



Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Academic Prioritization

Source:

[facultysenate.siu.edu/\\_common/2016/attachments/senate-resolution-recommend-jtfreport-with%20report.pdf](http://facultysenate.siu.edu/_common/2016/attachments/senate-resolution-recommend-jtfreport-with%20report.pdf)

Downloaded:

8/2/2019

## **Faculty Senate Resolution in Support of the Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Academic Prioritization**

**Whereas**, in a memo dated September 21, 2015, SIUC Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Susan M. Ford, asked the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council to “evaluate all academic degree programs . . . in a cross campus matrix of comparison”; and

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate approved Senate Resolution 1608, Resolution on creation of a Task force to develop criteria for Academic Program Prioritization; and

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate’s Task Force and the Graduate Council’s Task Force worked together as a Joint Task Force (JTF) comprised of faculty from all SIUC colleges; and

**Whereas**, the JTF developed: 1) a preliminary academic scoring rubric and guidelines for program evaluation, that include nine major criteria and their relative weights, and 2) a questionnaire that helps data acquisition from a program and its department; and

**Whereas**, the JTF recommended that these criteria are expected to be used to “shed light on programs and departments, though whether this actually works as expected can *only* be determined through pilot testing (which has not been conducted”); and

**Whereas**, the JTF presented the final report to the Faculty Senate;

**Therefore, be it resolved** that the Faculty Senate recommends the approval of the final report of the Joint Task Force on Academic Prioritization.

# Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Academic Prioritization September 2016

## Task Force Membership

Natasha Zaretsky (Co-Chair, History), Mike Eichholz (Co-Chair, Zoology), Sarah Lewison (Chair of the Qualitative Subcommittee, Radio, Television, and Digital Media), Julie Partridge (Chair of the Uniqueness Subcommittee, Kinesiology), Tomas Velasco (Chair of the Quantitative Subcommittee, Engineering Technology), Gary Apgar (Animal Science), Amanda Barnard (Graduate Student), Amy Boren (Agriculture), Sandra Collins (Allied Health), Judy Davie (Molecular Biology, Microbiology, and Biochemistry), William Drennan (Law), Johnathan Flowers (Graduate Student), Boyd Goodson (Chemistry), Darla Karnes (Accounting), Michael May (Special Education), Scott McEathron (English), Richard McKinnies (Allied Health), Aldo Migone (Physics), Prema Narayan (Physiology), Marcus Odom (Accounting), Cinzia Padovani (Radio, Television, and Digital Media), Charles Ruffner (Forestry), Mark Schultz (Law), Alison Watts (Economics), Peggy Wilken (Health, Education and Recreation), Wanli Zhao (Finance), Linda McCabe Smith (ex-officio), Jim Allen (ex-officio)

## Task Force History

In a memo dated September 21, 2015, SIUC Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Susan M. Ford asked the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council to “evaluate all [213] academic degree programs . . . in a cross campus matrix of comparison.” The Provost further requested that the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council appoint committees to “determine criteria and their relative weight,” and to “identify the top and bottom [by your own criteria] 10% and 25% of programs.” The Provost asked that the final report on a comparative evaluation of academic programs be submitted to her and to the chancellor by May 1, 2016.

The memo further stated, “campus-wide restructuring is long overdue,” and that a similar evaluation was occurring at Northern Illinois University (“NIU”). In regards to goals, the memo talked about better aligning our academic offerings with the needs of the 21st century and “providing guidance and information critical to academic decisions over the next several years.” The memo directed that we incorporate the IBHE criteria for program evaluation, and it encouraged “transparency and openness with the campus community as the process unfolds.”

While the Graduate Council approved the Provost’s charge in its entirety, the Faculty Senate intentionally omitted the ranking of programs. In October, the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council solicited nominations from all Colleges for faculty to serve on a prioritization task force. In November 2015, despite the disparity between the charges accepted by each body, the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council created a joint task force (the “Joint Task Force” or “JTF”) comprised of faculty from all SIUC colleges. On December 2, 2015, the JTF met and created three subcommittees from its membership: the Quantitative Subcommittee, the Qualitative Subcommittee, and the Uniqueness Subcommittee.

Faced with a disparity between the charge of the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate, the JTF understood its task as follows: to develop criteria that would help the Administration obtain a clear, robust, and fine-grained picture of the prodigious research, creative, pedagogical, and

mentoring work being done by faculty in programs across the University community and to reflect on the relationship between this important work and the overall mission of the University<sup>1</sup> at what has turned out to be a critical juncture in its history. Consistent with the charge, the JTF has developed a Preliminary Academic Scoring Rubric and Guidelines (Appendix A and sometimes referred to in this document as the “Scoring Document”), and Questionnaire (Appendix B). The scoring document includes nine criteria and their relative weights that could *potentially* be used to shed light on programs and departments, though whether this actually works as expected can *only* be determined through pilot testing (which has not been conducted).<sup>2</sup>

There were also things that JTF members explicitly identified as beyond the scope of its charge. These included 1) solving the thorny problem of how the requisite data will be collected and compiled across the University and 2) identifying those programs that should be expanded, merged, cut, or eliminated. Per Article 9 of the SIUC BOT-FA contract, while the Faculty Association, the Faculty Senate, and the Graduate Council can make recommendations in response to proposed program changes, the responsibility for any such changes, including mergers, reductions, or eliminations, resides wholly with the Administration.

Rather than coming up with a new rubric from whole cloth, the JTF decided to modify the NIU rubric mentioned in the Provost’s memo. The rationale for this decision was two-fold. First, in light of our tight deadline, we wanted to benefit from the considerable time and effort that went into the process on the NIU campus. Second, the JTF felt that the NIU rubric successfully incorporated most of the criteria that JTF members identified as critical.

Once we decided to start with the NIU rubric, we revised it in ways that best reflected SIUC’s mission and incorporated those elements that we found most significant into our Scoring Document.

### **Subcommittee Structure of the Joint Task Force**

The JTF has three subcommittees: a quantitative committee, a qualitative committee, and a uniqueness committee.

#### **The Quantitative Subcommittee:**

This subcommittee, chaired by Tomas Valesco, PhD (Professor, Engineering), was tasked with identifying important quantitative characteristics for assessing program contributions. The subcommittee sought to develop criteria that

- were balanced,
- could be objectively measured with existing data (or reasonably obtainable data), and
- would allow comparisons among programs within the University and/or comparisons with comparable programs at peer universities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The University’s statement of mission and scope: SIU embraces a unique tradition of access and opportunity, inclusive excellence, innovation in research and creativity, and outstanding teaching focused on nurturing student success. As a nationally ranked public research university and regional economic catalyst, we create and exchange knowledge to shape future leaders, improve our communities, and transform lives.

<sup>2</sup> Any attempt at pilot testing would impose substantial data-collection and report-writing burdens on those programs selected and others. Furthermore, the Faculty Senate did not accept the charge to rank programs.

As an example of balancing criteria, programs in which faculty have a heavy teaching load would be expected to generate less research/creative production, therefore requiring that the metrics consider both teaching and research/creativity. Related to the concept of balance, the subcommittee assumed that all programs will be suboptimal under some questions in our Scoring Document and that every program will be able to point to multiple questions and claim that it shows poorly in those area(s) due to factors beyond its control. In evaluating the Scoring Document, it should be remembered that forty-five diverse components will be considered to evaluate programs under the nine criteria. Thus, suboptimal performance on a small number of components is unlikely to have an overwhelming impact on the overall prioritization.

In striving to develop criteria and questions that can be objectively measured with currently available data (or reasonably available data), the Quantitative Subcommittee evaluated multiple sources. In particular, when it came to measuring research and creative activity, the subcommittee concluded that information from neither Academic Analytics nor Activity Insight were sufficient for use at this time. Our reasoning is as follows:

*Academic Analytics* - After reviewing results of data queries of production for individual researchers, it became clear to the subcommittee that the data Academic Analytics seeks to collect is too limited in scope to provide an adequate representation of the productivity of both individual faculty and programs on our campus.

*Activity Insight* – In contrast to Academic Analytics, Activity Insight seeks to collect a sufficiently broad array of information, so someday it could be an appropriate mechanism for consolidating research and creative activities data for program comparison. However, there is currently very little data entered into the system, so data availability is not sufficiently comprehensive at this time. A considerable effort on the part of both the Administration and Faculty will be required to make Activity Insight useful for prioritization purposes. One obvious barrier is data input. Activity Insight allows for the recording of accomplishments in excruciating detail (much greater detail than will likely ever be used). Data entry at this level of detail imposes an unacceptable burden on faculty. If the Administration expects the Faculty to input their own data, it would need to provide clear direction as to what specific data is to be entered for use.

After considering Academic Analytics and Activity Insight, the subcommittee invited representatives from the University's Institutional Research Department to identify and explain current sources of available data. Again, the aim is to reduce the information-gathering burden placed on Faculty and others. The results were mixed. On the one hand, the subcommittee believes that data exists (or can be obtained with reasonable effort) to measure some meaningful criteria (for example, credit hours generated per tenured or tenure-track faculty member in a program). On the other hand, department chairs and program directors will likely need to provide substantial information for other questions and criteria (often in the form of narrative descriptions). This information will be solicited from Department Chairs and Program Directors using the attached questionnaire (Appendix B).

#### **The Qualitative Subcommittee:**

This subcommittee, chaired by Sarah Lewison (Associate Professor, Radio, Television, and Digital Media), met regularly to discuss the JTF charge. Its purpose was to identify the pertinent

qualitative criteria that could be used for reviewing the work of programs and departments across the University. The subcommittee was comprised of one graduate student plus faculty across a range of colleges, departments, and programs, representing fields in STEM, education, the social sciences, the humanities, and the business school.

### **The Uniqueness Subcommittee:**

The University's current mission statement reads as follows: *"SIU embraces a unique tradition of access and opportunity, inclusive excellence, innovation in research and creativity, and outstanding teaching focused on nurturing student success. As a nationally ranked public research university and regional economic catalyst, we create and exchange knowledge to shape future leaders, improve our communities, and transform lives."*

Although this statement provides an accurate overview of the goals of the University's various programs, the JTF believes it to be both somewhat generic and vague when it comes to the unique nature of SIUC. SIUC is unique in that it holds a "Higher Research" university classification, yet it is located in a rural, generally low-income region and emphasizes access for low-income, minority, and first generation students. The JTF believes the programs that support these unique facets of the University should be recognized and supported.

With that aim in mind, the JTF formed a subcommittee, chaired by Julie Partridge (Associate Professor, Kinesiology), for the explicit purpose of determining some of the factors that shape SIUC's distinctiveness as a whole, as well as to identify criteria that provide a clear picture of how programs contribute to the University community. This subcommittee identified several unique characteristics, including our diverse student population and our geographic location. The Southern Illinois region is characterized by high poverty rates, slower rates of economic development, and diverse ecosystems and topography. In particular, the subcommittee identified SIUC's importance as a guiding force for regional sustainability and community engagement.

### **Joint Work of the Qualitative and Uniqueness Subcommittees**

As discussions progressed, the Uniqueness and Qualitative Subcommittees determined that there were several areas of overlap between them and realized that their work could be improved through joint meetings. Thus, during the final month of the Fall semester, these subcommittees combined efforts and met together.

The Uniqueness and Qualitative Subcommittees identified and discussed a number of goals and programmatic missions across our campus that should be taken into strong consideration when reviewing and prioritizing programs (and that we have tried to incorporate into the attached Scoring Document).

- **The Role of SIUC in the Southern Illinois Region:** One theme that came up throughout our discussions was the University's crucial place within the Southern Illinois region. As of this writing, Illinois has the second highest rate of out-migration in the country. Like many predominantly rural regions, Southern Illinois is being left behind by the new economy and is not attracting people from outside the state. Thus, one recurring theme was the need to foster and support programs that will simultaneously keep young

people here and train them to provide basic social services throughout the region—for example:

- the provision of public health in the case of the School of Medicine;
- the training of educators in the COEHS who will go on to teach in public schools throughout the area;
- the SIUC business incubator which seeks to support small regional businesses, and
- the work of the College of Mass Communications in introducing students to media arts and practices that they can then use to document and thus better understand socioeconomic and cultural conditions in Southern Illinois.

In other words, the University should support programs that qualify and equip students for viable careers and prepare them to shape the social infrastructures that the region needs—whether through the provision of healthcare, teaching young people, training students for careers in the media industry, or fostering locally owned businesses.

At the same time, members agreed that SIUC’s regional role should not be understood in strictly vocational terms. Part of the gift of having a large state university in an isolated region is that it creates opportunities for students to engage in forms of knowledge, critical thinking, and creativity that they would otherwise not have—from reading a Shakespeare play or hearing an opera, to learning the history of Ancient Rome. At a time when the Humanities are under attack nationally, SIUC should unapologetically champion the right of their students to have access to these experiences in the college classroom and push back against the unfortunate tendency to define these experiences as the exclusive province of students at more elite institutions.

- **The Diversity of SIUC’s Undergraduates:** The subcommittees explored the theme of diversity along two lines. First, as of Fall 2015, racialized minority groups (American Indian, Asian, African-American, Latino) constituted 32.3 % of the undergraduate student body. This diversity is a source of institutional pride, yet a number of committee members noted a gulf between the lip service paid to the value of diversity and the on-the-ground erosion of the considerable resources that are actually required for minority students to not only stay here, but to thrive. The subcommittees strived to identify program features that help narrow that gulf and qualitative criteria to measure those efforts and achievements.

The second diversity theme hinged on SIUC’s historic status as an institution that has attracted poor, urban and rural students who are often “first generation” (that is, the first in their families to attend college). SIUC attracts students from Central and Northern Illinois, but it is also surrounded by three of the poorest rural regions of the entire country: Appalachia to the East, the Ozarks to the West, and the Mississippi Delta to the South. At a time of widening class and social inequality, we want to serve these regions, as well. We strove to include criteria that support this aspect of the University’s mission.

- **A Student-Centered Approach:** SIUC is in a unique position of being a large research university with a high acceptance rate for undergraduate enrollment. As a result, undergraduate students often find themselves arriving here unprepared and struggling

with the rigors and demands of college. We strove to identify program features that (i) nurture students from a diversity of backgrounds; (ii) provide them with experiences and skills in their chosen majors; and (iii) facilitate a strong sense of community support. Assessing program success in these areas cannot rely solely on empirical data or metrics (such as retention rates), but would depend on more qualitative information gathering about what helps students succeed in their course of study, what works and what does not, what services students believe are helpful, and what could be improved. While some of this information may be contained in departmental self-studies and strategic plans, we are concerned that the University has not compiled this information in a consistent way.

- **A Focus on Environmental Sustainability:** SIUC has a rich tradition in the fields of sustainability and environmental innovation (for example, the work and study of Buckminster Fuller). It is also located in a region well known throughout the state for its beauty, nature, and national forests, with a growing emphasis on local food, wine, and beer production. Depending on future programming, these things provide SIUC with an opportunity to promote itself as a campus where students who care about environmentalism, sustainability, and climate change could find a welcome home—more so than at any other campus in the state system. Given that young people exhibit high levels of interest in environmental issues, it is something of a mystery why SIUC does not do more to both strengthen these programmatic areas and highlight them in its own marketing. While we understand that this particular theme may be more pertinent to long-term planning than to short-term prioritization, this was a theme that came up throughout our subcommittee discussions.

### **Next Steps, Caveats, and Shared Concerns**

If as indicated in the Provost's September 21, 2015 memo the goal is for an evaluation of academic programs similar to the one at NIU, future steps (or phases) could include:

- Generating and distributing data necessary to apply the criteria and supplying that data to program authors;
- Providing guidance to program authors to allow them to write the program reports to address the 8 questions included in the attached Questionnaire (Appendix B);
- Reviewing the program reports and applying the criteria to score each academic program;
- Identifying the top and bottom 10% and 25% of programs (the NIU Report categorized their programs on a scale from 1 to 5); and
- Adopting a transparent process and communicating consistently and comprehensively to all campus stakeholders as appropriate.

The NIU report notes that “nearly 500 distinct individuals have played an important role in program prioritization at NIU.” NIU Report page 4.

**Data Collection:** Although the attached Scoring Document refers to data in many questions, the person writing the report for each program is invited to write one narrative report of up to 500 words discussing program specific opportunities and challenges associated with the



nine criteria (see Question #8 at the end of the Questionnaire). In addition, the writer is invited to write narratives of 250 words, 250 words, 300 words and 500 words respectively regarding four specific criteria. Thus, for criteria based solely on numeric data, the writer will have an opportunity to comment. Consistent with the NIU report, the person drafting the response for each program will be referred to as the “program author,” and the response will be referred to as the “program report.”

Regarding the numbers, at NIU, a Data Support Team issued a Program Prioritization Data and Reporting Glossary, dated Oct. 7, 2015 (the “NIU Glossary”) “to help program authors and approvers better understand the underlying data and reporting deliverables that have been provided as institutional uploads.” NIU Glossary at page 2. The NIU Data Support Team provided a “point person” to divisions/colleges to centralize the question and answer process, and “public panel discussions were scheduled for the benefit of program authors seeking advice and feedback.” NIU Academic Report page 8. A similar approach to data collection and reporting might be helpful at SIUC.

A mechanism for data collection is currently not in place. In connection with establishing data collection and distribution procedures, the Provost’s Office also may wish to simultaneously begin the process of requesting qualitative information from the individual program representatives who will be the program authors.<sup>3</sup> Hopefully, this will provide the information needed to determine whether each program is *exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, or falling below expectations* for each of the nine specific criteria.

**Student Input:** Some JTF members are concerned that we did not adequately consider student input for most of the criteria. The JTF rejected suggestions to use data from course/teaching evaluations because of their subjective nature and other factors that would make program-to-program comparisons unreliable. Although the JTF remains unable to identify an approach that would allow the Administration or the program authors to collect student input in an efficient and useable form, some JTF members believe that the Administration should continue to strive to acquire input from this crucial constituency. One potential way to do this would be to consult departmental self-studies and program reviews, which gather survey data from both undergraduate and graduate students.

**Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Metrics to Create the Scoring Document:** One of the more difficult tasks for the JTF was to combine both quantitative and qualitative criteria into a single scoring rubric.

In its efforts to allow meaningful comparisons between programs at the University (or comparisons with similar programs at other universities), the Quantitative Subcommittee searched for an objective approach to categorize programs based on the information provided for each criteria.

---

<sup>3</sup> As the leadership structure for degree programs differs among the various schools, colleges, and departments, the titles of the persons charged with providing the information may vary from program to program. It is hoped that these persons (i) will be sufficiently objective to candidly evaluate the program, and (ii) will have the necessary background and overview to evaluate programs in comparison to other University programs and programs at other universities, as appropriate.

The subcommittee proposed using “z scores” with scores ranging from 1 to 5 based on the number of standard deviations a specific program is from the mean of the comparable programs. After considerable deliberation with the remaining members of the JTF, the group settled on using “z scores” with a score within 1 standard deviation (SD) of the mean being considered to meet expectation, a score above 1 SD from the mean exceeding expectations, and a score below 1 SD from the mean as falling below expectations.

This approach provides a categorization that was broader than the subcommittee preferred. In a typical statistical analysis presuming a normal distribution, approximately 68% of subjects would fall within one SD of the mean, and the September 21, 2015 charge from the Provost requests identifying the top 25% of programs and the bottom 25% of programs. Nevertheless, this will allow for the combining of quantitative and qualitative criteria. Although the JTF has agreed that 1 SD is a good starting point, more time and data are required to compare results between different scoring approaches.

**Weighting:** The Qualitative Subcommittee first proposed a weighting system for the criteria. The Quantitative Subcommittee then proposed an alternative that was brought to the entire JTF for discussion and became the basis for the Scoring Document. The JTF recognized that the IBHE has developed its own metrics for identifying underperforming programs, which the university likely will need to address in the near term. While the JTF agrees these metrics are important (they are our first 4 criteria and receive 46% of the total weight), the JTF has identified additional complementary criteria that, over the long term, we believe help recognize the value of programs that support high performing faculty and students, provide a unique value to the university’s mission, are important for maintaining the program diversity of a leading academic institution, and support the southern Illinois region. Actual testing of the scoring rubric may demonstrate that the nine criteria and/or their weighting need adjustments. Testing may indicate that a criterion should be divided into two or three criteria so that a borderline decision between exceeds or meets (or between meets or falls below) expectations on one criterion does not inappropriately upgrade or downgrade a program.

**Data Analysis and Comparisons Among Programs:** For some criteria (especially those associated with research/creative activities), the JTF recognized it would not be appropriate to compare each program to all programs across campus. For example, in some programs faculty create articles, while in other programs faculty create artistic performances; in some programs faculty generate very time-consuming lengthy works while in other programs faculty routinely create multiple shorter works in the same period of time; and in some programs faculty regularly apply for and generate substantial grants while faculty in other programs rarely apply for or receive grants. For these criteria, the JTF recommends either that the program be compared to similar programs at other universities, or as in the case of research/creative activities, the attached Scoring Document uses expected productivity within the program as an approach to standardize the scores for comparison. The JTF recognizes, however, that without actually going through the prioritization process, we will not be able to identify all of the areas where direct campus-wide comparisons are not appropriate. Thus, for some criteria, it will be up to the program authors and/or the Provost’s Office to identify and make appropriate comparisons.

**Final Scoring:** To calculate prioritization scores, program specific scores for each of the nine criteria should be determined (for example, a score of two if the program meets expectations for a criterion; a score of three if it exceeds expectations; and a score of one if it fails to meet expectations for a criteria). Then those scores should be weighted based on the weight provided for that criteria (e.g., the score for criteria #1--“External Demand”-- should be multiplied by 11, while the score for criteria #2--“Financial Efficiency” -- should be multiplied by 15, etc.), in order to calculate the total score for the program. Thus, the highest possible score for a program would be 300, and the lowest possible score would be 100. It is imperative that the Provost’s Office realizes that, at this point, the JTF has not had adequate time or data to test the prioritization rubric to ensure that it performs as expected. As information becomes available and as time permits, the JTF strongly recommends that testing be conducted prior to any large-scale prioritization. Finally, although this document provides the criteria the JTF believes should be used for program prioritization, the JTF recognizes that while data for some criteria are readily available, initiation of data collection for other criteria has yet to begin, leading to a strong imbalance in data availability. This imbalance of data availability would severely skew the results of any program prioritization based on this document. **Thus, the JTF believes strongly that this document should not be used as a basis for either short- or long-term program prioritization or modifications until all data for all criteria identified in the document are available.**

**Shared Concern about Non-Academic Units:** The members of the JTF wish to raise a shared concern that, while we have been meeting since December 2015 and have recently finalized this report after revising for comments from the faculty (Appendix C), we understand that little progress has been made by the comparable body tasked with prioritization of non-academic units across the SIUC campus. An email from Faculty Senate President Andrea Imre (dated April 15, 2016) asked for input from faculty about non-academic program prioritization, but it is our impression that there has been no comparable committee work underway to review non-academic units. It is the strong recommendation of the JTF that non-academic units be reviewed first, and that they should be the focus of proposed budget cuts (both immediate and long-term) first in order to do the absolute best we can to preserve the academic mission of the University under admittedly difficult circumstances.

**Appendix A:**  
**Preliminary Academic Scoring Rubric and Guidelines prepared by the SIUC Joint Task  
Force on Academic Prioritization, September 2016**

General guidelines for program evaluation:

- When possible, quantitative metrics will be calculated as standardized Z-scores (Mean=0, Standard Deviation=1). For this conversion methodology, the Mean and Standard Deviations for the populations would be calculated based on all programs for the University or similar programs from outside the University when deemed appropriate. Programs at the undergraduate level should be standardized based only on information from undergraduate programs, and the same procedure to be followed for Masters and Ph.D. programs. Programs that are above 1 SD from the mean will be considered exceeding expectations and receive a score of 3 for that criterion, programs that are within 1 SD of the mean will be considered to be meeting expectations and will receive a score of 2 for that criterion, and programs that are below 1 SD from the mean will be considered performing below expectations and receive a score of 1 for that criterion.
- After considering the relevant narratives provided from the Questionnaire (Appendix B), each criterion, for each program, should be ranked as either exceeding expectations, performing as expected, or performing below expectations and receive the corresponding score of 3, 2, or 1. The relevant context for “exceeds”, “meets”, or “below” for a given criterion may be your peer institutions or it may be other programs in the University.
- Program specific scores for each criterion should be determined based on the weight provided for that criteria (e.g., the score of 1, 2 or 3 for criteria #1 “External Demand” should be multiplied by 11, while the total score for criteria #2 “Financial Efficiency” should be multiplied by 15 etc... to calculate the total score for the program. The total maximum total score would be 300; the minimum total score would be 100.
- All criteria types should include a narrative discussing opportunities and challenges faced by the program.
- All metrics should be based on performance for the last 5 years, or the life of the program if shorter, unless otherwise indicated.

## Quantitative and Qualitative Criteria

Criterion	Weight		
<b>External Demand</b>	11%	<p><b>Criterion 1 Student Demand:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Application data</li> </ul>	
<b>Financial Efficiency</b>	15%	<p><b>Criterion 2.1 External Revenue:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dollar value of external grants</li> <li>- Dollar amount of fund raising</li> <li>- Dollar amount of endowments</li> <li>- Dollar value of in-kind gifts</li> <li>- Level of alumni engagement</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 2.2 Costs and Revenues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total Cost (Expenditure of \$) / # of student credit-hours generated by the Program</li> <li>- Total Income = Total Revenues - Total Expenses</li> <li>- Profit/Loss Ratio = Total Revenues / Total Expenses</li> </ul>	
<b>Internal Demand</b>	12%	<p><b>Criterion 3.1 Trends for Majors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of student credit-hours taught by the program per year</li> <li>- Number of students enrolled in the program per year as Primary Major.</li> <li>- Number of students enrolled in the program per year as Secondary, Tertiary, Quaternary majors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 3.2 Trends for Non-Majors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of student credit-hours (from non-majors) taught by the program per year</li> <li>- Number of students enrolled in the program per year as minors, certificates, general education, or service purposes.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Student Success</b></p>	<p>8%</p>	<p><b>Criterion 4.1 Alumni Perceptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data from most recent program review for undergraduate and graduate students separately.</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 4.2 Persistence and Graduation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of graduates in the program per year as Primary Major/# enrolled at the <math>\geq 60</math> credit hour level</li> <li>- Number of graduates in the program per year as Primary Major.</li> <li>- Number of graduates in the program per year as Secondary, Tertiary, Quaternary majors, or minors.</li> <li>- Number of graduates in the program per year as Secondary, Tertiary, Quaternary majors, or minors/# enrolled at the <math>\geq 60</math> credit hour level</li> <li>- Number of students graduating (Primary + Secondary + Tertiary + Quaternary) per year / Estimated Full-Time Equivalent Faculty</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 4.3 Student Engagement - from questionnaire question 3:</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 4.4 Student Recognition - from questionnaire question 1:</b></p>
<p><b>Importance of Program to University Mission &amp; Uniqueness</b></p>	<p>8%</p>	<p><b>Criterion 5.1 Teaching Centrality:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Student Credit-Hours from outside Program / Total # of Student Credit-Hours generated by the program</li> <li>- Student Credit-Hours from non-core curriculum courses taught by the Program / Total # of Student Credit-Hours generated by the program</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 5.2 Research and Artistry (students) - from questionnaire question 4:</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 5.3 Uniqueness of the Program - from questionnaire question 5:</b></p>

<p><b>Faculty research and creative activity</b></p>	<p>15%</p>	<p><b>Criterion 6.1 Exemplary Recognition – from questionnaire question 1:</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 6.2 Research and Creative Activity:</b> Based on metrics for tenure decisions typically considered within the specific program or department, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of journal articles</li> <li>- Number of book chapters</li> <li>- Number of books (list textbooks and non-textbooks separately)</li> <li>- Number of grants (regional, state, national, international)</li> <li>- Number of artistic performances, screenings, exhibitions, commissions, curated programs, residencies, screenplays optioned, workshops</li> <li>- Number of grant proposals submitted</li> <li>- Number of presentations at professional meetings</li> <li>- Number of applied products produced</li> <li>- Number of consultations with original creative design work</li> <li>- Number of commissions</li> <li>- Number of contracts</li> <li>- Number of patents.</li> </ul> <p>Basis to measure this criterion will be the minimal Departmental requirements for tenure; or if they have not been established in the Departmental Operating Paper, the criterion will be based on the average of the productivity standards for the last five successful candidates to tenure.</p> <p>The metric would be calculated as:</p> <p><i><u>Production by all faculty in the Department (articles, books, grants, etc.) including N.T.T.s * 100</u></i>  <i>Requirements for Tenure for the Department * Number Tenured &amp; Tenured Track Professors</i></p> <p>After this number has been determined for all programs, this metric will be calculated as a standardized Z-</p>
--	------------	---

		<p>scores (Mean=0, Standard Deviation=1), taking into account all Departments with programs at the undergraduate, Masters, or Ph.D. level.</p> <p><b>Criterion 6.3 Interdisciplinary Activities - from questionnaire question 2:</b></p>
<b>Faculty Teaching</b>	15%	<p><b>Criterion 7.1 Teaching:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of credit-hours generated by Faculty (including adjuncts) in the Program weighted by class level with upper level classes receiving more weight*</li> <li>- Number of credit-hours generated by Faculty (including adjuncts) in the Program/Number of NTT and TT/T faculty (including adjuncts) in the program weighted by class level with upper level classes receiving more weight *</li> </ul> <p>* Direct instruction-not independent study, thesis, research</p> <p><b>Criterion 7.2 Indirect Teaching: Data from Activity Insight</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of Independent Studies / Research Projects</li> <li>- Number of Theses advised</li> <li>- Number of Thesis committees</li> <li>- Number of Dissertations advised</li> <li>- Number of Dissertation committees</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 7.3 Interdisciplinary Activities - from questionnaire question 2:</b></p>
<b>Contribution to Diversity</b>	10%	<p><b>Criterion 8.1 Student Diversity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of students in each program by: Race, Gender, First Generation, Disability, Veterans.</li> <li>- Proportion of students in each program by: Race, Gender, First Generation, Disability, Veterans.</li> </ul>



		<p><b>Criterion 8.2 Faculty Diversity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of faculty members in each program by: Race, Gender, Disability.</li> <li>- Trend in the number of faculty members in each program by: Race, Gender, Disability over the last 5 years.</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 8.3 Diversity Actions - from questionnaire question 6:</b></p>
Regional Sustainability / Community Engagement	6%	<p><b>Criterion 9.1 Faculty Involvement &amp; Support - from questionnaire question 7:</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 9.2 Curricular Integration - from questionnaire question 7:</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 9.3 Student Awareness &amp; Engagement - from questionnaire question 7:</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 9.4 Community Partnerships - from questionnaire question 7:</b></p> <p><b>Criterion 9.5 Program Sustainability - from questionnaire question 7:</b></p>

## Appendix B

### Campus-Wide Academic Program Prioritization Questionnaire

This Questionnaire is to be completed by the Program Author (likely the Departmental Chair or the Program Director) as part of a Campus-Wide Program Prioritization. Based on the numerical data and narratives provided from this Questionnaire, each criterion, for each program, will be ranked by the Provost's office as either exceeding expectations, performing as expected, or performing below expectations and receive the corresponding score of 3, 2, or 1. The relevant context for "exceeds", "meets", or "below" for a given criterion may be your peer institutions or it may be other programs in the University.

Note: We are aware that some terms like "diversity" have many possible meanings. When writing narratives, please inform the Provost's Office of the definition of the term as you understand it and are using it in your narrative.

**Question 1 (Corresponds to Criterion 6.1 - Exemplary Recognition and Criterion 4.4 - Student Recognition):** Please provide, in table format, forms of recognition (e.g., honors and awards) the faculty and students bring to the program and institution in the area of professional and public service and other exemplary performance.

Examples:

- Number and quality of awards for professional, institutional, and public service and exemplary service received by program faculty
- Number of awards obtained by students and reasons.
- Number of licenses obtained by students and brief descriptions.
- Number of certifications obtained by students and brief descriptions.
- Offices held in professional organizations.

**Question 2 (Corresponds to criterion 6.3 and criterion 7.3 - Interdisciplinary Activities):** Interdisciplinary activities in both teaching and creative activities are considered beneficial by employers and external funding agencies. Using  $\leq 250$  words, comment on all interdisciplinary activities pursued within your program.

**Question 3 (corresponds to criterion 4.3 - Student Engagement):** Please provide, in table format, trends in student engagement in curricular and co-curricular activities (e.g., internships, Research Rookies, service learning, Study Abroad, etc.). Be sure to include both number of students involved and a brief description of outcomes of activities.

**Question 4 (corresponds to criterion 5.2 - Research and Artistry [students]):** In table format, identify and if possible enumerate how the program and faculty support the capacity of students to engage in excellence and innovation in research, scholarship, creativity, and artistry, including but not limited to the following:

Examples:

- REACH grants sponsored, creative advisement, facilities provided for student-generated work, etc.
- Number of graduate and undergraduate students involved in research and creative activities

**Question 5 (corresponds to criterion 5.3 - Uniqueness of the Program):** Using ≤ 300 words, explain why the program has an important role to play in the university's program portfolio, region, or country.

Examples:

- Programs that are unique in some context
- Programs that cater to success of unique student demographics (i.e. Veterans, students not prepared for college or for their specific program).
- Programs that are unique in that the number of similar programs in Illinois or the United States is limited.

**Question 6 (corresponds to criterion 8.3 - Diversity Actions):** Using ≤ 250 words, describe how the program is addressing the issues of inclusion and diversity through curriculum, research, and service. Diversity of representation among authors of curricular or exemplary material.

**Question 7 (corresponds to criterion 9.1-9.5 - Faculty Involvement & Support, Curricular Integration, Student Awareness & Engagement, Community Partnerships, Program Sustainability):** Using ≤ 500 words, describe and discuss ways faculty and students support regional sustainability/community engagement into both the program's mission and the faculty members' individual professional work.

Examples:

- Describe how the curriculum for the major is integrated with developmentally appropriate elective and community-based learning course requirements.
- Describe how programs serve local communities, offering timely careers with local relevance.
- Describe and quantify the engagement of students in the unit with community engagement opportunities through course listings, community-engaged research, assistantships, internships, etc.
- Describe how the program builds economic and cultural stability in the region.
- Describe the program's ability to train professionals in health, education, cultural, ecological, agricultural, economic and other regionally critical fields.
- Describe, discuss, and enumerate the partnerships that the program has established with community, state, and national organizations in the region that provide professional development opportunities for faculty and students
- Describe and discuss programs that enhance the use and development of regional resources important for economic, social, and ecological sustainability.
- Describe the RSO activities that support and provide service to the university and community.

**Question 8:** For the criterion (1-9) of the Scoring Document (Appendix A), using one narrative of less than ≤ 500 words, discussing program specific opportunities and challenges, such as why any data for any particular criterion does not accurately reflect the quality of the program for that criterion.