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Motion from the Executive Committee (Wes Chapin, Chair) to approve changes to the Program Prioritization Process (changes are noted in the attached document of the same name – NOTE all changes are in the timeline located at the end of the document)

Approved  

Disapproved  

Dean Van Galen, Chancellor

Date 5/21/13
Program Prioritization and Program Audit and Review

The measures below are intended to provide comparative data that can be used to assess programs and rank them using categories. The process requires significant contributions and activity on the part of academic programs across campus. The end goal is to provide useful information to decision makers at all levels of the institution.

Three categories have been identified: intellectual strength, enrollment strength, and financial strength.

It is anticipated that this document will be refined and amended in the future. The Committee anticipates that if the overall point allocation remains the same, it should be possible to amend the categories and continue the process while minimizing problems of comparability over time.

The University will adjust, allocate, and prioritize resources to implement this plan.

The Provost is responsible for the oversight and implementation of this plan.

The Faculty Senate and Administration will work to establish a six-year program audit and review process that is linked to, and primarily achieved by, program prioritization.

Working definitions:

Communication and Records: To ensure transparency, the Provost’s Office will have primary responsibility to ensure appropriate communications regarding PP-PAR are provided to the university community. A secure, password-protected site will be created by the Provost’s Office that allows members of the university community to access the materials used in PP-PAR activities (e.g. documents, data, scoring sheets, and so on)

Dates: If a calendar deadline happens to fall on a weekend or holiday, the next business day (i.e. regular workday, Monday-Friday) will serve as the deadline.

Definitional Disputes: Minor definitional issues will be resolved through consultation between the Provost’s Office and the Faculty Senate Chair. Major definitional issues must be resolved through governance consultation between the Administration and Faculty Senate. Any definitional issues that arise will be reported to the Faculty Senate.
Faculty: Staff will be defined as “faculty” if their primary appointment is instructional. Faculty consists of instructional staff within a department, unless noted otherwise for a specific factor.

Majors: All students within a program (e.g. 1st, 2nd, etc. majors) will be counted.

Program: consists of a major or graduate degree.

Program Chair: In most situations, the program chair will be the department chair. In instances of graduate programs, the graduate director might serve as the chair for the program. In cases where a chair is in charge of multiple majors, he/she will represent one program, and another member of the faculty in that program will serve as “chair” of the program when evaluations and scoring occurs for Intellectual Strength category D. The requirement is that each program be represented by a unique individual for the purposes of that item.

Program Faculty: consists of faculty serving a major. For departmentally-based majors, this includes only the faculty within that department who serve that major. For multi-disciplinary majors, this includes only the faculty on the steering committee (or equivalent if named something else). In cases where faculty serve more than one major, their contributions will count equally and fully towards each major (e.g. a history professor on the BFSS committee will have his/her contributions count towards the calculations for both history and BFSS majors).

Rankings: All programs will be scored on a three-year cycle, but will be re-ranked annually. Rankings will be reported in four, equally-weighted categories, under the heading of “Prioritization: Prospects for Program Investment.”

Prioritization: Prospects for Program Investment

1. “Enhance”
2. “Maintain”
3. “Monitor”
4. “Eliminate, Reduce, Integrate, or Reorganize”

Scoring: Unless noted otherwise for a specific factor, scores will be reported on a per capita basis (e.g. 15 publications for 10 FTE equals 1.5 per FTE). All scores will also be reported on a pro-rated basis. For example, when adjuncts are counted, an adjunct with a 20 percent annual appointment with two professional memberships in a given year will contribute 0.4 professional memberships (0.2 time appointment times 2 publications equals 0.4 publications). A second example is that a full-time faculty member co-authoring a
publication with someone either at the university or in another institution in a given year will contribute 0.5 publications (One FTE times 0.5 publication equals 0.5 publications). This is particularly important for Intellectual Strength category D.

Scoring Categories: Unless noted otherwise for a specific factor, a continuum scoring system is used. The highest result for a program will be placed onto one end of a continuum and the lowest result will be placed onto the other end. This will result in the creation of a range. The range will be divided by the number of points allocated to the factor to create the scoring categories. For example, if fifty programs are being scored, and a factor is worth 10 points, ten equally divided and weighted categories on the continuum will be created. If the lowest result is 80 and the highest is 110, the scoring categories would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results will then be slotted into the appropriate place on the continuum and the resulting score will be recorded for each program. In this example, a program with a result of 94.7 would receive 5 points, a program with a result of 104.9 would receive 8 points, and a program with a score of 110 would receive 10 points.

It is important to note that in some cases, lower results are preferable to higher results, and the scores must be calculated accordingly.

Software packages: Sedona, or a similar package, will be used campus-wide to collect data where appropriate regarding faculty activities (subject to a recommendation from Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies committee to the Faculty Senate). This decision will be reviewed after year one to assess its effectiveness. The package that is used will have a single template or set of categories for all programs that will be used for PP-PAR purposes.

Student contact hours: This is the total number of “hours” of lecture, discussion, lab, and other time provided for a “course,” multiplied by the number of students in the course.

Timeline for data: Data will be collected for the previous three years, where available, unless specified otherwise for a particular factor. It is expected that for some items where new measures are being developed, such as the use of a standardized scale for surveys of graduating seniors, data for less than three years will be available for several years. Such situations will be specified before the process begins for a given year.

Timeline for scoring programs: All programs will be scored in year one. In year two, one-third of programs will be scored, with another third in year three, and another third in year four. This means some programs will be scored in two consecutive years. This is
necessary to produce usable, campus-wide data in years one and two. Without this significant, initial investment of effort, it would take three years to obtain usable, campus-wide data. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the order that programs will be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments housing more than one program, all programs will be grouped together in the year they are scored. Departments that wish to be scored in a non-scheduled year can elect to do so, but they must then be scored again in their regularly scheduled year.

**Intellectual Strength: 210 points**

**A. The extent to which the program meets University Assessment plan and report expectations.**

**Points:** Sixty points are allocated to this measure.

**Process:** The Assessment Committee will use its assessment rubric to place programs into six categories, and this data will be provided to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The highest category will be worth 60 points, the second highest will be worth 50, the third highest 40, and so on. In year one, this rubric will be applied to all programs. In subsequent years, one-third of programs will be assessed using this rubric. The Assessment Committee will report the scores to the Program Audit and Review Committee.

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**B. The extent to which the needs of graduates are being met by program learning outcomes.**

**Points:** Thirty points are assigned to this measure.

**Process:** Each program will administer an exit survey to graduating students that provides indirect measures of program learning outcomes. The standardized scale, below, will be used for each survey.

Please fill in the circle that best reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place outcomes in this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>column</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chair will report the resulting data on an overall percentage basis (i.e. the percentage of overall responses scoring in each of the six approved categories). Note that there is no particular advantage or disadvantage to having more or fewer learning outcomes, as long as the totals are reported as aggregated percentages. Here is an example for a program with two outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Total Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program outcome ONE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program outcome TWO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical &amp; Percentage</td>
<td>15/80</td>
<td>20/80</td>
<td>30/80</td>
<td>10/80</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>0/80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting data will be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee, and programs will be slotted into one of the six categories after calculating a final figure. Strongly agree will be worth 30 points, agree worth 25, slightly agree worth 20, slightly
disagree worth 15, disagree worth 10 and disagree strongly worth 5 points. Using the example above, the final score will be calculated as

\[(18.75 \times 30) + (25.00 \times 25) + (37.50 \times 20) + (12.50 \times 15) + (6.25 \times 10) + (0.00 \times 5)] / 100 = \text{Final percentage, or}

\[562.5 + 625 + 750 + 187.5 + 62.5 + 0] / 100 = \text{Final percentage, or}

2187.50 / 100 = \text{Final percentage, or}

21.875 = \text{Final percentage}

The table below will then be used to score the program. In the example above, 21.875 would place this program into the "agree" category, with its 20.001-25.000 range. This program’s score is the figure in the “agree” column, “score by category row (i.e. the bottom row), and results in a “score” of 25 points being assigned to this factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final percentage</td>
<td>30.000-25.001</td>
<td>25.000-20.001</td>
<td>20.000-15.001</td>
<td>15.000-10.001</td>
<td>10.000-5.001</td>
<td>5.000-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score by category</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

C. The five-year trend in percentage of employed and continuing education of graduates by major.
This factor will be left in the equation, but all programs will be assigned the full thirty points until a mechanism approved by Senate is developed by the Program Audit and Review Committee to provide meaningful and comparable data for all programs. The Program and Audit Review Committee will provide a recommendation to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and this will be submitted to the Senate for its consideration. After a measure is developed and adequate data are collected, this factor will be scored.

**Points:** Thirty points are assigned to this factor.

**Process:** After the score and process are approved, data will be reported to the PAR Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 30 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with thirty points. Subsequently, each program’s “employment” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

---

**D. The extent to which tenure-track faculty have remained actively engaged and up-to-date in their discipline.**

**Points:** Sixty points are allocated to this measure. Programs will be scored and then placed into one of six categories (i.e. one-sixth in each category), worth 60, 50, 40, 30, 20, or 10, with 60 being the highest.

**Process:** Each program chair, or designee, will provide a list of items for their tenure-track faculty that demonstrates their engagement and how up-to-date they are in their discipline (on a per capita, pro-rated basis, and within three years the Program and Audit Review committee will recommend a mechanism to include academic staff and report to the Senate each year regarding its progress beginning in 2013). Names are not necessary, and it should consist of a list of activities with numerical scores for each category (on a per capita, pro-rated basis) that cover the previous three-year period (for the purposes of this measure, the “year” is defined as ending on the last contract day of spring semester. Representative examples of items to include are:

- RSCA activities, such as reviews, papers, presentations, books, works of art, performances, and so on.
- Teaching related activities if they relate to activities such as writing new courses, revising significantly existing courses, writing new programs or revising existing programs, applying innovative teaching methods, and related “teaching activities,” such as education abroad, undergraduate research, mentoring internships, and supervising independent readings and independent studies.
• Relevant public service and activities related to one’s program, such as memberships and participation in professional organizations, relevant university bodies (e.g. assessment committee, general education and university requirements committee, academic program and policy committee, faculty senate, and so on), professional presentations (in-person, radio interviews, television appearances, and so on), professionally-related volunteer work, and so on.
• Professional development, such as completing additional coursework in one’s field, workshops, sabbaticals, grants (e.g. number and/or financial value).
• Other relevant activities (must provide adequate definition for readers).

In year one, all programs will be evaluated, and all “chairs” will participate. In other years, only one-third of programs will be evaluated, and they will be evaluated by all “chairs,” including those whose programs are not being evaluated in that year.

The list will be forwarded by the chair to the Provost, who will compile the information and distribute it to all “chairs” and deans. Each chair/dean will rank all the programs into the six categories, assigning one-sixth to each category. These scores will be reported to the Provost, who will aggregate them and provide an overall ranking, placing all programs into the six categories, assigning one-sixth to each category. (Note: if an odd number of programs exist that is not divisible by six exactly, it might be the case that one or a couple of categories might each have one more program placed into it/them). This data will be provided to the Program Audit and Review Committee.

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

E. Strategic Planning Goals: the extent to which a program supports the strategic planning goals of the university.

Points: Thirty points are allocated to this measure.

Process: Each program chair will write an approximately one-page narrative (i.e. maximum of 2500 characters) that discusses specifically how the program supports the strategic planning goals of the university. The narrative will be forwarded to the deans of the four colleges and the Provost. These five individuals, or their designees, will assign each program to one of the six categories represented in the table below, assigning one-sixth of the programs to each category. The Provost will aggregate the five recommended scores, dividing by five to provide a score for each program (e.g. if a program receives recommended scores of 25, 25, 25, 20, and 20, the final score is 23) that will be used to assign programs to one of the six categories, with one-sixth being assigned to each category. If an odd number of programs exists, the distribution will be made as equally as possible (e.g. three categories might
have 12 programs, three categories might have 11 programs). The final scores for all programs will be forwarded to the Program Audit and Review Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>30 points</th>
<th>25 points</th>
<th>20 points</th>
<th>15 points</th>
<th>10 points</th>
<th>5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which a program supports the strategic planning goals of the university</td>
<td>Top one-sixth of programs</td>
<td>Second one-sixth of programs</td>
<td>Third one-sixth of programs</td>
<td>Fourth one-sixth of programs</td>
<td>Fifth one-sixth of programs</td>
<td>Sixth one-sixth of programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timeline**: See overall timeline at end of document.

**Enrollment Strength (combined with market strength): 150 points**

**A. Five-year trend of number of majors in a program divided by total majors on campus, reported as a percentage.**

**Points**: Twenty points are allocated to this measure.

**Process**: Institutional Research will provide this figure to the Program and Audit Review Committee. All majors (1st, 2nd, etc.) within a program will be calculated each year after the tenth day of fall semester enrollment. The total for each year will be divided by the number of overall majors on campus, resulting in a percentage. The percentages for the five year period will be aggregated, and then divided by five to provide a final score for each program. Institutional Research will report the figures to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 20 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with twenty points. Subsequently, each program’s “total majors” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

**Timeline**: See overall timeline at end of document.
B. Five-year trend of the change in the number of majors in a program, reported as a percentage.

Points: Twenty points are allocated to this measure.

Process: Institutional Research will provide this figure to the Program and Audit Review Committee. All majors (1st, 2nd, etc.) within a program will be calculated each year after the tenth day of fall semester enrollment. The percentage change (positive or negative) in the number of majors from the previous year shall be calculated. The percentages for the five year period will be aggregated, and then divided by five to provide a final score for each program. Institutional Research will report the figures to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 20 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with twenty points. Subsequently, each program’s “majors’ trend” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

C. Five-year trend of number of program graduates within a specific program divided by total program graduates for the university, reported as a percentage.

Points: Twenty points are allocated to this measure.

Process: Institutional Research will provide this figure to the Program and Audit Review Committee. All majors (1st, 2nd, etc.) graduating from a specific program will be calculated for each year (a year will be defined to end on June 30, encompassing the previous summer, fall, and spring graduates). The total for each year will be divided by the number of overall majors on campus, resulting in a percentage. The percentages for the five year period will be aggregated, and then divided by five to provide a final score for each program. Institutional Research will report the figures to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 20 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with twenty points. Subsequently, each program’s “graduation trend” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).
**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**D. Five-year trend of median total credits to degree for academic program degree completers.**

**Points:** Twenty points are allocated to this measure.

**Process:** Institutional Research will provide this figure to the Program and Audit Review Committee. The median number of credits (i.e. all credits from any source) of students (i.e. those who transfer in fewer than 15 credits) graduating from a specific program will be calculated for each year (a year will be defined to end on June 30, encompassing the previous summer, fall, and spring graduates). The median scores for each year in the five year period will be aggregated and then divided by five, resulting in an “average” median score. Institutional Research will report the figures to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with low scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 20 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with twenty points. Subsequently, each program’s “Median credits to degree” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**E. Five-year trend of median time to degree for academic program degree completers.**

**Points:** Forty points are allocated to this measure.

**Process:** Institutional Research will provide this figure to the Program and Audit Review Committee. The median number of semesters to degree of students (i.e. those who transfer in fewer than 15 credits) graduating from a specific program will be calculated for each year (a year will be defined to end on June 30, encompassing the previous summer, fall, and spring graduates). The median scores for each year in the five year period will be aggregated and then divided by five, resulting in an “average” median score for each program. Institutional Research will report the figures to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with low scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 40 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with forty points. Subsequently, each program’s “Median time to degree” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).
Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

F. Five-year trend of retention rate by program.

Points: Thirty points are allocated to this measure.

Process: This is calculated by identifying members of both the first-time, full-time freshman cohort and the transfer cohort for fall semester of entry, and comparing that figure with the retention rate in fall of their second year. (Note: The expectation is that within three years the Program Audit and Review Committee will develop an alternative measure that will capture second year to fourth year student retention rates, and this will replace the first to second year measure. Institutional Research will report the figures to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 30 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with thirty points. Subsequently, each program’s “Five-year retention” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

Financial Strength: 180 points

A. Departmental Revenues-Program: Net revenue for all courses that count towards a major, divided by FTE cost.

Points: Thirty points are allocated to this measure.

Process: Institutional Research, or Finance, will calculate the revenue generated by either general purpose revenue and/or program revenue for each credit in courses that count towards a major, and also would calculate the costs of the faculty teaching the courses (on the tenth weekday that is a business day, or whichever date is used to calculate the enrollment snapshot). The net revenue total for all courses that count towards a major will be divided by the FTE costs for all courses that count towards that major. Required supporting courses are included in the calculation. (Note: the long-term goal after staffing allows is to identify only those students enrolled in courses required by a program who are majors in that program). These figures will be collected for fall and spring terms, for a three-year period, and then the mean score will be calculated for the six semesters included in the three-year period. This figure will then be
reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 30 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with thirty points. Subsequently, each program’s “Departmental Revenues-Program” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”). Note: some overlap between Financial Strength categories A and B is expected.

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**B. Departmental Revenues-University:** Total revenue for all courses that service the university, divided by FTE cost

**Points:** Thirty points are allocated to this measure.

**Process:** Institutional Research, or Finance, will calculate the revenue generated by either general purpose revenue and/or program revenue for credits in courses provided by a program that service the university, and also would calculate the costs of the faculty teaching these courses (on the tenth weekday that is a business day, or whichever date is used to calculate the enrollment snapshot). The net revenue for the courses that service the university provided by a program will be divided by the FTE costs for these courses that are provided by the program (e.g. general education, foundation courses, liberal arts, university requirements, required supporting courses or directed electives that service other programs). (Note: the long-term goal after staffing allows is to identify only those students enrolled in courses that service the university’s programs, and to exclude majors and those taking the course as a general elective). These figures will be collected for fall and spring terms, for a three-year period, and then the mean score will be calculated for the six semesters included in the three-year period. This figure will then be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 30 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with thirty points. Subsequently, each program’s “Departmental Revenues-University” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”). Note: some overlap between Financial Strength categories A and B is expected.

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**C. External Grants**
Points: Ten points are allocated to this measure.

Process: Accounting services will calculate external grants by department (and by individual if possible) on an annual basis over a three-year cycle. The end of the “year” shall be defined as the end of the fiscal year (i.e. June 30). The resulting data will be provided to departments. For departments with multiple programs, the department will recommend an allocation of the percentage of “External Grants” that services each program to the dean where the program is housed administratively. In all cases non-majors and non-graduate programs (e.g. minors and certificates) will not be included in the calculation (i.e. 100 percent of the allocations must go to majors and/or graduate programs). If the dean disagrees, he/she will provide his/her own decision to the department. The sum total for each year will be divided by the FTE assigned to the program for that year to obtain a calculation of external grants per FTE. Using a three-year cycle, the three annual figures will be divided by three to obtain a final figure that will then be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 10 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with ten points. Subsequently, each program’s “external grants” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

D. Internal Grants

Points: Ten points are allocated to this measure.

Process: Accounting services will calculate internal grants by department (and by individual if possible) over a three-year cycle on an FTE basis. The end of the “year” shall be defined as the end of the fiscal year (i.e. June 30). The resulting data will be provided to departments, and internal grants earned by any faculty member serving a program, or programs, will be aggregated (and prorated if needed) for each year. For departments with multiple programs, the department will recommend an allocation of the percentage of “Internal Grants” that services each program to the dean where the program is housed administratively. In all cases non-majors and non-graduate programs (e.g. minors and certificates) will not be included in the calculation (i.e. 100 percent of the allocations must go to majors and/or graduate programs). If the dean disagrees, he/she will provide his/her own decision to the department. The sum total for each year will be divided by the FTE assigned to the program for that year to obtain a calculation of internal grants per FTE. Using a three-year cycle, the three annual figures will be divided by three to obtain a final figure that will then be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with high scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 10 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with ten points.
Subsequently, each program’s “internal grants” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**E. Departmental Costs (Note: all of the factors below are calculated as three-year averages)**

**E.1 Human Resources:** FTE, IAS, Lab Managers, graduate assistants, and support staff (e.g. program assistants/academic department associates)

**Points:** Forty points are allocated to this measure.

**Process:** Institutional Research will provide to each department the amount spent on FTE faculty (i.e. tenure track and instructional academic staff), managers (e.g. laboratories, farms, and so on), graduate assistants, and support staff (e.g. program assistants, academic departments, and so on) over a three year period. Student workers are not included in the calculation. For departments with multiple programs, the department will recommend an allocation of the percentage of “human resources” that services each program to the dean where the program is housed administratively. If the dean disagrees, he/she will provide his/her own decision to the department. In all cases non-majors and non-graduate programs (e.g. minors and certificates) will not be included in the calculation (i.e. 100 percent of the allocations must go to majors and/or graduate programs). After the allocation is completed, the total “human resources” assigned to each program shall be divided by the student contact hours (these will be provided by institutional research) generated by the program for each of the three years in the cycle, and then divided by three to obtain an average result. This figure will then be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with low scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 40 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with forty points. Subsequently, each program’s “human resources” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**E.2 S&E**

**Points:** Twenty points are allocated to this measure.
Process: Institutional Research will provide to each department the amount spent on supplies and expenses over a three year period. For departments with multiple programs, the department will recommend an allocation of the percentage of “S&E” that services each program to the dean where the program is housed administratively. If the dean disagrees, he/she will provide his/her own decision to the department. In all cases non-majors and non-graduate programs (e.g. minors and certificates) will not be included in the calculation (i.e. 100 percent of the allocations must go to majors and/or graduate programs). After the allocation is completed, the total “S&E” assigned to each program shall be divided by the student contact hours (these will be provided by institutional research) for each of the three years in the cycle, and then divided by three to obtain an average result. This figure will then be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with low scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 20 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with twenty points. Subsequently, each program’s “S&E” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

E.3 Space: Square footage for office complexes, and spaces such as computer and science labs, athletic facilities, farm buildings, studio rooms, performance areas, display areas, work areas, and so on that are dedicated for a program (i.e. designed primarily for a program).

Points: Twenty points are allocated to this measure.

Process: The Executive Director for Division of Administrative Services will provide figures showing the amount of space allocated to each department. For departments with multiple programs, the department will recommend an allocation of the percentage of “space” that services each program (if programs from multiple departments share dedicated spaces, the dean(s) will determine the proportion assigned to each department). If the dean disagrees, he/she will provide his/her own decision to the department. In all cases non-majors and non-graduate programs (e.g. minors and certificates) will not be included in the calculation (i.e. 100 percent of the allocations must go to majors and/or graduate programs). After the allocation is completed, the total “space” assigned to each program shall be divided by the FTE (i.e. instructional staff FTE, a figure provided by institutional research) for the program. These figures will then be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with low scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 20 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with twenty points. Subsequently, each program’s “space” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its
points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”). Note: if a program’s space allocation has changed over the three year period, the “space” calculation will need to be done for each year and then divided by three.

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**E.4 Unique Equipment Costs:** Defined as special purchases, such as laboratory equipment, computers, farm investments, and so on.

**Points:** Twenty points are allocated to this measure.

**Process:** The Assistant Chancellor for Business and Finance will provide figures showing the amount of money invested in departments for unique equipment costs for a three-year period. For departments with multiple programs, the department will recommend an allocation of the percentage of “unique equipment costs” that services each program. If the dean disagrees, he/she will provide his/her own decision to the department. In all cases non-majors and non-graduate programs (e.g. minors and certificates) will not be included in the calculation (i.e. 100 percent of the allocations must go to majors and/or graduate programs). After the allocation is completed, the total “unique equipment cost” assigned to each program shall be divided by the FTE for the program for each of the three years in the cycle, and then divided by three to obtain an average result. This figure will then be reported to the Program Audit and Review Committee. The PAR Committee will create a continuum, with low scores considered preferable. The resulting range will be divided into 20 discrete and equally weighted categories starting with one point and ending with twenty points. Subsequently, each program’s “unique equipment cost” result will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points (see example of this in the “working definitions” section titled “scoring categories”).

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document.

**OVERALL TIMELINE:**

**Notes:** dates without years associated with them are annual deadlines. Some adjustment of this timeline is anticipated.

**THE 2013-14 YEAR WILL BE A TRIAL RUN**
Proposal sent to Senate: December 1, 2012

December 2012: Senate adopts proposal

December 2012-April 2013: Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee recommends whether or not Sedona should be adopted for campus-wide usage.

January-May 2013: Senate adopts new assessment rubric

January 15, 2013: Provost forwards to all program, department, and graduate chairs the standardized scale for Intellectual Strength category B, along with appropriate directions, including that this be adopted for use during spring 2013.

January-March 2013: The Provost will organize two or more meetings with chairs to review the program prioritization process.

February 1, 2013-May 2013: The Provost will forward to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a list of all programs, including their departmental affiliations.

February 1: Departments that wish to be scored in a non-scheduled year must notify both their dean and the provost by this date.

February 1: The Provost's Office will provide an updated list of programs and their departmental affiliations to the Executive Committee, indicating programs that have been dropped and those that have been added since the previous year.

February 28: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will amend the rotation of programs to take into account those that have been dropped and those that have been added since the last evaluation cycle. The revised list must, insofar as practical, retain balance among the three years in the cycle, and must keep the programs provided by one department within the same rotational year. New programs will be included in program prioritization after they have been in existence for two full academic years. This information will be communicated to the chancellor, provost, faculty senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

February 28-November 1, 2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the order that programs will be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments housing more than one program, all programs will be
grouped together in the year they are scored. The results will be reported to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, and chairs.

| February 2013: | The Provost's Office will organize two or more assessment workshops for departments and programs. |

| March 11: | (FOR 2013-14 only, the date will be September 1, 2013) The Provost's Office will forward to the program chairs electronic copies of the document needed to complete “Strategic Planning Goals” (Intellectual Strength category E). |

    Spring semester, by April 1, 2013: Programs on campus adopt the exit survey scale for use with their indirect assessment measures of their program outcomes. If programs do not have an exit survey, interview, or other indirect assessment measure for their program outcomes, they will develop these and use them to collect data during spring semester 2013 (Intellectual Strength category B). |

    Spring semester, by April: Program “chairs” are identified by departments for the purposes of Intellectual Strength category D, and their names are reported to the Provost and their dean. Program chairs remind faculty to update their c.v. (i.e. providing information for the previous three years only) for Intellectual Strength category D. |

| April 1, 2013: | (FOR 2013-14 only, the date will be September 1, 2013) Program Audit and Review Committee develops annual timelines and processes to utilize data reports, and reports to the Provost and Faculty Senate. |

    Spring semester, by May 15, 2013: Programs have implemented the use of the exit survey scale for Intellectual Strength category B (i.e. have used it to collect data). |

| May 22June 1: | Exit survey data is forwarded to the chair of the Program Audit and Review Committee (Intellectual Strength category B). |

| May 22August 29: | Programs forward assessment plans/reports to the Assessment Committee Chair (Intellectual Strength category A). |

    Spring semester, by end of contract year: Faculty will provide an updated c.v. (or provided the information in Sedona) to their “chair” for items related to professional engagement (Intellectual Strength category D). |

    Spring semester, by end of contract year: FOR 2013-14 only, the date will be October 1 Chairs forward one-page narrative (i.e. 2500 characters) to the Provost that discusses specifically how the program supports the strategic planning goals of the university (Intellectual Strength category E). |
June 20: **FOR 2013-14 only, the date will be October 15** Provost compiles and forwards one-page narratives to the deans that discuss specifically how the programs support the strategic planning goals of the university (Intellectual Strength category E).

June 30: **FOR 2013-14 only, the Provost will provide a separate timeline for activities related to Intellectual Strength Category D and communicate the dates to the chairs.** Chairs will send a compilation report for their programs of items under Intellectual Strength category D to the Provost (Note: it might be possible for chairs who prefer to relay this information by the end of the regular nine-month contract period to do so if they can encourage their faculty to update their c.v. information in a timely manner).

August 15: **FOR 2013-14 only, the Provost will provide a separate timeline for activities related to Intellectual Strength Category D and communicate the dates to the chairs.** Provost will provide an aggregate report of all program information for items under Intellectual Strength category D and send this information to all “chairs” and deans.

August 15: The Executive Director for the Division of Administrative Services will provide figures to chairs and deans showing the amount of space (Financial Strength category E.3) allocated to each department.

August 15: The Assistant Chancellor for Business and Finance will provide figures to chairs and deans showing the unique equipment costs (Financial Strength category E.4) allocated to each department.

August 15: Institutional Research will provide to each department chair and the deans the amount spent by each department on Human Resources (Financial Strength category E.1), the amount spent by each department on S&E (Financial Strength category E.2), student contact hours (for use with human resources and S&E, or Financial Strength categories E.1 and E.2, respectively), and the instructional staff FTE (for use with External Grants, or Financial Strength category C, Internal Grants, or Financial Strength category D, Space, or Financial Strength category E.3, and Unique Equipment Costs, or Financial Strength category E.4).

August 15: Accounting Services will provide the following to program chairs: External Grants (Financial Strength category C), and Internal Grants (Financial Strength category D).

August 20: **For 2013-14 only, the date will be November 15.** Deans and Provost provide recommended scores for “strategic planning” to the Provost (Intellectual Strength category E).

September 10: Departments with multiple programs will recommend to the dean the percentages of External Grants (Financial Strength category C), Internal Grants (Financial Strength category D), Human Resources (Financial Strength category E.1), S&E
(Financial Strength category E.2), Space (Financial Strength category E.3), and Unique Equipment Costs (Financial Strength category E.4) and FTE (used for multiple purposes) that will be assigned to each program.

**September 15:** For 2013-14 only, the Provost will provide a separate timeline for activities related to Intellectual Strength Category D and communicate the dates to the chairs. Chairs and deans will complete their scores of programs for Intellectual Strength category D, and send this information to the Provost.

**September 20:** For 2013-14 only, the date will be December 1. Provost reports final “strategic planning” scores to the Program Audit and Review Committee (Intellectual Strength category E).

September 30: Deans will communicate their approval or disapproval of the recommendations from departments with multiple programs regarding the percentages of External Grants (Financial Strength category C), Internal Grants (Financial Strength category D), Human Resources (Financial Strength category E.1), S&E (Financial Strength category E.2), Space (Financial Strength category E.3), and Unique Equipment Costs (Financial Strength category E.4), and FTE that will be assigned to each program, and provide their own decision regarding assignment of percentages in those cases where disapproval occurred.

**October 15:** For 2013-14 only, the Provost will provide a separate timeline for activities related to Intellectual Strength Category D and communicate the dates to the chairs. Provost will provide final scores for programs under Intellectual Strength category D, and send these to the Program Audit & Review Committee.

October 22: Program chairs will provide the following to the Program Audit and Review Committee: External Grants (Financial Strength category C), and Internal Grants (Financial Strength category D).

October 22: Institutional Research will provide the following to the Program Audit and Review Committee: the five-year trend of number of majors (Enrollment Strength category A), the five-year trend of the change of majors (Enrollment Strength category B), the five-year trend of the number of program graduates (Enrollment Strength category C), the five-year trend of median total credits to degree (Enrollment Strength category D), the five-year trend of median time to degree (Enrollment Strength category E), and the five-year trend of retention rate by program (Enrollment Strength category F).

November 1: Programs chairs will provide to the Program Audit and Review Committee the Human Resources (Financial Strength category E.1), S&E (Financial Strength category E.2), Space (Financial Strength category E.3), Unique Equipment Costs (Financial Strength category E.4) results.
November 1: Assessment Committee provides scores to the Program Audit and Review Committee (Intellectual Strength category A).

November 10: Institutional Research will provide the following to the Program Audit and Review Committee: Departmental Revenues-Program (Financial Strength category A), and Departmental Revenues-University (Financial Strength category B).

December 1: Program Audit & Review Committee will report to the Senate the progress made to incorporate instructional academic staff into Intellectual Strength category D, “The extent to which tenure-track faculty have remained actively engaged and up-to-date in their discipline” (the expectation is that such a measure will be developed no later than December 2015 and recommended to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee).

December 1: Program Audit and Review Committee will report to the Senate the progress made to develop a process to score Intellectual Strength category C, “The five year trend in percentage of employed and continuing education of graduates by major” (the expectation is that such a process will be recommended to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee).

December 1: Program Audit and Review Committee will report to the Senate the progress made to develop an alternative measure for Enrollment Strength “Five-year Trend of Retention Rate by Program,” category F (the expectations are that the alternative measure will be developed within three years and that it will capture second year to fourth year student retention rates, replacing the current measure). The alternative measure will be recommended to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

December 15: Program Audit & Review Committee will report final, overall program prioritization scores and rankings to the campus community (in particular, the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, and program chairs). All programs will be scored on a three-year cycle, but will be re-ranked annually. Rankings will be reported in four, equally-weighted categories, under the heading of “Prioritization: Prospects for Program Investment.”

**Prioritization: Prospects for Program Investment**

1. “Enhance”
2. “Maintain”
3. “Monitor”
4. “Eliminate, Reduce, Integrate, or Reorganize”
January 15: The Program Audit & Review Committee and the Assessment Committee will report/make recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Provost regarding the implementation of the program prioritization process and possible improvements.

February 14, 2014: Program Audit & Review Committee will report to the Senate regarding whether or not the use of Sedona (or another package if an alternative is adopted), should continue for Intellectual Strength category D, “The extent to which tenure-track faculty have remained actively engaged and up-to-date in their discipline.” If the Senate has not adopted one of these packages, the method that is used will be evaluated and a report to the Senate will occur by this date.

March 1: The Faculty Senate will consider any proposed changes to the program prioritization process for the next year’s implementation (i.e. the round of program prioritization that will “begin” during that spring semester).

By the end of year one of full implementation, the Assessment Committee will announce and then implement a cycle of program-level assessment that will occur on a three year cycle, with one-third being assessed each year. This assessment cycle will correspond to the rotational schedule used for program prioritization.