FS 10-71/Ex.   POLICY ON INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES:
                    ACADEMIC PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND
                    ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT, AMENDMENT OF

Supercedes UMI 07100; INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES; GUIDELINES FOR
ACADEMIC PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND ENROLLMENT
MANAGMENT.

The following policy proposal was initially prepared by the Task Force on Possible Revisions to
University Policy on Instructional Priorities and Resource Allocation. The Task Force was
created by President Gonzalez after a recommendation from the Faculty Senate (FS 09-86/Flr),
and the charge of the Task Force was endorsed by the Senate on 2/25/10 (FS 10-17/Ex). After
the Task Force concluded its work, the Faculty Senate took action to receive the proposal FS 10-
71/Ex.) and distributed it to its standing policy committees and to the Senate for review and
comment. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee then reviewed the feedback and amended
the original Task Force proposal.

Academic Program Priorities

I. UNIVERSITY-WIDE PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

It is the responsibility of the University to establish University-wide priorities among its
academic programs in order to guide the allocation of resources across the University. These
priorities shall be established using the criteria described in this policy. The decisions regarding
priorities shall be made in an open and transparent way utilizing data provided by the programs
being prioritized as well as data provided by other sources. These decisions shall be made under
the principles of shared governance between the Faculty Senate and the Administration, after
prior consultation with the Colleges, programs. Each academic department shall be responsible
for describing how its programs contribute to the Mission of the University, as well as to the
desired balance and mix of programs offered by the University. The prioritization process shall
examine programs holistically, using both qualitative and quantitative data. While any
prioritization process must necessarily be driven by the qualitative and quantitative data, *data are
not to be a substitute for exercising sound judgment.*

Any implementation of program prioritization shall be carried out under the following guiding
principles:
1. *Transparency*: All decisions shall be made in an open and transparent fashion, based upon
   evidence.
2. *Comprehensiveness*: To the extent allowed by available information, all aspects of a program
   will be examined during the prioritization process.
3. *Consistency*: The same criteria will be used to evaluate each program for prioritization; data
   will be considered in the reports holistically, without assigning particular weights to given
   categories or criteria.
4. *Inclusiveness*: All programs within Academic Affairs shall be evaluated and all faculty and
   staff shall have the opportunity to have input into the analysis of their programs.

5. *Utilization of Data:* Prioritization of programs will be based on examination of both quantitative and qualitative data provided by the programs and other sources.

II. DESIRED BALANCE AND MIX OF PRIORITY PROGRAM CATEGORIES

For the purposes of this policy, a program is defined to be; a unit within Academic Affairs that uses resources from Academic Affairs and which either: offers majors, minors, or certificates; or provides resources to students. Under this definition, departments and divisions within Academic Affairs *are not* programs; however majors, minors and certificates *are* programs. Non-degree granting academic units such as the University Library, Learning Skills, and other special academic Centers are also considered programs.

General Education (GE) is mandated by Title V and cannot be prioritized as an independent program, but components of the GE program housed within departments will be recognized/evaluated.

Graduate programs are an essential part of the mission of the California State University (CSU System Mission Statement) and of the mission of California State University, Sacramento (California State University, Sacramento Mission Statement). As such, a high priority is placed on maintaining a viable graduate program with a mix of graduate programs that is appropriate to a comprehensive, metropolitan university. To assure continued viability of graduate education at California State University, Sacramento, the University shall maintain a minimum degree-seeking graduate enrollment of 10% of the FTE of the University. In addition, the University shall maintain a minimum of 5% of the FTE of the University in postbaccalaureate credential and certificate programs, if consistent with and justified by regional need and agency data (e.g., the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing). Consistent with Section III below, second baccalaureate students shall be counted in undergraduate FTEs. The proportion of graduate and postbaccalaureate enrollment may be increased above these levels, but enrollment shall not exceed the maximum level permitted by CSU system mandates.

III. PRIORITIES WITHIN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY

The University is committed to offering undergraduate programs leading to a baccalaureate degree in selected disciplines. This includes first and subsequent baccalaureate degrees. Nine criteria are specified for the purpose of comparing undergraduate programs across the University. The criteria are broad in nature and are selected to capture as much information as possible about programs, in order to take into account the size, scope and nature of each program. In this way, decisions made regarding priorities are to be made in a way that is both informed, and transparent to the programs being prioritized. These criteria have been adapted from Dickeson(2010). For each criterion some examples of information/data are given, to illustrate how programs may choose to respond to the criterion. Not all of these examples will be relevant to every program on the campus and in such cases those examples should be ignored by such programs when responding to the criterion. When prioritizing programs within undergraduate education across the University, the following criteria shall be used to compare undergraduate programs:

- Program history and development status
  What is the context of the program, to inform the subsequent criteria. Is the program young and still building to meet expectations or is it a fully mature program and capable of adapting to changing demands? Has the program considered what lies in its future?
  - Level of program development (*e.g.* young, growing, mature)
  - Ability of program to adapt to current demands
  - Future goals of program

- Impact, justification and centrality to University mission.
  In what ways does the program fulfill the University's mission? Is the program unique in our region? Does the program add to the distinctiveness of our campus? Does the program serve a unique demographic or societal function?

- External demand for the program
  How does the program support community engagement with the campus? What is the demand for the program's resources and expertise? What are the local trends in enrollment? What is the demand from employers, or from graduate schools?

- Internal demand for the program
  What is the demand for the program's courses from other programs on campus? Does the program produce other services used by different programs in the home department or in other departments? How do the program's courses fulfill demand for general education on campus?
  - Service courses
  - GE courses
  - Research resources

- Quality of program
  How does the program use its resources to carry out its mission? Are those resources used efficiently and effectively? Is the program curriculum appropriate to breadth, depth and level of the discipline? How does the program use technology?
  - Faculty and Staff qualifications
  - Faculty Productivity
    - Teaching effectiveness, research & scholarly activity, service
  - External assessment and accreditation.
  - Percent of instruction by full time faculty
  - Curriculum
  - Use of technology as appropriate for discipline
    - Success in adapting technology to pedagogy
    - Student currency in discipline-specific technology
    - Ability to meet future technology demands of discipline
  - Access to and utilization of resources
  - Collaboration across program lines that improves the quality of programs.
    - Working with other Programs
    - Effective sharing of resources

- - Facilitating student access to Programs

- Student learning outcomes assessment and student success
  Are student learning outcomes achieved? How well do students do after graduation (employment, graduate school, professional licensing and/or certification)?
  - Student outcomes
    - Graduation rate, impact on community, etc…

- Program size, scope, productivity
  Number of majors, number of FTES. How many degrees or certificates are awarded? Are the program's resources and faculty expertise appropriate to support and enhance the breadth and depth of university curriculum?
  - Relative to campus standards, or national standards, as appropriate

- Revenue and other resources generated by program
  What sorts of revenues does the program generate, to be compared with costs. What are the other, non-monetary resources generated (e.g. relationships with outside institutions)?
  - Enrollment
  - Research grants, in-kind equipment donations, fundraising
  - Potential revenue (gifts, alumni support)
  - Value of other services and resources provided

- Costs and other expenses of program
  A criterion not to be examined independently from the others, but to provide context. Consider both indirect and direct costs. What steps has the program taken to improve efficiency? What kind of investment is needed to improve the program?
  - Dollars per FTES
  - Dollars per degree produced
  - Dollars per program

IV. PRIORITIES WITHIN GRADUATE EDUCATION ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY

The University is committed to offering graduate programs leading to the master's, doctoral or terminal degree, or postbaccalaureate credential in selected disciplines.
Nine criteria are specified for the purpose of comparing graduate programs across the University. The criteria are broad in nature and are selected to capture as much information as possible about programs, in order to take into account the size, scope and nature of each program. In this way, decisions made regarding priorities are to be made in a way that is both informed, and transparent to the programs being prioritized. These criteria have been adapted from Dickeson (2010). For each criterion some examples of information/data are given, to illustrate how programs may choose to respond to the criterion. Not all of these examples will be relevant to every program on the campus and in such cases those examples should be ignored by such programs when responding to the criterion. When prioritizing programs within graduate

education across the University, the following criteria shall be used to compare graduate programs:

- Program history and development status
  What is the context of the program, to inform the subsequent criteria. Is the program young and still building to meet expectations or is it a fully mature program and capable of adapting to changing demands? Has the program considered what lies in its future?
  o Level of program development (*e.g.* young, growing, mature)
  o Ability of program to adapt to current demands
  o Future goals of program

- Impact, justification and centrality to University mission.
  In what ways does the program fulfill the University's mission? Is the program unique in our region? Does the program add to the distinctiveness of our campus? Does the program serve a unique demographic or societal function?

- External demand for the program
  How does the program support community engagement with the campus? What is the demand for the program's resources and expertise? What are the local trends in enrollment? What is the demand from employers, or from graduate schools?

- Internal demand for the program
  What is the demand for the program's courses from other programs on campus? Does the program produce other services used by different programs in the home department or in other departments?
  o Service courses
  o Research resources

- Quality of program
  How does the program use its resources to carry out its mission? Are those resources used efficiently and effectively? Does the program attract students who are ready to succeed in graduate study? Is the program curriculum appropriate to breadth, depth and level of the discipline? How does the program use technology?
  o Faculty and Staff qualifications
  o Faculty productivity
    ▪ Teaching effectiveness, research & scholarly activity, service
  o External assessment and accreditation
  o Percent of instruction by full time faculty
  o Quality of students attracted to program
  o Curriculum
  o Use of technology as appropriate for discipline
    ▪ Success in adapting technology to pedagogy
    ▪ Student currency in discipline-specific technology
    ▪ Ability to meet future technology demands of discipline
  o Access to and utilization of resources
  o Collaboration across program lines that improves the quality of programs.

- Working with other Programs
- Effective sharing of resources
- Facilitating student access to Programs

- Student learning outcomes assessment and student success
  Are student learning outcomes achieved? How well do students do after graduation (employment, graduate school, professional licensing and/or certification).
  - Student outcomes
    - Graduation rate, impact on community, etc…

- Program size, scope, productivity
  Number of active graduate students, number of FTES. How many degrees or certificates are awarded? Are the program's resources and faculty expertise appropriate to support and enhance the breadth and depth of university curriculum? Is size of program faculty appropriate to breadth and depth of curriculum?
  - Relative to campus standards, or national standards, as appropriate

- Revenue and other resources generated by program
  What sorts of revenues does the program generate, to be compared with costs. What are the other, non-monetary resources generated (e.g. relationships with outside institutions)?
  - Enrollment
  - Research grants, in-kind equipment donations, fundraising
  - Potential revenue (gifts, alumni support)
  - Value of other services and resources provided

- Costs and other expenses of program
  A criterion not to be examined independently from the others, but to provide context. Consider both indirect and direct costs. What steps has the program taken to improve efficiency? What kind of investment is needed to improve the program?
  - Dollars per FTES
  - Dollars per degree produced
  - Dollars per program

V. PRIORITIES WITHIN OTHER ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Academic programs that exist to support students and faculty in successfully accomplishing the goals of undergraduate and graduate programs shall also be evaluated. To the degree possible for each program in question, the same criteria shall be applied as for undergraduate and graduate programs. For example, as the Library does not offer a major program, graduation rate is not an appropriate criterion, but other measures of student outcomes will be.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY

The process of making recommendations for academic prioritization shall result in undergraduate and graduate programs (separately) being grouped into quartiles based upon the

criteria. Such grouping will be done by a Senate Select Committee which may solicit input from the Curriculum Policies Committee and the Graduate Studies Policies Committee on the implementation of the criteria prior to initial and/or final prioritization of programs. The Senate Select Committee may, in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs, create guidelines for presenting information for all Programs. Programs may produce additional reports using qualitative and quantitative data that address the criteria in whatever manner they deem appropriate. The Senate Select Committee will consider the data in the reports holistically, without assigning particular weights to given categories or criteria. The Senate Select Committee shall recommend program prioritization across university units.

It is the charge of a Faculty Senate Select Committee (formed for these purposes) to examine the data and make recommendations, as both are described in this policy. The first such Select Committee shall be formed following both the passage of this policy and the collection of data. The data shall be collected, from Departments, by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Membership of the Senate Select Committee shall invite Administrators with Program responsibility such as Deans to participate in the process. Chairs are not intended to serve this role.

Upon approval of this policy, an initial call for data as described in this policy will go to Departments from the Office of Academic Affairs. A separate process for the ongoing and periodic gathering of such data, including review by programs and the archiving of data, will be developed by the Office of Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Faculty Senate.

Subsequent to the completion of the work of the first such Select Committee, the question of whether or not to form a new Select Committee for these same purposes shall be brought to the Faculty Senate on a periodic basis. Normally, this question shall be considered no later than five years after the last such committee completed its work and was disbanded, or five years after the question was most recently considered by the Faculty Senate, whichever comes later.

Interested parties may petition the Faculty Senate, via its Executive Committee, to consider the question of forming a Select Committee for the purposes outlined in this policy prior to the described five year period elapsing.

Producing the recommendations for prioritization shall be a two stage process, specifically designed to allow programs to respond to the recommendations before any final decisions are made. Final Senate Select Committee recommendations will then be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for receipt of its report and to the President for disposition.

1. An initial recommendation for prioritization will be made based upon data collected from the Office of Institutional Research and other institutional sources, and information/data provided by the programs being prioritized.
    a. All programs shall have the opportunity to provide their data in a timely fashion.
    b. The information/data provided must be organized according to the criteria used in forming the recommendations for prioritization, and it must be made clear how the information/data inform the criteria.

c. Each program shall be grouped into quartiles under each of the criteria. The recommendation for the preliminary overall grouping of each program shall be based upon the program's relative standings in each of the criteria, taken as a whole.

2. After the initial recommendation for prioritization is finished and before the final recommendation is made, the initial recommendation shall be made available in an open and transparent manner to the University community.
   a. Enough information shall be made available so that the assignments of programs to quartiles are known, and programs can understand how the initial assignments were achieved.
   b. Before a final recommendation is made, every program shall be given sufficient time to prepare a response to its grouping. The response may include supplemental information not previously provided in any of the criteria, and may address the issue of incomplete or inaccurate information being used in the initial recommendation.
   c. With the supplemental information given due consideration, each program shall again be grouped into quartiles under each of the criteria. A final grouping of all programs into quartiles shall be done based upon the programs' relative standings in each of the criteria, taken as a whole.

After the final recommendation is made, the results shall be made available in an open and transparent manner to the University community, with enough information being made available so that the assignments of programs to quartiles are known, and programs can understand how the assignments were achieved.

RESOURCES USED

Dickeson, Robert C.; Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services; 2010; Jossey-Bass

California State University Mission Statement: www.calstate.edu/PA/info/mission.shtml

California State University, Sacramento Mission Statement: www.csus.edu/webpages/mission.stm

California State University Policy Manual, Policy UMI07100 "Instructional Programs Priorities; Academic Planning Resource Allocation and Enrollment Management": www.csus.edu/umanual/UMI07100.htm

University of Southern Mississippi, University Priorities Committee Plan: www.usm.edu/upc/upc_charge.pdf

Indiana State University, Program Prioritization: www.indstate.edu/academicaffairs/program_prioritization.htm

Humboldt State University, Program Elimination Criteria: www.humboldt.edu/~anstud/PEC2010.html