

## **UPDATE ACTION PROJECT**

### **Revitalizing and Improving Program Evaluation**

#### ***1. Describe the past year's accomplishments and the current status of this Action Project.***

Academic Year 2009-2010 was the second year for this two-year action project. Six programs were identified for completing the evaluation process [English, Mathematics, Director of Christian Education, Gerontology, Leadership (Masters of Arts only), and Business (undergraduate program only)]. The six programs represent all four colleges of the university. The individual departments submitted information about the mission, goals, and accreditation of their programs while the Registrar shared data on enrollments. The Controller of the university is developing a new model to more accurately reflect the expenses and revenues for each program. The Academic Cabinet (Senior Vice President for Academics, Assistant Vice President for Academics, and the Deans of each college) will review the program evaluations when the financial model is complete. Recommendations about the evaluated programs will be made to the Administrative Cabinet by the Sr. VP for Academics and discussions will take place about the recommendations with the appropriate department.

#### ***2. Describe how the institution involved people in work on this Action Project.***

Department chairs and program coordinators worked with their department faculty members and the Registrar to complete the program evaluation. The Controller developed the new financial model for the program evaluation. The Academic Cabinet will serve as the reviewers of the program evaluations.

#### ***3. Describe your planned next steps for this Action Project.***

Six new programs were chosen by the Academic Cabinet for review during 2010-11. From the College of Arts and Sciences, Music and Communication/Theatre/Art will be reviewed; from the College of Education the Undergraduate Special Education program and the application process for Professional Studies were chosen (an alternative approach will be developed to review the application process since this is not an academic program); and from the College of Graduate and Innovative Programs, Reading at the masters level and English Language Literacy – ELL bilingual will be reviewed. For the College of Business, the Masters of Business Administration (MBA) will be reviewed during 2011-12.

After this Action Project is reviewed the project will be retired although program evaluation will continue on a yearly basis. The Academic Cabinet will devise a review cycle for the programs. Also, a remediation process for programs that are not meeting their goals and objectives or consistently have low enrollments, will be developed.

At the completion of each program evaluation, an Executive Summary will be written and posted on the internal University web site (the Concordia Connect Portal). The summary will be available to all faculty, staff and students. Departments completing their program evaluations can review the summaries for guidance. Also the posted program evaluations give staff and faculty an opportunity to learn about the other department programs.

***4. Describe any “effective practice(s)” that resulted from your work on this Action Project.***

The improved process for academic program evaluation will provide more meaningful data useful in making decisions about the effectiveness and financial viability of current academic programs. This is also an opportunity for departments to communicate their goals and objectives to the university community. A new cost analysis model is being designed by the finance unit to compare revenue and expenses for each academic program. Valuable cooperation between units of the university (academic departments, the Registrar’s office, Finance, and Academic Cabinet) has been established.

***5. What challenges, if any, are you still facing in regards to this Action Project?***

A more timely process for using the new financial model to review university programs needs to be developed. The success of program evaluation will depend on appropriate turn-around time for implementing recommendations, the effectiveness of changes made, and communication about the program evaluation process to faculty and staff.