<div align="center">

MINUTES
LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

November 7, 1996

</div>

The University of Southern Indiana Board of Trustees Long Range Planning Committee met on Thursday, November 7, 1996, in Room 100 of the Wright Administration Building. Present were Trustees Bruce Baker, Louise Bruce, Nicole Cable, Thomas McKenna and Harolyn Torain. Also attending were Vice Presidents John Byrd, Robert Reid and Sherrianne Standley, and Pat Swanson from The Press.

There being a quorum present, Mrs. Torain called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Mr. Reid distributed Academic Affairs Program Review Schedule (Attachment I) and Program Review Recommendations (Attachment II). The Commission for Higher Education has asked that each institution submit a review of its academic programs. USI recently completed a full review that was part of the North Central self study. To make certain that we are on a time table, North Central suggested to review the programs over a ten year period. USI will begin to look at the program once every five years. Much of the data needed will be gathered by the Office of Institute Research.

The Academic Planning Council created a Sub-Committee chaired by Jerome Cain, School of Science and Engineering. The Sub-Committee prepared a set of recommendations to provide a format for the program review. For the 1996-1997 school year, the Dental Assisting and Dental Hygiene programs, as well as, School of Business will be reviewed.

USI feels the review of its academic programs is a valuable experience for faculty. The review is a good opportunity for deans and others to be familiar with programs outside their areas. This review will also take a look at the work force for graduates. It was suggested that USI keep track of the number of alumni who are able to find employment and also track salary leads.

Mrs. Standley commented on the Boards Division Capital Campaign Kickoff dinner on November 6, 1996. She reported to the Committee that the Capital Campaign solicitation has begun with the two divisions, Faculty/Staff and Boards Division (includes Board of Trustees and Foundation Board of Directors). The volunteer Captains, Vice Chairs and Prospects will solicit no more than five people for pledges. Before the volunteers begin soliciting, they are expected to make a campaign pledge. To date, there are 151 volunteers who have made their pledge. We will then start calling next on the Academic Affairs and Administrative sides. Mrs. Standley is very proud of the employees that took the initiative to participate in the campaign. The Campaign Committee is aware of the difficulties some employees may have with giving a pledge due to their personal budget.

The gift levels of the Boards Division were explained. The gift levels are split into leadership, major and special.

The goal is to have pledges of the two divisions completed by the end of December with cleanup in January. Then the external divisions, Alumni and Friends, would begin. We do not have volunteers for the two chairs yet. We will have 12,000 people to solicit in the Alumni Division. The Friends Division consists of corporations, companies and businesses.

The total goal of the Capital Campaign is 10.5 million. It was noted that 4.5 million is ongoing and our objective is to raise 6 million.

The Committee reviewed the Capital Campaign video.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

AGENDA
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA
Board of Trustees Long Range Planning Committee

November 7, 1996

I.   ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PROGRAM REVIEW PLANNING

II.   CAPITAL CAMPAIGN UPDATE

III.   REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR ARCHITECTURAL AND
        ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR STUDENT HOUSING PLANNING AND SELECTION OF ARCHITECTURAL
        FIRMS FOR INTERVIEWS

PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE

1995-96

All Academic Programs (North Central Association Self-Study)

1996-97 (Also 2001-2002)

Accounting
Business Administration (MBA & BBA)
Business Education
Computer Information Systems
Economics
Finance
Management
Marketing
Office Information Systems
Mathematics
Communications
Philosophy
Psychology
Dental Assisting
Dental Hygiene
MSW (Social Work)

1997-98 (Also 2002-2003)

Health Services
English
History
Chemistry
Occupational and General Studies
University Division

Program Review Recommendations

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Program Review Group
Jerome Cain (Convener), Charles Harrington, Charles Petranek, C. Thomas
Pickering, Timothy Schibik, Richard Schmidt

1. That the Office of Institutional Research be charged with administrative coordination of the program review process.

2. That academic degree programs, rather than departments or other cost centers, be the units evaluated during program review.

3. That the information obtained for program reviews be sufficiently broad to permit meaningful, program-level assessment, but sufficiently limited in scope to minimize workloads for programs and their home departments.

4. That the information obtained for use in program reviews come from two sources: the programs themselves and a centralized database to be maintained by the Office of Institutional Research.

5. That programs under review provide their information through responses to a specific question set. A suggested list of questions is attached.

6. That the Office of Institutional Research establish the centralized database for all programs as soon as possible, update the database annually, and maintain the database continually. A suggested list of data items to include in the centralized database is attached.

7. That, at the time of program review, the Office of Institutional Research provide the programs being evaluated with the centralized database information for the preceding five years. In preparing their question responses, programs should refer to and cite, as necessary, the database information.

8. That all program review information collected be forwarded by the Dean of the School housing the program to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs should review this information, share and discuss it with the Academic Affairs Council, and prepare an overall University-level program analysis. The results of this analysis, which would include identification of program strengths, weaknesses, and areas in need of address, should be conveyed to the Dean of the School in which the program resides, for follow-up and address. In instances where serious program concerns are noted, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, at his/her discretion, may request an interim program report, to be prepared before the next regularly-scheduled program review period, to show progress made toward addressing the concerns.

9. That a linkage be established between program review and development of the University budget. Departments and Schools should include in their annual budget requests funds required to address concerns, implement plans, and/or

achieve goals identified during their program reviews. The University's standard budget request form, used by departments and Schools in describing their annual budget request priorities, should be modified to ask whether the particular budget item requested responds to the outcomes of program review. If yes, then the department/School should provide specific information about how the request so responds.

10. That, at some future date, consideration be given to incorporating surveys of program alumni, current students, and faculty into the program review process.

11. That, at some future date, consideration be given to including program cost data in the information obtained during program reviews.

Suggested Data Items to be Compiled Centrally for All Programs

Number of program majors
Number of program minors
Number of program graduates
Number of majors in department that houses program
Number of graduates in department that houses program
Number of credit hours generated by department that houses program
Percentage of program freshman cohort that graduates in 5 years.
Percentage of freshman cohort in department that houses program that graduates in 5 years.
Percentage of freshman cohort of University that graduates in 5 years (all majors combined)
Average SAT scores of program majors
Average University SAT scores (all majors combined)
Average GPA of program graduates
Average GPA of University graduates (all majors combined)
Average general assessment exam scores of program freshmen
Average general assessment exam scores of program juniors
Average University general assessment exam scores of freshmen
Average University general assessment exam scores of juniors
Average discipline-based assessment exam scores of program majors
Number of full-time faculty assigned to program
Number of part-time faculty assigned to program
Ratio of full- to part-time faculty assigned to program
Number of full-time faculty assigned to department that houses program
Number of part-time faculty assigned to department that houses program
Ratio of full- to part-time faculty assigned to department that houses program
Ratio of FTE program students to FTE program faculty
Ratio of FTE program faculty to FTE program support staff
Ratio of FTE students in University to FTE faculty in University
Number of credit hours taught per FTE program faculty member
Number of credit hours taught per FTE faculty member in department that houses program
Number of credit hours taught per FTE faculty member in University
Ratio of service course credit hours taught to majors course credit hours taught
Percentage of program credit hours taught by part-time faculty
Percentage of credit hours taught by part-time faculty in department that houses program
Information about individual program and departmental faculty
    name
    highest academic degree earned and year earned
    academic rank
    tenure status (i.e., tenured, tenure track, adjunct, etc.
    full- or part-time
    gender
    ethnicity
    number of years service at USI
    percentage of faculty load time devoted to program
Ratio of male to female program faculty
Ratio of tenured to non-tenured program faculty
Percentage of minority program faculty
Ratio of program faculty with terminal degrees to those without terminal degrees

Suggested Questions for Programs to Address in Reviews

1. Describe the program in terms of its educational goals (i.e. knowledge and skills it intends to convey to students), curricular structure, currency of content and pedagogy, and incorporation of modern technology. Explain how the curriculum leads to accomplishment of the educational goals.

2. Describe any contributions the program curriculum and faculty make to the University Core Curriculum or other academic degree programs in the University.

3. Discuss the program enrollment trends over the past five years and indicate whether any increases or decreases are anticipated during the next five years. As part of your answer, indicate how student demand for the program relates to the program's capacity to enroll students; (i.e., can the program accept more majors, or is enrollment limited because student demand exceeds program capacity?)

4. Describe the methods used to recruit, retain, and academically advise program majors.

5. Describe the assessment measures used to evaluate program effectiveness, and discuss the results obtained from these measures.

6. Provide collective information about noteworthy academic and career activities and accomplishments of program students and alumni.

7. Provide collective information about noteworthy professional activities and accomplishments of program faculty during the last five years. (NOTE: Only *collective* information should be reported; e.g., include the total number of scholarly books and research papers published by program faculty during the period in question. Do likewise with other types of faculty professional activities and accomplishments.)

8. Identify concerns raised about the program during its last program or accreditation review, the steps taken to address those concerns, and any progress made toward rectifying the concerns.

9. Describe major changes made, if any, to the program or its faculty during the last five years. Explain fully why the changes were made.

10. Describe major changes planned, if any, for the program or its faculty during the next five years. Explain fully why the planned changes are needed.

11. Indicate what new major resources, if any, the program received during the last five years and explain how those resources were used.

12. Indicate what new major resources, if any, the program requires during the next five years to address concerns, implement plans, and/or achieve goals. Justify fully why the new resources are needed.