Faculty Governance Committee
Preliminary Report on Program Evaluation
Nov. 11, 2014

Introduction

The University of New Orleans is a unique institution that has tremendous opportunity to be highly successful. Due to a confluence of factors, the university has yet to achieve its potential. Strong leadership, vision, focused efforts, clear communication, and effective use of resources are all required in order to overcome current challenges and to thrive.

The Faculty Governance Committee has responded to its charge and carefully considered all programs at UNO in order to assess each program's potential for supporting the university mission into the future. Throughout the program review process, the committee has worked to overcome two basic challenges. First, there was a compressed time frame to design, accomplish, and evaluate all programs. Second, there is a mismatch between the sort of data needed to do a comprehensive evaluation and the data that can be provided by current UNO administrative systems. The committee has done a thoughtful and thorough job of evaluating programs given our current challenges. Additional work is needed over the next 6-12 months to further evaluate programs as supplementary data are gathered in more usable formats. It is important for the university community to understand that we cannot wait for either perfect data or a perfect evaluation system. We must work with available data in order to institute a concurrent process of continuous improvement into our program evaluation system.

Approach

The Faculty Governance Committee, including the addition of all Deans to the committee, investigated processes used by other universities as well as additional resources. From these resources, the committee selected 6 evaluation criteria and weighted each (see Table 1). Subcommittees then determined the data needed to score each program based on the criteria and developed protocols for assessing these data and assigning scores. Once subcommittee scores were assigned, the full committee reviewed the scores. After soliciting feedback from department chairs and all faculty members, the 6 criteria scores were revised as needed. Appendix 1 provides the assigned criteria scores as well as an overview of the scoring methods. Each committee member considered the program scores, statements from department chairs, inter-program connections, and the university mission in sorting programs into categories. The four categories are: 1) Enhance, 2) Sustain, 3) Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform, and 4) Close. These categories are further explained in Table 2. Committee members first made preliminary votes for program categories. After tabulating these votes, the full committee met to consider the results and make a final vote for Category 3 and 4. Placement into Category 4 (Close) required a 2/3 majority vote of the committee. Members who had a conflict of interest abstained from voting (for example, members could not vote on programs from their own department).

Due to time constraints, the committee has not finalized sorting of programs into Category 1 and Category 2. Additional work will be completed over the next 6-8 weeks in order to differentiate between Category 1 and 2.

The current committee recommendations balance a careful approach with an immediate need for revitalization and restructuring. Hasty closure of programs puts the university at risk for future instability and impaired growth. Consequently, the committee has recommended for closure only programs that were deemed to be unable to survive in the current fiscal and enrollment climates. Programs that we thought needed further investigation (including cost analysis) were placed in Category 3. We recommend that these programs address the findings of the evaluation by the end of the spring 2015 semester. The aim of such review is to stimulate positive change and growth in order to build a stronger university. We have the opportunity with these programs to merge, restructure, or transform them. Throughout the review process, it became obvious to the committee that there are strategic ways to use the limited resources across campus for growth and innovation. However, the faculty and Deans of each college should undertake that process as they know their departments best. For example, the College of Education and Human Development has undertaken a thirteen-month process of evaluating its own programs and is well on the way to its own conclusions. Some academic programs in the College of Liberal Arts have also developed strategies for collaboration, and others are building on previous efforts to systematically use limited resources. However, we fully expect that the outcome of Category 3 program review may result in merging and closure of some of these programs.

Administrative Costs
The Faculty Governance Committee has taken a systematic, open, inclusive, and unbiased approach to evaluating degree programs and recommending a program array for future growth of the university. While this process is essential to the health of any university, it cannot be effectively undertaken without a parallel process in non-instructional administrative departments. Cost containment and minimization of administrative and instructional overhead rates are key strategies to overcoming financial difficulties. While enrollment growth is the best long-term solution to fiscal instability, short-term strategies must include administrative efficiency as the number one priority. Strategic changes in operating procedures must be instituted immediately, and the process must involve broad, meaningful input from faculty constituents. The careful and difficult work undertaken by the Faculty Governance Committee is meaningless without a parallel process for administrative programs.

Limitations
A number of limitations emerged in the process. While we are confident that this represents our best attempt, we note the limitations of this study. The time frame was compressed. Most universities that have embarked on this process, such as the University of Alaska, worked for 18 months to two years. We had barely five months for this process that had never been attempted at the University of New Orleans. Therefore, there was no precedent to follow; we created the process, which in itself is time consuming.

There remain limitations in the data itself. Because of the type of data needed, we were unable to measure cost by program. With additional time for further review we plan to link costs to individual programs. Collecting the data into usable form took more than two months. We expect going forward that we can build databases that will more easily reflect the evaluation needs. Because of the data limitations, some quantitative data was used in three different criteria, leading to some bias against small programs. We worked carefully to address this bias through the use of the more qualitative narratives developed by the chairs of each department. External demand in this time-compressed period was difficult to measure. We hope for programs in Category 3 to explore this issue in more depth.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria and Their Weighting

Criterion	Key Components	Weight
External Demand for Programs	Short term and long term demand (new students); workforce demand	15%
Internal Demand	General education and support of other programs, feeder to masters programs, number of majors	15%
Size, Scope, and Productivity	Retention, SCHs, Completers, research	20%
Quality of Inputs and Outputs	Number of full time, tenure track faculty; Quality of student outputs	10%
Revenue	Tuition, state allocations, indirect from grants, donation	15%
Impact, Justification, Essentiality	Alumni, industry, mission alignment	25%

Table 2. Program Categories

Category	Description
1) Enhance	Programs with the highest potential for positively impacting the university mission; should receive enhanced resources to support growth in student learning outcomes, scholarly productivity, and revenue (current resources are deemed insufficient)
2) Sustain	Programs with clear potential for positively impacting the university mission; should receive sufficient resources to support growth in student learning outcomes, scholarly productivity, and revenue (current resources are deemed insufficient)
3) Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform	Programs have potential for growth and making an important impact on the university mission; scarcity of resource, changing demand, program stagnation, or other limitations threaten program viability; new models or approaches are needed to build stronger programs that can flourish; some programs may later be deemed non-viable, but the majority are expected to emerge with strength; Colleges must devise transformation plans by the end of the spring 2015 semester
4) Close	Due to the current fiscal and enrollment climate, these programs can no longer be maintained and should be closed

Recommendations
The expanded Faculty Governance Committee puts forth the following recommendations to President Fos. The committee *strongly* urges the President to consider these recommendations carefully. Wide faculty participation was involved in completing this work, and development of continued shared governance and faculty-administrative collaboration can only be achieved if faculty driven leadership is respected and valued by the administration. Premature closure of programs placed in Category 3 would have a negative impact on the future of the university.

Category 1 and 2: Enhance or Sustain. Programs in these two categories are currently combined since the committee did not have sufficient time to differentiate these two categories. The committee will continue with this endeavor with a goal of refining these categories by January 2015.

B.A. English
B.A. Film & Theatre
B.A. Fine Arts
B.A. History
B.A. Music
B.I.S. Interdisciplinary Studies
B.S. Accounting
B.S. Biological Sciences
B.S. Business Administration
B.S. Chemistry
B.S. Civil Engineering
B.S. Computer Science
B.S. Earth & Environ Sciences
B.S. Electrical Engineering
B.S. Finance
B.S. Hotel, Restaurant, & Tourism
B.S. Human Performance & Health Promotion
B.S. Management
B.S. Marketing
B.S. Math
B.S. Mechanical Engineering
B.S. Naval Architecture & Marine Engineering
B.S. Psychology
B.A. Sociology
M.A. English

M.A.T. C&I
M.B.A. Business Administration
M.Ed. Counselor Education
M.F.A. Creative Writing
M.F.A. Film & Theatre
M.M. Music
M.P.A. Public Administration
M.S. Accounting
M.S. Biological Sciences
M.S. Chemistry
M.S. Computer Science
M.S. Earth & Environ Sciences
M.S. Engineering
M.S. Financial Economics
M.S. Health Care Management
M.S. Hospitality & Tourism
M.S. Math
M.S. Psychology
M.S. Tax Accounting
M.U.R.P. Urban & Regional Planning
Ph.D. Chemistry
Ph.D. Counselor Education
Ph.D. Engineering & Applied Science
Ph.D. Financial Economics
Ph.D. Integrative Biology
Ph.D. Psychology
Ph.D. Urban Studies

Category 3: Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform. Declining state allocations to public higher education institutions, declining enrollment, and changes in workforce needs have all contributed to difficulties for many programs at UNO. While external pressures have played a large role in creating challenges for all programs, the reality of higher education requires new vision to build stronger, more viable programs. In order to remain competitive, programs in this category must create new operating models. Such models may include merged programs, focus on high demand sub-disciplines, cross-discipline endeavors, development of certificate or other high demand markets, and in some cases discontinuance of programs. Because program characteristics are best understood by those in the field, strategies for program transformation must come from the programs themselves in collaboration with college leadership. Each program in this category is required to prepare a Restructuring Plan and submit the plan to the Faculty Governance Committee by the end of the spring 2015 semester. Plans should be innovative, student centered, and focused on strengthening the university. The committee will be providing guidance to each program to help in preparing plans. A majority vote was required to place a program in Category 3.

B.A. Anthropology
B.A. International Studies
B.A. Philosophy
B.A. Political Science
B.A. Romance Languages
B.S. Elementary Education
B.S. Physics
B.S. Secondary Teaching
B.S. Urban Studies
M.A. Arts Administration
M.A. History
M.A. Political Science
M.A. Romance Languages
M.A. Sociology
M.A.T. Special Education
M.Ed. Curriculum & Instruction
M.Ed. Educational Leadership
M.Ed. Special Education
M.F.A. Fine Arts
M.S. Applied Physics
M.S. Engineering Management
M.S. Urban Studies
Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction
Ph.D. Educational Administration
Ph.D. Special Education

Category 4: Program Closure. The programs in this category are recommended for closure. This recommendation is based on enrollment patterns, expected future demand for the program, and anticipated trends in future workforce needs. Only programs that were deemed unable to remain viable were place into this category. It is important to note that a number of factors contributed to the demise of these programs. Placement into this category does not reflect in any way on the quality of students and teaching in these programs.

B.S. Early Childhood Education
B.S. Elem Ed & Mild Mod Disabilities
Ph.D. Political Science

Voting Members of Faculty Governance Committee:

<u>Chair</u>
Matthew Tarr

<u>Members</u>
Pat Austin
Edit Bourgeois
Elaine Brooks
Nancy Easterlin
Renia Ehrenfeucht
Cheryl Hayes
Pamela Jenkins (Faculty Senate President and co-Facilitator of Program Evaluation)
Darrell Kruger
Enrique LaMotta
Jim Logan
Marie Morgan
Jeanne Pavy
Dinah Payne
Connie Phelps
Jairo Santanilla
Wendy Schluchter
Peter Schock
Greg Seab
Tumulesh Solanky
Richard Speaker
Cherie Trumbach

<u>Guest Members with Voting Privileges for Revitalization Process</u>
Kevin Graves
Steven Johnson
Sharon Mader
Norman Whitley
John Williams