# Academic Degree Program Audit

The ongoing vigor and distinctiveness of the university depend in some measure on our ability to review and discuss, in an objective, critical, and timely fashion, our existing programs, and based upon the outcome of such review to make sound decisions regarding the future allocation of our resources.

In a period of declining external funding for public higher education, planning for new programs and growth of existing programs must be accomplished by making informed decisions about funding replacement and resource reallocation. Such reallocation is best achieved through a process in which each program, including majors, is evaluated on a regular basis.

The proposed procedure, criteria, and sequence are designed to move us into an academic evaluation process that will take place on an ongoing basis using both qualitative and quantitative data that is guided by our commitment to excellence, distinctiveness, and opportunity. Every attempt will be made to coordinate academic program audit with other review processes.

## PROCEDURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair and Departmental Faculty</td>
<td>1. Using university-wide criteria and appropriate data, conduct internal evaluation of each degree program. The departmental input process should be used in a fashion appropriate to each department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Make a specific recommendation regarding whether or not a degree program should be expanded or maintained at the current level, or whether or not the degree program should be revised, consolidated with another program or programs, banked or discontinued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Forward the review materials, supporting documents, and final departmental recommendations to the dean of the college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research.
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4. In the case of graduate programs, also forward information copies to the graduate dean.

College Dean/Graduate Dean

5. Using, but not limited to, the same criteria and data, review the materials from the department and make a recommendation. The college input should be obtained in a fashion appropriate to each college.

6. Forward the recommendation and all support material from each level to the PAC.

Program Audit Committee

7. Forward information copies to the department and if appropriate, also to the graduate dean.

8. Using, but not limited to, the same criteria and data, review the departmental materials and make an independent recommendation.

9. If the PAC recommendation is that the program be discontinued then the procedures for Academic Degree Program Discontinuance are followed. Otherwise, forward the recommendation along with relevant supporting materials to the Provost and, in the case of graduate programs, to the graduate dean.

Provost

10. Forward information copies to the department.

11. Using, but not limited to, the same criteria and data and taking into account the recommendations at the various levels, the Provost will make a recommendation to the President’s Cabinet.

President’s Cabinet

12. The President’s Cabinet will make a recommendation to the President who recommends to BOT for ultimate decision.
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The Program Audit Committee consists of one faculty member from each college/school appointed by the Provost, the deans of each of the colleges and the school, and a student representative appointed by the president of the ASEWU. The Vice Provost for Academic Resources, Administration and Planning, the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Institutional Research will be ex-officio members of the committee and will serve as staff to the committee. The task of the committee is to review the materials and recommendations submitted by the department for accuracy and objectivity, to collect new information where appropriate, and to make an independent recommendation.

**GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM EVALUATION**

**QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT**

1. Data will be provided to department chairs in an appropriate format. These data will include:
   - five year comparative EWU data including:
     - FTES, FTEF and FTES/FTEF ratio for each program
     - # of undergraduate majors who have completed more than 90 total credits
     - # of active students for graduate programs
     - # of graduates for each undergraduate and graduate program
     - # of undergraduate graduates/# of majors for each program
     - # of credits required in the undergraduate major
     - # of credits required in the undergraduate degree
     - # of credits from outside the department included in the undergraduate major
     - Average class size for group instruction at the undergraduate and graduate level
     - Percentage of sections offered with enrollments smaller than 20 in undergraduate classes and smaller than 10 in graduate classes (excludes individualized instruction)
   - comparative data from CWU and WWU (provided to department)
   - comparative data from the EWU peer institutions outside of Washington where it is possible to obtain such information
   - accreditation criteria
   - total cost for educating a student (including non-instructional costs such as library allocations and services, department administrative costs apportioned to the degree program and costs of Information Technology support)
   - department administrative costs
   - job placement analysis and alumni surveys where possible (optional)

Arbitration will be used to settle questions raised concerning discrepancies between departmental data and the data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research. The Arbitrator will be appointed by the Provost.
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2. The final evaluation summary should be limited to a three- to four-page document per degree program evaluated.

PROCEDURE

Departments should review their five year data and compare it with comparable data from CWU and WWU and, when possible, with data from EWU peer institutions outside of Washington. Where program data and departmental data are not concurrent, department chairs will need to work with the Provost’s office to refine the data to the extent possible. (SIS recoding needs to be completed before data that reflects the current academic organization can be provided accurately.)

All programs will also provide a brief qualitative program assessment using the guide below.

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. What is the quality of the degree program? Assessment of quality should take into account the quality of the faculty, the value and distinctive character of the program and student performance. Use the end-of-program assessment reports as one measure of quality.

2. What is the centrality of the degree program to the mission of the college and the larger mission of the university? The congruence of the role and mission of the degree program with those of the college and university should be demonstrated.

3. How does the degree program meet regional needs now? Will it continue to meet these needs over the next five years?

4. What is the service value of the degree program to other units in the college? University? Community?

5. To what extent does the degree program duplicate or overlap with other degree programs in the university? Could it be made less costly yet retain its effectiveness by combination with other units?

6. If this degree program duplicated offerings of sister institutions, what are the reasons for offering it at EWU? Some possible reasons could be: unique features, geographic service area, and institutional mission.

---

2 Quality of faculty should be judged on the following criteria: Instructional effectiveness, scholarly activity and service. A brief faculty resume outline will be provided if needed.

3 Qualitative evaluation should be emphasized here. Some examples might be: co-curricular activities, which enhance program offerings and have helped the program meet accreditation requirements.

4 Current student placement records and employment demand studies will provide relevant data.
POSSIBLE MODELS FOR CONDUCTING THE INTERNAL EVALUATION

There are many models available for conducting the internal evaluation process. Two of these, somewhat adapted to EWU’s situation, are described briefly below. The desired outcome is to achieve a reasonable level of consensus with respect to the final recommendation.

1. After individual review of the materials, the department as a whole under the leadership of the department chair meets in a structured setting, which allows each individual to express his/her opinion. This is followed by a group discussion, which is focused on achieving a statement of consensus. Finally, independent voting takes place. The group decision is the mathematically pooled outcome of the individual votes.

2. An ad hoc committee evaluates the degree program(s) according to the established criteria. The evaluation materials are circulated for comment to all members of the department. The evaluation materials with all comments are brought to the total faculty for discussion. A statement of consensus is prepared, and independent voting takes place.