

Report  
of the  
Resources For Our Vision  
Committee  
for  
Fiscal Year  
July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2004

June 30, 2004

## Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary.....	4
II.	Committee Membership .....	5
III.	Viability Studies Completed in 2003-2004 .....	6
	1. Overview.....	6
	2. Program Viability Outline .....	6-7
	3. Department of Physics.....	7
	4. Department of Political Science .....	8
	5. Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology .....	8
	6. Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education .....	8-9
IV.	Academic Unit Selected for Alternative Review.....	9
	1. Department of Mathematics and Statistics .....	9
V.	Review of Degree and Certificate Programs Reviewed .....	10
	1. Degree and Certificate Programs Reviewed.....	10-11
	2. Committee Recommendations for Selected Programs .....	11-13
	3. Additional Degree and Certificate Program Actions.....	13-14
VI.	Unit Categorization.....	14-16
	1. Priority Programs.....	16
	2. Sound Programs.....	16
	3. Priority and Sound Programs with Potential Problems .....	17
	4. Programs in Need of Program Review .....	17
VII.	Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program.....	17-18
VIII.	Data Integrity Issues and Plans Implemented.....	18
	1. Committee Activities on Data Integrity.....	18-20
	2. Committee Recommendations on Data Integrity .....	20-21
	3. Committee Recommendations on Annual Review of Data.....	21
	4. Academic Unit Benchmarks for Specific Professional Schools.....	21-22
IX.	The Future of the RFVC .....	22-24
	1. Annual Committee Responsibilities .....	24

## Appendices

Appendix A: Charge to the Committee .....	25
Appendix B: RFVC Meeting Schedule and Summary .....	26-29
Appendix B1: RFVC Meeting Minutes .....	(attached)
Appendix C: Viability Submissions .....	(attached)
Appendix D: Math Committee Final Report .....	(attached)
Appendix E: Letter to Provost on Recommendations .....	30-32
Appendix F: Proposed Elements for Annual Data Review – Program Assessment Matrix .....	33-36
Appendix G: Proposed Data Integrity Plan .....	37-38

## I. **Executive Summary**

Chancellor Gilliland charged the Resources For Our Vision Committee (RFVC) to perform a variety of functions, as outlined in Appendix A. In order to fulfill its charge, the committee undertook and completed a number of tasks.

The committee formulated a Program Viability Audit outline to be used by academic units in preparing their Viability Audits. The committee then requested the academic units chosen by the UM System, in consultation with the Provost's Office, to conduct Viability Studies. The academic units selected were: Department of Physics, Department of Political Science, Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology, and the Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies (ULAPSIE). The committee reviewed the reports and made specific recommendations to the Provost.

At the same time, it was determined that a separate committee thoroughly review the Department of Mathematics & Statistics. That committee conducted the review and made a series of recommendations which can be found in Section IV. The full report is attached as Appendix D.

The RFVC committee also reviewed data on the number of majors and graduates in all degree and certificate programs offered at UMKC. They identified a number of programs that appeared to have few majors and/or graduates. Questions were raised with the Deans of the Schools and the College housing the programs identified. Some programs were eliminated, and some programs were analyzed and suggested initiatives for improvement were identified by the Deans and/or the committee. Letters were sent to the Deans and the Provost recommending appropriate actions (see Section V).

The committee worked with the Academic Deans to define 'academic units' at UMKC. Definitions varied from school to school, and include divisions, departments, and areas of study. All academic units were classified by the RFVC committee into four categories: 1) Priority Academic Units, 2) Sound Academic Units, 3) Priority and Sound Academic Units with Problems, and 4) Academic Units that should undergo a Viability Study. The categorization is found in Section VI, pages 16 and 17. The Provost has been informed of the outcomes of the categorization process and the nature of the problems associated with specific academic units.

The RFVC committee strongly recommended an in-depth review of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program. The Provost requested that the RFVC committee conduct the review. The RFVC will carry out the review during the 2004-2005 academic year.

In the course of reviewing data regarding academic units provided by UM System, a number of errors were identified in the UM System data. The RFVC committee recommended a set of processes to be initiated on the UMKC campus by the academic units that would provide for the systematic review and correction of data prior to the data being submitted to the UM System. These processes will be in place for the next academic year. The committee also recommended the annual review of certain data concerning academic units and degree and certificate programs by the committee in order to identify emerging problems.

Finally, the RFVC committee recommended that it be made a standing committee. Its membership should be augmented by several members of the Council on Program Evaluation (COPE), and the Council on Program Evaluation should be eliminated. The RFVC committee should oversee the entire academic unit review function.

## II. **Committee Membership**

In August 2003, Chancellor Martha Gilliland, in consultation with Provost Steve Ballard, appointed a group of faculty and Deans to serve as committee members under the chairmanship of Frank Horton, Special Assistant to the Provost. These faculty members were selected for their significant scholarly accomplishments and recognition from within their respective fields and from within UMKC. Additionally, representatives were identified from the UMKC Faculty Senate, the UMKC Student Government, and Provost Office personnel to support the work of the committee.

The Resources For Our Vision Committee for academic year 2003-2004 included:

Frank E. Horton, Chair  
Bill Osborne, Dean, School of Computing and Engineering  
Randy Pembroke, Dean, Conservatory of Music  
Betty Drees, Dean, School of Medicine  
Jim Durig, Faculty Senate, College of Arts & Sciences  
Jim Mobberley, Conservatory of Music  
Richard Derman, School of Medicine  
Bruce Jones, School of Education  
David Eick, School of Dentistry  
Max Skidmore, College of Arts & Sciences  
Ralph Kauffman, School of Medicine/Children's Mercy Hospital  
Keith Haddock, College of Arts & Sciences  
Kathleen Schweitzberger, University Libraries and Faculty Senate  
Misti Shaw, Student Government Representative  
Steve LaNasa, Provost Office, ex-officio  
Debbie Jarvis-Ferguson, Provost Office, Staff

### III. **Viability Studies Completed in 2003-2004**

#### 1. Overview

In the summer of 2003, Provost Steve Ballard and UM System administration began the process of identifying programs likely to undergo Program Review.

The following academic units were identified as potential candidates for review:

- Bloch School (excluding Public Administration)
- Department of Chemistry
- Department of Geosciences
- Department of History
- Department of Mathematics and Statistics
- Department of Physics
- Department of Political Science
- Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology
- Department of Theatre
- School of Education

In consultation with the Provost and respective Deans, the following units were selected to undergo Viability Studies:

- Department of Physics
- Department of Political Science
- Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology
- Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics was considered as a candidate for Viability Study; however, based on the unique situation faced by the department following the retirement of a majority of faculty, an alternative review process was selected. The work of this committee is summarized in Section IV.

As an initial step, the RFVC began to examine the landscape of program evaluation within UMKC and quickly identified significant similarity between issues of viability and the current program evaluation procedures that units undergo on a five-year cycle, overseen by the Council on Program Evaluation (COPE).

In consultation with the COPE program administrator, the committee developed the following outline on which Viability Studies were to be based:

#### 2. Program Viability Outline

- 1) Explain how your unit's activities are central to the vision, mission and values of UMKC.
- 2) Qualitative issues:
  - a. Assess the quality of the faculty

- b. Assess the quality of the students
  - c. List the funded research grants or contracts that were awarded to faculty in the department for 2001-02 and 2002-03.
  - d. List publications in refereed journals for 2001-02 and 2002-03.
  - e. The number of graduates from your program(s) are listed below. Please explain how these data represent appropriate productivity.
  - f. If your unit participates in outreach activities, please evaluate their significance to the community and to the university.
  - g. How does your unit measure outcomes of your instructional efforts?
- 3) Do other higher education institutions in Eastern Kansas and Western Missouri offer programs similar to yours? Are your program offerings unique in certain ways? Will the student demand for your programs change in the near future?
  - 4) Listed below are the data from system regarding comparative data on cost per credit hour, credit hour production per FTE, and research funding. Your unit is substantially below the national average. How will your unit improve in these areas? When will your unit exceed the national averages?
  - 5) What, if any, campus partnerships have been in place or recently initiated with other academic units within the university?
  - 6) What is your assessment of the quality, productivity and efficiency of your unit? Please provide a rationale for your assessment. Given the institutional resource constraints, explain how your unit will improve its quality, productivity and efficiency, and explicitly state the timeframe necessary to accomplish those improvements.

It should be noted that the above outline was subsequently forwarded to the COPE program administrator in order that the COPE review outline incorporate all aspects of the Viability Audit outline not currently included in COPE reviews.

### 3. Department of Physics

The committee reviewed the Department of Physics Viability Study. After consultation with the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, the RFVC committee recommended that the Department of Physics undertake a vigorous and systematic effort to meet with representation from the Health Sciences units, and others where appropriate, in order to conduct serious discussion regarding joint research and instructional needs.

The committee also recommends that the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences prepare a report on the outcomes of these joint discussions. The report should contain specific information regarding joint research activities initiated, grant proposals submitted, alterations to existing courses, and the development of new courses meeting the needs of other academic units. The committee requests that the report be submitted to the Provost and the RFVC no later than April 1, 2005.

#### 4. Department of Political Science

The committee reviewed the Viability Study completed by the Department of Political Science. The committee determined that the academic unit's performance was satisfactory with an important caveat. The committee was concerned that the Department was spread too thin and that enrollment in graduate courses was too small. In further analysis, it appeared that increased efficiencies, without academic consequences, could be attained by having several departments combine graduate level courses in order to reduce the number of low enrollment graduate courses and free faculty to teach other courses, perhaps reducing the need for adjunct or part-time professors. The committee recommended that the Dean work with the Departments of Economics, History, Political Science and Sociology, and perhaps others, in order to strengthen Interdisciplinary Ph.D. courses and programs and to increase enrollments in graduate courses. The Dean of the College is to report back to the committee on the outcome of the departmental deliberations by January 31, 2005.

#### 5. Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology

The committee reviewed the Viability Study completed by the Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology. The committee came to the conclusion that the Department appeared to be the victim of an incorrect database. However, in reviewing the materials provided by the Department, the committee recommended that the Dean of the College, working with the Department, review the various degree programs offered in order to identify selected programs that might be eliminated. A reduction in degree programs would allow the Department to focus their limited resources on fewer programs. The Dean is to report back to the committee by January 31, 2005.

#### 6. Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education

The committee reviewed the Viability Study prepared by ULAPSIE. The committee requested that some of the data be recomputed and appended to the original report. The committee felt that a metropolitan based institution like UMKC should provide access to the kind of academic programs offered by ULAPSIE. However, the committee also felt substantial work needed to be accomplished to move ULAPSIE into a viable status. Specifically, four recommendations were forwarded to the Provost:

1. The academic unit should develop a proposal for a strong Ed.D. program by December 2004. Since members of this academic unit will be participating in the writing team for a leadership preparation program associated with the IUE [Institute for Urban Education], this plan should be relevant in developing the Ed.D. program.
2. ULAPSIE needs to put together a plan for increasing grant proposal development. Further, proposals should be developed in the near future. The committee recommends that ULAPSIE provide the committee with the plan during the Winter semester of 2005, along with a listing of grant proposals forwarded by the department during the academic year 2004-2005.
3. The department should take steps immediately to come into compliance with state and national accreditation requirements. The committee recommends that ULAPSIE

provide the committee with a report that includes an appropriate plan on how it will come into compliance with state and national standards by December 2005.

4. The committee recommends that ULAPSIE seek external validation of its programs by submitting their programs for review by the Educational Leadership Constituency Council (ELCC). The committee recommends that ULAPSIE submit to the committee a copy of its request and accompanying materials to ELCC by February 2006.

#### IV. Academic Unit Selected for Alternative Review

##### 1. Department of Mathematics and Statistics

In August 2003, Provost Steve Ballard, with the concurrence of Dean Bryan Le Beau, appointed a committee to review the status of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics housed in the College of Arts & Sciences. Dr. Frank E. Horton was appointed Chair of the committee, which was comprised of tenured faculty members from throughout the university and one member representing the field of mathematics external to the university.

UMKC was presented with a unique opportunity to re-examine and re-define the role played by the department, in part brought on by the retirement of a majority of the faculty. This review sought to examine the campus needs and requirements associated with mathematics and statistics, and how the discipline fits into university wide goals, as well as how it supports other academic units and programs.

Overall, committee recommendations focused on the following:

- Initiating a vigorous effort to improve the learning environment in mathematics courses, due in part to the critical role these courses play as gatekeepers to other disciplines and programs, as well as the challenges facing the field nationally;
- The development of a thorough program of outcomes assessment;
- Examination of the pre-requisites associated with various courses;
- The identification of mathematics and statistics course needs and requirements of other academic units and programs, and regular consultation with other units to discuss ongoing effectiveness;
- Initiation of the above items as a requirement in order to discuss resource needs as part of the strategic planning process with the Dean; and
- Continued suspension of graduate admissions until such time as a majority of the recommendations have been initiated and a strategic focus for the department has been defined.
- Before the graduate program in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics can admit students, the proposal for the program should be reviewed by the RFVC.

The Final Report of the committee, as submitted to the Provost in February 2004, may be found in Appendix D.

## V. **Review of Degree and Certificate Programs with Low Enrollment or Low Graduation Rates**

In accordance with its charge, the committee undertook a review of each degree and certificate program currently offered by the university.

The committee reviewed the declared majors and degrees granted from each program over an eight-year period. The committee identified programs that appeared to show declining trends in either declared majors or degrees granted. From that review, the committee as a whole then identified degree programs from which it would solicit additional information. The degree and certificate programs identified for additional review are as follows:

### 1. Degree and Certificate Programs Reviewed

#### College of Arts & Sciences

- B.A. and B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies
- M.S. in Chemistry
- B.A. in French
- B.A. in German
- B.S. in Geography
- B.S. in Geology
- M.S. in Urban Environmental Geology
- B.A. in American Studies
- M.S. in Theatre

#### Conservatory of Music

- D.M.A. and M.M. in Conducting
- M.M. in Music History and Literature
- B.M. and M.M. in Music Theory

#### School of Biological Sciences

- M.S. in Biology
- B.S. in Medical Technology

#### School of Computing & Engineering

- M.S. and M.E. in Civil Engineering
- M.S. and M.E. in Mechanical Engineering
- M.S. in Electrical Engineering

#### School of Dentistry

- M.S. in Dental Hygiene Education
- M.S. in Oral Biology
- Graduate Certificate in Oral Medicine

#### School of Education

- M.A. in Educational Research and Psychology

- B.A. in Early Childhood Education
- Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction
- Ed.S. in Reading Education
- Ed.D. in Education

Working through the respective Deans for the units, the committee solicited responses to selected questions regarding each degree program. The questions to be responded to were identified by the committee as a whole during review of the enrollment and graduation data.

The potential set of questions was as follows:

- 1) The degree or certificate programs noted above are enrolling very few students. Assuming increased enrollment capacity is possible, what specific actions will your unit take to increase the number of majors in this (these) degree or certificate program(s) within the next 18 months? (If increased capacity is not possible or preferable, explain why.)
- 2) In light of the low enrollment numbers, (a) justify why the program(s) should be retained (overall cost of the program(s) should not be the primary focus of your answer), (b) explain how this (these) program(s) help your academic unit accomplish its goals, and (c) explain how this (these) program(s) help UMKC achieve its goals.
- 3) Has the academic unit given consideration to changing the program(s) (e.g. merging, reconfiguring or ending it)? If yes, please outline the considered action and the advantages and disadvantages of such a change. If not, please outline potential changes and the advantages and disadvantages of such a change.
- 4) The number of graduates in the program(s) is low. Why? What specific actions can the academic unit take to increase the number of graduates?

## 2. Committee Recommendations for Selected Programs

### College of Arts & Sciences

- B.A. and B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies

Upon recommendation of the Dean, the B.A. and B.S. degrees in Interdisciplinary Studies will be closed.

- M.S. in Chemistry

The committee recommends that the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences work with the department to develop a recruiting plan for the degree program.

- M.S. in Theatre

The committee recommends that this degree program be reviewed upon the retirement of the sole primary faculty member supporting the program.

### School of Biological Sciences

- M.S. in Biology

Upon recommendation of the Dean, the M.S. degree in Biology will be closed.

- B.S. in Medical Technology

The committee continues to be concerned about the small number of students that graduate from the program. Based on consultation with the Dean, it is apparent that this fact is a result of limited internship opportunities. The committee recommends continued efforts to develop additional partnerships with surrounding hospitals designed to increase the number of placement opportunities for UMKC students. The number of graduates from this program should be monitored on an annual basis by the RFVC.

### School of Computing & Engineering

- M.S. and M.E. in Civil Engineering

Upon recommendation of the Dean, the M.E. degree in Civil Engineering will be closed.

- M.S. and M.E. in Mechanical Engineering

Upon recommendation of the Dean, the M.E. degree in Mechanical Engineering will be closed.

### School of Dentistry

- M.S. in Dental Hygiene Education

The School of Dentistry estimates that the number of students graduating from the M.S. in Dental Hygiene program will grow in the future as a result of changes in the program's faculty. The graduation projections are as follows: 2004: 2; 2005: 2; 2006: 4; and 2007: 5. The committee recommends a review of the graduation rates by the RFVC in 2007.

- M.S. in Oral Biology

The School of Dentistry estimates that the number of students enrolled in the M.S. in Oral Biology will grow in the future as follows: 2004: 12; 2005: 12; 2006: 14; and 2007: 14. The committee recommends a review of the enrollment by a future committee.

- Graduate Certificate in Oral Medicine

Upon recommendation of the Dean, the graduate certificate in Oral Medicine will be closed.

### School of Education

- M.A. in Educational Research and Psychology

Upon recommendation of the Dean, the committee recommends that the M.A. degree in Educational Research and Psychology be closed.

- B.A. in Early Childhood Education

The committee recommends a review of this program's enrollment during 2008.

- Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction

The committee recommends that the School of Education develop a marketing plan for the program in order to support enrollment growth, and share the plan with the RFVC.

- Ed.S. in Reading Education

The committee recommends that the School of Education develop a marketing plan for the program in order to support enrollment growth, and share the plan with the RFVC.

- Ed.D. in Education

The committee learned that the Ed.D. program has been inactivated. However, additional recommendations regarding this program can be found in the RFVC's recommendations regarding ULAPSIE.

### 3. Additional Degree and Certificate Program Actions

Through the committee's review and reconciliation of internal data, a number of inconsistencies were identified when comparing the CBHE inventory with internal data tables and the university's catalog. Committee staff worked with personnel in the respective units to identify the following program actions:

#### College of Arts and Sciences

- Inactivation of the B.A. in Earth Sciences
- Inactivation of the M.A. in Communication Studies
- Inactivation of the B.A. in Judaic Studies

#### School of Dentistry

- Inactivation of the graduate certificate in Prosthodontics (Combined and Maxillofacial)

## School of Education

- Inactivation of the Ed.S. in Educational Administration (Higher Education Administration)
- Inactivation of the B.A. degrees in Physical Education (Teaching and Non-Teaching)
- Inactivation of the M.A. in Curriculum and Instruction (English as a Second Language) (Teaching)
- Inactivation of the M.A. in Curriculum and Instruction (English as a Second Language) (Non-Teaching)

## VI. **Unit Categorization**

As requested in the Chancellor's charge, the committee has completed a review of each academic unit's sub-organizations (i.e. departments, divisions, focus area entities). The Dean of each academic unit was asked to identify academic logical units for evaluative purposes. The following list reflects those responses:

### College of Arts & Sciences

- Department of Architecture, Urban Planning & Design
- Department of Art & Art History
- Department of Chemistry
- Department of Communication Studies
- Department of Economics
- Department of English Language and Literature
- Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
- Department of Geosciences
- Department of History
- Department of Mathematics and Statistics
- Department of Philosophy
- Department of Physics
- Department of Political Science
- Department of Psychology
- School of Social Work
- Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice and Criminology
- Department of Theatre

### School of Biological Sciences

- Division of Cellular Biology and Biophysics
- Division of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry

### Bloch School of Business

- Department of Accountancy
- Department of Finance, Information Management, and Strategy
- Department of Organizational Leadership and Marketing
- Department of Public Administration (Cookingham Institute of Public Affairs)

Conservatory of Music

Music  
Dance

School of Computing & Engineering

Civil and Mechanical Engineering Division  
Computer Science and Electrical Engineering Division

School of Dentistry

Undergraduate Program in Dental Hygiene (BSDH)  
Professional DDS Program  
Advanced Education Programs

School of Education

Division of Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Exercise Science  
Division of Curriculum and Instruction  
Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies

School of Law

School of Medicine

Undergraduate Medical Programs  
Graduate Medical Programs

School of Nursing

Bachelor of Science in Nursing Programs  
Master of Science in Nursing Programs  
PhD Program in Nursing

School of Pharmacy

Division of Pharmacology  
Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences  
Division of Pharmacy Practice

The academic units were evaluated by the committee as a whole, in consideration of internal university data provided to the committee, information requested of the academic units and respective Deans (to include submitted Viability Studies), and internal knowledge of various programs.

The overarching rubric for this year's categorization was based on the Dean's Criteria, established by Provost Steve Ballard and the Deans at a planning retreat in November, 2002. The Dean's Criteria are as follows:

- Centrality to UMKC's Mission, Vision, and Values
- Quality of the Program (as measured by the 5 goal measures)
- Importance to the Community
- Efficiency
- Centrality to Student Success
- Builds Campus Partnerships

Based on these criteria and an overall evaluation of each unit, the committee grouped programs into one or more of the following categories: Priority Programs, Sound Programs, Priority and Sound Programs with the Appearance of a Problem(s), and Programs in Need of Program Review.

1. Priority Programs

Advanced Education Programs (School of Dentistry)  
Bachelor of Science in Nursing Programs  
Dance  
Department of Chemistry  
Department of Psychology  
Department of Public Administration (Cookingham Institute of Public Affairs)  
Department of Theatre  
Division of Cellular Biology and Biophysics  
Division of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry  
Division of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering  
Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences  
Division of Pharmacology  
Division of Pharmacy Practice  
Graduate Medical Programs  
Master of Science in Nursing Programs  
Music  
Ph.D. Program in Nursing  
Professional DDS Program  
Undergraduate Medical Programs  
Undergraduate Program in Dental Hygiene (School of Dentistry)

2. Sound Programs

Department of Accountancy  
Department of Architecture, Urban Planning & Design  
Department of Economics  
Department of English Language and Literature  
Department of Finance, Information Management, and Strategy  
Department of History  
Department of Organizational Leadership and Marketing  
Department of Philosophy  
Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology  
Division of Civil and Mechanical Engineering  
School of Law  
School of Social Work

### 3. Priority and Sound Programs with Potential Problems

The following Priority and Sound Programs were identified as potentially having problems that should be investigated in the subsequent academic year by the committee:

Department of Theatre—Efficiency Issues<sup>1</sup>  
Department of Chemistry—Efficiency Issues  
Division of Cellular Biology and Biophysics—Efficiency and Partnership Issues  
Division of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry—Efficiency and Partnership Issues  
Department of Accountancy—Efficiency Issues  
Department of Finance, Information Management, and Strategy—Efficiency Issues  
Department of Organizational Leadership and Marketing—Efficiency Issues  
School of Social Work—Efficiency Issues

### 4. Programs in Need of Program Review

Department of Art & Art History  
Department of Communication Studies<sup>2</sup>  
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures  
Department of Geosciences<sup>3</sup>  
Department of Mathematics & Statistics<sup>4</sup>  
Department of Physics<sup>5</sup>  
Department of Political Science<sup>5</sup>  
Division of Counseling and Educational Psychology<sup>6</sup>  
Division of Curriculum and Instruction<sup>6</sup>  
Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education<sup>5</sup>

In the coming academic year, the committee should determine a categorization method for identifying the quality level of each academic unit. Further, the committee should, over a reasonable period of time, categorize each academic unit by its quality level.

## VII. **Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program**

The committee reviewed Interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs across the disciplines. Given the resource constraints and questions regarding the ability of some academic units to provide for academically robust postgraduate coursework and research direction, the committee

<sup>1</sup> Efficiency issues suggest a possible higher than average cost per credit hour.

<sup>2</sup> This unit underwent the UM System's pilot "Academic Audit" in 2002-03. The committee will review this report and make recommendations in Fall 2004.

<sup>3</sup> This unit submitted a COPE Self-Study in May 2003. The committee will review this report and make recommendations in Fall 2004.

<sup>4</sup> This unit underwent an alternative review during Fall 2003 and is presently implementing changes and aligning the focus.

<sup>5</sup> This unit underwent Program Viability Audit in 2003-04, and is presently working to implement recommendations of the committee.

<sup>6</sup> This unit is fundamentally impacted by the planning associated with the Institute for Urban Education. Until the outcome of that initiative is made clear, any recommendation on this unit is deferred.

recommended to Provost Ballard that the I.Ph.D. program undergo a thorough review. The Provost wrote the committee on April 7, 2004, and requested the RFVC committee conduct a thorough review of the I.Ph.D. program. Since it was late in the Winter semester, the committee determined that their review would commence in the Fall semester of 2004, with the intent of providing recommendations no later than the end of the 2004-2005 academic year.

## VIII. **Data Integrity Issues and Plans Implemented**

As made apparent by the early Resources For Our Vision Committee (RFVC) work in the fall of 2003, UMKC does not have in place systematized processes to ensure that key university academic data are accurate. In turn, internal management reporting and analysis, as well as UM System analysis based on these data, were often viewed as suspect, and in many cases was in fact wrong.

### 1. Committee Activities on Data Integrity

#### A. Enrollment Data Clean-up

Through the committee's review of degree programs a great number of errors were detected in the degree program tables. These errors contributed to enrollment figure problems where data entry mistakes could potentially place students in programs that are not active, and were therefore not being counted in the area they are studying. These internal errors were corrected in UMKC's student information system, as noted in Section V.3. It is expected that the Provost will formally initiate status changes and degree program recommendations with the Department of Higher Education, through the University of Missouri System, by the end of July 2004

As a further step toward ensuring correct data, the Provost Office has worked with the Registrar's Office to implement a procedure where all students will be e-mailed information at the beginning of each term that indicates their declared major status, along with procedures to update this information. It is anticipated that doing this over time will make this more current, versus today's situation where many students indicate their intended major during the graduation application process.

#### B. Course Level Data

This year, course jurisdiction data were shared with every unit for review, and all responses identified mistakes to these codings.

While in the past these codings had little impact on internal processing or analysis, the underlying logic used in the Delaware Study submission identified the fact that many courses actually being offered as on-campus courses were incorrectly coded, and thus excluded from cost per credit hour calculations.

The Registrar's Office attributes much of these errors to the fact that the process for establishing a new term in the Student Information System simply copies from year to

year without being reviewed for any changes. Implementation of PeopleSoft is likely to improve this situation, but until that time, this review process will continue to be used to improve the accuracy of the data.

#### C. Workload and Instructor of Record

The committee's review identified a number of issues where course section data was not associated with the correct instructor, or the instructor of record data was missing entirely.

Based on this finding, draft workload reports were recently distributed to the academic units highlighting this problem. These reports identified inconsistencies and problems in the data, and the unit reviews identified other problems that could be remedied administratively. In the future, these reports will be sent to the units with time allowed for them to make their edits before the 20<sup>th</sup> day freeze. This will likely occur during the first week of class.

Additionally, based on committee findings, the Provost Office has committed to working with the Registrar's Office to ensure that all course sections have an identified instructor of record. Jointly, the offices will work with the academic units to ensure this is the case prior to the census file freezes on the 20<sup>th</sup> day.

#### D. Finance Data

Committee review of the Delaware Cost Study data for the units undergoing program viability audit identified a number of errors and processing problems associated with finance data.

In cooperation with staff from Finance and Administration, the university began a comprehensive clean up of the Program Classification Codes (PCS) in the course of the budget development cycle for FY 2005. These codes were found to be a primary determinant of whether or not expenditures are considered to be instructional or not. Because these had not been used in previous analysis they had not been edited in some time. This clean-up is expected to be completed prior to the launch of next fiscal year's budget.

Additionally, through this review and discussion with the academic units, the group identified edits to the chart of accounts that would help to better organize expenditures and/or to create tracking categories where previously none existed. For example, some units may not have had a fund to track continuing education expenditures in a sub-department.

#### E. HR Data

The committee's review revealed that there is not a standardized process for the review of personnel funding to ensure that payroll data fed to the finance system accurately

reflects the activity of personnel. The Provost's staff is working to incorporate this process into ongoing activities and an initial round of edits is waiting on the completion of the PCS code clean-up (see above).

## 2. Committee Recommendations on Data Integrity

Although only an initial effort, the work of the RFVC this year identified a number of focus areas that require ongoing attention and review in order to support management. The committee recommends that the Provost take steps to institutionalize these procedures through the formation of a Data Integrity Committee that will oversee an Academic Data Integrity Plan for the university.

The purpose of this committee is to promote shared accountability among key university constituents who are responsible for the use, production, data entry, and analysis of university data. This plan should be designed to recognize that there is no single accountable person or office, but that multiple administrative offices share this responsibility with the academic units.

The work of the RFVC lays the framework for the plan and the development and ongoing review of systematized processes that verify the accuracy of and allow for corrections to official university data. The plan should be administered by the Provost, and should rely upon a collaborative team representing key administrative offices and representatives. Some offices that should be involved include the following:

- Academic Affairs
- Academic Personnel
- Accounting
- Admissions
- Budget
- Cashiers
- Human Resources
- Institutional Research
- Records and Registration
- Sponsored Research

The committee recommends that the Provost charge this committee with the following responsibilities:

- Defining processes and procedures to review and edit data;
- Identifying data integrity issues; and
- Implementing steps or procedures to address issues.

The committee further recommends to the Provost that this committee, once formed, should submit a proposed Data Integrity Plan to the Provost and the RFVC for review and adoption.

Although by no means complete, the committee proposes a sample of elements that should be contained in the plan organized by activity/review time. This proposed sequence of events and activities is based on what the committee has learned through the course of the year

investigating a number of data related problems and issues. These data review activities are presented in Appendix H, Proposed Data Integrity Plan. Each academic unit should identify a primary contact person(s) to support the work of the committee.

Once developed, this plan is to be reviewed at least annually by the Data Integrity Committee. It should be noted, however, that it is highly likely that in the first years of implementation the plan will be updated each term as the committee continues to learn from experience, as well as dealing with issues brought about by the continued implementation of the PeopleSoft system.

### 3. Committee Recommendations on Annual Review of Data

It was apparent early on to the committee that the existing five-year time frame for Council on Program Evaluation (COPE) review was insufficient to support timely and proactive measures to identify program issues and ensure program effectiveness and efficiency.

Therefore, the committee recommends an annual review of pertinent data elements that will assist and inform the committee on the full range of degree and certificate program data, and aggregated academic unit data. Appendix G, Proposed Elements for Annual Data Review—Program Assessment Matrix, provides an extensive matrix of data elements to be assembled by central staff in conjunction with the academic units for review and analysis by future committees. This dataset should be produced annually and presented to the committee no later than November 15<sup>th</sup> of each academic year, reflecting data for the previously completed academic year.

The committee believes that this process, over time, will add an additional dimension to the review of academic units, as well as individual degree and certificate programs, which will support the planning activities of Academic Affairs and the individual academic units. Additionally, the success of this annual review will depend largely on improved data accuracy, and is a major reason supporting the committee's recommendations regarding formation of a standing data integrity committee and plan.

### 4. Academic Unit Benchmarks for Specific Professional Schools

The committee recognized the difficulties presented by the use of clinical instruction and the unique organization and funding of School of Medicine faculty. Due to these difficulties, there was only limited data available for the committee to review, and similarly the School of Dentistry and the School of Medicine did not participate in the Delaware Cost of Instruction Study.

Therefore, the committee worked through the Deans of the School of Dentistry and the School of Medicine to identify comparative data that will be reviewed by the committee on an annual basis, that will complement elements of the Annual Data Review Matrix, found in Appendix G, and in some cases entirely replace that data. In most cases these data are made available through professional associations of the field.

## 1) School of Medicine

- Passage rate on national board exams
- State appropriation per Basic Science Faculty and Clinical Faculty (separately)
- State appropriation per Student
- Research Funding

As suggested by the dean, the committee recommends comparison of these benchmarks against figures available for the School of Medicine's community-oriented peer comparator group and NEOUCOM, and against those of the School of Medicine at MU in Columbia. For comparison of research funding, the committee concurs with the Dean and recommends comparison against the community-oriented peer group as well as the institutions participating in the Delaware Cost of Instruction Study that have medical schools.

## 2) School of Dentistry

- Passage rate on national board exams
- State appropriation per faculty
- State appropriation per student (DDSE undergraduate equivalent)
- Total expenditures per DDSE undergraduate equivalent (excluding research expenditures)
- Research funding per fiscal year compared with other dental schools

## IX. **The Future of the RFVC**

The Resources For Our Vision Committee's nearly yearlong work has identified the continued need for an oversight body concerned with program evaluation, and has revealed several issues that will require further study. These issues include:

1. The last five-year cycle of reviews by the Council on Program Evaluation have not produced sufficient information to support planning and budgeting in Academic Affairs;
2. Historically, the Provost has had no support to systematically follow-up on recommendations made through program evaluation, accrediting bodies, or internal task forces;
3. There is no comprehensive, coherent process for program evaluation at UMKC; potentially useful assessment results are rarely aggregated and analyzed;
4. There needs to be further consideration given to the role and relationship of external accreditation to internal evaluation mechanisms;
5. Other evaluation systems are emerging that have the potential to further fragment the evaluation process (e.g. the UM System's "Comprehensive Program Assessment") unless strong oversight and guidance is provided. Since the Comprehensive Program

Assessment initiative is a COPE-alternative, the future RFVC will play a central role in this process.

Additionally, UMKC has attempted several disparate and methodologically varied program evaluation and assessment functions in the current year. These include various applications of the Dean's Criteria for resource allocation purposes, and the identification of programs of national prominence in accordance with the institutional Goal #2. The Budgeting for Excellence team is currently formulating plans for assessment of programmatic and academic unit quality to guide central funding allocation.

Based on our experience this year, it is apparent to the committee that there is no one straightforward method to accomplish this task and the issues involved are numerous. Having said that, it is also clear that to support varied institutional needs, Academic Affairs must provide leadership in the area of program evaluation, and should ensure that there are consistent and methodologically sound mechanisms and procedures in place. The committee recommends that accreditation reviews be substituted for COPE reviews wherever possible, and it strongly recommends that there be a single UMKC oversight committee whose intended purpose is to promote consistency and continuity of program evaluation activities, and to support the planning efforts of the Provost.

In order to address these issues and concerns, and to further develop, refine, and implement an evaluation system that will provide:

- annual assessment of progress toward academic unit goals,
- internal and external comparisons, and
- analysis of trends,

the committee recommends that the RFVC become a standing committee comprised of members of the RFVC and of the Council on Program Evaluation (COPE), and the Council on Program Evaluation should be eliminated. The RFVC committee should oversee the entire academic unit review function. The committee recommends that criteria for faculty and academic administrators continue to be based on:

- holding tenure in an academic department,
- significant scholarly accomplishment in both teaching and research,
- recognition both within and external to the university for his/her work, and
- some experience with program evaluation.

The committee should have oversight of all evaluation processes, and it should be led by the Provost. The committee should continue to refine the process of categorization to incorporate both priority and quality dimensions, as defined on page 18. Personnel in Academic Affairs should continue to provide staff support for the committee.

The committee should be of sufficient size to allow for adequate, yet reasonable, faculty involvement in the wide-range of program evaluation procedures. Each faculty member should be appointed for a term of service to be determined by the Provost. The RFVC recommends

that terms be staggered in order to preserve continuity of membership and process into the future.

### **Annual Committee Responsibilities**

- The committee, by September 30, 2004, should review institutional policies and procedures for regular program review, revise, if necessary, and approve the accreditation and evaluation calendar for the next full cycle.
- The committee should convene each September shortly after the beginning of the academic year and outline the agenda for the year. This agenda should include:
  - Identification of issues and responses to be submitted to the committee from academic units, as requested by the committee in previous academic years,
  - Approval of timelines for program responses scheduled for regularly scheduled program evaluation reviews,
  - Identification of issues and problems that the committee intends to address in the upcoming year.
- On an annual basis, the committee will review the standardized data elements for degree and certificate programs and academic units, as defined in the Measures Matrix found in Appendix G. This review should be completed each year by Thanksgiving.
- As responses are submitted to the committee from academic units on questions and/or issues raised, the committee is responsible for reviewing those submissions, making further requests if required, and ultimately making recommendations to the Provost on resolution of specific questions and/or issues.
- At the conclusion of each academic year, the committee should submit a summary report to the Provost. Although no standard template is recommended, the report should summarize committee recommendations submitted to the Provost, highlighting the intended outcome of each recommendation and the due date imposed in order to facilitate the planning of the next committee's agenda.

## *Appendix A*

### *Charge of the Committee*

#### **Committee Mandate**

Chancellor Gilliland has established a campus-wide committee to make recommendations to her to:

- Generate resources necessary to fuel our vision
- Ensure the success of our goals
- Focus our resources on priorities

The committee will be chaired by Frank Horton, Special Assistant to the Provost, and will be comprised of eight faculty, three deans, and one department chair.

The specific mandate of the committee will be to:

1. Evaluate and categorize all academic programs by unit, to be based on the six “Deans’ Criteria” and the relationship of each program to our 5 goals.
2. Complete a degree program inventory of all degree programs by academic unit. The goal is to identify those degree programs with insufficient students, insufficient demand, or insufficient quality, and recommend which degrees should be eliminated.
3. Complete viability audits consistent with System Directives (December 16, 2002) for the following programs: ULAPSIE (School of Education), Physics, Political Science, and Sociology.

#### **Products**

The Committee on RESOURCES FOR OUR VISION should submit a report to the Provost and Chancellor by June 1, 2004 addressing the three mandates above. While the report format is open to recommendations from the Committee, it must include:

- A rank ordering of academic departments and/or divisions by academic unit, with recommendations on the programs that are least central to our vision, values, and goals (mandate #1);
- Recommendations for each department or division under Viability Audit. Recommendations must include either: (A) a clear plan so that the unit will become clearly viable and the expected date by which that will happen; or (B) a plan for program merger, discontinuance, or elimination;
- A list of degree programs to be eliminated; and
- Recommendations for incentives that will improve the productivity and efficiency of our academic programs, emphasizing inter-disciplinary programs, alliances with other institutions, and departmental mergers and consolidations.

## *Appendix B*

### *RFVC Meeting Schedule and Summary*

The Resources For Our Vision Committee met a total of 21 times from September 2003 to June 2004. Below are summaries of these meetings. Full meeting minutes follow the summaries.

#### September 9, 2003

Provost gave charge. Four categories identified for evaluating programs. Criteria discussed. Viability Study outline to be drafted. Determine if more data needs to be collected. Go through Deans with all requests to units.

#### September 17, 2003

Institutional Research personnel from System and UMKC were invited for input. Update on System reporting strategies given. The Delaware data was discussed in depth. System data reflect data given by units – units will review data for accuracy before final input in future. Minutes and meeting dates will be posted on committee website for open communication. Observers welcome.

#### October 7, 2003

Viability Audit outline draft finalized. COPE comparison reviewed. Dr. Fred Lee presented unofficial study he conducted on College of Arts & Sciences to show more in-depth analysis. Data discussed again. Institutional Research requested to send 2004 data to units before submitting to System. Dr. James Durig presented Student Credit Hour analysis showing collaborative departments for degree participants. Steve Graham, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at UM System, began joining meetings by phone.

#### October 23, 2003

Data was discussed further – what we need and what’s missing. There are many variables that are simply not tracked. A list of possible programs for review was compiled from a matrix of number of graduates per program. It was requested to show number of declared majors for each program. Institutional Research joined meeting to update on data submission status: ’00 and ’01 data to be forwarded to units; ’04 enrollment data frozen; ’04 expense data to units to review for needed changes.

#### November 6, 2003

Degree Productivity and Student Headcount numbers reviewed. Actual data count by units vs. 20 day in capture by System was discussed. This is a problem. Committee will request units to review data for validity and contact Admissions to correct. Draft Survey of Degree and Certificate Programs reviewed briefly. Faculty Senate Open Faculty Meeting notes reviewed. Criteria options discussed. Different in this committee’s work and the Goal #2 Team’s work was discussed.

#### November 14, 2003

Request went out to Deans to review data for validity and contact Admissions to correct. Survey of Degree and Certificate Programs reviewed and finalized. Survey will go out only to programs with few graduates, and with certain questions tailored to the data. Criteria options discussed and five criteria identified.

#### December 3, 2003

Listing of Major Academic Units and Sub-Units was reviewed. Purpose of this list is to have a basis to apply the criteria. Comparative data for Medicine and Dentistry was reviewed – working with these schools to identify appropriate comp data. Criteria for priority programs was reviewed and revised.

#### December 16, 2003

Declared Majors data being collected. Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program questioned as to if we should and how we should survey. Reviewed Degree Productivity and Student Headcount spreadsheets and determined which programs to send survey and applicable questions to. Trend lines in the data were discussed. Request made for ability to correct old data that's incorrect in System – System will check into this.

#### January 14, 2004

Steve Graham of UM System joined in person. They are working on changes to data prior to freeze and comp data other than Delaware. Data accuracy discussed again. Low Enrollment/Low Graduation Rate Survey finalized. Criteria for categorization of academic units approved.

#### January 27, 2004

Student Credit Hour data will be run at conclusion of each term and sent to units with contact for correction of discrepancies. PCS codes must be cleaned up with units on HR data. Count and credit for students in Master's and Certificate programs, and Interdisciplinary Ph.D. students with co-disciplines, was discussed (students only get counted in one). Comparator groups discussed again. Recommendation to Provost regarding Interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs being evaluated by Ph.D. Program Executive Committee approved. Discussion of how to approach ranking of programs using all criteria and data begun.

#### February 5, 2004

Quorum not present due to weather. Reviewed measures for School of Medicine. Medicine comparators discussed. Comparators chosen and measure approved for School of Medicine. School of Dentistry comp data reviewed. Urban 13 school listing suggested as good comparator group to use overall.

#### February 24, 2004

School of Medicine measures were reviewed by the quorum. Add peer institution accreditation data to measures. Same measures will be applied to School of Dentistry. Recommended programs for elimination were reviewed and discussed.

#### March 16, 2004

The draft letter to the Provost of various committee recommendations reviewed. Inactive degrees need to be reviewed. Letters to Deans with various requests still pending. Low Enrollment/Low Graduation Rate responses reviewed, discussed, and recommendations made. Math Committee Final Report synopsis given.

#### March 30, 2004

Sociology Viability Study reviewed. Recommend program is solid and should continue. Format of responses questioned. Chair will request Deans ensure outline is followed. Political Science Viability

Study reviewed. Recommend Dean work with Departments of Sociology, History and Political Science to draw on courses from each department to collaboratively reduce costs and maintain quality. Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program brought up again. Physics Viability Study reviewed. Recommend Dean negotiate merger of Physics and Mathematics & Statistics Departments to reduce costs and further life sciences.

#### April 13, 2004

Overview of COPE Review Process. Update on actions taken on data issues identified by this committee, including Enrollment Data Cleanup, Course Level Data, Workload and Instructor of Record, Finance Data, HR Data, and Ongoing Data Cleanup. First draft of Final Report outline reviewed and changes in structure recommended. Categorization of Academic Units discussed. Definition still under dissension.

#### April 27, 2004

ULAPSIE Viability Report issues discussed with ULAPSIE Director (full report to be reviewed at next meeting). Review of response letter from Dean of College of Arts & Sciences regarding Political Science, Sociology and Physics recommendations. Dean will be invited to next meeting to address Physics recommendation. Revised Final Report outline reviewed, more changes made to structure. Dean's Criteria Matrix handed out for review and discussion at next meeting. Categorization of Academic Units spreadsheet and coding page reviewed to ensure understanding of rating procedures. Committee to submit finished rating sheets prior to next meeting.

#### May 4, 2004

Three Categorization rating sheets still pending – analysis to be completed when those are received. Review of the ULAPSIE report and SOE Dean's cover letter, which outlines four key issues. The Acting Chair responded to the committee's inquiries. Discussion regarding the environment within the School of Education in relation to the uncertainty of what form and structure the proposed Institute for Urban Education will take. This committee can recommend the planning to strengthen programs, the administration must determine resource availability and ultimate structure. Recommendations on ULAPSIE were outlined for draft letter to Provost. Sections of Final Report to be sent to committee for review as they are completed.

#### May 6, 2004

The Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences attended this meeting to address questions on his response to the proposed recommendations to the Provost regarding the Department of Physics. Discussion regarding pros and cons of merging the Departments of Physics and Mathematics & Statistics. The committee agreed with the Dean that a merger would not benefit the Math Department, as it is already moving forward with the recommendations from the Math Committee's Final Report. The committee withdrew its recommendation for a merger of the two departments, and will recommend instead that the Department of Physics undertake a set of activities and develop a definitive plan for moving toward emphasis in the life sciences. The draft of the ULAPSIE letter to the Provost was reviewed and finalized. The Matrix and Categorization of Programs results were reviewed and revisions suggested. Priority, Sound, Priority or Sound with Potential Problems, and Program Review Candidates were defined.

May 25, 2004

COPE is nearing the end of a cycle – this is a good time to make changes in structure, as there will be no outstanding reviews. Suggestion to change “Priority” category to “Priority with Excellent Performance” led to a discussion regarding reviewing of quality of programs. Since committee has not done this, it was determined that the future RFVC will undertake this endeavor, and will design a process for determining the level of performance and create categories of quality. The RFVC will need to have a different name, which can be determined in the future. Draft of entire report will be sent to committee members to provide feedback no later than June 7<sup>th</sup>.

June 8, 2004

Changes were made to the ULAPSIE Addendum and to the Final Report, after which the committee adopted the Final Report as finalized. The letters to the Provost and to Lehmkuhle were pronounced finalized.

## *Appendix E*

### *Letter to Provost on Recommendations*

June 15, 2004

William P. Osborne  
Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Dear Bill,

In accordance with our charge, the RFVC committee has completed the work assigned for academic year 2003-2004. Please find the committee's Annual Report attached. Additionally, Vice President Lehmkuhle has requested a copy of the Annual Report of the committee's activities by July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2004. I have made plans to transmit the attached report through the Chancellor's office to comply with this deadline.

#### Program Viability Studies

This year, the committee defined the parameters of the program viability audit, as outlined on pages 6-7 of the report. Following that work, the committee communicated this outline to the affected units through their respective Deans. The committee received and reviewed the Viability Audits completed by the four units identified. Specific comments and recommendations on these programs may be found as follows:

- Department of Physics, page 7
- Department of Political Science, page 8
- Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology, page 8
- Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education (ULAPSIE), pages 8-9

A copy of each academic unit's Viability Audit may be found in Appendix C.

A separate committee reviewed the Department of Mathematics and Statistics concurrently, and this report was submitted to the Provost in February 2004. Summary comments on that work and the Final Report of that committee may be found on page 9 and Appendix D, respectively.

#### Review of Degree and Certificate Programs

The committee also reviewed all degree and certificate programs offered by UMKC. Programs that appeared to show declining enrollments and/or low numbers of graduates were selected by the committee for further examination. The committee communicated questions and requests for data through the Dean of the respective units, and based on this information made a number of recommendations that warrant continued follow-up by the RFVC.

A more detailed description of this review process may be found on pages 10-11, and specific recommendations and issues begin on pages 11-13.

Through this review a number of degree programs were identified as currently inactive or closed. Additionally, several units identified degree or certificate programs that would close. It is expected that the Provost will formally initiate status changes and degree program recommendations with the Department of Higher Education, through the University of Missouri System, by the end of July 2004.

### Unit Categorizations

The committee worked with the academic Deans to identify academic units to be used in a unit categorization process. This listing is provided on pages 14-15. The committee applied an assessment of each unit's correspondence to the six "Dean's Criteria" and an overall ranking to facilitate and guide discussion of program categorization. The results of this effort may be found in the Final Report on pages 16-17.

### Future Program Review

Section VII of the report summarizes committee recommendations regarding other academic units that should undergo a program review in the near future. These units are listed on page 17.

### Data Integrity

The committee devoted a considerable amount of time grappling with the complexities and problems found with internal data and processes. Through the course of our discussions it became apparent that procedures were required to share data proactively with the units in order to improve the quality of data available for internal management analysis and reporting, as well as to facilitate understanding of the procedures used to collect these data.

Recommendations on a detailed plan for review of institutional data are discussed and presented in Section VIII, on pages 20-22.

### The Future of the Committee

Based on our experience this year, it is apparent that program evaluation is an important step in ensuring academic quality, but it is also clear that program evaluation is evolving and complex. Academic Affairs must provide leadership in the area of program evaluation, and should ensure that there are consistent and methodologically sound mechanisms and procedures in place. Although the committee does not recommend a single approach for all academic units, it does strongly recommend that the RFVC, including the Council on Program Evaluation (COPE), become a standing committee with responsibility for academic unit and degree and certificate program oversight.

Recommendations regarding the committee may be found in Section IX, on pages 22-24.

Should you have any questions regarding the committee's recommendations, I would be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

Frank E. Horton  
Chair, Resources For Our Vision Committee

cc: Academic Deans  
RFVC Committee  
Russ Wilson

*Appendix F:*

***Proposed Elements for Annual Data Review  
Program Assessment Matrix***

Measure	Description/Status
<b>Centrality to UMKC's Mission, Vision, and Values</b>	
Mission Alignment Ranking	Due to the highly subjective nature of this assessment, perhaps a representative body of the university could assess the extent to which the unit aligned with the university's goals. Then the committee could incorporate these.
<b>Quality of the Program (as measured by the 5 goal measures)</b>	
Learning Goals and Assessment Plans in Place <sup>1</sup>	Extent to which the program and unit have established, validated, designed assessment procedures, and incorporate these into curricular management and planning; progress varies considerably by unit
Results of Learning Outcomes Assessment <sup>1</sup>	Extent to which students perform on multiple indicators assessing student learning outcomes; not available in each discipline/major; unclear how available this is across institution
Standardized Test Passage Rates <sup>1</sup>	Rates at which students pass discipline specific certification exams; not available in each discipline/major
Employer Surveys <sup>1</sup>	Aggregated assessment, as reported by the current employer of program graduates, of the preparation of students (One year after graduation). Administered centrally or standard items included in unit survey (i.e. SOE). "How do UMKC graduates compare to employees from other institutions?"
Alumni Surveys <sup>1</sup>	Aggregated assessment, as reported by the graduate, of the preparation he/she received for graduate school and/or current employment. Administered centrally or standard items included in unit survey (i.e. SOE). "Upon reflection.....How would you rate the quality of the education you received at UMKC?" "If you had it to do over again, would you choose to attend UMKC?"
Senior Surveys	Level of satisfaction with the Quality of Instruction in the classroom; applicable to undergraduates (could include for graduate follow-up)
National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE)	Level of satisfaction with the UMKC experience, as reported by current students
External Accreditation	National bodies determine conformity to national standards and often assess specific areas of quality and/or deficiencies
National Rankings	Potential sources include national magazines, as well as discipline/professional specific bodies
Faculty Teaching (Regular)	Percent of credit hours taught by regular appointment faculty (by level)

Faculty Teaching (Non-Regular)	Percent of credit hours taught by non-regular appointment faculty (by level)
Faculty Activity Reports	At present, the Dean's have paper Faculty Activity Reports available. In the future, the Faculty Accomplishment System (FAS) will permit role-up reporting of activity. Dean's could potentially assess the work of the faculty and provide input.
Teaching Evaluations	Aggregated scores by unit; at present there is not a universal instrument administered
Research Expenditures	Variance by discipline/field creates issues. Dean's could potentially assess this within college/school numbers to add a qualitative dimension to address disciplinary differences and to address the "impact" of the work.
Public Service Expenditures	Variance by discipline/field creates issues. Dean's could potentially assess this within college/school to add a qualitative dimension to address disciplinary differences and to address the "impact" of the work.
External Evaluation of Faculty	Periodic assessment of unit (currently COPE potentially in the future "Complete Program Assessment") could call for external evaluation of faculty quality by disciplinary expert. External accreditation may/may not address this.
Faculty / Staff Satisfaction	% of employees from unit that report enjoying working at UMKC, as indicated by a rating of 4 or higher on the workplace survey
Diversity	5-year student and employee diversity patterns

### **Importance to the Community**

Relevance to Workforce Trends <sup>1</sup>	What is the employment outlook for graduates in the Metro area, as well as nationally?
Offerings in the Metro Area <sup>1</sup>	Is the program unique to the KC area? If so, how and to what extent?
Survey of KC Area Employers and Community	"What programs are of most importance to you as an area employer/community member/civic leader?"
Alumni Surveys <sup>1</sup>	What proportion of alumni are employed in the KC area?

### **Efficiency**

Student Majors <sup>1</sup>	5-year enrollment patterns, headcount (by degree & emphasis area)
Degree Production <sup>1</sup>	5-year enrollment patterns (by degree & emphasis area)

Average Class Size	Average class size in relation to other programs in the unit and the institutional average
Cost of Instruction	Total Instructional Costs per On-campus SCH generated
Fundraising	Amount of external funding (non-research or service) generated; applicability varies by unit
Students Per Faculty <sup>1</sup>	SCH (unit-wide) / Faculty
Students Per Faculty <sup>1</sup>	FTE Students Taught (unit-wide) / Faculty
Revenue Generation	Earned Income (SCH) / Direct Instructional Expense
Annual Finacial Outlook	Did the unit operate in the positive last fiscal year? especially applicable to centers and institutes.
Evaluation of Faculty Time Commitment <sup>1</sup>	Dean's assessment of the commitment of faculty time and resources against product; especially applicable to centers and institutes

**Centrality to Student Success (*these likely need to be revised to reflect intent of measure*)**

Standardized Test Passage Rates <sup>1</sup>	Rates at which students pass discipline specific certification exams; not available in each discipline/major
Retention <sup>1</sup>	Cohort based tracking within programs
Graduation Rates <sup>1</sup>	6-year graduation rates (or other time frame appropriate for the program i.e. Dentistry, Law)
National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE)	Student evaluations of faculty interaction, instructional activities, opportunities for involvement on campus, etc..
Learning Goals and Assessment Plans in Place <sup>1</sup>	Extent to which the program and unit have established, validated, designed assessment procedures, and incorporate these into curricular management and planning
Results of Learning Outcomes Assessment <sup>1</sup>	Extent to which students perform on multiple indicators assessing student learning outcomes; not available in each discipline/major; unclear how available this is across institution

**Builds Campus Partnerships**

Extent of Service Teaching	Percent of SCH Taught as Service
----------------------------	----------------------------------

Joint Degree and/or curricular offerings

Simply identifying cross listed courses is not the same as providing evidence of collaboration within and among units to produce tangible results

Outcomes of Partnerships

Outcomes and/or results of partnerships. For example, having a “partnership” with Jackson County Social Services is not the same as 14 of 21 M.S.W. students interned with Jackson Co. Social Services.

Fundraising

\$ amount of fundraising

Service to the Community

Must define

## *Appendix G:*

### *Proposed Data Integrity Plan*

Note: The following template is a proposed framework for on-going data review. Several of the items listed here are not yet adequately defined or may not have the necessary supporting procedures in place to be effective. Additional detail and refinements will be made by the Data Integrity Committee during the summer months of 2004, and a finalized proposal will be reviewed by the RFVC during the Fall 2004 semester.

#### Plan Components

There are numerous ways to display the activities necessary to support institutional data integrity. For these purposes, however, a periodic presentation is selected as data integrity is a continuous process that must be maintained continuously.

The following summarizes the timeframes, action steps, and responsible parties for identified data integrity processes.

#### *Daily and Weekly*

Each office is responsible for maintaining its own inventory of daily and weekly procedures and data edits. On an annual basis, and as needed, the Data Integrity Committee will review each inventory to examine the need for updates and/or modifications.

#### *Monthly*

	Timeframe	Action	Responsible Party
1.		Monthly summary of expenditures	
2.		Labor distribution report	HR/Finance
3.		Review of Faculty Data Elements for all new hires during period	Academic Affairs

#### *Quarterly*

	Timeframe	Action	Responsible Party
1.		Quarterly summary of expenditures	

#### *Each Semester*

	Timeframe	Action	Responsible Party
1.	Prior to Registration for a term	Send units report to verify the course jurisdiction	Records and Registration
2.	Two weeks prior to start of classes	Send units roster of all sections missing a valid instructor of record	Records and Registration
3.	First day of class	Send declared major e-mail to all enrolled undergrads	Records and Registration
4.	First week of class	Send out preliminary workload	Provost/Institutional

5.	10 <sup>th</sup> day of term	analysis Send units roster of all sections missing a valid instructor of record	Research Provost/Records and Registration
6.	15 <sup>th</sup> day of term	Send units roster of all sections missing a valid instructor of record	Chancellor/Records and Registration
7.	Start of term – 20 <sup>th</sup> day	Extract Edit Scripts	Institutional Research/Records and Registration
8.	After 20 <sup>th</sup> day	Distribute summary report of SCH by academic unit	Institutional Research
9.	Two weeks after start of class	Review all Faculty Data Elements	Academic Affairs

*Fiscal Year End (June or July)*

	Timeframe	Action	Responsible Party
1.	While transfers can still be processed	Distribute summary report of expenditures by classification for each academic unit	

*Annually*

	Timeframe	Action	Responsible Party
1.	October	Send units report of courses not offered in 4 years	Provost/Records and Registration
2.	For application printing	Comprehensive review of the degree program inventory	Provost/Records and Registration/Admissions
3.	Pre Budget Dev	Review PCS coding schemes and Chart of Account needs	Accounting/Budget
4.	September	Distribute Summary HR report for validation	
5.	September (FY close out)	Update Academic Unit Profiles	Academic Planning