



Faculty Senate • [http://www.uwrf.edu/faculty\\_senate/welcome.html](http://www.uwrf.edu/faculty_senate/welcome.html)

Senators: Chair – David Rainville, Vice Chair – Kristen Hendrickson, Secretary – Kris Hiney, Executive Committee – Glenn Potts, David Furniss

To: Connie Foster, Chancellor  
116 North Hall  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: David Rainville, Chair  
Faculty Senate  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

RE: UW-RF Faculty Senate Motion 2008/2009/48

At the December 10, 2008 meeting of Wisconsin-River Falls Faculty senate, motion 2008-2009/48 was passed. This motion is forwarded for your action.

A **motion** from **AP&P** to approve the Academic Program Ratings Document below. This document is to be used to by reviewers who will rate programs in six areas. Each area will be rated either 1,2,3,4 or 5 with the appropriate weighting in each area. The total possible number of points for each area is indicated in the product column. The total possible score is 500. This score will be used to help prioritize programs as described in OP 2.1 of the Strategic Plan.

### ACADEMIC Program Ratings

Reviewers will rate each program on each criterion and assign a rating score ranging from 0 to 5. Each score will then be multiplied by the associated weight for the criterion and these products are totaled. A program scoring 5 on every criterion would have a total score of 500.

Criterion	Rating Score	Weight	Product
I. Mission	5	15	75
II. Demand	5	20	100
III. Quality	5	20	100
IV. Prod/Cost/Effic.	5	20	100
V. Benchmarking	5	15	75
VI. Other Info.	5	10	50
Total Score			500

I: Consistency with University Mission, Vision and Values and UWRF's Strategic Plan

1 = Consistency is lower than most programs

3 = Consistency is typical of most program

5 = Consistency is higher than most programs

II: External and Internal Demand

- 1 = Low Demand
- 3 = Average Demand
- 5 = High Demand

III: Quality – Program Inputs and Outcomes

- 1 = Weaker than most programs
- 3 = Typical of most programs
- 5 = Among the strongest programs

IV: Productivity, Cost and Efficiency

- 1 = Low Efficiency
- 3 = Average Efficiency
- 5 = High Efficiency

V: Benchmarking with Peers

- 1 = Consistently lower than peers
- 3 = Consistently typical of most peers
- 5 = Consistently higher than most peers

VI: Crucial Information Not Addressed by other Criteria

- 1 = Weaker than most programs
- 3 = Typical of most programs
- 5 = Among the strongest programs

X

Approved

\_\_\_\_\_

Disapproved

Connie Foster  
Connie Foster, Chancellor

1-26-09  
Date