

MEMORANDUM

To: *All Interested Parties*: Academic Senate, College Councils of Chairs, Staff Council, Associated Students
From: Prioritization Task Force
Subject: Revised Criteria: Request for Weightings
Date: 14 March 2008

Based on input received from numerous sources (Senate Committee on Educational Policies, University Curriculum Committee, Associated Students, Staff Council, Graduate Council, Academic Deans, and others), our Prioritization Task Force has developed a set of draft criteria that we believe may be appropriate for evaluation of academic programs at HSU. We have attached this set of draft criteria and we seek your input in two specific respects:

- 1) We seek further comments on the main criteria (Linkage with HSU Mission and Vision; Demand for Program; Program Quality; Synergy/Broader Impacts of Program; Program Costs, Revenues, and Efficiencies; Program Potential/Opportunity Analysis) that we have proposed and/or on specific items included under these main criteria; and
- 2) We seek your recommendations on the numerical weightings that each of the main criteria should receive.

We request that you respond to us using the attached file, "Submit Recommendations" as a template, and that you communicate your responses to us by Wednesday, April 2.

A work in progress

First, we wish to state that, in the attached document, we may have provided *too much* (too many questions, too many examples) rather than *too little*. Please feel free to suggest substantial revision of items listed under various criteria, to suggest additional criteria, or to provide explicit suggestions for how we might standardize responses to criteria in program reports. The attached document is a *work in progress* and substantial campus involvement will be required before we can develop a final set of criteria and weights which accurately reflects the sense of our campus community and will be fully appropriate for HSU.

How will scoring and weighting work?

In the formal Program Prioritization Process, programs will be scored on each criterion with an initial **criterion rating score** on a 1-10 basis, with 1 being lowest and 10 being highest. A particular criterion rating score would then be multiplied by a **criterion weight** so as to generate a **total criterion score**. The sum of the total criterion scores across all criteria would generate an overall **total program score**. Total program scores would be used as the primary basis for assignment into one of four categories (Enhance Resource Allocation, Maintain Resource Allocation, Reduce Resource Allocation,

Reorganize or Discontinue), as indicated in our 14 March 2008 revised draft of the Program Prioritization Process (Item 9), also attached. To simplify our interpretation of the weightings that you suggest to us, we ask that the weights range from 5 – 50 so that the maximum relative weight of one criterion compared to another would be 10:1. The sum of all weights must be 100. A sample weighting of criteria is included in the attached file, “Submit Recommendations.”

We cannot overemphasize the importance of the weightings that will be used to generate total program scores. If, for example, the weight applied to the Program Costs, Revenues, and Efficiencies were 50 and the weight applied to Program Quality were 5, then the total criterion score for the cost-efficiency of a program would greatly exceed that for program quality, and vice versa. Because we believe that it is critical to receive input concerning weightings from the entire academic community, we will be taking the initial input that we receive from you, proposing draft criterion weightings, and will then seek input via a Task Force-organized town hall meeting to be held on or about April 16.

What reports will departments prepare?

Departments will be responsible for production of individual academic program reports for those programs specified by the Task Force in consultation with departments and their dean. (The Task Force will confirm the list of academic programs for each department by April 30.) Each of these program reports, approximately 10 pages in length, will address the six program criteria and would be scored in the manner described above.

In addition to these individual program reports, department chairs or appropriate administrators would also be asked to prepare a departmental report which will include: department history, mission, and goals; various data and statistics from Analytic Studies; norms for delivery of curriculum in the discipline; and departmental actions on assessment, recruitment, and retention. This report would be use by the Prioritization Task Force to provide the broader context or setting within which specific departmental programs are found. At various places in the attached document, you will find references to this departmental report. Among other things, the departmental report will provide estimates of the proportions of departmental faculty resources and costs that are devoted to specific programs.

We believe that our Task Force has achieved sufficient agreement concerning program evaluation criteria that we can distribute our working draft of evaluation criteria. But we do not feel that we have yet achieved sufficient agreement regarding the proposed content of departmental reports to warrant distributing a draft for comment at this time. We hope to do so within the next two weeks.