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Charge to Program Performance Committee

• Provide a framework (tools and process) by which programs can be evaluated from the perspective of delivering on the academic mission
  – Quantifiable metrics:
    ▪ Provide performance data of credits generated over time
    ▪ Provide program margin over time
    ▪ Provide data on employment potential (Burning Glass)
    ▪ Provide national education statistics data (IPEDS)
  – Qualifiable metrics:
    ▪ Non-tangible aspects such as reputation and service.
Intent for Program Performance Evaluation

• Deliver access to metrics via Prism dashboard for ease of review
  ─ Derived from Workday
  ─ Featured as dashboard in green / yellow / red indicators

• Foster a spirit of inquiry, innovation and continuous improvement where:
  ─ Metrics are determined and understood by leaders and community stakeholders
  ─ Programs are evaluated and performance is assessed
  ─ Resourcing strategies are determined
  ─ Next step plans are established
Process for Evaluation

- First year of Program Performance
  - Establish Baseline
  - Engage in Appreciative inquiry for Programs Evaluation
    - Discovery – What gives life?
    - Dream – What might be?
    - Design – How can it be?
    - Destiny – What will be?
  - Make assessment / recommendations based on evaluation.
Assess current status against N-1 Evaluation
- What is working
- What could be improved
- How does current status measure against prior recommendations

Determine next steps
- Develop specific plan for N+1
Performance Evaluation Should Answer

What is the evaluation of the program?  
- Growing?
- Steady state?
- Declining?

What is the evaluation conclusion based upon?  
- Enrollments?
- Industry or market drivers?

What is your recommendation for the program?  
- Increased investment?
- Continued investment?
- Re-deployment?
Expected Benefits

• Create a regular rhythm and cycle to assess program performance
  ─ August/September timeframe to be complete for budgeting in November

• Create a process by which programs are evaluated using accessible program performance data by program leaders / department heads

• To make it possible to evaluate programs objectively to achieve academic mission

• Provide data-informed input to the budgeting process