SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Fall 2026 Administrative Program Review: *Summative Evaluation*

Program Reviewed:

Governing Academic Unit:

Reviewer(s):

Instructions: Complete this Summative Evaluation Form ***only after fully completing*** each of the Evaluation Worksheets on the pages below. Your worksheet responses and notes should directly inform your Summative Evaluation.

☐ Grow

With investment

***Generally*, programs warranting investment for growth are those that evidence many (but not necessarily all) of the following:**

- Stable or growing enrollment
- Favorable market conditions indicating capacity for substantive growth
- Positive student employment outcomes (current and/or projected)
- Stable NTR
- Sufficiently robust NTR
- Persistence and/or graduation rates are at or above University rates [UG]
- Faculty workload analysis indicating effective allocation of faculty time
- Enrollment that rarely requires (a) running low-enrolled or dual-listed courses and/or (b) course substitutions or waivers in support of timely student persistence and graduation
- Curricula, modality(ies), target student population(s), or other key program element(s) substantively consistent with those of comparative programs (or, if distinct, the distinctions are demonstrably a competitive strength)

☐ Sustain/Stabilize

With or without investment

***Generally*, programs indicated for sustaining/stabilizing are those that evidence many (but not necessarily all) of the following:**

- Stable and satisfactory enrollment
- Favorable market expectations for sustaining current enrollment levels (or capacity for small levels of growth)
- Positive student employment outcomes
- Stable NTR
- Sufficiently positive NTR

- Faculty workload analysis indicating effective allocation of faculty time
- Enrollment that rarely requires (a) running low-enrolled or dual-listed courses and/or (b) course substitutions or waivers in support of timely student persistence and graduation
- Curricula, modality(ies), target student population(s), or other key program element(s) substantively consistent with those of comparative programs (or, if distinct, are deemed a clear competitive strength)

☐ Reimagine/Transform

With significant changes to (and, potentially, investment in) programs design, modality, marketing, faculty [either quantitatively or qualitatively], etc.

Generally, programs determined to be in need of being reimagined or substantively transformed are those that evidence many (but not necessarily all) of the following:

- Consistently low enrollment, or a clear trend of substantive enrollment decline
- Enrollment underperforms demonstrably strong market demand (GrayDI)
- Student employment outcomes underperform demonstrably strong comparison/national data
- Unstable NTR
- Negative NTR
- Persistence and/or graduation rates are at or below University rates [UG]
- Faculty workload analysis indicating inefficient allocation of faculty time
- Enrollment that occasionally requires (a) running low-enrolled or dual-listed courses and/or (b) course substitutions or waivers in support of timely student persistence and graduation
- Curricula, modality(ies), target student population(s), or other key program element(s) are substantively inconsistent with those of comparatively successful programs

☐ Close

Sunset over time, with appropriate Teach-Out plans and in fidelity with the Faculty Manual

Generally, programs determined to warrant closure are those that evidence many (but not necessarily all) of the following:

- Enrollment is consistently low or evidences a clear trend of substantive decline
- Enrollment is consistent with demonstrably low market demand (GrayDI)
- Student employment outcomes consistent with demonstrably poor comparison/national data
- Unstable, substantively negative NTR
- Persistence and/or graduation rates are at or below University rates [UG]
- Faculty workload analysis indicating inefficient allocation of faculty time
- Enrollment that that regularly requires (a) running low-enrolled or dual-listed courses and/or (b) course substitutions or waivers in support of timely student persistence and graduation
- Curricula, modality(ies), target student population(s), or other key program element(s) substantively consistent with those of comparative programs

Fall 2026 Administrative Program Review: *Evaluation Worksheets*

Student Demand (Historical)

Are enough students regularly enrolling in the program? Are historical enrollments growing, flat, or declining?

Data Reviewed

What data were reviewed to help inform a holistic program viability determination?

- 5-Year Median Enrollment at Fall Census (all majors)
- 5-Year Enrollment Trend Line at Fall Census (all majors)
- 5-Year Admission Yield Rate Trend Line (% admitted who enrolled)
- 5-Year SCH Production (Fall Census)

Analysis

What are the summative analyses of the data that help inform a holistic program viability determination?

Check all that apply

The program evidences:

- ☐ Positive enrollment trend
- ☐ Negative enrollment trend
- ☐ Consistently low enrollment
- ☐ Enrollment instability that clouds trend analysis
- ☐ Yield rates that predict enrollment stability
- ☐ Yield rates that do not predict enrollment stability
- ☐ Yield rates that predict enrollment growth
- ☐ Yield rates that do not predict enrollment growth
- ☐ SCH production that supports enrollment concerns
- ☐ SCH production that contradicts enrollment concerns
- ☐ Other: briefly describe here…
- ☐ Other: briefly describe here…

Notes on Analysis

What were the key performance thresholds (absolute and/or comparative) applied in the analysis? What particular findings from the data were most influential in the analysis?

[enter notes here]

Market Demand (Projected)

Is there a strong, sustainable market for the program as designed (e.g., modality, required credit hours, complexity/ structure, tuition pricing, marketing, etc.)? If not, would there be a sustainable market for the program if re-imagined in a certain manner? Is there evidence that graduates of the program will be employable for the foreseeable future?

Data Reviewed

What data were reviewed to help inform a holistic program viability determination?

- Gray DI Market Program Demand Analysis (predicted program size)
- 5-year Applications Trend Line
- Gray DI Career Outcomes Analysis

Analysis

What are the summative analyses of the data that help inform a holistic program viability determination?

Check all that apply

The program evidences:

- ☐ Sufficient GrayDI-predicted program sizes
- ☐ Very positive GrayDI-predicted program sizes
- ☐ Insufficient/unsustainable GrayDI-predicted program sizes
- ☐ Application trends that predict enrollment stability
- ☐ Application trends that do not predict enrollment stability
- ☐ Application trends that predict enrollment growth
- ☐ Application trends that do not predict enrollment growth
- ☐ GrayDI-predicted growth in positive student employment outcomes
- ☐ GrayDI-predicted decline in positive student employment outcomes
- ☐ GrayDI-predicted stability in student employment outcomes
- ☐ Other: briefly describe here…
- ☐ Other: briefly describe here…

Notes on Analysis

What were the key performance thresholds (absolute and/or comparative) applied in the analysis? What particular findings from the data were most influential in the analysis?

[enter notes here]

Financial Outcomes

Is the program generating sufficient revenue relative to costs? Is financial performance improving, stable, or declining?

Data Reviewed

What data were reviewed to help inform a holistic program viability determination?

- 3-Year Net Tuition Revenue
- 3-Year Net Tuition Revenue Per Student FTE
- 3-Year Net Profit/Loss (including taught-taken credit)
- Research Expenditures [if applicable]

Analysis

What are the summative analyses of the data that help inform a holistic program viability determination?

Check all that apply

The program evidences:

- ☐ Positive and robust NTR
- ☐ Positive but minimal NTR
- ☐ Minimally Negative NTR
- ☐ Substantively Negative NTR
- ☐ Stable NTR
- ☐ Unstable NTR
- ☐ Net Profit (after including overhead expenses)
- ☐ Net Loss (after including overhead expenses)
- ☐ Contribution Margin Exceeding Overhead Rate
- ☐ Contribution Margin Less Than Overhead Rate
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*

Notes on Analysis

What were the key performance thresholds (absolute and/or comparative) applied in the analysis? What particular findings from the data were most influential in the analysis?

[enter notes here]

Student Persistence & Graduation

How do persistence and graduation rates within the program compare to other SLU rates overall? Are students taking significantly longer than expected to complete the program?

Data Reviewed

What data were reviewed to help inform a holistic program viability determination?

- 5-Year Trend Line New Freshmen UG Persistence
- 5-Year Trend Line New Transfer UG Persistence
- 5-Year Trend Line UG 4-year Graduation Rate
- 5-Year Trend Line UG 5-year Graduation Rate
- 5-Year Trend Line GR Student Average Time-to-Degree

Analysis

What are the summative analyses of the data that help inform a holistic program viability determination?

Check all that apply

The program evidences:

- ☐ [UG-NF] First-to-second year persistence rates that exceed University rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] First-to-second year persistence rates consistent with University rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] First-to-second year persistence rates demonstrably lower than University rates
- ☐ [UG-TR] First-to-second year persistence rates consistent with non-transfer persistence rates
- ☐ [UG-TR] First-to-second year persistence rates demonstrably lower than non-transfer persistence rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] Four-year graduation rates that exceed University rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] Four-year graduation rates consistent with University rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] Four-year graduation rates demonstrably lower than University rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] Five-year graduation rates that exceed University rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] Five-year graduation rates consistent with University rates
- ☐ [UG-NF] Five-year graduation rates demonstrably lower than University rates
- ☐ [GR] Average time-to-degree rates consistent with the program design
- ☐ [GR] Average time-to-degree rates substantively exceeding the program design
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*

Notes on Analysis

What were the key performance thresholds (absolute and/or comparative) applied in the analysis? What particular findings from the data were most influential in the analysis?

[enter notes here]

Faculty Workload analysis

Is the program generating sufficient revenue relative to costs? Is financial performance improving, stable, or declining? Would additional investment generate meaningful returns?

Data Reviewed

What data were reviewed to help inform a holistic program viability determination?

- 5-Year Trend Line Credits Taught for the UG Major, by Faculty Type
- 5-Year Trend Line Credits Taught Outside the UG Major, by Faculty type
- 5-Year Trend Line Credits taught for GR degree program, by Faculty Type
- Alignment of workload policy with audited faculty data
- Faculty research profile [PhD]

Analysis

What are the summative analyses of the data that help inform a holistic program viability determination?

Check all that apply

The program evidences:

- ☐ [UG] Credits taught in the major that signal effective use of faculty resources
- ☐ [UG] Credits taught in the major that signal inefficient, ineffective use of faculty resources
- ☐ [UG] Credits taught outside the major that signal efficient, effective use of faculty resources
- ☐ [UG] Credits taught outside the major that signal inefficient, ineffective use of faculty resources
- ☐ [GR] Credits taught for the program that signal efficient, effective use of faculty resources
- ☐ [GR] Credits taught for the program that signal inefficient, ineffective use of faculty resources
- ☐ Faculty workload data consistent with the governing faculty workload policy
- ☐ Faculty workload data inconsistent with the governing faculty workload policy
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*

Notes on Analysis

What were the key performance thresholds (absolute and/or comparative) applied in the analysis? What particular findings from the data were most influential in the analysis?

[enter notes here]

Curriculum Efficiency & Design

Does the management of the program's curriculum evidence viability concerns? Does the design and delivery of the program's curriculum evidence effective and efficient use of institutional resources?

Data Reviewed

What data were reviewed to help inform a holistic program viability determination?

- 5-year review of percent of low-enrolled courses (min 10 for UG courses; 5 for GR courses)
- 5-year review of percent of courses filled at 80% or higher
- 5-year review of number of requirements waived or substituted per student annually
- 5-year review of # of dually-Listed Courses
- 5-year review of DFW rates for foundational courses
- Curricula, modality(ies), target student population(s), or other key program element(s) compared to peer/competitor programs

Analysis

What are the summative analyses of the data that help inform a holistic program viability determination?

Check all that apply

The program:

- ☐ Almost never/never runs low-enrolled courses
- ☐ Regularly runs multiple low-enrolled courses
- ☐ Almost always/always runs courses at 80% capacity or higher
- ☐ Regularly runs multiple courses below 80% capacity
- ☐ Almost never/never waives or substitutes other courses for published requirements
- ☐ Regularly waives or substitutes other courses for published requirements
- ☐ Almost never/never dually-lists courses
- ☐ Regularly dually-lists courses
- ☐ DFW rates consistent with the University-wide average
- ☐ DFW rates substantively higher than the University-wide average
- ☐ Regularly waives or substitutes other courses for published requirements
- ☐ Curricula, modality(ies), target student population(s), or other key program element(s) substantively consistent with those of comparatively successful programs
- ☐ Curricula, modality(ies), target student population(s), or other key program element(s) substantively inconsistent with those of comparatively successful programs
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*
- ☐ Other: *briefly describe here…*

Notes on Analysis

What were the key performance thresholds (absolute and/or comparative) applied in the analysis? What particular findings from the data were most influential in the analysis?

[enter notes here]