

**Scoring Rubric Draft, 4/18/08**  
**Prioritization Task Force**

---

**Note:** A holistic rubric is proposed for evaluation of the program criteria. The language of the specific categories is still under revision, but the general plan is to avoid formal weightings of the components within the criteria.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>8 – 10</b>	<b>5 – 7</b>	<b>2 – 4</b>	<b>0 - 1</b>
<b>I. Mission and vision</b>	There is evidence that the program activities described provide outstanding support for the mission and vision of Humboldt State University.	There is evidence that the program activities described provide strong and meaningful support for the mission and vision of Humboldt State University.	There is evidence that the program activities described provide some meaningful support for the mission and vision of Humboldt State University.	There is little or no evidence of activities related to the mission and vision of Humboldt State.
<b>II. Demand</b> Scores may be differentiated by degree option.	There is evidence of strong internal <u>and</u> external demand for the program.	There is evidence of strong internal <u>or</u> external demand for the program.	There is evidence that internal and external demand is sufficient, but not strong for the program.	There is evidence that neither internal nor external demand for the program is sufficient to justify the level at which the program is supported.
<b>III. Program Quality</b>	The evidence demonstrates a variety of strengths in the program, including but not limited to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong student engagement and achievement,</li> <li>• relevant faculty expertise and activity,</li> <li>• effective pedagogy and curriculum, and</li> <li>• advantageous use of HSU environment.</li> </ul>	The evidence demonstrates at least three areas of strength in the program, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong student engagement and achievement,</li> <li>• relevant faculty expertise and activity,</li> <li>• effective pedagogy and curriculum, and</li> <li>• opportunistic use of HSU environment.</li> </ul>	The evidence demonstrates at least two areas of strength in the program, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong student engagement and achievement,</li> <li>• relevant faculty expertise and activity,</li> <li>• effective pedagogy and curriculum, and</li> <li>• opportunistic use of HSU environment.</li> </ul>	The evidence provides limited support for strength or quality in the program.

<b>IV. Costs/Efficiencies</b> Scores may be differentiated by option, if appropriate.	The evidence indicates that the program is in the top one quarter of HSU programs in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high revenues.	The evidence indicates that the program is in the third quartile of HSU programs in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high revenues.	The evidence indicates that the program is in the second quartile of HSU programs in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high revenues.	The evidence indicates that the program is in the bottom one quarter of HSU programs in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high revenues.
<b>V. Potential</b>	The evidence given shows strong potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.	The evidence given shows moderate potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.	The evidence given shows weak potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.	The evidence given shows a lack of potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.
<b>VI. Other</b>	The additional evidence clearly suggests that a program should be receive a much more favorable evaluation	The additional evidence suggests that a program should be receive a more favorable evaluation	The additional evidence may suggest that a program should be receive a slightly more favorable evaluation	The additional evidence is not clearly relevant to program prioritization

#### Draft Weightings

I.	Mission and Vision	15%
II.	Demand	15%
III.	Quality	30%
IV.	Costs/Efficiencies	20%
V.	Potential	15%
VI.	Other	5%

Note: If the “other” category is not used, 5% weight will be added to the criteria which is of greatest benefit to the overall program score.