February 6, 2014

To: Dean Van Galen, Chancellor
   116 North Hall
   University of Wisconsin-River Falls

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

Re: UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2013-14/47

At the February 5, 2014 meeting of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls Faculty Senate, motion 2013-14/47 was passed and is effective immediately. The motion is forwarded to you for you action.

A motion from the Executive Committee to revise the Program Prioritization and Program Audit and Review Process/Document. The revisions are indicated on the appended document.

Approved ✅

Disapproved

Dean Van Galen, Chancellor

2/12/14
Date
Definitory Disputes: Whether definitory issues will be resolved through consultation between the Provost’s Office and the Faculty will serve as the deadline. If a calendar deadline happens to fall on a weekend or holiday, the next business day (e.g., regular workday, Monday-Friday).

Documents, data, scoring sheets, and so on will be released by the Provost’s Office that allows members of the university community to access the materials used in PDP+PR activities (e.g., communications regarding PDP+PR are provided to the university community. A secure, password-protected site will be created by the Provost’s Office to ensure transparency, the Provost’s Office will have primary responsibility to ensure it services the needs of the university.

Committee and Records: To ensure transparency, the Provost’s Office will be responsible for the oversight and implementation of this plan.

Working definitions: The Provost’s Office, along with the administration, will work to establish a six-year program audit and review process that is linked to, and

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

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

Staff categorizations have been identified: intellectual strength, enrollment strength, and financial strength.

Program Evaluation and Program Audit and Review
Process begins for a given year for a given position. Data for less than three years will be available for several years. Such situations will be specified beforehand. If expected that for some items, new measures are being developed, such as the use of a standardized scale for surveys.

It is expected that for some items, new measures are being developed, such as the use of a standardized scale for surveys.

**Timeline for data:** Data will be collected for the previous three years, where available, unless specified otherwise for a particular course.

- All programs will be used for PEP purposes.
- The package that is used will have a single template or set of catalogues for software prescriptions. Selection of a similar package will be based on the data where appropriate descriptions for software prescriptions are used.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>0</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00-0.1</td>
<td>018-019</td>
<td>67.6-68.1</td>
<td>69.2-69.7</td>
<td>70.8-71.3</td>
<td>72.4-72.9</td>
<td>74.0-74.5</td>
<td>75.6-76.1</td>
<td>77.2-77.7</td>
<td>78.8-79.3</td>
<td>80.4-80.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chart will report the resulting data on an overall percentage basis (i.e., the percentage of overall responses scoring in each of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score for this factor is computed in the previous cycle, and will be used for each survey. In years that a program is not "rescored" overall, it will remain

Outcome: Each program will administer an exit survey to graduating students that provides indirect measures of program learning.
Representative examples of items to include are:

- 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).

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).

E. The five-year trend in percent of employed and continuing education of graduates by major.
A Five-Year Trend of Number of Majors in a Program Divided by Total Majors on Campus, Reported as a Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Sixth of Programs</th>
<th>Fifth of Programs</th>
<th>Fourth of Programs</th>
<th>Third of Programs</th>
<th>Second of Programs</th>
<th>First of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Timeline:** See overall timeline at end of document
Points: Forty points are allocated to this measure.

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

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

Examples of this in the "working definitions" section include "scoring categories." Scoring categories will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points. Scoring categories will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points. Scoring categories will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points. Scoring categories will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points. Scoring categories will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points. Scoring categories will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points. Scoring categories will be placed onto the continuum to determine its points.
Points: Thirty points are allocated to this measure.

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

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

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.
E. Human Resources: FTE, IAS, Lab Managers, Graduate Assistants, and Support Staff (Note: all of the factors below are calculated as three-year averages)

E.1. Departmental Costs

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.

The working definitions section includes "scoring categories.

Subsequently, each program's financial report will be placed onto the continuum to determine its position (see example of this in.

The resultant range will be divided into 10 discrete and equal weighted categories spanning from one point and ending with ten points.

E.1. Departmental Costs (Note: all of the factors below are calculated as three-year averages)
Points: Twenty points are allocated to this measure.

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

Timeline: See overall timeline at end of document.
copies of the document needed to complete "Strategic Planning Goals (Intellectual Strength category E)",

March 11: FOR 2013-14 only, the deadline will be September 1, 2013.

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

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

Faculty Senate, Executive Committee.

November 1, 2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.

2013: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will determine the other departmental programs to be scored using a random method applied in a meeting open to the public. For departments having 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, chairs, and others.

This information will be communicated to the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate, deans, department chairs, and the assessment committee members.
and Review Committee (Intellectual Strength category E). September 20: For 2013-14 only, the date will be December 1. Proposal reports must be submitted at least 60 days before this date. Departments with multiple programs will provide a separate timeline for each program.

Categories F, E.4, and E.5 (used for multiple purposes) will be assigned to each program. 

External Resources (Financial Strength category C), Financial Resources (Financial Strength category C), Internal Grants (Financial Strength category C), and Human Resources (Financial Strength category C). 

Proposal reports will provide a separate timeline for each program.

August 20: For 2013-14 only, the date will be November 15. 

August 20: For 2013-14 only, the date will be December 1. Proposal reports must be submitted at least 60 days before this date. Departments with multiple programs will provide a separate timeline for each program.

External Grants (Financial Strength category C), and Internal Grants (Financial Strength category C).

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

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) allocated to each department.

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) allocated to each department.

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) allocated to each department.

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) allocated to each department.
March 1: The Faculty Senate will consider any proposed changes to the program prioritization process for the next year.

Method that is used will be evaluated and a report to the Senate will occur by this date.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Provoset Recommended the implementation of the program prioritization process and possible

Improvements:

Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Provosts Regarding the implementation of the program prioritization process and possible

January 15: The Program Audit & Review Committee and the Assessment Committee will report their recommendations to the

Prioritization: Proposed for Program Investment

Prioritization: Proposed for Program Investment

December 15: Program Audit & Review Committee will report their overall program prioritization scores and rankings to the campus

December 1: Program Audit & Review Committee will report to the Senate the progress made to develop a process to score

Explanation is that a process will be recommended to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Intellectual Strength Category C, “The Five Year Trend in Performance of Employed and Continuing Education of Graduates by Major” (the

December 1: Program Audit & Review Committee will report to the Senate the progress made to develop a process to score