

SEM Academic Programs and Deliveries Council  
November 6, 2019

The SEM APD Council members spent their most recent two meetings focusing on issues that would be addressed in developing new and supporting existing programs. After those meetings, Deans Masterson and Meinert met with the SEM chairs, president, and provost. The importance of addressing barriers and involving subcommittees in future work was stressed. Consequently, we will use *identifying barriers* as our primary framework and form subcommittees to develop lists of items to consider along with sources of data for scorecards to help programs identify and eliminate barriers in (a) program access/student demand, (b) enrollment and completion, (c) delivery modalities. It should be noted that attention to determining *demand* (developing programs and deliveries that meet student demand, being responsive to workforce demand and needs) is somewhat subsumed in the first two main categories. However, it is likely that this area will need additional attention so that units that are considering new programs have the necessary resources to accurately gauge demand. This issue may be addressed by the APD council during the next few months or may be an important recommendation for the future.

This framework was discussed during the council meeting on November 6. The members supported the use of the three major categories and did not identify any additional categories that warranted immediate attention. Each council member indicated a choice of committee assignment, and these appear below, with an asterisk by each group leader who will ensure meetings are conducted, liaison with council co-chairs, etc. A list of potential volunteers who could serve in addition to the council members will be disseminated by Dean Masterson. It is important to have both widespread involvement, but also group sizes that allow meaningful work to be conducted.

We stressed that the outlines provided during the meeting were merely starting points, and that their groups would need to revise, add, and/or subtract as they work through what ultimately will become a roadmap or several roadmaps with accompanying scorecards to be used in assessing these areas for academic units. We ensured that each committee included a member that would be familiar with existing data sources and able to advise the committee members regarding the process for ensuring that all data necessary to ultimately develop accompanying scorecards would be available.

The council will meet again on November 20 and December 10. Calendar invites have been sent.

<b>Access/Student Demand</b>	<b>Enrollment, Retention, Completion</b>	<b>Models of Program Delivery</b>
Rob Moore*	Kent Ragan*	Chuck Hermans*
Kristi Oetting	Michelle Olson	Nancy Gordon
Heidi Backes	David Rohall	Jen Cox
Christi Sudbrock	Hayden Hollingsworth	Gary Michelfelder
Jessica Nelson	Shannon Holt	Monica Feeney
	Rachel Anderson	

**PROGRAM ACCESS/STUDENT DEMAND**

<b>Items</b>
Can prospective students find your program?
What strategies are you using to actively recruit students to your program? Are there special strategies to recruit students from underrepresented groups?
Does the website highlight admission criteria, curriculum, career opportunities, and cost?
How do students inquire about the program and what is the system for following-up on inquiries?
Are your admission criteria optimal? Do they result in best fit students? To what extent do they keep potentially qualified students out? What strategies do you use to determine prognostic value or your standards?
How do you move an inquiry to an applicant and an applicant to a matriculant?
What scholarship opportunities do you offer and how to you market these possibilities?
Are revisions to degree title, course titles, course content desirable to reflect advances in the field?

<b>Data Source/Scorecard Items</b>
# of applicants, admits, matriculants; focus groups with prospective students
Description and analysis of current strategies
Website inventory
Admission criteria inventory and comparison to comparable programs at MSU and other institutions
Relationship between performance on admission criteria and performance in degree program
Environmental scan of job market, advisory boards, curricular comparison to other programs that are highly ranked

**PROGRAM ENROLLMENT, RETENTION, COMPLETION**

<b>Item</b>
What are your goals for year-to-year retention rates and are you meeting those standards?
What are your goals for program completion (graduation) rates and are you meeting those standards?
Are the retention and completion rates different for various subpopulations?
What advising model to you use and how do you evaluate its effectiveness?
What is the lead time to see an advisor?
At what point you provide a program of study?
Is advising proactive or passive (by student request)?
Is published periodicity accurate?
Are all prerequisites justified? Could concurrent enrollment work just as well?
How are class schedules determined? (student or faculty desires)
Are the number of sections and their size reflective of demand, room capacity, grading workload?
Are waiting lists working effectively?
What are the top D,F,W courses and what strategies have you used to decrease the DFW rate to desired levels?
Is course attendance monitored and if so, how are the data used?
Are scheduling and available space for high demand courses optimal?
Are internships, capstones, and/or research experiences offered regularly and is student performance/completion actively monitored and supported?
Is the level of available faculty appropriate for student demand?
Is the cost of running the program equal to, above, or below revenue generated by tuition and fees?

<b>Data Source/Scorecard Items</b>
Yearly (5 year, 10 year) Enrollment Trends (headcount and credit hours) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree (comparison to initial projection)</li> <li>• Course enrollment trends</li> </ul>
Yearly (5 year, 10 year) Retention
Yearly (5 year, 10 year) Awards (completers) and Graduation Rates (comparison to initial projection)
Enrollment in and completion of internships, capstones, and/or research experiences (by individual faculty member)
Cost per credit hour, individual faculty workloads, Delaware data
Identification of break-even enrollment level

**PROGRAM DELIVERY MODELS**

<b>Item</b>
Are the delivery models meeting the needs of the student population or desired student population?
Are space need and utilization appropriately aligned?
Have faculty been trained to proficiently use various delivery models?

<b>Data Source/Scorecard Items</b>
Yearly (5 year, 10 year) Enrollment Trends by Delivery Model (headcount and credit hours) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Degree (comparison to initial projection)</li><li>• Course enrollment trends</li></ul>
Yearly (5 year, 10 year) Retention by Delivery Model
Yearly (5 year, 10 year) Awards (completers) and Graduation Rates (comparison to initial projection) by Delivery Model
Analysis of student population (target student population) and delivery strategies
Inventory of classroom and other academic space usage