Program Review

The primary purpose of program review is to improve academic and non-academic programs, and thereby enhance the ability of WTAMU to achieve its educational mission. It is assumed this will occur through the processes of: collecting evidence relative to productivity and quality; shared reflection regarding a program’s current status and future directions; and constructive feedback through peer and administrative review.

The information gathered for each criterion is to inform decision makers. Of the criteria utilized for program reviews, only one is a sufficient condition for program termination – program/activity is inconsistent with the mission of the WTAMU. Decisions are to be based on sound judgment utilizing the collectivity of information gathered.

In making decisions regarding program expansion, reduction, or termination, the university

1. Academic programs that are deemed to be absolutely essential or essential to the mission of WT, have a positive rate of return, and demonstrate high quality and potential for growth OR are deemed to be absolutely essential or essential to the mission of WT, have a positive rate of return, and demonstrate that they are underfunded shall receive first priority among the academic programs for additional discretionary funding.

2. New academic programs shall be given second highest priority among the academic programs for discretionary funding based upon centrality to mission, a positive expected rate of return, and the potential for growth and high quality.

3. Non-academic programs that are deemed to be absolutely essential or essential to the mission of WT, have a positive rate of return, demonstrate high quality, and demonstrate that they are underfunded shall receive first priority among the non-academic programs for additional discretionary funding.

4. New non-academic programs shall be given second highest priority among the non-academic programs for discretionary funding based upon centrality to mission, a positive expected rate of return, and the potential for providing better support of academic programs or the recruiting/retaining of students.

5. Preservation of the educational mission of the university will be accorded the highest priority when consideration is given to program reductions or termination. First and foremost, the university shall protect the central role of the liberal arts at WTAMU.

6. Programs deemed as “Inconsistent with Mission” will be terminated or re-purposed. Programs that provide services that are currently performed in several areas across campus will be consolidated if it is determined the impact on customers is enhanced or the negative impact of consolidation is minimal.

7. Programs deemed as “Consistent with Mission but not critical” will next be considered for reduction or termination. The decision regarding reduction or termination will take into consideration program’s rate of return, quality and potential for growth.

---

1 Discretionary funding changes are those made in the annual budget process. Non-discretionary funding changes will occur as enrollment or credit hour generation changes and fees or designated tuition dollars flow by formula to a program/unit.
8. Programs deemed as “Essential” will next be considered for reduction or termination. The decision regarding reduction or termination will take into consideration program’s rate of return, quality and potential for growth.

9. In the event the decision is made to reduce or terminate an academic program, the university shall recognize and protect the principle and practice of tenure.
   a. Tenure track faculty shall be considered for termination before tenured faculty
   b. Temporary faculty shall be considered for termination before tenure track faculty

The university shall also recognize variances in faculty performance.
   a. Three year average of Annual Performance Evaluations shall be used to prioritize faculty on the basis of performance
Criteria for Program Reviews

Academic Programs

Centrality to Mission

In relation to the Working Mission Statement for WTAMU, a program will be rated as:

Absolutely Essential – WTAMU would not be a university in the absence of this program.

Essential – Program is vital given its support of other academic programs or meeting the needs of regional labor market.

Consistent with Mission but not critical – Program is not absolutely necessary in support of other academic programs or meeting the needs of regional labor market.

Inconsistent with Mission

Proxies for Rate of Return

• Academic Programs –
  o Ratio of Program Revenue from Teaching to Cost of Program Faculty and Support – Modified TAMU Study (TAMU Study does not include direct support costs of academic programs, i.e., departmental support (department head, secretarial support, M&O, faculty travel and development, release time for faculty, lab expenses as appropriate, and wages for student workers, institutional scholarships awarded to majors).
  o External Grants Received
  o Accomplishment of Global Learning Objectives – Value added with regard to Global Learning Objectives (critical thinking, written communication, problem solving, ethical decision making, oral communication, information literacy, and cultural understanding).

• Efficiency of Program – Comparison with Programs on campus and/or Peer Institutions
  o Direct Instructional Cost per FTE Student – Delaware Study
  o FTE Students/FTE Faculty – Delaware Study

Quality of Program

• Accreditation Status
• Placement of Graduates
• Pass Rates on Certification Exams

Demand for Program and Potential for Growth

• Program Enrollment (Student Credit Hours) Over Past Five Years
• Program Enrollment (Majors) Over Five Years
• Program Graduations Over Past Five Years
Non-Academic Programs

Centrality to Mission
In relation to the Working Mission Statement for WTAMU, a program will be rated as:
Absolutely Essential – WTAMU would not be a university in the absence of this program.
Essential – Program is vital given its support of academic programs or recruiting/retaining students.
Consistent with Mission but not critical – Program is not absolutely necessary in support of academic programs or recruiting/retaining students.
Inconsistent with Mission

Proxies for Rate of Return
• Benefit/Cost Ratio –
• Efficiency of Program – Comparison with Programs on campus and/or Peer Institutions
  o Ratio of Cost of Outsourcing Activity to Cost of Program
  o Comparison of Outcomes with Programs of Similar Mission and Size
• Each function performed by staff members in the central administration will be analyzed to determine if their services are needed by the customer (student and academic enterprise). If these services are needed, a determination will be made as to how function can be performed efficiently and cost effectively. (See Process Review.)

Quality of Program
• Customer Satisfaction Rates
• Each unit must identify top three key processes, utilizing a tool such as Pareto Analysis. Metrics will be developed and tracked for each key process (i.e., processing time for completing work orders, time to process travel reimbursements, etc.)

Questions to be asked with regard to all resource reallocation considerations:
1. What is the effect of the proposed change on
   a. Student learning
   b. Time to graduation
      How many students would be adversely impacted? If resources are reallocated to another academic program, how many students would benefit?
   c. Program growth
   d. University growth
   e. External support/funding for the university
   f. Discipline specific and/or SACS accreditation
Process Analysis

Each function performed by staff members in the central administration will be analyzed to determine if their services are needed by the customer (student and academic enterprise).
Review Process

Committee Composition

Co-chairs - 2
  Associate Provost – Wade Shaffer
  Vice President for Student Affairs – Don Albrecht

Faculty Representatives – 11
  Faculty representatives appointed by each dean to include Graduate Dean - 6
  Faculty representatives elected by the faculty of each of the five academic colleges – 5

Staff Representatives - 3
  Three staff members appointed by President of Staff Council

Student Representatives - 3
  Three students appointed by President of Student Government

President’s Representative
  One representative appointed by the President

Faculty Senate’s Representative
  One representative appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate

Resource Support (non-voting)
  Controller – Rick Johnson
  Director of Institutional Research – Gary Kelley
  Director of Personnel Services – Harvey Hudspeth
# Timeline

## Summer 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task – Review of Non-Academic and Academic Programs</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All non-academic units and academic support units develop and propose at least three metrics which their respective units will utilize to track performance. One of the measures must be customer satisfaction. President’s office will review and approve, as appropriate, proposed metrics</td>
<td>August 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans, Faculty Senate President, Staff Council President, and President appoint representatives to Review Committee</td>
<td>August 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Institutional Research gathers for and provides to Review Committee  
  Delaware Study Data  
  Academic Program Enrollment (Student Credit Hours) Over Past Five Years  
  Academic Program Enrollment (Majors) Over Five Years  
  Academic Program Graduations Over Past Five Years  
  Accreditation Status of Programs  
  Pass Rates on Certification Exams | September 16, 2011 |
| Business and Finance gathers data for Review Committee  
  Direct costs of each academic program, i.e., departmental support (faculty salaries, department head, secretarial support, M&O, faculty travel and development, lab expenses as appropriate, wages for student workers, and institutional scholarships awarded to majors)  
  Direct costs of each non-academic program | September 16, 2011 |
| Business and Finance collects NUCUBO data regarding performance measures for non-academic units | September 16, 2011 |
| Counseling & Career Services provides data on placement of graduates and average starting salaries to Review Committee | September 16, 2011 |
| Associate Provost for Learning Assessment provides data on value added with regard to Global Learning Objectives (critical thinking, written communication, problem solving, ethical decision making, oral communication, information literacy, and cultural understanding) by program to Review Committee | September 16, 2011 |
| Graduate Dean provides data on external grants received by program to Review Committee | September 16, 2011 |
### Fall Semester 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task – Review of Non-Academic and Academic Programs</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College faculty elect representatives for respective colleges</td>
<td>August 26, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost with regard to academic programs and academic support programs and other vice presidents, AD, CIO and Director of PPHM with regard to non-academic programs provide to Review Committee ratings of centrality of mission of programs under their supervision</td>
<td>September 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Finance gathers data for Review Committee Costs of outsourcing activities of each non-academic program</td>
<td>October 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic units provide to Review Committee data regarding metrics which their respective units will utilize to track performance</td>
<td>October 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Review Committee interview staff members to determine if their services are needed by the customer (student and academic enterprise). If these services are needed, a determination will be made as to how function can be performed efficiently and cost effectively</td>
<td>November 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task – Review of Non-Academic and Academic Programs</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Committee provides recommendations to Provost, other Vice Presidents, AD, CIO, Director of PPHM, Faculty Senate and Staff Council regarding ways to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of resources for comments</td>
<td>February 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost, other Vice Presidents, AD, CIO, Director of PPHM, Faculty Senate and Staff Council provide comments to Review Committee regarding recommendations</td>
<td>March 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Committee provides to President final recommendations inclusive of comments received</td>
<td>April 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>