

**Report of the  
Program Prioritization Taskforce  
September 28, 2006**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary .....   | 4  |
| I. Introduction.....  | 6  |
| II. Overview of Review Process and Criteria .....                                       | 7  |
| III. Review of Departmental Programs  |    |
| A. Findings of the Review .....   | 8  |
| B. Projections for Reallocation from Department Programs .....                          | 9  |
| IV. Review of General Education Program   |    |
| A. Findings of the Review .....   | 10 |
| B. Projections for Reallocation from General Education.....                             | 11 |
| V. Recommendations to Identify Funds for Reallocation and Programs for Enhancement .... | 12 |
| VI. Impact on Faculty and Students.....   | 13 |
| VII. Recommendations for Implementing Changes .....                                     | 14 |
| VIII. Conclusion.....   | 15 |
| References .....  | 15 |
| Appendix A –The Prioritization Process .....  | 16 |
| Appendix B –Program Ratings and Rankings .....  | 18 |
| Appendix C –Discussion of Programs by Category .....                                    | 28 |
| Appendix D –Analysis of Reallocations from General Education.....                       | 32 |
| Appendix E –Task Force Members .....  | 35 |

## List of Tables

### Appendix B

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1 – Programs in Category I: Retain and Possibly Enhance .....         | 18 |
| Table 2 – Programs in Category II: Monitor and Address Issues .....         | 22 |
| Table 3 – Programs in Category III: Realign, Reorganize, or Integrate ..... | 23 |
| Table 4 – Programs in Category IV: Eliminate .....                          | 26 |

### Appendix C

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1 – Enrollment and Degree Completion by Category.....   | 28 |
| Table 2 – Distribution of Candidates for Retention and Possibe Enhancement .....  | 28 |
| Table 3 – Distribution of Candidates for Monitoring and Addressing Issues .....   | 29 |
| Table 4 – Distribution of Candidates for Realignment, Reorganization,<br>or Integration with Other Degree Programs..... | 30 |
| Table 5 – Distribution of Candidates for Elimination .....  | 30 |

### Appendix D

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1 – Enhanced General Education Option Two ..... | 33 |
| Table 2 – Summary of General Education Models .....   | 34 |

## Executive Summary

The goals of program prioritization were to identify \$2 million for reallocation to academic programs and to reduce the number of programs offered at ISU. The prioritization process included the evaluation of programs based on qualitative and quantitative measures, and a review of the way in which the General Education program is offered.

ISU offers 214 academic programs delivered by the equivalent of 438 full-time faculty. Approximately 90% of students are enrolled in 50% of the programs; thus, 100 programs enroll 10% of students. ISU offers 116 undergraduate programs and 98 graduate programs. These findings suggest that ISU should significantly reduce the number of programs it offers to give greater focus to faculty work and to support its mission to provide “graduate programs that are selected ... [in scope]...”

Departmental programs were reviewed by their college governance, deans, and the Prioritization Task Force. At each level, programs were rated and ranked. The Task Force assigned programs to one of four categories according to their ranking. 1. Retain and Possibly Enhance: 97 programs; 33 graduate and 64 undergraduate. 2. Monitor and address issues: 22 programs; 11 graduate and 11 undergraduate. 3. Realign, Reorganize, or Integrate: 58 programs; 31 graduate and 14 undergraduate. 4. Eliminate: 37 programs; 23 graduate and 14 undergraduate. Deans and department chairs were asked to respond with plans for programs ranked in the lower two groups and indications of funds available for reallocation. However, few responses contained information adequate for the Task Force to make projections of reallocations from department programs.

Review of the General Education program revealed that 1,427 sections of General Education courses were offered in the academic year 2005-06. There were 9,410 unfilled seats in these sections. Salary costs for the program are estimated at \$9,230,000. The primary way to free up resources for reallocation from General Education is to teach the same number of students in fewer sections. The General Education Council has presented options for modifications to the Liberal Studies component of the program. Option Two would limit the number of Liberal Studies courses that a department could offer, releasing approximately \$335,000. A version of this model incorporating other measures such as eliminating small sections and offering more large sections would cost approximately \$1,400,000 less than the current program.

Current decisions on the allocation of new faculty positions are being made with consideration of the recommendations for program prioritization, among other factors. To further identify funds for reallocation, the Task Force recommends that

- Deans and chairs continue the elimination and realignment of programs that are not viable and/or not central to the future of ISU.

- The General Education Council work with departments to implement Option Two and ensure more efficient delivery of curriculum.
- A task force be appointed to review the Current General Education program to enhance coherence of the curriculum and the efficient use of resources.

To identify programs for enhancement, the Task Force recommends that

- Colleges create strategic plans for program development, based on the prioritization process. Used in collaboration with other colleges, these plans will make optimal use of reallocated funds to strengthen programs, bring new students to ISU, and generate new resources for the University.

In all these initiatives, amounts of resources identified for reallocation and recipients of reallocations should be communicated to the campus community.

Changes resulting from prioritization recommendations will be implemented over the next two to three years. All curriculum modifications will be approved through established governance procedures.

Implementation of prioritization recommendations and continued effective use of resources will require support for students, faculty, and programs in transition, and enhanced monitoring of programs and curriculum in the future. Recommendations for these actions are also included in the report.

## I. Introduction

This report contains the final recommendations of the Task Force on Program Prioritization. Program prioritization was a collaborative endeavor initiated to identify and invest in core strengths of the University. The process had two overarching goals. One was to develop a process to prioritize existing academic programs and identify sources for \$2 million for reinvestment in high priority academic programs. The second was to respond to the University's accreditor, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (NCA), which stated in its 2000 report that "there are too many programs for the size of the faculty and student body" and that ISU must reduce "the allocation of resources to low enrollment activities." Realignment, reorganization, and elimination of programs should lead to fewer, stronger programs with more adequate enrollment and faculty resources.

The prioritization process also demonstrates to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and the General Assembly that ISU maintains internal processes that control costs and are forward-looking. Such demonstration is imperative given recent reductions in levels of state funding for the University (6%, or \$5,018,301 in the last two years) and the difficulty of justifying our unusually high state appropriation for in-state students (\$1646 more per FTE student than Ball State and \$4002 more than the University of Southern Indiana). Additional background on the need for program prioritization can be found in the Task Force Recommendations document posted at the Program Prioritization web site, <http://www.indstate.edu/site/acad-aff/2757.html>.

To address the purposes of prioritization, the Task Force developed a process that included department input, faculty participation, review at multiple levels, and evaluation of qualitative as well as quantitative measures. The University's mission, state and national needs, and the nature and roles of the many disciplines represented at ISU informed the professional judgments throughout the process. The identification of resources to be reallocated and the recommendations for their reallocation can thus be grounded both strategically and academically. The Task Force ranked programs, placed them into four groups (not intended to be of equal size), and made recommendations that would reduce the number of programs through elimination and realignment. Specific recommendations on reallocations must be made by the deans, working with department chairpersons, and with the provost. All decisions that affect academic programs will be reviewed by the established governance process. The entire process is expected to take two to three years.

Resources to be reallocated consist primarily of faculty salary dollars that can be distributed to focus on new strategic programs as well as enhance current programs and improve efficiencies. Some additional resources may be identified through program realignment, administrative reorganization, and/or program consolidation. All funds identified through program prioritization will be reinvested in academic programs.

The report presents an overview of the prioritization process. Both departmental programs and the General Education program were reviewed. General findings from each review are followed by recommendations for processes to identify specific resources for reallocation and programs for enhancement. The likely impacts on faculty and students are assessed, and with

these in mind, further suggestions for implementing program modifications are presented. A detailed description of the review process and results of the ratings and rankings, as well as calculations of funds that could be made available from General Education are given in the appendices.

Task Force members would like to thank all who have contributed to and participated in the process, including members of CAAC, FAC, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the General Education Council and Coordinator, program report authors, department chairpersons, college review committee members, deans and associate/assistant deans, and OSPIRE staff. The hard work and dedication of faculty is evident and greatly appreciated.

## II. Overview of Review Process and Criteria

This section summarizes the review process with attention to matters of greatest importance in arriving at the final recommendations. Full documentation of the review process and criteria is available in documents posted at the Web site of the Task Force on Program Prioritization, <http://www.indstate.edu/site/acad-aff/2757.html> .

For purposes of prioritization, a program was defined minimally as any academic program requiring six or more semester hours of unique coursework.<sup>1</sup> Within this definition fall:

- Majors
- Minors requiring six or more hours not offered within a major
- Certificates requiring six or more hours not offered within a major
- Master's degrees, with the exception of master's degrees that are embedded within a doctoral program
- Specialist's degrees
- Doctoral degrees

There are other ways to define "program." The classification of instructional program (CIP) code<sup>2</sup> by degree level (i.e., baccalaureate, master's) is widely used, particularly by external entities such as NCA and the ICHE. However, this system does not distinguish tracks or emphases and in some cases disparate and distinct programs share a CIP code. For these reasons the Task Force determined that CIP code by degree level would not be a sufficient definition of program for prioritization purposes.

All programs were rated and ranked by college governance groups, by the respective dean, and by the Task Force. These evaluations were based upon reports submitted by the programs and upon data from OSPIRE. The reports addressed the following criteria: 1) Consistency with University Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals and Goals for Higher Education

---

<sup>1</sup> The document entitled "Task Force Recommendations," posted at <http://www.indstate.edu/site/acad-aff/2757.html>, provides further background on the definition of "program."

<sup>2</sup> CIP codes are established by the U.S. Department of Education.

in Indiana;<sup>3</sup> 2) External and Internal Demand; 3) Quality; 4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency; 5) Potential; 6) Crucial information not addressed by other criteria.

The Task Force used its independent rating for each program report, along with the ratings from the college level, to rank all academic programs. These rankings were not purely numerical. Given the varied nature and complexity of programs, professional judgment had to be exercised. A program's ranking by the Task Force always began with a numerical analysis based on the rankings across all programs. In some cases adjustments were made, and were always based solely on the material reported in the reports and OSPIRE data. The Task Force evaluated each program individually, with a view across the entire University. The Task Force did not compare within colleges or try to achieve a certain percentage in each category for each college. Preliminary recommendations were distributed in July and departments were given until early September to respond to the preliminary recommendations. The Task Force reviewed the responses prior to making its recommendations.

In addition to prioritizing department programs, the Task Force also examined the way in which the General Education program is delivered. The Task Force charged the General Education Council to provide the Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee (CAAC) with a General Education course inventory that increases focus and efficiency while maintaining or enhancing quality. The report from the Council is posted at: [http://www.indstate.edu/acad-aff/doc/program\\_prioritization/gen\\_ed\\_prog\\_prior\\_report.pdf](http://www.indstate.edu/acad-aff/doc/program_prioritization/gen_ed_prog_prior_report.pdf) . It was accepted by CAAC in April, 2006. Subsequently, the General Education Coordinator and the Program Prioritization Task Force developed additional possible options for modifying the delivery of General Education to provide funds for reallocation to other academic units.

The prioritization process is an initial step in identifying programs that, relative to others, are not enhancing the University's competitiveness as evaluated by a variety of factors. Recommendations for program elimination, reorganization, and change were difficult to make. All programs and courses currently offered are valuable and contribute to students' learning and development. At the same time, however, resources are increasingly limited and we must, as a community, make difficult choices.

### **III. Review of Departmental Programs**

#### **A. Findings of the Review**

The review confirmed that ISU offers more programs than its faculty and students can support. In fall 2005, ISU had 214 academic programs delivered by 438.5 full-time faculty (<http://irt2.indstate.edu/home/stats/cds/files/CDS05.pdf>). Many programs serve few students.

---

<sup>3</sup> Posted at <http://www.indstate.edu/site/acad-aff/2757.html>.

Approximately 90% of ISU students are enrolled in 50% of our programs.<sup>4</sup> The remaining 10% of our students are enrolled in the other 100 programs. This distribution leads to low enrollment in many programs and classes, and to low graduation numbers for many programs. A class of four and a class of 40 is the same fractional instructional load, and since low-enrolled programs and larger ones may consume similar amounts of faculty resources (especially when required classes have to be taught on an arranged basis), such a large number of small programs is not an efficient use of our limited resources.

Of the programs reviewed, 98 were graduate and 116 were undergraduate. Our program array supports the University's identification as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research-Intensive institution and reflects our commitment to graduate education. However, the fact that 46% of our total programs are at the graduate level appears to go beyond what would be consistent with the University's mission, which states that "graduate programs are selected [in scope] as appropriate to the needs of society and the expertise of the faculty."

The results of the ratings and rankings were placed into categories as follows:

- Retain and Possibly Enhance— 97 programs; 33 graduate and 64 undergraduate
- Monitor and Address Issues – 22 programs; 11 graduate and 11 undergraduate
- Realign, Reorganize, or Integrate– 58 programs; 31 graduate and 27 undergraduate
- Eliminate—37 programs; 23 graduate and 14 undergraduate

A spreadsheet of all program rankings is in Appendix B. Tables for each category showing numbers and percentages of programs by college, accompanied by explanations and discussion of characteristics of programs in those categories, appear in Appendix C. Implementation of Task Force recommendations would reduce the number of programs from 214 to 119. The number of programs as defined by CIP code by degree level would be reduced from 155 to approximately 127 (depending on reorganization), as called for in our upcoming NCA review. The Task Force did not attempt to create a fifth category by distinguishing candidates for enhancement from those programs to be maintained at current levels. Additional processes are needed to identify recipients of reallocated funds, based on comprehensive plans.

## **B. Projections for Reallocation from Department Programs**

Initial prioritization recommendations are being considered in determining which searches to authorize for tenure-track faculty positions in the 2007-2008 academic year. As this process has not been completed at the time of submission of this report, how much of the funding devoted to these positions will be included in the \$2 million reallocation is unknown. Final prioritization recommendations over the next several years will play an important role in future allocations of tenure lines.

---

<sup>4</sup> Concentration of students in a limited number of majors is typical. According to leading higher education researchers Pascarella and Terenzini, "Irrespective of initial career choice, the dominant academic majors at an institution influence a student's major field of study and career choices" (p. 601).

Deans and departments were asked to respond to recommendations for program elimination and modification, and to identify resources that could be reallocated. This process resulted in a variety of responses that gave little specific information on funding, although some included creative plans for reorganization. A number of responses stated that a program required no resources. However, as was noted in the earlier document entitled Task Force Recommendations, “All programs require resources. They tap from the time, treasure, and talent pool available to the institution. Stated another way, if a program truly consumes no resources, it is not a program. Falling for the ‘it takes no resources’ argument further diminishes institutional focus” (Dickeson, 1999, p. 93). Given the lack of data about funds for reallocation, the Task Force was unable to develop reasonable projections of the resources that could be freed up through elimination, realignment, reorganization and integration of programs.

## **IV. Review of General Education**

### **A. Findings of the Review**

More specific information about potential funds for reallocation can be derived from an analysis of the General Education program, since figures on enrollments and sections taught are readily available and can be easily analyzed in terms of faculty load.

The General Education program is very resource-intensive. In the fall 2005 and spring 2006 semesters, 1427 sections of General Education courses were offered. A rough estimate of the salary costs<sup>5</sup> for these sections is \$9,230,000. Total Liberal Studies salary costs are \$4,833,625 per academic year. The capstone class requirement alone requires \$286,104 in faculty salaries.

Liberal Studies General Education sections, which constitute 61% of all General Education sections (and 58% of all General Education sections taught on-campus), are frequently under-enrolled. For example, during the 2005-06 academic years, in on-campus day and evening Liberal Studies classes, there were 9,410 unfilled seats.<sup>6</sup> This surplus is a problem especially in courses with multiple sections of which several are under-enrolled.

A number of courses that often are taught in large format at other universities, such as Music Appreciation and Visual Arts in Civilization, are taught in multiple small or medium sized sections at ISU. Larger format sections, defined as 80 or more students enrolled, are uncommon at ISU in general and in General Education in particular, and have been declining, from 18 in fall 2003 to 6 in spring 2006. Conversely, the number of small and very small sections has increased.

---

<sup>5</sup> This does not include benefits, supplies, equipment, etc.

<sup>6</sup> Excess seats were determined by computing the difference between the limit set by the department and actual enrollment. Enrollments in cross listed courses were combined. In some cases, enrollment limits may be artificially high or low, depending on room seating limits. Empty seats are concentrated in the following core areas: Scientific and Mathematical Studies—Foundational and Elective; Social and Behavioral Studies—Foundational and Elective; Multicultural Studies, International Cultures, and Literary, Artistic, and Philosophical Studies—Elective.

In the fall semester 2005, 32 on-campus day and evening General Education sections enrolled 1-7 students, up from 10 in fall 2003.

Liberal Studies sections are most frequently taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Of the 620 on-campus day and evening Liberal Studies sections offered in the 2005-06 academic year, 70% were taught by full-time regular faculty, 13% by full-time temporary faculty, 8% by part-time temporary faculty, 8% by graduate assistants, and 1% by administrators and others.

## **B. Projections for Reallocation from General Education**

While the Task Force on Program Prioritization was not charged to recommend specific changes to the General Education program, its review of course offerings and enrollments suggests several general recommendations that would make resources available for reallocation. To further indicate potential for reallocation, the Task Force has developed funding projections based on possible modifications to ISU's General Education program and on programs of other similar universities. Most of the focus is on the Liberal Studies area of General Education because of its very large number of courses and the large number of excess seats.

The primary way to realize resources for reallocation from General Education is by teaching the same number of students in fewer sections. This goal can be accomplished in a variety of ways, including reducing the number of sections taught, increasing section enrollments, increasing section size in those courses that can be taught well in larger formats, and reducing the number of courses offered. The following projections are based on analyses which are fully presented on the Prioritization web site at <http://www.indstate.edu/site/acad-aff/2757.html>; further details appear in Appendix D. For example, a 20% reduction in the number of multiple section non-lab Liberal Studies sections would mean 62 fewer sections and release approximately \$450,000 per year. Eliminating the nine lowest enrolled course sections would make \$70,000 available.

The simplest way to identify resources for reallocation in General Education would be to reduce funds for Liberal Studies sections by a given percentage, such as 10%, which would yield \$483,000 for reallocation.

For purposes of illustration, the Task Force also analyzed funding to support a modified General Education program. During the spring semester 2006, the General Education Council submitted a report to CAAC describing three options to increase focus and efficiency in the program posted at <http://www.indstate.edu/site/acad-aff/2757.html>. Option Two, endorsed by CAAC, would limit the number of Liberal Studies courses per discipline per core area that departments could offer. Analysis suggests an approximate reduction of 43 sections per academic year, releasing approximately \$335,000; an enhanced version of Option Two that also

incorporates the practices outlined above would require \$1,300,000 less than the current program.<sup>7</sup>

## **V. Recommendations to Identify Funds for Reallocation and Programs for Enhancement**

Approximately half of the \$2 million for reallocation can be derived from modifications to the General Education program. The other half can be derived from elimination and modification of departmental programs in the two lowest categories. The following actions will identify specific sources of and amounts to be redistributed, as well as programs to receive enhancements. If the targeted \$2 million is not achieved, additional programs may need to be eliminated rather than realigned, reorganized, or integrated.

### **1. Identify funds available from modification of General Education:**

The General Education Council, in consultation with CAAC, should implement Option Two and consider implementation of the enhanced version of Option Two, detailed in Appendix D. Departments should plan reductions in course offerings and institute efficient practices for course delivery. Projections of resources that would become available for reallocation should be presented to the campus community.

### **2. Identify funds available from departmental programs :**

Deans and department chairs should move forward with the process of eliminating and reorganizing those programs identified in the two lowest groups. The resources that become available for reallocation should be identified and an accounting made to the campus community.

### **3. Identify programs to receive reallocated funds :**

The prioritization process should be the basis for the creation, at the college level, of strategic plans for program development. These plans should be used in collaboration with those of other colleges to make optimal use of reallocated funds with specific emphasis on strengthening programs, bringing new students to ISU, and generating new resources for the University. Some programs that have high rankings and ratings may be operating at a desirable level and not require additional funds. Other programs could make significant improvements with a modest amount of new resources.

In addition to the short-term actions listed above, the Task Force makes the following recommendations. They will take longer to achieve, but they are no less important.

---

<sup>7</sup> For purposes of comparison, the Task Force modeled General Education programs based on core curricula. For example, a program designed around a limited core curriculum could serve the same number of students as ISU's for \$2,260,820 less; an expanded core would require \$1,426,655 less.

#### **4. Establish a task force on General Education:**

In 2006, the Task Force on the First Year (TAFFY) recommended the formation of another task force to review the General Education program in terms of its coherence and complexity.<sup>8</sup> Such a group should be formed and charged with recommending appropriate curricular modifications. These recommendations could both strengthen the program and release faculty resources for redirection to other priority activities.

#### **5. Provide financial data on academic programs :**

The Task Force was severely limited by the lack of budgetary information at the program level. Most University records and budgets are kept at the level of the department only. It is possible to associate faculty salaries with particular programs and disaggregate costs in departments with multiple CIP codes, since each faculty member is assigned to a CIP code in Banner. Figures for cost per credit hour should include costs of graduate assistantships and tuition waivers. Figures should also be provided on revenues generated, especially tuition. This information can be used to more precisely identify amounts that become available for reallocation from discontinued and reorganized programs.

#### **6. Revise the University's mission statements:**

The current mission statements are so broad that they give little direction for making strategic decisions. A clear, narrowly defined mission should be the basis for academic planning and prioritization as programs are recommended to receive reallocated funds.

## **VI. Impact on Faculty and Students**

Reallocation of resources identified through the prioritization process will strengthen academic programs across the University. In the long term, faculty and students will benefit from this strengthening; however, in the short term many adjustments will be required. Implementation of program realignments and discontinuations will take place over the next two to three years.

Faculty associated with programs that have been eliminated or realigned will still be needed for instruction in support of remaining programs. Some classes taught exclusively by a particular faculty member may no longer be offered; however, other teaching opportunities should be available, including teaching in cognate areas. Since changes initiated by the prioritization process will be phased in over two or three years, affected faculty will have time to prepare for new teaching responsibilities.

---

<sup>8</sup> See its final report, "Ensuring More from Day One: Laying a Foundation for Excellence," p. 42, posted at <http://www.indstate.edu/site/fyp/img/final-report.pdf>. This report notes that "The General Education program is not viewed by faculty nor by key administrators as being a coherent program. There are more than 200 courses that qualify for General Education credit" (p. 24).

With departments offering more focused arrays of courses and programs, it should be easier for faculty to manage their workload. This is particularly true of faculty in low-enrolled programs who have regularly taught required courses on an arranged basis. Another consequence of the more efficient use of available faculty time is that new faculty may not need to be hired in some areas. It is possible that some of the funds made available through increased efficiency could be used for salary increases.

Few students are enrolled in most of the programs recommended for elimination. Of the 37 candidates for discontinuation, only three have had enrollments of more than five average student headcount for the last five years. There is much more variation in enrollments in programs recommended for reorganization, with many very small programs and a few very large programs in this category. More students will be impacted by realignment than discontinuation, but realignment assumes that a program in the area still exists. Program elimination and modification take time; so students should have a reasonable amount of time to complete programs or change to new ones.

Modification of General Education offerings will have less effect on students than will modifications to programs. Most students have considerable choice in which Liberal Studies courses to take, and so a reduction in sections would not adversely affect their ability to make progress towards meeting General Education requirements.

## **VII. Recommendations for Implementing Changes**

The following list anticipates steps that the University should take in implementing changes arising from prioritization and in maintaining an appropriate program array. Changes must be accomplished through established University procedures and in ways that support the goals of prioritization, particularly effective use of resources and faculty time.

- Post sources, recipients, and funds for reallocation on the prioritization web site.
- Schedule courses carefully to avoid conflicts among requirements, and provide proposed schedules three or four years in advance.
- Consider impacts that program and course changes may have on other programs.
- Maintain courses from discontinued programs when those courses support higher priority programs.
- Consider expanding Liberal Studies and General Studies majors.
- Emphasize advising and develop transition plans for students in discontinued or reorganized programs.
- Promote faculty development in support of changes resulting from prioritization.
- Develop retirement options to support prioritization.<sup>9</sup>
- Establish a base budget pool for lab and studio renovations, and equipment purchases.

---

<sup>9</sup> More than fifty faculty retirements are expected in the next three years. ISU should develop options such as early or partial retirement. Purdue has several early retirement alternatives described at [http://www.purdue.edu/policies/pages/human\\_resources/c\\_32.html](http://www.purdue.edu/policies/pages/human_resources/c_32.html)

- Review programs on a regular cycle.<sup>10</sup>
- Automatically identify low enrolled programs.<sup>11</sup>
- Manage curriculum to maintain a reasonable course inventory.<sup>12</sup>
- Develop institutional processes that identify and provide evidence of program quality.

## VIII. Conclusion

The Task Force has completed those tasks that were within the scope of its charges to the best of its ability with the information provided to it. It is our hope that our recommendations will allow the University to change in ways that make it more vital and competitive within the state and nation. ISU has seldom undertaken institutional changes of such magnitude as those now being proposed, or faced such an urgent need to align available resources with priorities of the institution.

We must, individually and collectively, change and strengthen our institution as a whole. The changes recommended here are based upon a process designed to be comprehensive, principled, systematic, fair, and strategic. Implementation and specific resource allocation decisions must be made by those closest to the units. In contrast to reactive, top-down strategies based solely on financial considerations, such a process favors the identification and implementation of successful academic initiatives. The efforts of the Task Force will be continued by faculty members, program directors, department chairs, deans, and governance committees.

## References

- Dickeson, R.C. (1999). *Prioritizing academic programs and services: Reallocating resources to achieve strategic balance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pascarella, E.T, & Terenzini, P.T. (2005). *How college affects students*. Vol. 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Report of a comprehensive visit for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools* (2000). Chicago: The North Central Association.

---

<sup>10</sup> These reviews should include analysis of sections, enrollments, desired mix of regular and temporary faculty, curriculum and teaching load, costs, and evidence of quality.

<sup>11</sup> Departments with flagged programs should report to their deans on plans to increase enrollment, or submit paperwork to eliminate or suspend the program.

<sup>12</sup> ISU has more than 5000 active courses—one for every two students and more than ten for every tenured/tenure track faculty member.

## **Appendix A – The Prioritization Process**

### **Timeline**

The Task Force on Program Prioritization began work in October 2005. The Task Force followed processes described in “Recommendations,” posted at [http://www.indstate.edu/acad-aff/doc/program\\_prioritization/taskforce\\_recomm.doc](http://www.indstate.edu/acad-aff/doc/program_prioritization/taskforce_recomm.doc). Input from Faculty Senate committees, including CAAC, the Graduate Council, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Senate Executive Committee, went into the development of the process.

In February, departments were asked to prepare reports for each of their programs. These were submitted to deans by March 31. Training sessions were provided for writers of department program reports and for members of college review committees. These committees, deans, and the Task Force each rated and ranked the academic programs, as described in the section below.

The initial mean ratings and ranking from all sources for the programs were provided in a spreadsheet; spreadsheets for each college were provided to deans on July 11 and posted on the pass word protected Prioritization web site on July 25. Faculty were notified via global and e-mail announcements.

Department chairs, in consultation with their deans, responded to their programs’ ratings and rankings. The Task Force received these responses in September, developed recommendations, and composed this final report.

Upon receiving the report, the Provost will distribute it to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and thus to CAAC, Graduate Council, and Faculty Senate during fall semester. Their responses will go to the Provost and President who will forward them with the report to the Board or Trustees. For extensive background information, please see the web site on Program Prioritization, <http://www.indstate.edu/site/acad-aff/2757.html>

### **Rating and Ranking Process**

To ensure the fairness of assessments requiring judgment, the process incorporated multiple ratings that provided a basis for establishing reliability and recognizing differences in perception. The different perspectives of college governance, the deans, and the Task Force added different information.

Members of the full Task Force on Program Prioritization assessed the ratings of the program by the College Review Committee, the Dean, and the Task Force rating subgroups. The maximum number of points that could be awarded by any of these groups is 1000. The three rating scores given to each program were translated into simpler measures by arraying, for example, all college committee scores across the university and assigning a “1” to those in the top 20%, a “2” to those in the second 20%, and so forth. This process was repeated for the deans’ scores and the task force scores. A program whose scores placed it in the top group from each rating would have three “ones” and so have a total program ranking score of  $1+1+1 = 3$ . At the other end of the spectrum, a program ranked at the bottom by each of the three groups would

have three “fives” and so have a total ranking score of  $5+5+5 = 15$ .<sup>13</sup> The full Task Force reviewed the array of programs twice, using rating information, insight from Task Force primary readers, and the OSPIRE data.

Based on the information available, the Task Force placed each program in a preliminary category that indicated the program’s candidacy for a recommendation by the Task Force. These assignments are open to change as a consequence of other aspects of the prioritization process which include changes in the way that the General Education program is delivered and possible reorganization or realignment of colleges, departments, or programs. The categories were:

- Not of immediate concern. Funding may be recommended to remain at current levels or programs may be potential candidates for additional resources.
- Issues that need to be addressed or monitored.
- Realignment, reorganization, or integration with other degree programs.
- Candidates for elimination.

Deans were asked to consult with departments and provide initial recommendations for discontinuation, reorganization, and realignment of programs. These recommendations could include strategies to increase program efficiency and effectiveness which might affect a program’s standing in the overall array. Deans were also asked to provide an assessment of resources available for reallocation from the recommended changes, as well as information on how the modifications might be best implemented.

---

<sup>13</sup> Ratings from the deans and college committees generally were similar, with a correlation of .705. Mean ratings were 681 for college governance and 676 for the deans. These ratings are higher than those of the Task Force. Standard deviations were 130 for college governance and 148 for deans. The mean rating of the Task Force was 596 and standard deviation was 136. Correlation between the Task Force and college governance was .594 and correlation between the Task Force and the deans was .611.

## Appendix B: Program Ratings and Rankings

This appendix provides average rating score and total ranking score for all programs that were reviewed. There is a separate table for each category, showing the programs in that category sorted according to the average rating score the program received from the three review groups (the maximum possible average score is 1000). Each program's total ranking score is also presented (the best possible total ranking score is 3).

**Table 1: Programs in Category I: Retain and Possibly Enhance (sorted by Average Rating Score, then by Total Ranking Score)**

| Category | College | Dept | Program  | Degrees | Average Rating Score | Total Ranking Score |
|----------|---------|------|--|---------|----------------------|---------------------|
| I        | CON     | NURS | MS-FNP Track Program   | MS      | 872.67               | 3                   |
| I        | CON     | NURS | Baccalaureate Degree Program   | BS      | 865.33               | 4                   |
| I        | CON     | NURS | Baccalaureate Degree Nursing Baccalaureate Track for Registered Nurses | BS      | 863.67               | 4                   |
| I        | CON     | NURS | FNP Post Master's Certificate Program                                  | CERT    | 856.33               | 3                   |
| I        | CAS     | PSY  | Clinical Psychology  | PSD     | 829.33               | 3                   |
| I        | CAS     | PSY  | Psychology   | AB / BS | 803.67               | 4                   |
| I        | CHHP    | ATTR | Athletic Training  | MS      | 801.67               | 4                   |
| I        | COB     | ORG  | Management   | AB/BS   | 799.33               | 3                   |
| I        | COT     | MCT  | Construction Management  | BACC    | 799.33               | 3                   |
| I        | COE     | COE  | Teacher Education: 5-12 and All Grade Licensures                       |         | 798.33               | 3                   |
| I        | COB     | ORG  | Marketing  | AB/BS   | 798                  | 3                   |
| I        | CHHP    | ATTR | Athletic Training  | BS      | 795.67               | 4                   |
| I        | COB     | ANA  | Insurance and Risk Management  | AB/BS   | 795.33               | 3                   |
| I        | COB     | COB  | MBA  | MBA     | 789.67               | 5                   |
| I        | COT     | IMT  | Automotive Technology  | BACC    | 786.33               | 3                   |
| I        | CAS     | CRIM | Criminology  | AB/BS   | 781.33               | 4                   |
| I        | COE     | ELAF | Student Affairs and Higher Education                                   | MS      | 775.33               | 3                   |
| I        | CAS     | LLL  | Lang,Lit,Ling-Linguistics/TESL   | MA      | 768                  | 5                   |
| I        | COE     | ELAF | Educational Specialist and Ph.D in Educational Leadership              | EdS/PhD | 766.67               | 6                   |
| I        | COE     | COUN | School Counseling  | M.Ed.   | 766.33               | 3                   |
| I        | COE     | EPSY | Educational Psychology Undergraduate Service                           |         | 765                  | 4                   |
| I        | COE     | ELAF | K-12 School Administration and Supervision                             | M.Ed.   | 764                  | 4                   |
| I        | CAS     | MACS | Mathematics Education  | AB / BS | 762.33               | 5                   |
| I        | CAS     | CHEM | Chemistry  | AB/BS   | 762                  | 5                   |

|   |      |      |   |             |        |   |
|---|------|------|---|-------------|--------|---|
| I | COE  | CD   | CD Speech Language Pathology            | AB/BS       | 761    | 4 |
| I | COB  | ANA  | Accounting                              | BACC        | 760.67 | 3 |
| I | CHHP | PE   | Physical Education - All Grade          | BS          | 760.33 | 8 |
| I | COT  | AST  | Professional Aviation Flight Tech       | BACC        | 760.33 | 5 |
| I | COT  | ITE  | Human Resource Development              | MS          | 757.67 | 5 |
| I | CAS  | GEO  | Geography                               | MA/MS       | 751.33 | 5 |
| I | COE  | SPSY | School Psychology                       | Ed.S./Ph.D. | 750.67 | 5 |
| I | CAS  | SOWK | Social Work                             | BSW         | 745    | 6 |
| I | COE  | EESE | Special Education                       | AB/BS       | 745    | 5 |
| I | CAS  | FCS  | Human Development and Family Studies    | AB/BS       | 744.33 | 5 |
| I | CHHP | PE   | Exercise Science                        | BS          | 744    | 5 |
| I | CAS  | FCS  | Family & Consumer Sci Educ              | AB/BS       | 743.67 | 5 |
| I | COT  | ECT  | Electronics & Computer Tech             | MS          | 740.67 | 6 |
| I | COE  | CD   | Speech-Language Pathology               | MA/MS       | 736    | 5 |
| I | COE  | COUN | Counseling Psychology                   | Ph.D        | 736    | 4 |
| I | CAS  | CRIM | Criminology                             | MA/MS       | 734    | 7 |
| I | COT  | ITE  | Human Resource Development              | BACC        | 733.67 | 8 |
| I | CAS  | LIFS | Life Sciences                           | AB/BS       | 732.67 | 6 |
| I | COE  | EPSY | Educational Psychology Graduate Service |             | 731    | 6 |
| I | CAS  | ENG  | English                                 | AB/BS       | 731    | 5 |
| I | CAS  | PSCI | Political Science                       | AB / BS     | 730.33 | 7 |
| I | CAS  | LLL  | LLL-Spanish                             | AB          | 729    | 7 |
| I | CAS  | HIST | History                                 | AB/BS       | 726.33 | 6 |
| I | COE  | CIMT | Education Curriculum and Instruction    | M.Ed.       | 725.33 | 6 |
| I | CHHP | HLTH | Safety Management                       | BS          | 723    | 6 |
| I | COT  | ECT  | Electronics Technology                  | BACC        | 721.67 | 5 |
| I | CAS  | FCS  | Interior Design                         | AB/BS       | 714.67 | 6 |
| I | CAS  | LLL  | LLL-Cross-Linguistic                    | AB          | 714    | 7 |
| I | CAS  | MACS | Information Technology                  | BS          | 713.33 | 6 |
| I | COE  | COUN | Mental Health Counseling (MHC)          | M.S.        | 711.67 | 6 |
| I | COB  | ANA  | Finance                                 | AB/BS       | 708.33 | 7 |
| I | COE  | CIMT | Educational Technology                  | M.S.        | 708    | 7 |
| I | CHHP | RCSM | Sport Management                        | BS          | 706    | 6 |
| I | CAS  | ENG  | English Teaching                        | AB/BS       | 702    | 7 |
| I | CAS  | THTR | Theater                                 | AB / BS     | 701.33 | 7 |

|   |      |      |                                       |         |        |    |
|---|------|------|---------------------------------------|---------|--------|----|
| I | CAS  | COMM | Communication Studies                 | AB/BS   | 701    | 7  |
| I | CHHP | RCSM | Parks and Community Recreation        | BS      | 700    | 7  |
| I | CAS  | FCS  | Dietetics                             | BS      | 699.67 | 7  |
| I | CAS  | WS   | Women's Studies minor                 | MINOR   | 699.67 | 6  |
| I | CAS  | MACS | Computer Science                      | AB / BS | 692.67 | 7  |
| I | CAS  | COMM | Comm Studies Public Relations         | AB/BS   | 692.33 | 7  |
| I | COT  | AST  | Aerospace Administration              | BACC    | 691    | 7  |
| I | COT  | IMT  | Packaging Technology                  | BACC    | 690    | 7  |
| I | CAS  | MACS | Mathematics                           | AB / BS | 687    | 7  |
| I | CAS  | PSCI | Master Of Public Admin                | MPA     | 684.67 | 8  |
| I | CAS  | S S  | Social Science Education              | AB / BS | 684.67 | 8  |
| I | CAS  | LLL  | LLL-Spanish Teaching                  | AB      | 678.67 | 8  |
| I | CAS  | FCS  | Textiles, Apparel & Merchandis        | AB/BS   | 677.67 | 8  |
| I | CAS  | PSCI | Political Science - Legal Stud        | AB / BS | 674.67 | 8  |
| I | CAS  | LLL  | Lang,Lit,Linguist-TESL/TEFL           | CLG     | 672.67 | 8  |
| I | CHHP | HLTH | Occupational Safety Management        | MS      | 669.67 | 8  |
| I | CAS  | ENG  | Creative Writing minor                | MINOR   | 667.67 | 9  |
| I | CAS  | ART  | Fine Art                              | BFA     | 665.33 | 8  |
| I | CAS  | ART  | Art                                   | AB/BS   | 663.33 | 8  |
| I | COT  | ITE  | Technology Education                  | BACC    | 661.67 | 6  |
| I | COB  | ORG  | Management Information Systems        | AB/BS   | 657    | 9  |
| I | COT  | ITE  | Career & Technical Educ (non-tchg)    | BACC    | 654    | 8  |
| I | CHHP | RCSM | Recreation and Sport Management       | MS      | 651.67 | 9  |
| I | CAS  | SCED | Science Education                     | AB / BS | 644    | 10 |
| I | COE  | ELAF | Educational Foundations               | ND      | 640    | 9  |
| I | CAS  | ART  | Master Of Fine Arts                   | MFA     | 637    | 10 |
| I | CAS  | COMM | Journalism                            | AB/BS   | 636    | 10 |
| I | CHHP | PE   | Martial Arts Minor                    | MINOR   | 632.33 | 9  |
| I | CHHP | HLTH | Driver Education                      | UG      | 632    | 10 |
| I | CHHP | PE   | Dance Minor                           | MINOR   | 627.67 | 10 |
| I | CHHP | HLTH | Driver Education                      | GRAD    | 591.33 | 11 |
| I | COE  | EESE | Elementary Education                  | B.Ed.   | 583    | 7  |
| I | CAS  | G S  | Liberal Studies-Human Interact        | AA      | 575.67 | 12 |
| I | CAS  | G S  | Liberal Studies-Human Interact        | BS      | 575.67 | 12 |
| I | CAS  | LLL  | Teaching English as Second Lang minor | MINOR   | 572.33 | 12 |

|   |     |      |                                     |         |        |      |
|---|-----|------|-------------------------------------|---------|--------|------|
| I | COE | CIMT | C & I Transition to Teaching        |         | 452.67 | 15   |
| I | CAS | PSY  | Psychology                          | MA / MS | 392.67 | 11   |
| I | COE | EESE | EESE Transition to Teaching         |         | 194    | 15   |
|   |     |      | Averages for Programs in Category I |         | 709.31 | 6.53 |

**Table 2: Programs in Category II: Monitor and Address Issues (sorted by Average Rating Score, then by Total Ranking Score)**

| Category                             | College | Dept | ISU Major Description                     | Degrees | Average Rating Score | Total Ranking Score |
|--------------------------------------|---------|------|---|---------|----------------------|---------------------|
| II                                   | COE     | ELAF | Higher Education Leadership               | PHD     | 788                  | 4                   |
| II                                   | COB     | ANA  | Operations Management and Analysis        | AB/BS   | 765.67               | 3                   |
| II                                   | CON     | NURS | MS Nursing Administration                 | MS      | 762.33               | 6                   |
| II                                   | COB     | ORG  | Business Education                        | AB/BS   | 752.33               | 5                   |
| II                                   | COT     | COT  | Tech Mgt(Construction Mgt)                | PHD     | 743.67               | 6                   |
| II                                   | COT     | COT  | Tech Mgt(Digital Comm Systems)            | PHD     | 743.67               | 6                   |
| II                                   | COT     | COT  | Tech Mgt(Indust Train&Devel)              | PHD     | 743.67               | 6                   |
| II                                   | COT     | COT  | Tech Mgt(Manufact Systems)                | PHD     | 743.67               | 6                   |
| II                                   | COT     | COT  | Tech Mgt(Quality Systems)                 | PHD     | 743.67               | 6                   |
| II                                   | COT     | COT  | Technology Management                     | PHD     | 743.67               | 6                   |
| II                                   | COT     | IMT  | Mechanical Engineering Technology         | BACC    | 738                  | 6                   |
| II                                   | COE     | EESE | Early Childhood                           | B.Ed.   | 702                  | 8                   |
| II                                   | COE     | COUN | Counselor Education                       | Ph.D    | 700                  | 7                   |
| II                                   | CAS     | ECON | Economics                                 | AB/BS   | 698                  | 8                   |
| II                                   | CHHP    | PE   | Coaching                                  | MS      | 680.33               | 8                   |
| II                                   | CAS     | MUS  | Music Education                           | BME     | 655.33               | 9                   |
| II                                   | COT     | ECT  | Computer Hardware Technology              | BACC    | 652.33               | 9                   |
| II                                   | CAS     | ART  | Art Education All Grade                   | BS      | 646.67               | 10                  |
| II                                   | COB     | ORG  | Information Design and End-user Computing | AB/BS   | 619.33               | 11                  |
| II                                   | CAS     | MACS | Mathematics                               | MA / MS | 619                  | 11                  |
| II                                   | CHHP    | HLTH | Community Health Promotion                | BS      | 615.33               | 11                  |
| II                                   | CAS     | EOB  | Life Sciences-Ecol & Org Biol             | AB/BS   | 412                  | 11                  |
| Averages for programs in Category II |         |      |   |         | 694.03               | 7.41                |

**Table 3: Programs in Category III: Realign, Reorganize, or Integrate (sorted by Average Rating Score, then by Total Ranking Score)**

| Category | College | Dept | ISU Major Description  | Degrees | Average Rating Score | Total Ranking Score |
|----------|---------|------|--|---------|----------------------|---------------------|
| III      | COE     | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Language Education Specialization    | Ph.D    | 758.67               | 5                   |
| III      | CAS     | GEO  | Geography (Phys Geography)                                       | PHD     | 751.33               | 5                   |
| III      | CAS     | GEO  | Geography  | AB/BS   | 749.67               | 6                   |
| III      | CAS     | GEO  | Geology  | BS      | 743.67               | 5                   |
| III      | CAS     | GEO  | Anthropology   | AB/BS   | 712.33               | 7                   |
| III      | CHHP    | PE   | Exercise Science   | MS      | 704.33               | 6                   |
| III      | CAS     | HIST | History  | MA/MS   | 701                  | 7                   |
| III      | COE     | CIMT | Educational Technology, Library Media Strand                     | M.S.    | 691                  | 8                   |
| III      | COE     | EESE | Elementary Education   | M.Ed.   | 687.67               | 8                   |
| III      | CAS     | LIFS | Life Sciences(Ecology)   | PHD     | 685.67               | 8                   |
| III      | CHHP    | HLTH | Environmental Health Sciences                                    | BS      | 679.33               | 8                   |
| III      | CHHP    | PE   | Adult Fitness  | MS      | 678.67               | 8                   |
| III      | CAS     | FCS  | Fam Consum Sci (Dietetics)                                       | MS      | 654                  | 9                   |
| III      | CHHP    | HLTH | School Health  | BS      | 653.33               | 10                  |
| III      | COE     | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Secondary Education Specialization   | Ph.D    | 652.67               | 9                   |
| III      | CAS     | MUS  | Music Conc Business Adm  | BS      | 650.67               | 9                   |
| III      | CAS     | ENG  | English (Writing)  | MA      | 647.67               | 9                   |
| III      | CAS     | PHYS | Physics  | BS      | 645.67               | 10                  |
| III      | CAS     | GEO  | Geographic Information Science minor                             | MINOR   | 644                  | 10                  |
| III      | CAS     | COMM | Radio-TV-Film  | AB/BS   | 632.33               | 10                  |
| III      | COE     | EESE | Masters of Special Education                                     | M.S.    | 628.33               | 10                  |
| III      | COT     | MCT  | Computer Integrated Manufac Tech                                 | BACC    | 623                  | 11                  |
| III      | CAS     | LIFS | Life Sciences(Microbiology)                                      | PHD     | 617.67               | 10                  |
| III      | COE     | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Teaching and Learning Specialization | Ph.D    | 615                  | 11                  |
| III      | CAS     | AFRI | African & African Amer Studies                                   | AB/BS   | 609.67               | 10                  |
| III      | CAS     | PHIL | Philosophy   | AB / BS | 609                  | 11                  |
| III      | CAS     | MUS  | Music Conc Merchandising   | BS      | 608.67               | 11                  |
| III      | CAS     | ENG  | English (Engl & American Lit)                                    | MA      | 605.67               | 11                  |

|     |     |      |  |         |        |    |
|-----|-----|------|--|---------|--------|----|
| III | CAS | PSCI | Political Science  | MA / MS | 599.33 | 10 |
| III | COT | MCT  | Industrial Supervision   | BACC    | 598    | 11 |
| III | CAS | LLL  | LLL-German   | AB      | 592.33 | 12 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary Education Specialization            | Ph.D    | 587    | 12 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, English Education Specialization               | Ph.D    | 586.67 | 12 |
| III | CAS | LLL  | Linguistics minor  | MINOR   | 584.33 | 12 |
| III | CAS | FCS  | Food Service Management  | BS      | 581.33 | 12 |
| III | CAS | LLL  | LLL-French   | AB      | 580    | 12 |
| III | CAS | IS   | International Studies minor  | MINOR   | 577.33 | 12 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Industrial Technology Education Specialization | Ph.D    | 575.33 | 12 |
| III | CAS | SOC  | Sociology  | AB / BS | 568.67 | 12 |
| III | CAS | LIFS | Life Sciences(Physiology)  | PHD     | 568    | 14 |
| III | CAS | COMM | Commun (General Studies)   | MA/MS   | 564.67 | 12 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Math Education Specialization                  | Ph.D    | 551.67 | 13 |
| III | COT | MCT  | Manufacturing Technology   | BACC    | 551.33 | 13 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Technology Specialization          | Ph.D    | 548.67 | 13 |
| III | CAS | MUS  | Music Performance  | BM      | 536.33 | 14 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, History Education Specialization               | Ph.D    | 534    | 12 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education Specialization               | Ph.D    | 523.33 | 13 |
| III | CAS | FCS  | General Family & Consumer Sci  | BS      | 512.33 | 14 |
| III | CAS | SCED | Science Education  | MA / MS | 502.33 | 14 |
| III | COE | CIMT | Curriculum and Instruction, Early Childhood Specialization                 | Ph.D    | 499.33 | 12 |
| III | CAS | MUS  | Music  | AB / BS | 498.67 | 14 |
| III | CAS | LLL  | LLL-Latin minor Liberal Arts option  | MINOR   | 495.33 | 15 |
| III | CAS | G S  | Liberal Studies  | AB/BS   | 440    | 15 |
| III | CAS | IS   | Latin American and Latino Studies minor                                    | MINOR   | 411.33 | 15 |
| III | CAS | EOB  | Life Sciences-Ecol & Org Biol  | MS      | 366.67 | 13 |
| III | CAS | COMM | Commun (Comm Studies)  | MA/MS   | 360    | 15 |

|     |     |      |                                       |    |        |       |
|-----|-----|------|---------------------------------------|----|--------|-------|
| III | CAS | COMM | Commun (Radio/TV/Film)                | MS | 360    | 14    |
| III | COT | ITE  | Vocational Director                   | ND | 156.67 | 15    |
|     |     |      | Averages for programs in Category III |    | 587.10 | 10.88 |

**Table 4: Programs in Category IV: Eliminate (sorted by Average Rating Score, then by Total Ranking Score)**

| Category | College | Dept | ISU Major Description                     | Degrees | Average Rating Score | Total Ranking Score |
|----------|---------|------|---|---------|----------------------|---------------------|
| IV       | CAS     | GEO  | Geology                                   | MA/MS   | 685                  | 7                   |
| IV       | COE     | EESE | Early Childhood Education                 | M.Ed.   | 652.33               | 9                   |
| IV       | COE     | EESE | Masters of Literacy (DART)                | M.Ed.   | 651                  | 9                   |
| IV       | COT     | ITE  | Career & Technical Educ teaching          | BACC    | 647.33               | 10                  |
| IV       | CHHP    | RCSM | Recreation Therapy                        | BS      | 612.33               | 12                  |
| IV       | CAS     | LLL  | Lang, Lit, Linguistics-Spanish            | MA      | 604                  | 10                  |
| IV       | CAS     | FCS  | Fam Consum Sci (Teacher Ed)               | MS      | 589.33               | 12                  |
| IV       | CHHP    | PE   | Master Teacher                            | MS      | 588                  | 11                  |
| IV       | CAS     | FCS  | Fam ConsumSci                             | MS      | 581.67               | 12                  |
| IV       | COT     | ITE  | Career and Technical Ed (Vocational Tech) | MS      | 570                  | 12                  |
| IV       | CON     | NURS | MS Adult Health Track Program             | MS      | 563                  | 12                  |
| IV       | CAS     | MUS  | Music                                     | MM      | 544.67               | 13                  |
| IV       | CAS     | ART  | Art                                       | MA      | 540.33               | 14                  |
| IV       | CAS     | ART  | Art History                               | AB      | 539                  | 14                  |
| IV       | COE     | ELAF | Director of K-12 Exceptional Needs        | ND      | 531                  | 13                  |
| IV       | CAS     | MACS | Mathematics Teaching                      | MA / MS | 521.33               | 14                  |
| IV       | CAS     | ENG  | English (Theater)                         | MA      | 507                  | 14                  |
| IV       | CON     | NURS | MS Community Health Track                 | MS      | 501                  | 13                  |
| IV       | CAS     | ENG  | English Teaching                          | MA/MS   | 495.67               | 15                  |
| IV       | COT     | ECT  | Electronics Technology                    | ASSOC   | 486                  | 13                  |
| IV       | CAS     | LLL  | LLL-Latin Teaching minor                  | MINOR   | 483                  | 15                  |
| IV       | CAS     | LIFS | Life Sci (Clinical Lab Sci)               | AB/BS   | 440                  | 14                  |
| IV       | CAS     | LIFS | Life Sciences(Sports Medicine)            | PHD     | 426.33               | 15                  |
| IV       | COT     | AST  | General Aviation Flight Tech              | ASSOC   | 421                  | 15                  |
| IV       | CAS     | HIST | History(Labor&Reform Move U S)            | MA      | 421                  | 14                  |
| IV       | COT     | ITE  | Technology Education                      | MA      | 396.67               | 12                  |
| IV       | COT     | ITE  | Technology Education                      | MS      | 396.67               | 12                  |
| IV       | CAS     | LLL  | Classical Studies minor                   | MINOR   | 383.67               | 15                  |
| IV       | COT     | ITE  | Career and Technical Ed Tchg              | MS      | 383.33               | 13                  |
| IV       | COT     | ITE  | Career & Technical Education              | ASSOC   | 330.33               | 14                  |
| IV       | CAS     | WS   | Women's Studies Certificate Grad          | CLG     | 318.33               | 15                  |
| IV       | COT     | MCT  | Construction Tech                         | ASSOC   | 283.67               | 15                  |

|    |     |      |                                      |       |        |       |
|----|-----|------|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|-------|
| IV | CAS | MUS  | Music Conc Composition               | BS    | 266.33 | 15    |
| IV | CAS | MUS  | Music Conc Mus Hist & Lit            | BS    | 214    | 15    |
| IV | CAS | MUS  | Music Conc Music Theory              | BS    | 208    | 15    |
| IV | CAS | MUS  | Music Theater minor                  | MINOR | 183.33 | 15    |
| IV | CAS | LIFS | Life Sciences (Systematics)          | PHD   | 33.33  | 15    |
|    |     |      | Averages for programs in Category IV |       | 459.43 | 13.05 |

## Appendix C: Discussion of Programs by Categories

This appendix presents enrollment and degree completion information<sup>14</sup> for the programs in each of the four categories, as well as the distribution of average program scores from the three rating groups and total rating scores for each category. Additional information describes the characteristics of programs in each category, including the number of programs in the category, the number of programs in each college, and the percentage of total number of programs in each college that were in the category. This information was released to the campus community in July 2005.

**Table 1 - Enrollment and Degree Completion by Category**

| Category   | 5-year enrollment average student headcount | Range of 5-year average student enrollment headcount | 5-year degree completion average student headcount | Range of 5-year degree completion average student headcount |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Retain and Possibly Enhance                                  | 58  | 3-525  | 16   | 0 <sup>15</sup> -117  |
| Monitor and Address Issues                                   | 19  | 1-121  | 4  | 0-14  |
| Realign, Reorganize, or Integrate with Other Degree Programs | 13  | 0-150  | 3  | 0-28  |
| Eliminate  | 2   | 0-16   | 1  | 0-7   |

### Programs in Category I: Retain and Possibly Enhance

Ninety seven programs were recommended for retention and possible enhancement: 33 graduate/post-baccalaureate and 64 undergraduate. Distribution by college is provided in the table below. The average total ranking score of the programs in this category is 6.5 (the best possible score is 3), and the average total score is 709<sup>16</sup> (best possible score is 1000).

**Table 2 – Distribution of Candidates for Retention and Possible Enhancement**

| College           | Number of programs | Percentage of college programs |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Arts and Sciences | 43                 | 41%                            |
| Business          | 7                  | 70                             |

<sup>14</sup> The number enrolled does not contain students in pre-professional programs, such as pre-business or nursing non-designated. Degree completion is not available for minors and some certificates. Enrollment and degree completion are not available for most non degree programs and configurations that are not in Banner.

<sup>15</sup> Includes new programs.

<sup>16</sup> The Transition to Teaching and Liberal Studies Human Interaction programs are not included in the average ranking and rating because they are unique programs to meet state requirements or needs, explained below.

|                              |    |    |
|------------------------------|----|----|
| Education                    | 19 | 49 |
| Health and Human Performance | 13 | 62 |
| Nursing                      | 4  | 57 |
| Technology                   | 11 | 35 |

Programs in this category usually have comparatively high ratings in most or all of the six criteria that provided the structure for the reports submitted for each program. Common characteristics include evidence, not assertions, of program quality; realistic assessment of potential and plans for the future; action to improve the program based upon feedback from stakeholders such as students and employers; stable or increasing enrollment; attention to resources through external grant activity; focus rather than trying to be all things to all people; and collaboration with other departments.

Two programs received low ratings and rankings but are placed in the Retain and Possibly Enhance category because they respond to specific state mandates. They are the Transition to Teaching and the Liberal Studies Human Interaction programs. Indiana's General Assembly enacted legislation which requires all colleges and universities that offer educator licensure programs to also offer a post-baccalaureate alternate licensure program called Transition to Teaching. The Liberal Studies Human Interaction program is only offered in prisons. The Department of Corrections requests that state colleges and universities offer programs in the prisons. As a state university, has an obligation to meet state needs when possible.

### **Programs in Category II: Monitor and Address Issues**

Twenty two programs were identified as needing to be monitored or to address issues: 11 graduate and 11 undergraduate. The average total ranking is 7.4 and average rating is 694. Distribution by college is provided in the table below.

**Table 3 – Distribution of Candidates for Monitoring and Addressing Issues**

| <b>College</b>               | <b>Number of programs</b> | <b>Percentage of college programs</b> |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Arts and Sciences            | 5                         | 5%                                    |
| Business                     | 3                         | 30                                    |
| Education                    | 3                         | 8                                     |
| Health and Human Performance | 2                         | 10                                    |
| Nursing                      | 1                         | 15                                    |
| Technology                   | 8                         | 25                                    |

Issues that need to be monitored or addressed vary. They include low graduation rates (a low ratio of graduates to students enrolled), adequacy of course enrollment in the major, declining enrollment, and questions on faculty resources needed for a quality program.

### **Programs in Category III: Realign, Reorganize, or Integrate with Other Degree Programs**

Fifty eight programs were recommended for realignment, reorganization, or consolidation: 31 graduate and 27 undergraduate. The average total ranking for this group is 11 and their average rating is 587. Distribution by college is provided in the table below.

**Table 4 – Distribution of Candidates for Realignment, Reorganization, or Integration with Other Programs**

| <b>College</b>               | <b>Number of programs</b> | <b>Percentage of college programs</b> |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Arts and Sciences            | 36                        | 35%                                   |
| Business                     | 0                         | 0                                     |
| Education                    | 14                        | 36                                    |
| Health and Human Performance | 4                         | 19                                    |
| Nursing                      | 0                         | 0                                     |
| Technology                   | 4                         | 13                                    |

Some programs in this category had high rankings and ratings. The Task Force recommends realignment or integration with other programs as a way to strengthen the programs and position them well for the future. A number of programs in this category suggested reorganization in their prioritization reports.

### **Programs in Category IV: Candidates for Elimination**

Thirty seven programs were recommended for elimination: 23 graduate and 14 undergraduate. The average sum of program rankings is 13 and average rating is 459. Distribution by college is provided in the table below.

**Table 5 – Distribution of Candidates for Elimination**

| <b>College</b>               | <b>Number of programs</b> | <b>Percentage of college programs</b> |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Arts and Sciences            | 21                        | 20%                                   |
| Business                     | 0                         | 0                                     |
| Education                    | 3                         | 8                                     |
| Health and Human Performance | 2                         | 10                                    |
| Nursing                      | 2                         | 28                                    |
| Technology                   | 9                         | 28                                    |

The relatively high percentages in Nursing and the College of Technology result from special circumstances. For Nursing, the recommendation to eliminate pertains to two tracks in the M.S. In Technology, several programs recommended for elimination basically are duplicate titles.

In a few instances, rankings and ratings are not low but the program is assigned to the “eliminate” category. In these cases five-year rates of enrollment and degree completion are so low that the resources devoted to the program would be better used by investing them in programs with greater student interest and productivity as measured by degrees completed.

Changing State needs and requirements account for a number of master’s programs in this category. In the past, teachers were required to earn a master's degree to professionalize their license or increase their salary compensation in keeping with locally bargained agreements. The State of Indiana has changed licensure requirements, providing other options for licensure renewal and locally bargained agreements have likewise developed alternative salary schedules not contingent on advanced degrees only. As a result, less incentive exists for teachers to obtain master's degrees and enrollments in teaching programs have fallen.

For teachers interested in obtaining a master degree, the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction is an alternative to degrees in their subject areas. This program is a flexible one in which more than half of the program can be in courses in the content area and electives outside professional education. The Task Force recommends that master's programs that have enrolled ten or fewer students per year on average over the last five years (unless totally subsumed under the doctoral program) be discontinued/realigned as a group and that those related to teaching consider the Curriculum and Instruction alternative programming.

## **Appendix D – Analysis of Reallocations from General Education**

Detailed analyses of more efficient ways of delivering the General Education program and courses can be found on the website of the Task Force for Program Prioritization. Assumptions and calculations are provided there. The information below, and on the web site, is provided solely to demonstrate that modifications to General Education could release considerable amounts of resources, not to suggest the adoption of any particular modifications. Changes to General Education must be based on sound curriculum designs developed through faculty input and established approval processes.

Resources available for reallocation are calculated based on 2005-06 instructor salary expenditures only, not benefits or other costs. Most calculations are based on the 620<sup>17</sup> regular day and evening Liberal Studies courses, not distance education or special programs. Liberal Studies courses are estimated to require approximately 24,000 seats per academic year (using 2005-2006 LS course enrollments). The proportion of faculty of different types and ranks teaching courses in each General Education category is taken into consideration.

### **Model 1: Current Program/Baseline**

The current Liberal Studies portion of the GE program required \$4,833,625 in instructor resources during academic year 2005-2006. Of these, approximately \$286,104 is devoted to the Liberal Studies Capstone requirement and \$311,000 to the Information Technology Literacy Basic Studies requirement. The Capstone area of Liberal Studies is excluded from the following models, as are all Basic Studies areas.

### **Model 2: General Education Council Option Two**

Under this plan, a department would normally retain no more than two courses per discipline<sup>18</sup> per core area in which the department already offers at least one GE course. Option Two modified to take into account those courses required for majors reduces the number of courses in inventory by 27. Forty-three fewer sections would be offered, releasing approximately \$335,225.

### **Model 3: Enhanced General Education Council Option Two**

The following model combines the reduced course inventory from General Education Council Option Two and the changes in current practices for course offerings.

---

<sup>17</sup> 623 sections were taught. This figure has been rounded to yield whole numbers of sections in estimates.

<sup>18</sup> Departments with more than one discipline may end up with more courses on the GE inventory than departments in a single discipline.

**Table 1: Enhanced General Education Council Option Two**

| Action   | Estimated Resources Available for Reallocation | Projected Resources Required for Liberal Studies under Model 2 | Total Sections Remaining (Average [F] Section Size) |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  | 623 (Φ=37)  |
| Implement Option Two course inventory <sup>a</sup>           | 335,225  |  | -43   |
| Eliminate small sections <sup>b</sup>                        | 70,163   |  | -9  |
| Reduce number of LS sections by 15% <sup>c</sup>             | 725,022  |  | -93   |
| Increase section size in 5 courses per semester <sup>d</sup> | 154,380  |  | -20   |
|  | <b>\$1,280,848</b>                             | <b>\$3,552,777</b>   | <b>458 (Φ=53)</b>                                   |

<sup>a</sup> Eliminates 27 Liberal Studies courses from the GE inventory, or approximately 43 sections.

<sup>b</sup> Eliminates the 9 lowest enrolled course sections.

<sup>c</sup> Eliminates an estimated 93 sections, either by reducing the number of sections of multi-section courses and/or by changing the rotation so that fewer courses are offered in a given semester. This action does not eliminate any courses from the inventory.

<sup>d</sup> Each course reduced from 3 sections to 1 allows reallocation of \$15,438. This model assumes that 5 courses will be redesigned for teaching in large sections and taught both fall and spring.

**Model 4: Limited Liberal Studies Core Curriculum**

A limited liberal studies core curriculum is characterized by course offerings that represent a common body of knowledge that all graduates are expected to possess. These programs have limited course inventories, fewer areas than ISU’s current program, and relatively large average section sizes in quite a few courses (an average of 60-70, rather than ISU’s current average of 37).

The core curriculum assumed for the model is similar to core curricula from several ISU peer institutions. Model 4 retains the ISU Liberal Studies areas and number of courses required in each area, but contains an inventory of only 45 courses, not including the capstone requirement. The model is estimated based on the need for approximately 333 sections per AY. Calculations for Model 4 assume an average section size of approximately 77.

### Model 5: Expanded Liberal Studies Core Curriculum

Model 5 uses the same general approach as Model 4, but it doubles the size of the inventory in each area proportionally (to a total of 90 courses), to provide more choice in course offerings, and assumes an average section size of 55.

**Table 2: Summary of General Education Models**

| <b>Model</b>           | <b>Resources Available for Reallocation (\$)</b> | <b>Resources Required for Program (\$)</b> | <b>Number of Courses on Liberal Studies Inventory</b> | <b>Number of Sections Offered per AY</b> | <b>Average Section Size</b> |
|------------------------|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Current Program     | 0  | 4,833,625                                  | 163   | 623                                      | 37                          |
| 2. Option Two          | 335,225  | 4,498,400                                  | 136   | 580                                      | 51                          |
| 3. Enhanced Option Two | 1,280,848  | 3,552,777                                  | 136   | 458                                      | 53                          |
| 4. Limited Core        | 2,260,820  | 2,572,805                                  | 45  | 330                                      | 73                          |
| 5. Expanded Core       | 1,426,655  | 3,406,970                                  | 90  | 437                                      | 55                          |

## **Appendix E: Prioritization Task Force Members**

Bradley Balch, College of Education: Chairperson Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations: Dean 06/06

Will Barratt, College of Education: member of Graduate Council

Susan Berta, College of Arts and Sciences: Chairperson Department of Geography, Geology, Anthropology

Blanche Evans, College of Health and Human Performance: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Ronald Green, College of Business: Dean

Harriet Hudson, College of Arts and Sciences: Past Chairperson of Faculty Senate

David Malooley, College of Technology: member of CAAC

Marcia Miller, College of Nursing: member of CAAC

Constance McLaren, College of Business

Michael Murphy, College of Arts and Sciences: Chairperson of CAAC, co-chair

Thomas Sauer, College of Arts and Sciences: Interim Dean

Karen Schmid, Office of Academic Affairs: Co-chair