

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 University¹ 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).²

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.

¹ 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.

² 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.³ 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.

³ 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			
External Demand	11%	Criterion 1 Student Demand: - Application data		
Financial Efficiency	15%	Criterion 2.1 External Revenue: - Dollar value of external grants - Dollar amount of fund raising - Dollar amount of endowments - Dollar value of in-kind gifts - Level of alumni engagement Criterion 2.2 Costs and Revenues: - Total Cost (Expenditure of \$) / # of student credit-hours generated by the Program - Total Income = Total Revenues - Total Expenses - Profit/Loss Ratio = Total Revenues / Total Expenses		
Internal Demand	12%	Criterion 3.1 Trends for Majors: - Number of student credit-hours taught by the program per year - Number of students enrolled in the program per year as Primary Major. - Number of students enrolled in the program per year as Secondary, Tertiary, Quaternary majors. Criterion 3.2 Trends for Non-Majors: - Number of student credit-hours (from non-majors) taught by the program per year - Number of students enrolled in the program per year as minors, certificates, general education, or service purposes.		

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

<p>Faculty research and creative activity</p>	<p>15%</p>	<p>Criterion 6.1 Exemplary Recognition – from questionnaire question 1:</p> <p>Criterion 6.2 Research and Creative Activity: 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"> - Number of journal articles - Number of book chapters - Number of books (list textbooks and non-textbooks separately) - Number of grants (regional, state, national, international) - Number of artistic performances, screenings, exhibitions, commissions, curated programs, residencies, screenplays optioned, workshops - Number of grant proposals submitted - Number of presentations at professional meetings - Number of applied products produced - Number of consultations with original creative design work - Number of commissions - Number of contracts - Number of patents. <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><u><i>Production by all faculty in the Department (articles, books, grants, etc.) including N.T.T.s * 100</i></u> <i>Requirements for Tenure for the Department * Number Tenured & 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>Criterion 6.3 Interdisciplinary Activities - from questionnaire question 2:</p>
Faculty Teaching	15%	<p>Criterion 7.1 Teaching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of credit-hours generated by Faculty (including adjuncts) in the Program weighted by class level with upper level classes receiving more weight* - 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 * <p>* Direct instruction-not independent study, thesis, research</p> <p>Criterion 7.2 Indirect Teaching: Data from Activity Insight</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Independent Studies / Research Projects - Number of Theses advised - Number of Thesis committees - Number of Dissertations advised - Number of Dissertation committees <p>Criterion 7.3 Interdisciplinary Activities - from questionnaire question 2:</p>
Contribution to Diversity	10%	<p>Criterion 8.1 Student Diversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of students in each program by: Race, Gender, First Generation, Disability, Veterans. - Proportion of students in each program by: Race, Gender, First Generation, Disability, Veterans.

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

Appendix C

Responses from SIUC faculty

Below are all responses received from a 2 June e-mail solicitation to the SIUC Faculty-at large. These responses were reviewed by the entire JTF and modification to the report were made when deemed appropriate.

Respondent 1:

To my knowledge, Paralegal Studies has not had any input on this yet. One concern we have is that Question 1.2 in the rubric bases the measurement on the minimal departmental requirements for tenure. Paralegal Studies is entirely a non-tenure-track model. The instructors are all licensed attorneys. We are unique in our successes in shaping future leaders, improving communities, and transforming lives as to the legal profession in enabling future paralegals and attorneys and beyond.

That said, one question I have is whether or not this exercise your committee is engaged in is directly entirely towards tenured faculty and tenure-granting programs or is meant to also embrace NTT faculty and NTT-granting programs? If the latter, then this particular criteria at Question 1.2 unfairly discriminates against Paralegal Studies and similarly situated faculty and programs.

I certainly understand that the criteria being measured in Question 1.2 must be measured according to the requirements for tenure for tenure-granting faculty and programs; however, I think some distinction should be included in the language in order to acknowledge the diversity of faculty types and programs on campus.

Respondent 2:

As this document is presented to higher administrators, you must emphasize LOUDLY that preparation of unit reports cannot be dumped on department chairs and program directors. If the document were handed to me with instructions that the report is due in 6 months, I would resign immediately. As pointed out in the opening pages, most of the data required do not exist or aren't in an accessible format. However, it would be CHARACTERISTIC of this administration to proceed as if chairs & directors could pull something together that would suffice. That would lead to huge inaccuracies among programs and must not be allowed to happen.

The "alumni perceptions" should distinguish between grad students and undergrads, because the characteristics of these two populations are very different. Grad students are relatively mature and professionally informed; modern undergrads are relatively childish and professionally ignorant, despite our best efforts. Opinions of the latter should be down-weighted. Not doing so would reward programs with lower academic rigor (and studies supporting this have been available for 30 years at least).

Donations should not be considered a factor in assessing “financial efficiency”. The amount of donations has nothing to do with program quality.

The combined weight assigned to student demand (8%) is too low. Programs that have a track record of high demand (i.e. many majors & grad students) have much more than an 8% claim on priority. If SIU exists to serve students, programs in high demand have effectively established their priority, almost regardless of other factors. Keeping this weight low protects programs that few students want. I’m all for preserving arts, humanities, and the whole academic spectrum, but number of majors is the bottom line and no amount of apologetics can change that. No other recommendation does as much to weaken the report’s utility as the low weight assigned to student demand.

Respondent 3:

Instead of:

'Quantitative Data for long-term prioritization should become available soon through either Academic (*sic*) Insight (Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research) or the Office of Institutional Research. For qualitative data, a mechanism for data collection is currently not in place.'

Write:

'Some Quantitative Data for long-term prioritization should be available soon from either the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research, or, the Office of Institutional Research. For much of the quantitative data, and all of the qualitative data, mechanisms for data collection are currently not in place. '

The reason why I am suggesting these changes is that Provost Ford has clarified the fact that Faculty do not need to complete **anything** in Activity Insight. There is no mandate and no requirement to provide the productivity information through that route. Specifically, on May 16, 2016 the Provost responded (through her designee Assoc. Provost DiLalla) to the question raised by the FA as to whether a mandate existed for Faculty to fill their productivity information in Activity Insight. The paragraph below is from the administration's response:

"1. Is it mandatory for faculty to use Activity Insight?

Response: Activity Insight reporting is not mandatory at the present time. The administration strongly recommends participation and believes that participation will be of benefit to faculty and the University. Please recall that all faculty **are** required to submit an updated CV annually, including their own updated reporting of any activities including scholarly work. It is our hope that use of Activity insight will facilitate individuals' ability to track and report their activities annually, and, eventually to make it easier to produce annual updates to CVs."

Since Activity Insight is not mandated, some alternative approach will have to be used. So the reference to the no longer mandatory Activity Insight should be dropped."

Respondent 4:

The prioritization document is very well done. I am sure this was a herculean (and thankless) task. My only comments are in regard to the “comparison between programs at SIU versus comparison with similar programs at other universities”. How will it be decided whether programs are compared to internal and/or external programs and will we have access to all of the data from an external program needed to complete the rubric? Will the programs targeted for external comparison be tasked with compiling the required data or will this fall to the committee/admin? It seems that there are already problems with simply compiling the needed data internally, let alone from an outside program.

Respondent 5:

In reviewing the template of factors to consider, I am surprised that “external demand” carries so little weight. I feel universities need to do a better job of educating students for the job market. I know that this should not be the highest priority, but students need to be employable once they finish their degrees.

Respondent 6:

Although it is useful for the university to have a performance rubric like the one the committee proposed, as far as this rubric addressing the question at hand, it is irrelevant.

Performance indices like publications, grants, and most of the other indices in the rubric can be good for evaluating a faculty for P&T in order to retain the faculty, but not for evaluating a program or a department.

A department is a fiscal entity for the purpose of administering degree programs. A department may graduate 50 students a year but the faculty may have low grant/publication performance; it should not be placed to low priority. Likewise, a department could have faculty with many grants/publications and only very few students. The faculty of the department can continue to be productive while merged into another unit.

Our product as university is degrees. Programs that do not graduate students should be taught out and eliminated. Departments with programs like that should also close. Affected faculty should merge into other related departments to continue being productive there.

For example: in our college, we have department of mining engineering with 2 faculty and maybe 20 students. It would be a great idea, if the faculty were merged with civil or mechanical where they can continue to teach and do research. The engineering technology department can move from the college of engineering to CASA where all the other technology programs are, so that college of engineering can be more focused and efficient. The computer science department can move from the college of science to the college of engineering and merge with ECE into a school making a much more efficient and dynamic unit. In your college, math and physics departments have more faculty than students. These can also merge or move (for example in other universities math and physics are in engineering). Not every program needs a director (we have four programs in my department and a single chair for all of them).

The above are some examples of the things where this university can focus to become more main stream and dynamic. Especially as enrollment goes down. Unfortunately your committee cannot make such proposals--that's why I refused to vote for it in the grad council; these decisions require higher level leadership. Your committee should have looked into the IBHE rules for closing programs and the credit hour cost study and draw useful conclusions to help the provost.

Finally, let me remind you that we have tried the rubric approach before (see Wedler's excellence criteria and Koropshack's performance radars). Where are we now?

Respondent 7:

I think discussions about diversity should look at the diversity of the graduating class, not just of the total enrollment.

Respondent 8:

The report readily admits it doesn't have the data it needs to make the crosscampus comparison using this rubric. At best, particularly with the admitted failure of Activity Insight, any data would be GIGO (Garbage In, Garbage Out). The Task Force knows we don't have the data needed to make adequate use of the rubric. What I do find troublesome is that

1. There is no clear distinction between what data might be used and what will be thrown out as incomplete, unrepresentative and/or flawed.

2. No deadline set to gather the data that is missing. I was one of the few who filled out the excruciating detail of AI for the past 18 months but that doesn't capture the years of awards, research and teaching activity, etc. that most faculty (myself included) accomplished prior to that AI window.

In the end, I don't know what to make of the report. It's up to the administration to use its judgment (according to the CBA referenced Article 9). What data has the administration used in the past? I've been here 21 years and the data held as top-priority has varied from credit hours to majors to federal grant dollars, etc.

I applaud the JTF members for their hard work. I just don't know what can be done with this report until the methodological issues and data collection are complete.

Respondent 9:

These comments aren't meant to be solely critical; to some extent they are just observations on things I found somewhat striking about the process as you all envisage it.

1. The plan may rank chairs rather than programs.

This may be unavoidable given the absence of ready comparative data, but you are obviously putting a huge burden on program heads to produce the equivalent of a self-study. That may be well and good. As a qualitative person, I appreciate the effort to do this rather than to attempt to provide some centralized ranking based solely on data crunching. Program heads will no doubt (despite your hope for objectivity in a footnote) make the best case they can for their programs--I think that's their job, actually. But the downside of this approach is that programs will rise and fall based in some large part on how effectively they make their case. I would expect that deans and provosts will weigh in to correct for known deficiencies in such positions, but there's only so much to expect there. Savvy chairs will enlist help from their more persuasive colleagues, and such colleagues would do well to help their chairs--though of course the latter can be awkward if one of your chair's weaknesses is an overestimate of his or her own persuasiveness.

2. The plan suggests a partial and somewhat muddled vision for SIUC.

The report takes a stab at articulating one partial vision for SIUC: sustainability. I'm fine with that--someone's got to come up with a vision for this place, as our last strategic plan certainly failed to do so (beyond the unavoidable basics: an accessible research university in Southern Illinois). And sustainability is relevant to our location, and clearly important to many faculty across a range of units. But I'm not sure how widely shared that vision is, especially among students, and it gets somewhat muddled, in the rubric, with "community engagement," another good thing, but not necessarily the same thing at all, of course.

3. The plan prioritizes quality over mission.

As part of our larger lack of vision--NOT the task force's fault by any means--there's no effort here to answer the \$64k question of: "Does a research university like SIUC need a department of X?" We'd all agree that we need departments/programs in Math and English, for example--and indeed that we need strong programs in both, at least strong from the teaching angle. But were this plan to determine that either of those units is weak (something I do not mean to imply by any means!), then they would presumably be cut, whereas what they may need is more resources, not fewer (at least if their shortcomings are related to resources). And we may, on the other hand, have very fine programs in areas less essential to our core mission as a research university. One could make the argument that such programs may have to be cut, despite their quality, in a desperate fiscal environment.

This sort of thing does get reflected indirectly via credit hours driven by the core curriculum, but I'm not sure how important those hours will end up being, and some room for direct comment on this would be helpful. If you don't work it in here, the process will be more vulnerable such comments later, when there's outrage like that at WIU about elimination of their philosophy program, for example.

Respondent 10:

(1) As a minor point, the evaluation criteria uses the term “artistry,” but the more common term in T&P documents and, at least my own school’s OP, is “creative activity.”

(2) I’m concerned about the evaluation of research productivity only by number of publications/activities, and am not convinced that dividing them with OP requirements will provide an accurate weighting. My own school’s OP deliberately does not set a required, or even expected, number of publications/activities, because the nature and quality of these activities varies widely. So, coming up with that calculation as a simple number divided by requirement would not be possible in Art and Design, and I’m guessing, many other humanities and arts departments.

Respondent 11:

Page 10

Point 2. “All qualitative metrics should be ranked by the Provost’s office”. Who in the Provost’s office will do this – the persons need to be qualified to properly evaluate the narratives. The persons’ positions should be transparent and included in this document.

Page 11-12: Question 1.2 Research and artistry

A. It seems like some of the products should be weighted in the calculation listed on p. 12. Is it really appropriate to equate a book and a journal article? In our discipline, one can get tenure with a book and a few journal articles OR with a lot of journal articles – so we weight the book higher than one product. You propose listing textbooks and non-textbooks differently but this doesn’t weight them differently.

** If there is no way to weight them across the university, let departments weight them internally as they produce these data.

B. The metric equation itself is clear (except see below C). However, it is unclear what departments are supposed to do with it vis a vis the paragraph above which is about setting a minimum for tenure (how does this figure come into play?).

C. 1. Why are NTTs included in the count of products when their assignments are typically 100% teaching? I suppose it’s a bonus for departments who have NTTs who produce.

2. I see that NTTs are not included in the denominator for calculating the products per tenured and tenured track faculty. Is this intentional? If so good; if not, they should be left out of the count of total faculty.

** I propose one of two options: a) include them in count but not in the total number of faculty (as it currently reads, if I understand it correctly), b) omit NTTs altogether.

** I oppose the idea of including NTTs as part of the faculty when they are not expected to produce.

Page 12. Questions 1.3 Teaching

A. What is the justification for counting upper level courses more? Why do they receive more weight? This seems unjustifiable. Lower division courses and upper division courses should be equal in weight. One level is not easier or harder to teach than the other. Both have their challenges. Further, departments that teach for the UCC tend to teach more lower level courses and should not be harmed by this service to the University.

Page 12. Question 1.4 Indirect Teaching

A. Why doesn't the count of indirect teaching take into account the size of the faculty available to do such indirect teaching? Small departments who have a lot of dissertation committees should get some recognition and the reverse as well. This must be considered relative to faculty size. Importantly, it's not just faculty size but specifically who has Regular Graduate Faculty Status (Thesis or Research papers) and who as Direct Dissertation Graduate Faculty Status (Dissertations).

B. Also please amend the list of Indirect teaching so that it reads Thesis/Research Paper because some departments grant MAs with MA Research Papers instead of Theses. The MA Research Paper is not equivalent to the Independent study/research project, it should go with the Thesis advised and Thesis committees.

Page 13. Question 2.2 Persistence and Graduation

A. Majors. There should be no distinction whatsoever in primary versus secondary, tertiary, or quaternary major. Item 2 (number of graduates in the program year as primary major) and Item 3 (number of graduates in the program year as secondary, tertiary, etc) should be combined into one item. Item 1 and item 4 should be combined. There is no distinction and no ranking, no lesser or greater departmental workload for a student listing one major first and another second. In fact, students are encouraged by competing departments to list one first – this is arbitrary and has no bearing on anything. There should be no penalty for being listed secondary – the student still completes all the requirements for the major.

B. Minors. Separately counting minors makes sense.

Page 14. Question 2.4 Student Recognition

A. There should be a NA option or the instruction used in other items, to provide a narrative discussing program specific opportunities and challenges associated with these metrics. Many programs do not have licenses or certifications.

B. Some guidance is probably needed for "awards", are these internal department awards, college or university, or external awards. Should these be weighted differently?

Page 14. Question 3.1 External Revenue

A. External grants should not be included in the same category as fund raising, endowments, in-kind gifts, alumni engagement. These are not equivalent. Grants should be measured separately with recognition that for some departments, grant funding is just not available or is in declining supply. The latter forms of revenue do not directly speak to the quality or productivity or efficiency of the department. Alumni engagement and gifts are largely related to the incomes such students earn and some field garner higher incomes than others. This should not be used against departments.

Page 14. Question 3.2 Costs and internal revenue

How is total revenue calculated? How will departments get this information?

** The weight of 25% for total financial efficiency seems too high especially for disciplines where federal grant dollars are dwindling or simply unavailable.

Page 16. Question 6.1 Trends for Majors

A. There should be no distinction between primary and secondary (etc.) majors. This should be one item.

B. It seems these numbers should be relative to department size (perhaps number of faculty or some other figure). Raw counts should never be simply compared across disparate units in terms of size and resources. The same holds for Question 6.2 Trends for non-Majors

Weighting

I appreciate the discussion on concerns with weighting. I would like to register my concern that 25% is too high for external funding (financial efficiency). But I also would like to register my concern that teaching and research combined is 35%. Teaching and research is what we do. I strongly encourage pre-testing be done with these weights and that the faculty (either at large or through the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council) be given another chance to offer feedback on such pre-testing.

Final Scoring

I strongly concur with the JTF that pre-testing occur to determine if the scoring formula performs as expected.

Respondent 12:

My first point is that I see very little in the scoring rubric that considers how SIUC fits into the larger state education system. Section (4) *Importance of Program to University Mission & Uniqueness* may touch on this point with question 4.4 – *uniqueness of the program*, but this translates to an overall value of 2% in the scoring rubric (1/4 of 8%). If we (SIU) are to survive in a State where Education Dollars are contested, we need to teach to our unique strengths and talents – what we and we alone do well – and spend less times trying to duplicate existing programs. I do not feel that even a 10-fold increase in the value of 4.4 would do the State Higher Education System justice. I also believe that failing to recognize the importance of this area is a primary reason for SIU's struggle to enroll students even before the state's budget troubles forced today's required introspection.

The next comment I have regards the assessment of quality of faculty teaching. Section 1 *Quality of Faculty and Faculty Teaching* correctly places high emphasis on this area. However, I do not feel that the 5 sub-sections accurately reflect upon the title of section 1 – particularly the *quality of faculty teaching*. 1.1 addresses recognition for service. This is important, but does nothing to recognize many hardworking faculty that labor with excellence without seeking recognition. 1.2 addresses research and artistry –important to the Quality of Faculty, but not a part of the quality of faculty *teaching*. 1.3 and 1.4 address the *quantity* of teaching, but do not address the *quality* of teaching. 1.5 addresses interdisciplinary measures, which are certainly important, but hardly related to the *quality of faculty instruction*. In fact, the quality of faculty teaching is not assessed in this rubric at all. This is somewhat sad, as the University has a massive data collection system for assessing quality in place in the form of the ICE system. While it is admittedly imperfect, no real assessment of the *quality of faculty teaching* that does not make use of this already existing data or propose another significant data gathering methodology can hope to meet its target.

Respondent 13:

I teach in the Automotive technology department. We are heavy in hands on. Our student contact is 4 hours a day. Then there is set up, maintenance of cars and equipment, and contact

with industry. Our indirect teaching is a huge part of our time. We have little time for publishing and presenting as compared to some classes which are not as lab intensive.

I would hope you or a designee would have time to investigate programs like ours to determine cost versus contact time versus academia norms for vocational programs.

Respondent 14:

Using credit hour generation as one of the metrics to gauge quantity of teaching (Question 1.3) may be valid for traditional disciplines, but programs involved in one-on-one instruction, like Aviation Flight, will always fall short in this area. The average flight instructor may generate only 12-15 credit hours per semester, but they also generate \$35,000 - \$40,000 in flight fees (in addition to tuition) that same semester. Flight instructors (NTT faculty) instruct as often as six days a week, including some evenings and weekends. In addition, they are also among the lowest paid NTT's on campus (\$2,500 per month). Flight fees are used to maintain aircraft, fuel aircraft, insure aircraft, purchase aircraft and compensate a significant portion of the flight instruction workforce. I believe these circumstances need to be considered when prioritizing programs.

Respondent 15:

This report is still discussing only credit hour equivalency. This is going to be very disproportionate to programs especially in the School of Allied Health and the College of Applied Sciences and Arts. Most of our programs in the School of Allied Health (SAH) have labs/clinics/internships that have less "credit" assigned to them, even though they may require more work than some lecture courses that are a 1:1 ratio. I have mentioned this numerous times at SIUFA meetings (I am the SAH Rep) as well as University Administration meetings with the SIUFA/IEA rep. Not everyone teaches all lecture courses---This is very skewed when evaluating workload.

NTT faculty do not always perform research and service because it is not mandated in their contract. Nor, do some assist with programmatic needs.

Many programs have lost many T/TT Faculty due to retirement (Dental Hygiene) and they have been replaced (if they are replaced) with NTT faculty. This affects research productivity not only for the program, but for the school, college and university. The T/TT Faculty that remain in the program(s) are left to attempt to assist the PD with day to day operation of the program and/or accreditation/assessment reports and compiling of data; along with other duties and responsibilities.

Question 7.1 and 7.2: May want to add "ethnicity" to these questions since race and ethnicity are different and may be important to track.

Since School of Allied Health (SAH) does not have a current accepted/approved Operating Paper, this has us in the "stone age" on the campus as a whole. This affects our entire makeup of the school in comparison to other schools/colleges on campus.

Respondent 16:

I apologize that I did not send my comment sooner. Thank you for sending the additional reminder.

My comment is that z-scores are NOT on a scale from 1 to 5, as it states in the report. This is a blatant factual error.

Respondent 17:

The only thing I wanted to add about the prioritization was a concern that the Z score approach may not be statistically appropriate with small samples, e.g., small departments. That's why with smaller samples, we use t-tests instead of Z tests - to adjust for increased variability associated with smaller samples and different distributions depending on degrees of freedom.

Respondent 18:

I support concerns about ensuring that the metrics used appropriately take into account departmental size (i.e., numbers of faculty contributing to productivity). Others in PLB (cced here) has also expressed this concern.

Respondent 19:

Thank you and your committee for your diligent work on the document that you provided us. I have one area of concern for the Quantitative and Qualitative Criteria under (1) Quality of Faculty and Faculty Teaching, Question 1.2. That particular area doesn't list any of the metrics for designers. Some items omitted from that area include: consulting with original creative design work, commissions, contracts, and patents.

I realize that you only listed general areas, but I feel that omitting design completely could be problematic for the arts.

Respondent 20:

The following remarks are extended on behalf of the Chair, Graduate Director and Undergraduate Director of Criminology and Criminal Justice regarding the Preliminary Report on Academic Program Prioritization.

First, the computation of Question 1.2 (p. 11) includes NTT personnel in the numerator. Yet, this section seems to address the research/creative activities considered for tenure decisions. Inclusion of NTT research seems inappropriate, as they are not expected to conduct research in their roles at the university.

Second, Question 1.3 part 2 speaks to number (and not FTE) of TT and NTT faculty. This is a critical distinction for units where most NTTs have historically been part time and where some faculty are assigned administrative roles or roles in other units and thus are not a full time equivalent in the department.

Question 3.1 seems to intermingle things ostensibly under a unit's control (grants) with things less within a unit's control and arguably the responsibility of other entities, such as the University Foundation. It would also seem to advantage programs that have more affluent alumni (College of Business programs, for example) over those without those frequent

outcomes (humanities graduates, among others). Also, the weight allotted (25%) seems excessive relative to the importance of other aspects.

Question 3.2 advantages units deeply embedded in the Core (students HAVE to take credit hours from those units), although some departments that have advocated to include more classes within the core have been denied. Having courses within the core (especially if those classes are taught by NTT or graduate students) can make a unit appear very efficient, but to some extent it masks the actual costs those units require to service their majors versus the broader university community. The cost of the unit and the cost of a degree program seem to be two distinct metrics.

Questions 4.1 and 4.2 seem redundant with earlier sections.

Does Question 7.3 suggest we would be asked to quantifying the diversity of authors in our course readings?

Respondent 21:

The Computer Science Department has a number of issues with the Preliminary Report of the JTF on Academic Prioritization.

(1) Internal Demand weighting will likely lead to further erosion of SIUC enrollment.

That Internal Demand is almost the *lowest* weighted criterion strikes us as a massive mistake that can result in nothing but further erosion of enrollment at SIUC. How can providing the programs that students are currently wanting to take, be deemed to hardly matter? SIUC already has a significant problem with allocating resources to meet student demand. E.g., CS has seen undergraduate and graduate enrollment *more than double* in the last five years, but had little increase in the number of faculty. This has resulted in high enrollments in courses, leading to reduced instruction quality and reduced faculty research productivity. We have now reached a point where we are going to have to begin turning students away from the major. Some of those students denied entry to their desired major may still come to SIUC, but most probably will not. Since CS majors take classes from many other departments as part of their programs, this will end up hurting everyone--not just CS.

Giving short shrift to what students want to study will result in the in-demand programs being shortchanged on resources and thus unable to accommodate the demand. The end result for SIUC will be continued enrollment declines!

(2) Quality of Students ignores eventual goal for many: good jobs

Many students (and their parents!) choose CS and other STEM fields because of the excellent job and salary prospects. E.g., nearly 100% of CS majors have had jobs at graduation over the last few years with salaries from \$50k to \$80k. We do not see this important metric mentioned in the Report. (Is this not an IBHE metric for programs?)

Instead, the metrics seem to focus only on moving students through programs, without regard for what awaits them. CS could easily increase our retention and graduation rates by simply watering down our requirements. That would make us look good given Report criteria. Unfortunately, the relatively poorly performing majors we would end up graduating would end up having trouble finding appropriate IT jobs (with good salaries), and their poor performance in interviews and entry jobs they did get would eventually result in the reputation of the CS Dept being diminished (along with ability of all graduates to get good jobs).

Once again, it seems that the Report criteria place little value on the things that are of highest importance to many potential SIUC students: getting an education that allows them to get a good paying job after they graduate.

(3) Financial Efficiency fails to recognize revenue generating graduate programs.

The Report fails to recognize the unique nature of the graduate programs at SIUC that generate revenue. Not all graduate credit hours are equivalent. Some programs, e.g., CS and ECE, have large numbers of graduate students who are tuition paying students. Students in the CS MS program have been generating more than \$500,000/year in tuition for SIUC the last two years, as have those in ECE. This is in stark contrast to most graduate programs. The unique nature of the graduate programs that generate revenue for SIUC appears to have been completely ignored.

(4) Quality of Faculty does not include accreditation.

Departments that undergo accreditation have had independent evaluation of their quality. This needs to be recognized under this criterion.

Respondent 22:

I appreciate the great deal of effort and time that you and others on the task force expended on this assignment. Some comments about the task force recommendations

Agree:

Activity Insight not fully operational

Academic Analytics does not reflect productivity

Other solid data is needed

Uniqueness is important

A student centered approach is needed

Testing of the approach is important

Perhaps most importantly with the current approach, the quantitative and qualitative criteria weights for each category should be changed.

- Much more weight should be given to the category of “Quality of Students” (though I would change that category title to “Student Success” :
 - Program enrollment
 - Retention

- Persistence
- Graduation numbers and rates

These are factors that are priority for the IBHE and will be used to judge SIU overall. Should be at least 30 to 40%. Student success integrates factors such as teaching and advisement prowess, a program's student services and student support, student satisfaction with programs, and overall student learning.

- Category 3 "Financial Efficiency" is important and is crucial for the long-term health, quality and growth of SIU. The percentage assigned (25%) is fair but considering these current and likely future extremely difficult financial constraints perhaps should be increased to 30% or more.

Respondent 23:

Points of concern for the Quantitative and Qualitative Criteria for Program Prioritization

1. Criterion 1 - Quality of Faculty and Faculty Teaching - except for 1.1, this is a measure of the faculty productivity, assessed as numbers of publications and/or creative products, and student credit hours generated, without consideration of quality. To gain some measure of faculty quality, there should also be a question addressing the number of offices held in professional organizations, not just honors received. In addition, the number and \$ amount of external grants for research and/or teaching should be included as a measurement of faculty quality (why is this currently under criterion 3?) Within the criterion, are all parts evaluated equally, or will they be weighted?

2. Criterion 3 - How are 3.1 and 3.2 related? Does total income refer only to the external funds listed in 3.1, or does it include what is also budgeted from state sources? It seems to me that the last 4 kinds of external funds are those that are contributed to The Foundation for very specific purposes, often by program alumni, and are not necessarily for support of teaching. External grants are usually for specific research projects and other than providing graduate student support, have nothing to do with student credit-hours generated. I note that these two criteria (1 and 3) account for 60% weighting, and are somewhat overlapping in that both include measures of student credit hours generated.

Addressing all of these criteria will require a substantial amount of faculty and administrative time. If possible, the form should be simplified;; e.g., the criterion 6 (internal demand) could be included under criterion 4, and criteria 5 and 8 could be united.

Respondent 24:

The heavy weighting/emphasis (i.e., in the numerator of calculation) on NTT will likely unduly advantage certain units. Our NTT are only part-time. If I'm reading this right, this heavy NTT weighting, combined with units that have more Core credits will further put a unit like ours at a disadvantage, regardless of how much we produce.

Respondent 25:

“Books” in the research section is a woefully inadequate designation. There are (at least) the following types of books:

- 1) single-author monograph
- 2) co-authored monograph
- 3) edited essay collection
- 4) edition of a primary text
- 5) novel
- 6) short-story collection
- 7) book of poetry
- 8) chapbook
- 9) textbook
- 10) pedagogical casebook

Relying on the minimal tenure requirements to sort this out just won’t work: a co-edited collection won’t get you tenure, but it’s counted in the broader calculus.

Art:

“Number of artistic performances, screenings, exhibitions, commissions, curated programs, residencies, screenplays optioned, workshops.” Why are these all together? A workshop, even an invited one, is nothing like a performance. See my previous comment about the limitations of the tenure requirements gesture.

Proposals:

Why count merely submitted proposals at all? I could submit ten proposals today if I wanted to goose these metrics.

Research Formula:

Does the formula on page 12 mean that the metric counts a single book as equivalent to a single article? Or that department chairs will get to weight books, articles, and grants as they see fit? Either way, that seems absurd.

RSOs:

Why would one ever measure a department by co-curricular activities? Boosterism and go-getter-dom don’t have anything to do with department quality. Internships here seem the only valuable measure. Even worse, how would one ever measure RSO “activity”: is a pizza party “activity” or simply a waste of money? The research grant metric on page 15 seems much more viable than this.

External Demand:

I don’t think we should be outsourcing our own prioritization criteria to national labor trends. To put a very fine point on it, employers in the region aren’t really qualified to determine which programs should or shouldn’t run. That’s our job.

Diversity:

Given that departments aren't the final hiring authority on this campus, I can't see how it's remotely plausible to include diversity of the faculty—something that deans and provosts decide—as part of a departmental evaluation.

Word Limits:

Why is there a word limit? I don't think it makes much sense to restrict a chair's ability to explain the productivity and value of her department. If administrators can't read more than 300 words, then they should be fired (to put a very fine point on it). In addition, it appears on page 13 that each subsection has a larger word limit than the grand total for each section.

Respondent 26:

The NIU rubric weighs no single criterion at more than 16%. This draft of the Scoring Document includes one criterion at 35% and another at 25%. With these high weights, a borderline decision between exceeds or meets expectations (or between meets expectations or falls below expectations) could trigger a substantial upgrade (or downgrade) for a program. It might be more appropriate to break criteria #1 on "Quality of Faculty and Faculty Teaching" into three criteria (weighing Teaching and Indirect Teaching at 13%, Research and Artistry at 12%, and Exemplary Recognition at 10% and dividing Question 1.5 on "Interdisciplinary Activities" between Teaching and Research/Artistry). Similarly, criteria #3 on "Financial Efficiency" could be broken down into two criteria (10% for External Revenue, and 15% for Costs and Internal Revenues).

Respondent 27:

Migration of students in and out of the major should be considered as a criterion.