

RECEIVED

FEB 24 2009

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
UW-RIVER FALLS



Faculty Senate • http://www.uwrf.edu/faculty_senate/welcome.html

Senators: Chair – David Rainville , Vice Chair – Kristen Hendrickson, Secretary – Kris Hiney, Executive Committee – Glenn Potts, David Furniss

To: Connie Foster, Chancellor
116 North Hall
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: David Rainville, Chair
Faculty Senate
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

February 23, 2009

RE: UW-RF Faculty Senate Motion 2008/2009/56

At the February 18, 2009 meeting of Wisconsin-River Falls Faculty senate, motion 2008-2009/56 was passed. This motion is forwarded for your action.

1. A motion from AP&P to approve the Guidelines for Reviewers of Academic Program Self-Studies. The document contains the guidelines that reviewers are to follow when reviewing Academic Programs pursuant to UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2008-2009/47 which approved the Academic Self-Study Tool.

The document is as follows:

**University of Wisconsin – River Falls
Guidelines for Reviewers of Academic Program Self-Studies**

The operating paradigm of the UWRF Strategic Plan requires the institution to assess programs and set budget priorities. A self-study of academic programs is one step in this process and will produce a deeper understanding of the quality of and resources devoted to our undergraduate and graduate programs. To ensure that the thoughtful work of faculty can be translated into strategic choices in meeting the University's mission and vision, program reviewers must analyze the program self-study documentation and offer recommendations regarding our future program array. Important judgments must be made to guide the allocation of our resources.

Academic Program Self-Study Tool [Faculty Senate Motion 2008-09/47]

The Self-Study will utilize six criteria to help obtain information for use in program evaluation:

- 1) Mission and Strategic Plan: How is the program critical to the University's Mission, Vision, and Values and to the "Living the Promise" Strategic Plan?
- 2) External and Internal Demand: What is the job outlook for graduates of this program? How many majors, minors, and transfers are there? What is the contribution to General Education and other university program requirements?

--3) Program Quality, Inputs, and Outcomes: Is the curriculum innovative and forward-focused? What is there evidence of teaching effectiveness? What are the professional, scholarly, and creative activities of the faculty in the program?

--4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency: What are the cost efficiencies of this program? What are the SCH, FTE, budget, and space utilized or produced by the program?

--5) Benchmarking with Peers: How does the academic program compare with others at peer institutions?

--6) Other Critical Information: What distinctive characteristics or other information are critical to the evaluation of this program?

Academic Program Ratings

As outlined in the Academic Program Ratings document [Faculty Senate Motion 2008-2009/48], a rating score ranging from 1-5 will be assigned to each of these six criteria. The score for the criterion will be multiplied by its appropriate weight factor and the products added for a program total score. Scores for each program as determined by individual members of the Deans Council will be averaged to generate an overall mean for each program.

Following are the general guidelines for scoring. Please note that a score of 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 might be assigned for a given criterion. While only scores of 5, 3, or 1 are described below, scores of 4 or 2 would naturally fall in between as appropriate based on the data and other information provided for that criterion.

Criterion	Rating Score		
	5	3	1
1) Mission and Strategic Plan	Strong alignment with and support for the UWRP Mission, Vision, and Values, and Strategic Plan	Clear alignment with support of the UWRP Mission, Vision, and Values, and Strategic Plan	Weak alignment with or support of the UWRP Mission, Vision, and Values, and Strategic Plan
2) External and Internal Demand	Strong job market for graduates; high internal demand of program (number of majors, minors, and transfers)	Good job market; good internal demand	Weak or no job market; low internal demand
3) Program Quality, Inputs, and Outcomes	Curriculum is clearly innovative; teaching is highly effective; faculty are very productive in scholarly and creative activities	Curriculum is current; teaching is effective; faculty productive in scholarly and creative activities	Curriculum not current or innovative; teaching effectiveness low; faculty not productive in scholarly and creative activities
4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency	High productivity of program (SCH/FTE, etc.); extremely efficient use of resources (budget/SCH, etc.)	Good productivity of program; efficient use of resources	Low productivity of program; inefficient use of resources
5) Benchmarking with Peers	Program compares very favorably with peers in terms of cost and productivity	Program compares well with peers	Program does not compare favorably with peers
6) Other Critical Information	Information provided is highly significant.	Information provided demonstrates some additional value of the program.	Information provided is not significant.

Programs whose overall mean scores are in the middle 60% of all program scores will be considered for maintenance at current resource levels or maintenance with monitoring.

Programs whose overall mean scores are in the upper 20% of all program mean scores will be considered for enhancement (e.g. increases in FTE and/or S&E, enrollment growth, etc.). Inclusion in this group does not automatically mean programs will be enhanced but rather that they will be considered as priorities for enhancement.

Similarly, programs whose overall mean scores are in the lowest 20% of all programs will be considered for reduction or elimination. Inclusion in this group does not automatically mean programs will be reduced or eliminated but rather that they will be considered as potential candidates for reduction or elimination.

Final decisions on enhancement or reduction/elimination will need to include considerations of university mission and balance of programs, strategic enrollment planning, budget restrictions and obligations, current students and completion of academic plans, implications for accreditations, and other factors.

Resource reallocation resulting from enhancement or reduction/elimination within specific programs will begin immediately but may require longer term adjustment due to the factors mentioned above.

X Approved

_____ Disapproved

Connie Foster
Connie Foster, Chancellor

3-9-09
Date