

## **Program Review – 2000**

### **Summary Description**

In February 2000, during his first year at Drake, President David Maxwell announced that Drake had launched “a year-long review process that will examine both academic and administrative programs. The initiative is part of a new long-range planning effort.” This program review was necessitated by existence of a planning vacuum during the previous dozen years and lack of any university-wide curricular approval process, resulting in a proliferation of academic programs and a relatively inefficient administrative structure.

The goals of the program review process were:

1. *To ensure the excellence of all University programs, and to ensure the ongoing availability of resources to guarantee their continued excellence.*
2. *To ensure that all programs are consistent with the core mission of Drake University.*
3. *To create a Fund for the Future that will provide resources to encourage and support creativity, innovation, and institutional transformation.*
4. *To ensure that Drake's resources fully address the University's priorities.*
5. *To ensure the efficient, responsible stewardship of the resources entrusted to the University in the form of tuition, gifts and grants.*
6. *To create and support an operating behavior that is strategic in nature and grounded in ongoing analysis of objective data and formative assessment practices.*
7. *To create a University structure that enables flexibility and agility in responding quickly and appropriately to changing conditions, and an operational culture that emphasizes responsiveness and service.*
8. *To ensure equity for faculty and staff across the University in workload, expectations, evaluation, and compensation.*
9. *To continue to balance the annual operating budget.*

This effort followed January campus presentations by Robert Dickeson who recently had published *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services* (Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1999). After his presentations, the Drake University Faculty Senate endorsed the idea of program review and designed the process to be used.

Academic and Administrative Program Review Steering Committees were appointed and charged with designing procedures for the review process. By early March both groups issued Guidelines for review and reports to their respective constituencies. These guidelines provided program definitions, laid out criteria for assessment, and provided templates for preparation of unit reports. For academic programs, essentiality, demand, quality, cost effectiveness and

opportunity were the criteria on which Deans were to prioritize programs. Administrative units addressed importance to Drake, external and internal demand, quality and cost effectiveness. [Guidelines for both review processes](#) were posted on the Drake University web site.

Deans and directors developed unit reports recommending for each program whether it should be enhanced, maintained, reduce and/or restructure, or possible elimination. A maximum of 20% of the programs could be recommended for enhancement, and a minimum of 20% were required to be identified for possible elimination.

In April 2000, Review and Priorities Planning Committee (RPAC) members, including faculty, staff and administrators were elected and appointed. The Academic RPAC reviewed and made recommendations concerning academic programs, and the Administrative RPAC reviewed all recommendations related to non-curricular and non-academic programs. These were submitted to the President's Advisory Committee, which reviewed all submitted documents and developed a set of recommendations.

In January 2001, President Maxwell issued [Program Review: Report of the President](#). The President's report prefaced final RPAC recommendations with discussion of "a set of external circumstances that are evolving at remarkable speed, presenting us with challenges that are both daunting and exciting" that confronted higher education nationally and Drake University in particular. Among the circumstances cited were dramatically shifting demographics, technology and access to knowledge, the cost of higher education, under-prepared students.

The 2000-01 Program Review resulted in elimination of several academic programs as well as reconfiguration of many service and administrative areas. These changes facilitated the University's efforts to regain financial stability and