit together, no matter what the enrollment measure is or no matter what the student credit hour measure is. We need to figure out how the process will go and how this committee wants to interact with it.**

To some extent, program review has never been entirely externally focused. I thought the APC existed in part to review programs, not only for IBHE purposes, but in theory to advise the provost about resources in connection with allocation. So this has always been a part of what we have been doing. So when you consider this, it makes a bit more sense to try to merge program prioritization and program review.

Why would we need KPIs?

We've always had some sort of data that people have looked at as far as the program review process. I think the difference is that we are moving towards resource allocation being connected with KPIs or some other type of individual goals.

Did I hear correct that teaching effectiveness is not mentioned anywhere in these KPIs in a school of higher learning?

No, we said engagement never had a measure connected with it.

But where is the effectiveness of the teaching going on when we are allocating resources?

Well I would say you would look at the teachers that you have and look at the student learning outcomes and that will give you a connection to engagement.

We didn't have CAD back then. We also didn't have equiproportional course evaluations reporting in all of the colleges. We certainly have the ability to provide students with the primary and secondary instructor, but it is not captured efficiently or institutionally.

The other thing, in program review, we've always asked for engagement and about teaching effectiveness goals and best practices, but it's really easy to just say we're great. Very few people say that we are not very good at teaching, I don't think I have ever seen that. So if we don't have some kind of measure to hang onto, it's really easy to make a narrative that says we are great.

**Going back to the KPIs for a second. One of the things that we try to do is to pick a relatively generic set of the KPIs, that you will see in some kind subset of program review requirements, accreditation requirements and whatever other requirements that we have to do.**

From what you have described, I think the KPIs are in the other two things in some form.

**Yes.**

So to me, that's an easy one to solve.

**We don't know how well KPIs are embedded in program prioritization and we may not know that until after April 30, 2016. We can start talking about it, but I would hate to see us say, we want to do this and this and this because it's in program prioritization and then find out afterwards that the task force said, of the five measures, only two of them actually work.**

This is the stuff that is hard to operationally define and to measure. The other things are the easily accountable KPIs.

I'd like to state for the record that there are only a few key performance indicators in Program Prioritization. Those are metrics that are worked out through cost studies, Delaware Cost Study, instructional staff reporting, and really only two metrics that we use, for Academic Analytics. The rest is reporting that can produce key performance indicators but one process needs the other.

There is always going to be this tension between justifying your existence and presenting your best foot forward and truly engaging in honest and meaningful self- reflection and quality improvement. There is nothing in merging the two that will make this any better. I don't know that this is solvable.

**We've already begun to interview folks in different places and determine best practices at different institutions for both program review and program prioritization. We've looked at the overlap with those and will bring you some of that information on March 28, 2016 meeting. I think it's important to consider what we think is meaningful, efficient and useful and see our own overlap and where there are gaps. We will document any KPIs as well as the associated data for that. This will then be posted in an online dashboard. I have asked Lisa Freeman and Al Phillips to come on March 7, 2016 to discuss key performance indicators, so maybe we will have a clearer sense of what they are thinking about. Basically, we have asked them both to come, Lisa as the Provost because she is the chief academic officer and obviously, what she has to say about the key performance indicators is very important. Al is important as well because we need a commitment and I think he is making one, to say "I am going to relate resource allocation to the KPIs and to the success of**

programs in meeting KPIs.” Also, we’ve scheduled to show you potential dashboard formats on March 28, 2016. Ultimately, we are hoping to have people access a dashboard, know what metrics are green, yellow or red, what they need to work on and to look at that on an annual basis and to provide some reflection and then have us provide them some feedback. That then builds up over five years or eight years or ten years or however long this process is, and then when they get to their program review, they don’t have to write a whole lot more. They’ve basically got all the pieces there, as well as the interactions over time. As far as the long term process, I would love to have a draft proposal by April 25, 2016 and something that we could actually send out to the IBHE finalized on our last meeting on May 2, 2016. That would then obviously have to be shared with campus constituent across the university in Fall 2016 before we could send it to the IBHE.

So we have already started doing some of this. Any thoughts?

The IBHE still requires every eight years?

They require every eight years, but they have said to me, if you guys are doing program prioritization every five years, and you can find a way to merge these processes, we will take that. But a proposal needs to be submitted. I think that proposal, the key audience isn’t even the IBHE, I think it really is the campus. What do people really want to see done on a cyclical basis? And if you look at your budgets, it actually makes sense. We do program prioritization every five years, it informs a five year budget and helps give programs a chance to review and discuss any goals that have been set out for them, it can help to tweak the budget through the recommendations that we make to the EVPP, the CFO and the rest of the senior leadership. And then another process begins. And it will not be aligned with accreditation. But we can take a chunk of accreditation and the reports and documents that they have done and put it into this as part of how they explain their program.

Just looking at the IBHE requirements, these reports, and there are not many of them, but it seems a little bit silly to make every program report on all the IBHE requirements every five years or eight years?

Possibly. Or maybe it won’t be that much more effort. I don’t know. Doing program prioritization, maybe it’s part of program prioritization and those requirements get folded into that. This is all up in the air.

I was just thinking of our accreditation process, which really is kind of a narrative. It’s very much about the skills and ideas, which is very different than the rest of these.

It’s more qualitative than quantitative?

Yes, more qualitative.

The feedback from the accreditor would be really important in terms of the report that comes back, once they have conducted the self-study. Meanwhile, the SLOs and the other evaluative part or qualitative parts would be important. You could take sections out of the self-study and the reviewer response.

I know it's not the majority of our budgeting, but if our legislature can't possibly come up with a budget, ever. So how can we plan on anything even if it's only twenty percent of budget, it is still a big chunk. I know we can create an idea, but what if that gets chopped off.

**So this is a great question for AI when he comes on March 7, 2016, but I think the idea is, that this is one of the reasons why program prioritization did not have a set amount of dollars. So a lot of places when they do program prioritization, they might say, "We want you to find a million dollars to cut out of the budget." We did not do that. We asked for programs to be ranked and ordered in priorities for resource allocation, but not for a specific dollar amount. I think that the idea behind that, and maybe in line with what you are talking about, is that we have to understand what our priorities are and then look at the budget, whatever that might be, and assign it based on those priorities. If it's small, if it's big, if we know eighty percent of it now and we know twenty percent later. I think that's the thinking behind this, we need to be more strategic in how we align our budgets with our priorities, but we don't have a set amount. The task forces weren't asked for a set amount.**

This summer was my first interaction with the program review process. And although I understand the importance of reflection from the department, self-evaluation and I think they are all really noble ideas. And I understand the alignment with accreditation and so forth. It was really unclear to me what the actual goal of the process was. So I'm reading the report and thinking to myself, why are they asking an academic an open ended question? It sort of like the tenure review process and how much should I write? Well, I don't know, but we will let you know when you get there. This to me, was the same thing. And so I just wonder can those both be articulated more cleanly and then on the heels of that, separate data driven outcomes that you want to see versus a narrative reflective kinds of outcomes? Because they were really blurred in those documents.

**That is a really good point. Yes, and it's not me, which is why I am asking this group to help to create that. To create those changes. I think the group has to think about the way that that needs to happen. Program Prioritization, having been heavily involved in that as well, I think that there was certainly an attempt to do more of that and to be more purposeful in terms of what we are asking and why we are asking and here is the associated data or you provide us with the associated data that speak to this criterion. Those criteria came out of our mission or at least what we think of as our mission and our priorities. Those of you that were on APC last year, took part in creating those criteria and I think that was maybe more purpose driven than what we have been doing in program review. Program review I think has just incrementally grown without a whole lot of rethinking of why we are doing this and do we still need to do that.**

You have to remember that a lot of the current form of program review reflects the long time adversarial relationship with the IBHE. So, that is why we had these massive reports and intensive process, is because there was a time, a long time ago, when the IBHE kind of made spreadsheets and they made spreadsheets of enrollments, and program costs of like CIP codes and just said well, these are above state-wide average or below state-wide average, so we don't need them. It was really a defensive document and a defensive process.

And I think we still, even though our relationship with the IBHE is very good, we still are sometimes defensive with the state legislature and the governor. We still have those issues, probably more so now than in the past. So it is always a balance in terms of what goes into those documents.

We want people to be honest about their strengths and weaknesses, but in the end, you have to be careful what you are exposing to the wider audience.

**So, I'm going to ask you to do something. I feel like there are some ideas percolating in some people's heads, but maybe we are not quite sure what the next steps are. Do you think we could maybe for a couple of minutes, talk in smaller groups to come up with two or three things that you think we should be doing this semester? I've laid out something, but maybe you don't want this and would like to throw it out and start over. Or maybe you have some other ideas. So, maybe just talk to a couple of other people in a smaller group and then we will go around and see if we can come up with a few ideas.**

It's a little hard for me to keep your timeline in my head. I suspect we may reinvent the wheel.

**It's on the BlackBoard, but basically, we have no meeting next week. We come back in two weeks, and my thought was that we would look at the templates and the process. What's working and what isn't. Then we have no meeting, we come back on March 7, 2016 and that is when Al and Lisa will be here. So I definitely want to talk about the KPIs and his commitment on how he is going to go forward on budgeting. We don't have a meeting on March 14, 2016, but then on March 21, 2016, I thought we could come back and finalize the templates and processes primarily because I need to let the people going through program review in 2016-2017 know what they are doing. So, I would really like to have that finalized by the end of March. Then on March 28, 2016, is when I asked Chris and Steve and Ritu to give us some information on best practices and Jeff on the dashboard, maybe with others involved with that as well. We have some other business that we have to take care of that's not related to this, that's not on this schedule. And then we have several weeks until April 25, 2016, where I thought we could actually have a proposal. And like I said before, I've got it as the IBHE proposal, but we can't do this unless we have people on campus who really want to do this. Even if we have a proposal by the end of the semester, we would still need to take it around to Faculty Senate and other units on campus to make sure this is something people really want to be done.**

**Write down a couple of things that you feel you would really like to see done this semester.**

***-Break for group discussion-***

Couple of quick things. If you start looking at the templates, start to look for the places where there is repetition. When you have degrees that are essentially the same (B.S, M.S., etc.), we shouldn't have to read three hundred to four hundred pages when it can be done in 105 pages. And we thought that word or page limits needed to be put in place.

**So everyone just went through the program prioritization word limit. Those of you who were authors, how do you feel about that?**

Well, I had said to our group, to compress things into 500 words is not easier.

**I know, it's harder on the writer, but easier on the reader.**

I don't know that 500 words is the answer or not, but you do absolutely have to have a word limit on the narratives.

We were just saying, that for these massive reports, there is data dump there. All of the information is maybe there, but there is no communication there. It's obvious as you read through these reports, how do you go through the M.A. in this or the B.A. in that when you have to sift through, what is the key distinction?

We talked about the steps and the redundancy in reviewing it.

**So, part of the process?**

Yes, the process.

**What steps would you cut?**

I don't know.

The whole part where it is written, you then come back with questions, they go to subcommittees, they go to the big committee. There surely is somewhere in there that we can cut down or refine.

What I keep hearing again and again is that the time spent and the information received from the subcommittee is where some of the most important information communication happens.

I would say the opposite. Get rid of the full committee. Maybe if we didn't invite the visitors to the full meeting, but they were with the subcommittee meeting, then the person that is giving the report could say, I asked this question and here is what they told me.

That is a possibility.

We did spend some time talking about this issue of what are the goals of the different review processes. Are they qualitative or quantitative and having to establish that prior to whatever kind of tweaks we want to do.

Maybe that should be at our next meeting is actually think about the purposes.

I guess that would have to come first, that's what we were talking about.

**Does that sound reasonable to people?**

I think there is a disconnect between the purpose versus what are you looking for in terms of each specific section of the document. If we're going to give someone enrollment data, what do you want them to do with it? Do you want them to understand the trend, tell you what they are doing about it if there is a problem?

It's going down, but it's going down in the field, or it's going up but we need more resources.

Can I ask a question? So are you saying that the questions should drive the metrics, kind of like we did in program prioritization, where there are the criteria and the questions? And then what kind of data do we need to deal with that?



Yes, to all of the above. I think you have to know what you're trying to get out of the question to be able to formulate the question so that you get what you are looking for. And if it is a data driven question and they need data, provide it. And if it's not and it's qualitative, why would you not ask exactly what you are looking for from that question?

So it goes back to the purpose.

You might also have a burning question, but then not have data that addresses it.

Which is exactly when you don't ask an academic an open ended question because you end up with a hundred and forty page paper.

### **Anything else from your group?**

I think there was discussion about sections of the report that people really aren't looking at. They write to them, but no one here is really doing anything with it.

And every year, your office asks about the data and something from the libraries and I wonder if it's useful? When I read the review from each program, I don't see them talking about it.

I think part of that is that we provide people with a lot of information and then we ask a lot of questions. And I've often thought that too, not just about the library resources, but the study abroad and some of the other things we ask about and people just don't say a word about those data. Are they useful or not?

Maybe the question should be, are your library resources adequate and why or why not?

There is certainly a legitimate reason for asking about the library resources, but then if we don't actually that embedded in the questions and they don't respond, then it's not helpful.

### **What were some of the things that the next group came up with?**

The one was, at least make the 2016-2017 cycle one that used the program prioritization narrative. Add anything that you need to for HLC or for accreditation and type of constraint and that's the program review document for this period.

I may be wrong about this, but I think people would be relieved to know they could turn in their program prioritization narratives as a big chunk of what they are doing for program review.

### **What else?**

I would love to hear from Lisa or someone at the end of the year, from all of your reports, this is what we decided to do.

### **You want to see the loop closed.**

Yes.

**So do I. And I want to see it closed not just by Lisa, but by Al too. It will be good to see this linked to resource allocation.**

It would help too, in the process of thinking about this and Geoff's point, what is the goal of this group and to me, you can't have a program prioritization or a program review group, it's got to be one group that does everything. And is this the right group to do that? And should it be one combined process?

**So I will tell you one of the reasons that I think the APC might be the right group to do this. And maybe the group needs to be comprised differently, but it's a shared governance body. I understand that we pulled people with the trustee mentality to be in the task forces but this is the shared governance body that exists all the time and has the ability to give information and feedback on a regular basis rather than pulling together and asking for a huge amount of work from forty-two people, which is what we are doing right now with Program Prioritization.**

The other thing that I would say is that I'm struggling with the timeline. So, the timeline to me with wanting to have this drafted by the end of April, but yet we don't want to draft it because we can't know what the outcome of program prioritization will be until the end of April. How do we finish the draft when we are still not done with and won't be done with the process until the same time as you would like to have a draft? Either the timeline has to be extended or...

**We can extend it, that's no problem.**

Or you have to have input from the program prioritization people. And that input would entail either talking about what works or doesn't work in general. This process works, this one doesn't, these questions work well, these ones do not, or asking the committee to provide you, from the task force perspective, what works and what doesn't work, with more than just the two of us.

**No, I agree, it needs to be more than just the two of you. So we have an evaluation team that is looking at literally every step of program prioritization. And I have been toying with the idea of having a mid-semester evaluation with the task forces just to get some of that kind of information. What questions work, which ones do not. My concern about that is the Task Force members are already doing so much, that I hate to take more of your time. On the other hand, if we wait until the very end when you are done, you may have lost some of the valuable information that is probably occurring right now in your processes. What do you think about that?**

I think that the people that authored for these programs also have some insight. Writing them, but there was a kind of resistance. Some questions seemed to enhance the opportunity to say something good about your program and others seemed to make that more difficult. I think we can give more input.

**Chris Parker has done a survey of authors and is now doing two focus groups with the approvers, asking some of those questions. So for the people that approved lots of programs, what did you find and like and what did you not. They survey came from Lisa, but was developed by Chris. It was sent at the end of the semester and it has given us some good feedback. I forget what the response rate was, maybe 30%. But we have some really good feedback into what was more or less helpful. We will bring that and show the results**

**of that to this group. I just threw a timeline out there. If it doesn't work for us, then it doesn't work for us. But if it does work for us, and we need some information, then I need to figure out how to get that information to you.**

My point is that if we are waiting for program prioritization feedback, then we can't do a proposal by the end of April.

If we wait until the end to find out what worked and what didn't work, yes.

And when you consider, what is the end? Is it when we are done reviewing all of the programs?

And I don't think we need to know what got ranked where, I think we need to know how the task forces felt about the usefulness of various questions and data points.

**Anyone else from this group have anything they would like to add?**

Our group agreed with everything up there as to what needs to be done. But we did feel there is a problem with program review. We felt that at the APC level, and these are my words not theirs, all brides are beautiful and all dead men are good. This is a problem at the APC level. From the programs perspective, they write these lengthy reports, but we felt they are never truly in perspective to the point of being very honest because there is no point in being honest when you want to show yourself in the best light. Two things that would come out of this issue, is having a dashboard on an annual basis that has interactive feedback with the APC would be helpful in keeping people more honest and more competitive. A second thing that we talked about was the value of having external review which is supported by the 2013 task force. Their report mentioned that external review is very important. An example of this is when a program is accredited, they get a very honest report. You have to show what your strengths and weaknesses are. Any external review that would be included would be helpful.

That conflicts with the prioritization, doesn't it? How do you standardize the process since not all programs are subject to accreditation?

Our office is trying to do a benchmark right now and coordinate it with what the task force did in 2013. This includes looking at different programs, talking to different universities, some comparable peers as to the process they use and how it was implemented. One particular school that we have talked to basically said that every program has an external review. The problem with that is that it is expensive. With that in mind, we will continue to benchmark and figure out how people do what.

What percentage of programs at different universities have accreditation?

About fifteen percent. But then we also have all of the doctoral programs in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Education and the College of Visual and Performing Arts have an external review.

I remember when we went through that process, they came in and said they don't have an official accreditation board, but they did come in with three people and the program was not that expensive, they only charged us about one thousand dollars, which wasn't bad at all. I think that is a wonderful thing and everyone should do that.

And we have a dean, particularly in in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences who is very supportive of that. When he brings in someone, because we have the requirement that the doctoral department be looked at, he also has them look at masters and bachelors within that same department. We could move towards that. We would need money to do that, but if that is a recommendation of the APC, we could put that forward.

Other thoughts?

Thank you. It sounds like maybe we will make some adjustments to this schedule. Maybe one of the things that we need to talk about for next time, is the purpose. I will then look through the notes and try to pick up some of the other ideas, but I hope you're all willing to work on this and would like to see the process change and are willing to work to bring that about, not only for ourselves, but for our colleagues. Thank you very much and have a good evening.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Essex

#### **Additional Notes From one Working Group that Recorded Their Thoughts:**

- Mandate cross referencing in the program review document for redundant information.
- Cut and slash the program review template, what does IBHE/HLC require use word or page limits.
- Cut steps out in the process; there is a redundancy in the committees, so kill the full committee and go just with the subcommittee.
- Identify the goals of the different review (accreditation and others) processes, note how much quantitative and qualitative material involved (e.g. CVPA APC rep cited their accreditation is more qualitative).
- For programs under the 2016-2017 period, a period of transition, program narrative plus HLC plus accreditation equals program review document.
- Goal of APC, what is it? Let's close the loop to program prioritization and program review.
- What is the goal of program improvement? We can't have program review and program prioritization, we need one.
- Timeline of APC program review improvement, don't know what the outcome for program prioritization. So, extend the program review improvement timeline or have input from program prioritization task force members, e.g. these criterion questions worked, these did not.
- Can get more input from program authors and approvers and improvers, e.g. efficacy of criterion questions, by all groups (authors, approvers, task force members); this will inform what questions need to be asked in PR.
- Annual dashboard and feedback from APC, seen as a good thing.
- Value of external review, seen as a good thing.